

John Slater Planning

# Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2029

---

## Submission Version

A Report to Chichester District Council on the Examination of the  
Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan

John Slater BA (Hons), DMS, MRTPI

John Slater Planning

[johnslaterplanning@gmail.com](mailto:johnslaterplanning@gmail.com)

23<sup>rd</sup> October 2015

## Contents

	Page
Introduction	3
The Examiner's Role	3
The Examination Process	5
The Consultation Process	5
Regulation 16 Consultation	6
The Basic Conditions	6
Compliance with the Development Plan	7
Compatibility with EU Obligations and Human Rights Legislation	8
The Neighbourhood Plan: An Overview	9
Policy 1 A Spatial Plan for the Parish	10
Policy 2 Strategic Housing Development	11
Policy 3 Employment Uses	15
Policy 4 Tangmere Academy	15
Policy 5 The Yews, City Fields Way	16
Policy 6 Tangmere Aviation Museum	16
Policy 7 Land to the West of Malcolm Road	17
Policy 8 Tangmere Green Infrastructure Network	18
Policy 9 Tangmere Sustainable Movement Network	18
Policy 10 Design	19
The Referendum Area	19
Summary	19

## Introduction

Neighbourhood planning is a process introduced by the Localism Act 2011 which allows local communities to create the policies which will shape the places where they live and work. The Neighbourhood Plan provides the community with the opportunity to allocate land for particular purposes and to prepare the policies which will be used in the determination of planning applications in their area. Once a neighbourhood plan is made, it will form part of the statutory development plan alongside, in the case of Chichester District outside the South Downs National Park, the recently adopted Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014- 2029. Decision makers are required to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The neighbourhood plan making process has been led by The Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, made up of Parish Councillors, the District and County Councillor and members of the West of Village Landowning Consortium who formed a series of Working Groups. The Steering Group was appointed to undertake the plan preparation on behalf of Tangmere Parish Council which is a “qualifying body” under the Neighbourhood Planning legislation.

This report is the outcome of my examination of the Submission Version of the Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan. My report will make recommendations based on my findings on whether the Plan should go forward to a referendum. If the plan then receives the support of over 50% of those voting at the referendum then the Plan will be “made” by Chichester District Council, which is the Local Planning Authority.

## The Examiner’s Role

I was formally appointed by Chichester District Council in August 2015, with the agreement of the Parish Council, to conduct this examination. My role is known as Independent Examiner. My selection has been facilitated by the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service which is administered by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS)

In order for me to be appointed to this role, I am required to be appropriately experienced and qualified. I have over 37 years’ experience as a planning practitioner, primarily working in local government, which included 8 years as a Head of Planning at a large unitary authority on the south coast, but latterly as an independent planning consultant. I am a Chartered Town Planner and a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute. I am independent of both Chichester District

## John Slater Planning

Council and Tangmere Parish Council and I can confirm that I have no interest in any land that is affected by the Neighbourhood Plan.

Under the terms of the neighbourhood planning legislation I am required to make one of three possible recommendations:

- That the plan should proceed to referendum on the basis that it meets all the legal requirements.
- That the plan should proceed to referendum if modified
- That the plan should not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet all the legal requirements.

Furthermore, if I am to conclude that the Plan should proceed to referendum I need to consider whether the area covered by the referendum should extend beyond the boundaries of area covered by the Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan area.

In examining the Plan, the Independent Examiner is expected to address the following questions

- a. Do the policies relate to the development and use of land for a Designated Neighbourhood Plan area in accordance with Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004?
- b. Does the Neighbourhood Plan meet the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 namely that it specifies the period to which it is to have effect? It must not relate to matters which are referred to as “excluded development” and also that it must not cover more than one Neighbourhood Plan area.
- c. Has the Neighbourhood Plan been prepared for an area designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted by a qualifying body.

I am able to confirm that the Plan, if amended in line with my recommendations, does relate to the development and use of land covering the area designated by Chichester District Council for The Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2013.

I can also confirm that it does specify the period over which the plan has effect namely the period between 2014 and 2029.

I can confirm that the plan does not cover any “excluded development”.

There are no other neighbourhood plans covering the area covered by the Plan designation.

Tangmere Parish Council as a parish council is a qualifying body under the terms of the legislation.

## **The Examination Process**

The presumption is that the neighbourhood plan will proceed by way of an examination of written evidence only. However, the Examiner can ask for a public hearing in order to hear oral evidence on matters which he or she wishes to explore further or if a person has a fair chance to put a case.

I am required to give reasons for each of my recommendations and also provide a summary of my main conclusions.

I am satisfied that I am in a position to properly examine the plan without the need for a hearing. No parties have requested a hearing. I did during the course of the examination invite further written representations from the Parish Council and the Local Planning Authority in respect of various matters which I will refer to in the relevant sections of my report. The relevant exchange of correspondence was placed on both the District Council and on the Parish Councils' respective websites.

I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the area on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2015 to familiarise myself with the village and I viewed all the sites referred to in the Plan. Following the receipt of the further representations I did make a second visit to the parish to view the site covered by Policy 7 and the land to the west of Saxon Meadow.

## **The Consultation Process**

The Consultation Statement describes how the neighbourhood planning exercise has been carried out. The process commenced with a public meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2014. This established 6 working groups whose initial work lead to the compilation of a public questionnaire which was sent to every home in the village. A total of 476 written returns and 51 electronic returns were received, representing 27% of the households in the parish- a very commendable response rate for such an exercise. The results from the questionnaire were analysed and helped inform the Pre Submission Consultation Version of the plan – the Regulation 14 Consultation. The consultation period for that draft plan was between 10<sup>th</sup> October 2014 and 21<sup>st</sup> November 2014. It was launched at a public meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2014 with a drop in session the following day. Additional publicity was given to the consultation through newsletters to every home and advertisements in the local press. Similarly, all the usual statutory bodies were consulted.

## John Slater Planning

The Consultation Statement sets out the response to the consultations and summarises the responses received both from residents and other bodies and stakeholders and sets out how the plan was to be amended to take account of the feedback received which were then incorporated in to the Submission Version of the Plan- the Regulation 16 Consultation.

I am fully satisfied that there has been full and proper consultation during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and that all stakeholders have had an ample opportunity to comment and influence the Neighbourhood Plan.

### **Regulation 16 Consultation**

I have had regard, in carrying out this examination, to the comments made during the period of final consultation which took place between 30<sup>th</sup> April 2015 and 11<sup>th</sup> June 2015. This consultation was organised by Chichester District Council who had received the Submitted Plan, prior to it being passed to me for its examination. This stage is known as the Regulation 16 Consultation.

In total 14 responses were received and a number were either entirely supportive or offered no objections / comments. A number of representations were made on behalf of major landowners who had detailed comments about the wording of the document and detailed comments came from one of the infrastructure providers, Southern Water. Only one representation was received from a local resident to this final stage consultation. I will refer to the results of the Regulation 16 consultation where relevant in the specific sections dealing with the Proposed Policies.

### **The Basic Conditions Test**

The neighbourhood planning examination process is different to a Local Plan examination, in that the test is not one of “soundness”. The Neighbourhood Plan is tested against what is known as the Basic Conditions which are set down in legislation. It will be against these that my examination must focus.

The 5 questions which constitute the basic conditions test seek to establish that the Neighbourhood Plan: -

- Has had regard to the national policies and advice contained in the guidance issued by the Secretary of State
- Will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development
- Will be in general conformity with the strategic policies set out in the Development Plan for the area?

- Does not breach or is otherwise incompatible with EU obligations or human rights legislation?
- Whether the making of the Plan will have a significant effect upon a European site or a European offshore marine site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

### Compliance with the Development Plan

To meet the basic conditions test, the Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Development Plan, which in this case is the Chichester Local Plan – Key Policies, 2014-29. Of particular relevance is the section from Page 111 to 119 dealing with the Tangmere Strategic Development Location and especially Policy 18 entitled Tangmere Strategic Development Location and Policy 19 headed Tangmere Strategic Employment Land. These two policies set the strategic framework for the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan was being prepared in parallel with the examination of the Local Plan, which was only adopted on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2015 which came after the Regulation 16 Consultation. Whilst I had been chosen at that stage to examine the plan, the examination process had not commenced but I did ask that all parties who had made representations on the Regulation 16 submission, should be asked whether the final adoption of the local plan led them to wish to alter their representations. That consultation was carried out before the plan was forwarded to me and no parties wished to change their representations. Accordingly, for the purpose of assessing the Basic Conditions I will test the plans against the strategic policies of the new plan. The Plan has in a number of places made reference to the Chichester *District* Local Plan and this should be changed to reflect the actual title of the Plan.

The text of the Neighbourhood Plan states that once “made”, it will replace the Local Plan. That is not totally accurate and this is a point made in a number of representations. Once “made” the Neighbourhood Plan will sit alongside the Local Plan. The relationship between the two plans follows the principles set out in paragraph 185 of the NPPF, which states that “once the Neighbourhood Plan has demonstrated its general conformity with the strategic policies in the Local Plan and has been brought into force, the policies it contains take precedence over existing non strategic policies in the Local Plan for that neighbourhood, where they are in conflict”.

The Plan includes a Policies Plan with an Insert Plan covering the western part of the village. It has been suggested that a more accurate description of what the Inset Plan is seeking to show would be a Concept Plan. The Parish Council has indicated that it is prepared to agree to this change and I will be recommending it being retitled accordingly. In addition, there is an area shaded dark pink on the Policies Plan

## John Slater Planning

without being identified on the key. It has been suggested that this may have been a site identified at the pre submission version in the plan and should be removed from the plan.

### **Recommendations**

All references to the Chichester *District* Local Plan should be changed to the Chichester Local Plan – Key Policies 2014-29.

In paragraph 4.6 in the second sentence delete “that are not replaced by the TNP” and insert at the end of the paragraph” except when there is a conflict between the non strategic policies in the local plan and the policies contained in this Neighbourhood Plan, in which case the policies in this plan will take precedence”.

Retitle Policies Map Inset as Concept Plan.

Remove the site identified as dark pink but with no reference on the key.

## **Compliance with European and Human Rights Legislation**

The Parish Council requested Chichester District Council to screen whether the Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan should be the subject of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) as required by EU Directive 2001/42/EC which is enshrined into UK law by the “Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004”. The Council consulted the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England. The Council concluded in a letter from its Head of Planning Services dated 13<sup>th</sup> November 2014 that the Neighbourhood Plan did not need to be subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment. I concur with that conclusion. The LPA has recommended that the first sentence of Paragraph 1.12 be changed to refer to reasoning given in the Screening Report rather than the original suggestion of SEA not being required due to the close relationship with the Local Plan and the nature of the policies. I will recommend accordingly. The District Council also issued a screening opinion that no Habitat Regulations Assessment was required under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).

I have also considered whether the Plan complies with the European Convention on Human Rights, particularly in terms of Article 8 (privacy): Article 14(discrimination) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (property) under the meaning of the Human Rights Acts 1998 and I am satisfied that the Plan is compatible with all these provisions.

### ***Recommendation***

That the first sentence of paragraph 1.12 be changed to “Chichester District Council determined that a strategic environmental assessment of the TNP was not required due to the reasons set out in the Screening Report.”

## **The Neighbourhood Plan: An Overview**

It is the strategic allocation of 1000 houses in the land west and south of the village that sets the context of the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. The primary purpose is set out in paragraph 3.10 which is to translate the provisions of the Local Plan’s policy for the village into a “policy framework to guide the preparation of a Masterplan to accompany future planning applications”. This is a challenge, bearing in mind the scale of new development compared to the existing size of the settlement, but it also demonstrates laudable realism - showing that it is better for the host community to take control over the planning of the new residential areas and by having a Neighbourhood Plan, it can shape the way the new development is master planned in a way that benefits the existing village. The ambition is encapsulated succinctly in the Vision for Tangmere in 2029 as “One Village”- a totally appropriate aim which will secure benefits for existing residents as well as the future residents who choose Tangmere as their home. The overall aim is broken down into five objectives, based on the public’s responses and the understanding of the issues currently facing the village. The five objectives are: -

- To broaden the range of households in the village
- To promote new jobs for villagers
- To build a stronger and more diverse village centre
- To broaden the range and quality of community facilities
- To use the village’s heritage and green infrastructure assets to shape the future village.

It then sets indices to measure performance although not targets for each. With the Plan’s 10 policies it provides for a proactive framework covering not just the strategic sites but also a number of development opportunities inside the village and establishes, through green infrastructure and sustainable movement networks, the means by which the new housing will integrate into the existing village, and act as a catalyst for improving village facilities.

## **The Neighbourhood Plan Policies**

## Policy 1 A Spatial Plan for the Parish

This is the policy that establishes the settlement boundary for the village. One representor has questioned the need for the policy, suggesting that Policy 2 of the Chichester Local Plan includes reference to a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the settlement boundary. However, that policy goes on to say that boundaries should be reviewed through the preparation of neighbourhood plans. The inclusion of this policy allows the neighbourhood plan to provide clarity for the plan period as to where the settlement boundary is to run.

One of the issues facing my examination is that the proposed settlement boundary for the village omits the area covered by the strategic development location. I can understand the conclusion reached to not include it within the area and I take reassurance from the fact that the supporting text indicates that the Plan will be first reviewed in 5 years' time. The timing of the provision of the extra waste water capacity is now likely to be 2017 rather than 2019 as referred to in Paragraph 1.8 of the Council's Five Year Housing Land Statement as published on the Council's website, which means that the first houses will not be provided until 2017 at the very earliest. My reservation is that any properties built would in future be covered by the countryside policies set out in Policy 45 of the local plan rather than policies more appropriately reflecting the residential character of the new development. I am on balance reassured that the early review will prevent any significant detriment.

There is one area where there is a disparity between the boundary of the Strategic Development Location as defined in the adopted Local Plan. There is a rectangular shaped area of overgrown land on the south side of Church Lane. It is shown as falling within the settlement boundary on the map accompanying Policy 1 but on the adopted Local Plan, on the map 12.8, it is shown as falling within the Strategic Development Location. I put the disparity to the Parish Council and the LPA. Tangmere PC noted that the land was not in the ownership of the consortium who are delivering the SDL. They pointed out that the site could be developed independently as a windfall site. The LPA's response pointed to the site's designation in the adopted Plan.

My conclusion, following my site visit, was that the plot is capable of independent development in line with the existing pattern of development on the south side of Church Lane. Whilst it could also be incorporated into the SDL, I do not consider it essential for the comprehensive masterplanning of the housing area. I am therefore content that the land should remain within the settlement boundary shown.

### Policy 2 Strategic Housing Development

This policy goes to the heart of what the neighbourhood plan is seeking to achieve by setting down the development principles by which the strategic development location is to be developed. It sets out the spatial parameters for the Masterplan to follow thereby meeting the village's aspirations as to how this large residential extension is to be integrated into Tangmere.

Policy 7 of the Local Plan – Key Policies sets out in general terms how masterplanning is to be carried out. The purpose of the neighbourhood plan to provide planning guidance for the detailed Masterplan to follow; it does not create the Masterplan itself. Some representations from stakeholders, who form part of the consortium, feel that certain elements of the policy are over prescriptive and will constrain the preparation of the Masterplan which should evolve following the findings of various studies. I recognise these concerns but equally believe one of the underlying principles of neighbourhood planning is for communities to set down how they wish to see development carried out in their area. I will address the specific points raised in representations when considering the individual criterion set within the policy. I would at this point restate that my consideration of the content is restricted to ensuring the Plan passes the Basic Conditions Test as required by legislation and regulation.

Turning firstly to the area covered by the SDL designation, I have already addressed the land at Church Lane. There is a further anomaly, in that the Neighbourhood Plan shows the medical centre in Malcolm Road as falling with the SDL, but the site falls outside of the SDL in the plan shown in the Local Plan. The Parish Council has confirmed that this is a mapping error and I will recommend its correction.

However, the Neighbourhood Plan is also proposing to omit from the SDL the field immediately to the west of Saxon Meadow which is included in the map 12.8 of the Local Plan – Key Policies which sets out the extent of the Strategic Housing Development. This has raised objections on behalf of one of the Consortium members.

I am not satisfied that the exclusion of the land is justified by the Plan, when it asserts in paragraph 4.20 that its exclusion is in line with CDC Conservation Policy and contributes to the setting of St Andrew's Church. I believe that that the close proximity of the SDL boundary immediately to the west and north of the church has the propensity for development to have a bigger impact on the listed church. In fact, the interface between the new development will need to be carefully considered but I consider that can be more appropriately be dealt with at the Masterplan stage as part

## John Slater Planning

of the development management process. I therefore consider that the omission of this area of the strategic development site would undermine the Policy 18 of the Local Plan which in terms of Tangmere is the strategic policy establishing the extent of the area to be covered by the housing proposals.

One of the main requirements of the policy is the creation of the East West Corridor and the North South Link Road to incorporate roads, footpaths, cycle ways and bus routes. There is a minor drafting point required to clarify the wording of the first criterion by the replacement of the word “of” by “including” when describing the components of the movement hierarchy with road, footpath, cycleway etc. Bloor Homes question whether the plan can be so explicit without the appropriate Transport Assessment being carried out. My view is that the Neighbourhood Plan is quite entitled to set out a requirement that there should be an “all transport link” between the new housing areas and the rest of the village and indeed state that Malcom Road should be the desired alignment. This is one of the main ways that the Plan will deliver its vision for “One Village”.

The Plan in criterion (iii a and b) seeks to establish different character areas, around the Village Main Street and the East West corridor where there will be an “*emphasis*” of providing smaller sized units in this area and larger family homes towards the southern and western periphery of the site. They argue that the proximity to the primary school would mean that this is a location less suitable to smaller homes. Such units will be appropriate across the whole SDL area.

The LPA and the Parish Council were asked by me to explain their thinking behind this policy. The Parish Council responded by suggesting that the policy is driven by the consideration of the accessibility of the residents, for example by persons downsizing, needing to be closer to amenities due to reduced mobility and car ownership /use. They also say that smaller units are likely to be occupied by families with younger children where access to amenities with push chairs and accompanied walkable school access for younger children would be of most benefit. They assert that the larger units are more likely to be occupied by families with older children who are more likely to be capable of making longer unaccompanied non car journeys to school and amenities as well as having higher car ownership.

The District Council question whether the criteria a and b will lead to exclusive areas of certain tenure and demographic but for the reasons I have given above I believe that the wording maintains sufficient flexibility to prevent this from occurring.

In coming to a view on this matter I need to assess the policy in terms of how it meets the basic conditions test. Advice is given in the NPPF in the sections dealing with Promoting Sustainable Transport and Promoting Healthy Communities. These encourage the need to promote accessibility by non car modes and the masterplanning offers an opportunity to create housing areas where there are

## John Slater Planning

separate routes for cyclists and pedestrians. The plan promotes these with the Sustainable Movement Network. In some ways the language of the policy as written can open the matter to misinterpretation, for example a starter home may be a one-bedroom unit whilst equally it could be a house occupied by a young family. Similarly housing types for persons looking to downsize could include specialist housing for the elderly. I have concluded that the Plan as drafted will deliver “sustainable development” and seeks to put higher density development in areas closest to local amenities such as shops and the primary school. The wording does not prevent smaller units from being distributed across the site or indeed does not stop larger properties being built closer to the east west corridor. The wording used talks of the “the emphasis on the provision of housing types...”; I am confident that the overall objective is sound and is in line with good planning practice.

Representations were submitted about whether the reference to flood protection as a result of high winter groundwater levels is premature pending the preparation of a Drainage Strategy. Again I find the wording in the Plan (policy 2 iii (b)) offers sufficient flexibility in that it refers merely to “*consideration* being given to ponds and water areas to create an effective flood prevention scheme”. That would not preclude an alternative sustainable urban drainage solution. However, ponds and water areas do also play a part of green infrastructure, with possible habitat creation for flora and fauna.

In terms of criterion (iv) dealing with affordable housing, the policy points to requiring at least 40% of the overall percentage set out in the development plan being for intermediate housing. The District Council whilst accepting that a higher than usual split between affordable rent and intermediate sales is justified would not wish to see the figure going above 40% in order that the site can help meet local housing need. It is clear to me that government policy is changing to give greater emphasis to starter homes to buy rather than to rent through the planning process, so I do not propose to recommend a change to the criteria. In order to give greater clarity, I propose to substitute “development plan” for Policy 34 of the Chichester Local Plan – Key Policies as this neighbourhood plan will once “made” equally be part of the development plan.

The criterion (v) stating that custom build / self build housing not being required, is an unnecessary policy as pointed out in a number of representations and I agree with a number of comments that the policy serves no purpose and should be deleted.

Criterion (viii) a-g sets out the means of delivering the Tangmere Green Infrastructure Network in to the masterplanning. One representation claimed that the criterion was over prescriptive and gives the example of the blanket requirement for the retention of existing hedgerows that could prevent alternative arrangements which create habitat and green infrastructure. My view is that a community can

## John Slater Planning

properly set out what it wants to see by way of broad principle, to deliver what it wants incorporated into the masterplanning. There is still sufficient flexibility at the next stage to cater for any adjustments but the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan is to set out how the masterplanning is to be approached.

The developers have questioned whether criterion(ix) should be explicit in stating that their obligation is merely to provide the land for the community facility. The District Council has asked for greater clarity regarding size and possible uses, but I do not feel I have sufficient information at this stage to make that recommended modification. I do not feel the need to change the policy as set out as the policy is to guide the Masterplan rather than establish responsibility for delivery. The development management stage is the correct place for the negotiations set in the context of Policies 52 and 54 of the Chichester Local Plan – Key Policies.

One part of the supporting text that has been the subject of explicit objections has been paragraph 4.23 which sets out that the width of the structural landscape belt between the housing and the A27 should be “around 25m” to provide sufficient noise and pollution attenuation in respect of the A27 trunk road. I accept that calculations could show a different depth was needed but the point of the buffer is not solely to achieve noise and air quality attenuation but to act as a structural landscape feature separating the housing from the busy trunk road. Furthermore I do agree that a substantial belt is justified where the housing area meets the countryside, I propose to recommend that the wording be changed to require a buffer of “at least 25 m” which will allow a larger depth of buffer if acoustic and air quality modelling show that greater separation is required along the A27 boundary.

The final matter I need to address in terms of Policy 2 is the representations of Southern Water, who have asked for the insertion of an additional criterion. Their proposed wording is

“development will be dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate waste water conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards”

I consider that the policy is justified in terms of ensuring that the drainage capacity is in place through the upgrade of the Tangmere WWTW which is expected to be available from 2017.

### *Recommendations*

Replace “of” by “including in criterion i.

That the Medical Centre be removed from the area shown on the Policies Map as Strategic Housing Development.

## John Slater Planning

The field to the west of Saxon Meadow should be coloured pink on the Policies Map to be included as Strategic Development Location. The Concept Map and the Settlement Boundary should be amended accordingly.

Criterion (iv) change “development plan policy” to “Policy 34 of the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-29.

Delete criterion (v) and renumber.

In paragraph 4.23 change “around” to “at least” before 25 m.

Insert a final criterion “Development will be dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate waste water conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards.”

### Policy 3 Employment Uses

This policy essentially draws upon Policy 19 of the Chichester Local Plan – Key Policies with the additional stipulation that the development of the Strategic Employment Area should contribute to the creation and sustenance of the Tangmere Green Infrastructure Network as part of its landscaping and design. The District Council has made a helpful suggestion to allow ancillary retail and other uses to serve the employment facilities. This should reduce the need for employees to travel off the site. For the sake of clarity, I would recommend changing reference to the “development plan” to the Chichester Local Plan – Key Policies 2014-29.

#### *Recommendations*

Delete “Chichester development plan” and insert “Policy 19 of the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-29”.

Insert at the end of the second paragraph of the policy “unless as an ancillary use to serve the employment facilities”.

### Policy 4 Tangmere Academy

WSCC has pointed out that the deliverability of this policy is dependent on decisions not just of the County Council as landowner but also the Academy who run the school, who have a long leasehold. That is accepted, but the Plan does need to address the future development of the land if the decision is taken to transfer the existing school and be enlarged to a two form entry as part of the Strategic Development Area. I did question during the course of the examination, whether the

## John Slater Planning

built up area covered the land occupied by temporary buildings on the site, but I have been advised by the Parish Council that the buildings are all on limited period planning permissions.

The District Council has suggested that criterion iv could be inappropriate as it may be possible to demonstrate that the flow from the site for residential use may not be greater than flows generated by the school use. The point is academic as the school could not move until the development of the Strategic Housing area had commenced, which itself is dependent on the upgrade of the sewage works. However, I will recommend a caveat to the criterion as the point itself is sound.

The policy meets the Basic Conditions with the following modification.

### *Recommendation*

Insert at the end of criterion iv “unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of Southern Water that the development will not increase the flow on the network.”

## **Policy 5 The Yews, City Field Way**

This policy promotes “primarily 3 and 4-bedroom housing” housing development to reflect the character of Arundel Road. The LPA has suggested that this is not in accordance with the mix that is normally sought. However, I am not satisfied that a change is required. For the sake of clarity, the policy would benefit from the addition of wording “subject to compliance with other policies” to meet Basic Conditions.

### *Recommendation*

Insert “subject to compliance with other policies” after “supported”.

## **Policy 6 Tangmere Aviation Museum**

This policy allows the extension of the museum operations onto the land which is currently used as allotments which would need to be relocated to facilitate the enlargement of the museum. This policy will help support the future of this popular visitor attraction and meets Basic Conditions.

## Policy 7 Land to the West of Malcolm Road

This policy allocates for development the open land to the west of Malcolm Road. The land use proposed is not defined in the policy wording except that the development should positively contribute to the Village Main Street. However, the site itself is not within the Strategic Development Land but lies adjacent to it. The supporting text suggests that the planning of the site should be considered as part of the masterplanning of the wider area. The District Council is arguing that the residential development of this land is capable of taking place in isolation from the strategic development area.

The supporting text refers to residential uses being located above the ground floor uses such as retail or offices. That may be appropriate for the parts of the site that could in time front directly onto the new Village Main Street but further into the site I can see no objections to normal residential uses.

My conclusion is that to ignore the site's adjacency, to what will be one of the major routes to the SDL where there is a clear desire for frontage development onto the Main Village Street would be a wasted opportunity. I consider that the design of the allocation is capable of coming forward in a way that as the policy suggests will contribute positively to achieving the wider objectives of this Neighbourhood Plan. I therefore do not propose any change to the first two criteria.

The final criterion (iii) requires the retention of the open land currently owned by A2 Dominion as amenity open space due to its current value to houses in Campbell Road and Malcolm Road. The extent of the land owned by A2 Dominion is not shown on the Policies Map and I questioned the extent of their ownership so that I could be clear the area of land the plan proposed not to be developed. I have been provided with a plan that shows Chichester District Council's ownership which excludes the area marked on the plan as Playground. From a second site visit I can see no natural boundary of the land and in fact the only evidence of a playground appears to be some hardstanding at the western end of the site.

The policy has drawn an objection from the owners of the land proposed to be retained as open space, namely the A2 Dominion Group who wish to see the land developed for housing in conjunction with the remainder of the site.

There are several factors that have influenced my conclusions on this site. I cannot understand how the land owned by A2 Dominion contributes to the amenity value of the adjacent roads whilst the land owned by Chichester District Council does not. Both areas are open grassland but do not appear to be managed in such a way as to provide a recreational role such as a kick about area. Secondly, the supporting text recognises that the land should be considered as part of the comprehensive

## John Slater Planning

planning of the Strategic Development Land especially the design and layout of the Main Village Street which will incorporate a major public open space.

At this point in time there is uncertainty as to how the SDL is to be masterplanned and that will clearly have an impact on how the site covered by Policy 7 should be designed. It may be that the open space function could be more effectively provided by the design and configuration of the new street and the new public realm. I have seen a layout provided by the District Council which shows the housing fronting the roads but turning its backs on to the suggested retained public open space. I do consider that this orientation of development would take advantage of the opportunities of this site. I propose to remove reference to the retention of the land owned as A2 Dominion as open space.

### *Recommendation*

Delete criterion (iii) and paragraph 4.50.

## **Policy 8 Tangmere Green Infrastructure Network**

This policy proposes the establishment of the green infrastructure network across the plan area as shown on the Policies Plan, except the policy plan and the inset plan do not show the network but rather it is shown in green on Plan G. I will correct that as a recommended modification.

This policy is broadly in line with up to date good planning practice both in terms of assimilating new development with existing landscape and other valued features but also in terms of minimising the environmental impact on the wildlife of the area. It also allows for the creation of improved routes connecting the new housing into the rest of the village. I consider the policy as modified meets Basic Conditions.

### *Recommendation*

Delete "Policies Map" and insert "Plan G".

## **Policy 9 Tangmere Sustainable Movement Network**

The policy refers to a Key Diagram. I can find no reference to this Diagram and the network is not shown on the Policies Plan. I recommend the substitution of Key Diagram with Plan G.

One representation has referred to the lack of clarity on the second criterion which refers to the strategic local road network. I will recommend for the sake of clarity the

## John Slater Planning

insertion of the word “and” between strategic and local”. The text also refers to proposals aligning their travel plans with the objectives of the policy. As all proposals do not require travel plans I will recommend the insertion of the proviso “where necessary”.

### *Recommendation*

Delete “Key Diagram” and insert “Plan G”.

Insert “and” between “strategic” and “local” in criterion (ii).

Insert “where appropriate” before “travel plans” in criterion (ii).

## Policy 10 Design

This is a straightforward policy that meets basic conditions.

## The Referendum Area

If I am to recommend that the Plan progresses to its referendum stage, I am required to confirm whether the referendum should cover a larger area than the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan. In this instance I can confirm that the area of the Neighbourhood Plan as designated by Chichester District Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2013 is the appropriate area for the Referendum to be held and the area for the referendum does not need to be extended.

## Summary

The Parish Council and the Steering Group, aided by the Task Groups have risen to the challenge when faced with the allocation of 1000 homes and new employment allocation on the edge of their village. They have worked with the developers and their consultants collaboratively and together they have grasped the opportunity that neighbourhood planning offers and the Tangmere community has set down clear planning principles to guide the house builders and their masterplanners. The development will provide much needed new homes but also tangible benefits to the structure, the infrastructure and the facilities of the village. This is a good example of positive community planning that recognises that development is coming and clearly stating how they expect that new housing areas to be planned. All parties should be congratulated on the quality not just of the document but of the clear thinking that has underpinned the Plan.

## John Slater Planning

Finally, my conclusions are that the Plan, if amended in line with my recommendations, meets all the statutory requirements including the basic conditions test.

**I am therefore delighted to recommend to Chichester District Council that The Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan, as modified by my recommendations, should now proceed to referendum.**

JOHN SLATER BA(Hons), DMS, MRTPI

John Slater Planning

23<sup>rd</sup> October 2015