

Chichester Local Plan Review 2034 – Issues and Options Consultation 22 June – 3 August 2017 2017

Results of Consultation – Main Issues Raised (Questions 21 to 30)

**Question 21: Are there any town centre or edge of centre sites available that would be suitable for retail, leisure or other town centre development?**

**Please provide details.**

TOTAL: 22 responses      No - 11

757796; 1103272; 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 559554; 1105588 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 1105041; 1115333; 1115347

General comments:

*The Southern Gateway area.*

Retail should be within or close to the city centre. This should be done by lowering rates and preventing more coffee shops and restaurants, and will keep the city centre vibrant.

If the Richard's holiday centre in East Wittering is found not to be viable following its current use, then it should be developed into a hotel to cater for those looking for an alternative to caravans and B&Bs. This will provide employment and a contribution towards the local economy. Its location is within walking distance of tourist facilities and the beach at Bracklesham.

No further out-of-centre retail development as yet constructed should be permitted, whether at Portfield Retail Park, on the Fuel Depot site at Bognor Road, or elsewhere.

It is not possible to suggest suitable locations without more information on the current environmental capacity of the District.

*Southbourne*

Land to the east of Southbourne would be an appropriate site to accommodate office and industrial uses, as part of a wider strategic allocation with a mix of other uses.

**Question 22: Are there any locations that would be suitable for tourism related development or facilities?  
Please provide details.**

TOTAL: 23 responses

757796; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 559554; 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 1104753; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106566; 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 398366 (CBRE obo Premier Marinas); 743931 (South Downs National Park Authority); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106446; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1110135; 1114938 (Barton Willmore)

General comments:

The outskirts of Selsey and East Wittering are ideal for tourist related developments. Small-scale facilities could also be suitably located in the settlements and the rural areas to the west of Chichester. This would help meet the shortage of holiday accommodation in the Manhood Peninsula.

East Wittering and Bracklesham lack good quality hotel accommodation. The Royal Oak public house site could be used for this purpose and would offer a choice to those looking for something other than caravan sites and B&Bs. Perhaps we should encourage Travelodge, Premier Inn or Wetherspoons to take an interest.

Boardwalks laid on the shingle at East Wittering/Bracklesham beach would help to alleviate the problem of access to the beach.

The Southern Gateway area: A high quality hotel is needed – particularly in the city centre.

Small-scale development of existing tourist facilities is acceptable, for example at the Southdowns Holiday Centre, Bracklesham.

The Manhood Peninsula is suitable for tourism, but is hindered by the A27 access.

Develop the South Downs National Park, Chichester Harbour and Pagham Reserve as tourist assets.

Chichester Marina is a sustainable countryside location which could support further tourism development, both in relation to the marina facilities, and facilities provided as ancillary to these.

Locations within Chichester city centre and other settlements in the East-West corridor close to the boundary with the South Downs National Park should be utilised to capitalise on their proximity to the National Park.

It is not possible to suggest suitable locations without more information on the current environmental capacity of the District.

The site behind the Westbourne Village Hall would make an excellent car park and picnic area.

Brownfield land at The French Gardens, Broadbridge could support a small number of tourism accommodation units or have employment uses.

Tourism related development and facilities should be located where there is a mix of other uses in order to provide a dynamic and vibrant area.

Tourist related development is employment generating, and as such should be considered alongside the traditional B-uses for employment uses.

**Question 23: Do you consider that the current Local Plan policies for shopping frontages leads to a vibrant city centre or should the policy approach be altered?**

TOTAL: 18 responses      Yes – 2

757796; 1103272; 375108; 383360 (Chichester Society); 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106336; 1106446; 1106566; 1110046; 1110054; 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council)

Greater diversity is the only way for the centre to survive due to internet and out of town centres

The city has too many eateries but nowhere affordable for other small retailers to open a business and make it viable. Need something to replace the lost retail spaces in Sadlers Walk, the Market House and The Boardwalk.

The retention of retail uses within the City should have priority.

Policies need to be reviewed as shopping habits have changed. A lot of shopping is done online these days so there needs to be a 'shopping experience' built into town centres. The current restrictions are an unfair burden on bricks and mortar retailers who are having a hard enough struggle already.

There is a surfeit of coffee and food chain outlets.

The policy should simply favour small local businesses over Multi-Nationals helping stimulate reinvestment in the local economy.

The process should be demand led.

No as increase charity shops in Chichester

The character of Chichester shops must be maintained.

Chichester is now a series of chain stores – independent boutique stores need to be encouraged through reasonable rents. The town centre is being subsumed by the very few things one cannot buy on the Internet - coffee shops, restaurants, hairdressers and charity shops. There is no engaging evening buzz in the city.

Consider the Royal Society for Public Health report “Health on the High Street” which includes a range of measures to make high streets more health promoting.

**Question 24: Should we require a lower threshold for impact assessments on retail proposals or rely on the national threshold?**

TOTAL: 26 responses    Yes – 11

757796; 1103272; 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 746653; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106446; 1106566; 1110046; 1110135; 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1115333; 1115347

Any commercial development should take account of tourism potential.

1500m<sup>2</sup> would be a good balance between national guidelines and the size of our town centres.  
Thresholds should be lower so that Chichester shops remain unique and attractive.

Any decision on threshold size should also take account of the impact of out of town developments on transport choices and particularly the availability of sustainable transport options.

A lower threshold for out of town retail development needs to be introduced.

A much lower threshold of 500m<sup>2</sup> should be considered

**Question 25: Horticultural development**

**(a) Do you have any views or suggestions for how planning policies should be used to promote horticultural development growth and/or provide for a wider range of opportunities?**

**(b) Are there any alternative sites that you think may be suitable to accommodate horticultural development?**

TOTAL: 33 responses

757796; 1103272; 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106336; 1106446; 1110046; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 557814; 558922; 560001; 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1110054; 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347; 558841; 585871; 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes)

Suggested alternative sites:

Southern extension to the Runcton HDA.

Tangmere.

Manhood Peninsula.

Sites could be identified in association with the Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan Green Ring Policy 3.

It is not possible to suggest alternative sites without more information on the current environmental capacity of the District.

Shopwyke.

Selsey.

**Question 26: Housing and Neighbourhoods**

**(a) Do you agree with the above planning policy aims for housing and neighbourhoods?**

**(b) Please provide any further comments.**

TOTAL: 71 responses      Yes – 56

1104136 (Bosham Association); 757796; 753618; 1104438; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1104958; 375108; 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 755714; 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 381100; 396970; 1021645; 1104753; 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106446; 1110000; 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 389541 (Loxwood Society); 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 878413 (Thakeham Homes); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1110024; 1110135; 1114550 (Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1115333; 1115347; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 753541 (Luken Beck obo Seaward Properties); 755602 (Savills UK obo Bloor Homes Southern); 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes)

Generally yes, but comments include:

There should be a requirement for a masterplan for developments to be phased.

New housing should be located near to employment areas or where access to employment, education and training is good. Dormitory settlements in relatively isolated areas including at the southern end of the coastal Manhood peninsula, for example East Wittering and Bracklesham, should be avoided.

Policies must be adhered to.

Infrastructure should be a priority, in particular sewage, transport links and encouraging public transport provision.

The policy is excellent but can it survive the pressures from higher authorities?

New housing should follow the design for life and should all be energy efficient.

Major schemes, and certainly strategic sites, should be required to provide community facilities as appropriate to the location.

Emphasis should be placed on the provision of affordable housing, for local occupancy.

There are too many developments where houses are not designed for local people who require cheaper housing and easy access to employment.

There is a particular need for affordable elderly care.

An additional category of specialist housing for agricultural and horticultural workers should be included.

Any requirements should be based on proportionate and robust evidence in accordance with paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

The Council should review the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and then set out the policy aims accordingly. The Local Plan Review should seek to ensure that new policies enable the delivery of these aims by allocating sufficient development sites to meet the Objectively Assessed Housing Need in full.

Roads within a new development must provide adequate space for parking, and access by full size service vehicles.

**Question 27: Local Plan policies**

**(a) Do you consider that current Local Plan policies are working to support the aims listed above?**

**(b) Please provide any further comments.**

TOTAL: 44 responses      Yes – 26

757796; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 381100; 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1105830; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106336; 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 389541 (Loxwood Society); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106446; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1110046; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114550 (Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties);

558841;  
558922; 560001; 585871; 753541 (Luken Beck obo Seaward Properties); 755602 (Savills UK obo Bloor Homes Southern); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1115333; 1115347

General comments:

The policies are weak in relation to the provision of necessary community facilities.

Increasing densities means the quality of developments, especially larger estates, is very poor. There should be a focus on quality of the building, and ensuring room size and plot size is adequate.

Housing design and construction should recognise all aspects of sustainability and energy efficiency and incorporate opportunities offered by new technology.

The failure by the Council to allocate sufficient housing sites and to ensure adequate affordable housing provision means that the site allocations within the Local Plan do not help to ensure a built environment that meets the needs of the community.

Chichester city cannot accommodate additional major growth, and the Local Plan Review should distribute a higher proportion of housing to the settlement hubs.

The policies will need to be revised to ensure delivery of new aims, and the Council should consider the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment before assessing whether current policies are fit for purpose.

Current policy does not provide for alternative housing types e.g. starter homes and specialist housing for agricultural and horticultural workers.

Consider meeting the unmet needs of neighbouring districts.

Some parishes already have development which exceeds the figures agreed in the Local Plan.

By undertaking a sound assessment of needs, the physical capacity of the district to accommodate additional development, sustainability objectives and robust constraints, strong policies can be developed and defended. These policies will allow for a differentiation between sites to allow appropriate development solutions and demonstrate why not all sites should be treated the same and why more specific policies are required in specific areas of the district.

Market forces are limiting sites capable of coming forward to meet the housing trajectory – more sites need to be identified.

Necessary to provide affordable houses for local people. The Plan should set out type and affordability of housing.

More innovative low cost housing should be encouraged.

Smaller houses are required for first time buyers and households who are downsizing, including bungalows for the elderly.

Windfall development does not allow for new facilities and infrastructure to meet needs.

Promote infrastructure development to make certain kinds of buildings more viable.

The continued allocation of the Tangmere Strategic Development Location will make a significant contribution in achieving policy aims, particularly in increasing housing supply and including an appropriate mix of housing to meet identified needs.

**Question 28: Do you have any views or suggestions for how planning policies could be better used to ensure that planned housing meets local needs?**

TOTAL: 42 responses

Identify properties which can only be sold to local people, or must be sold at a discount to local people.

Affordable should be understood to mean affordable for local people.

The local need is for affordable housing and for key worker housing.

Use exception sites and social landlords to provide affordable rent or part buy/part rent for local people.

Give policy priority to community-led schemes rather than national developers.

Not sure how planning policies could stop the building of expensive houses.

Build smaller targeted developments of 2/3 bed houses alongside 2 storey flats near to town centres.

The number of new houses has no relation to local need. Chichester District does not have the land to meet the suggested numbers and will destroy many villages in the process.

Housing Needs Surveys should be undertaken by the Council in conjunction with local parishes to determine local needs. The outcome of these surveys should be used as a basis to determine where housing is required and the type of housing.

Consider higher densities and additional flats. Consideration should be given to precluding some second homes within specific allocated sites.

Work closely with the South Downs National Park to establish whether the District can accommodate some or all of the National Park's unmet housing needs.

Allocations and applications must be based on up-to-date ecological information to ensure that there is sufficient natural capital to maintain the level of ecosystem services required by residents.

Developers should adhere to conditions. One condition of all planning consents should be that the builder must offer a deposit to guarantee that the project will be completed.

The delivery of a single Local Plan document that allocates strategic and non-strategic sites would help to reduce the lag period between preparation of separate documents, and improve the Council's five year housing land supply position and delivery rates.

The Council should review the findings of the new Strategic Housing Market Assessment as well as other essential evidence based documents before it seeks to revise policies.

Large and small developments should provide suitable ANGs.

Housing need should be rigorously upheld when determining planning applications.

The policy should be flexible to allow small-scale sustainable, carbon-neutral development to be built inside or outside the defined settlement areas.

Builders must adhere to providing accommodation for all types of house buyers, but especially first time buyers.

Look at current provision and requirement for care home places with a view to including a policy for the retention of residential care homes.

Secure the right type and range of accommodation to support industry.

Need to see figures for housing already built to see how many are occupied by needy and local people.

Adopt a more positive approach to housing provision and a broader definition of affordable housing. Suggest revising Policy 34 to allow a proportion of overall affordable housing requirement to be delivered as starter homes.

Policy should be flexible and focus on place-making and housing mix and tenure to ensure development proposals respond to the current needs of the community.

Take into account the potential contribution of self-build/custom building housing, including level of demand. This should inform the SHMA to help understand and consider future need for this type of housing.

Undertake meaningful and regular consultation with local communities/representatives, then take account of and, where possible, implement their views.

Tangmere Strategic Development Location could accept at least 300 additional dwellings. Policy 18 should be adapted to reflect the increased capacity.

Enable second and third ranked sites (<50 houses) within parishes to submit applications if they can demonstrate local support, can deliver in a short time period and can mitigate against constraints.

A standard approach to new housing provision is not appropriate across all areas of the District. Seek to address this shortfall and identify areas where a general policy approach is appropriate and those where a strict, locally defined approach is appropriate.

**Question 29: Do you think that the current criteria based policy should continue to be used to determine planning applications for new gypsy and traveller sites, or should we allocate sites for gypsy and traveller sites taking account of the criteria in the current policy?**

TOTAL: 30 responses .... Continue with current criteria based policy – 10

757796; 1103272; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 383360 (Chichester Society); 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 381100; 1102692; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106336; 1106446; 1110000; 1110046; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375142 (Historic England); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne

Parish Council)

General comments:

Recent appeals need to be determined by PINs before a decision can be taken.

If sites are unused, they must leave the area.

The criteria for planning permissions for sites for gypsies and travellers should be, as far as possible, the same criteria for everyone else with the aim of giving equal opportunities for housing to all.

There should not be any more traveller sites within the District area, and more robust enforcement is required for existing traveller sites.

Criteria needs to be changed so there are less gypsy and traveller sites west of Chichester.

Identify sites for occupation by gypsies/travellers and travelling showpeople.

Allocate sites within the main housing sites allocated in the Local Plan process. Even if sites are allocated, a situation could arise where such sites become full and the Council still receive planning application for further pitches; a policy is required to determine such applications.

Planning should aim to reduce the number of prefab dwellings.

If a criterion-based policy is to be continued, suggest reword the policy to “not compromise the essential features of nationally designated areas of landscape, historic or nature conservation protection or individual historic features or non-designated heritage assets”. If sites are allocated, they should be selected having regard to this criterion.

There is a need for a coherent District wide strategy.

If the criteria based policy is continued, recommend that criterion 4 is expanded to include other levels of designated sites, including local wildlife sites.

Current criteria has not worked. The current policy pays little attention to the effect of the additional strain that these sites place on local infrastructure. Any revised policy should take account of the ability of a parish to accommodate additional strains, and contribute towards them.

Ensuring new homes can be adapted is important, and need a firm commitment to water conservation and efficiency measures.

Allocations for housing development can ensure that necessary infrastructure is identified and required to mitigate planned development.

**Question 30: Do you have any views or suggestions for how planning policies could be better used to achieve attractive, sustainable neighbourhoods?**

TOTAL: 32 responses

1103023; 757796; 375108; 1103272; 1104438; 1104958; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106336; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375142 (Historic England); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375277 (Fishbourne Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106566; 1110046; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1115662 (Hague Farms)

**General comments:**

Identify properties which can only be sold to local people and/or must be sold at a discount to local people as opposed to newcomers.

Reduce housing developments.

Produce guidelines or design codes regarding the quality of design and materials, and enforce them.

Build only what is required: social housing.

Stop building bland, ugly estates of executive 3 and 4 bed homes which are not fit for purpose.

Provide suitable numbers of parking spaces for residents and businesses, not on-street parking. Focus on the quality of the build, and ensuring that the room size and plot size is not too small.

Provide more infrastructure and cycle lanes to encourage children to cycle safely to schools and work.

Give greater weight to Village Design Statements and Neighbourhood Plans.

Encourage low-car developments to promote car sharing and home working.

Increase the amount of vegetation, for example use hedges instead of fences.

Roads in new developments should be wider with pavements, as many cars end up parking on narrow roads thus reducing them to a single carriageway.

Housing design and construction should recognise all aspects of sustainability, should aim to be zero carbon and energy efficient, and incorporate the opportunities offered by new technology.

Provide play areas for children away from traffic.

Include a new policy covering soft landscaping/planting in new developments, retention of trees/hedges, and sympathetic planting schemes. Should be based on Policy BE14 and include that the Council will enforce requirements.

Robust policies on quality of design, including with respect to the historic environment, and sustainability of new developments, and implement the policies rigorously. Supplementary planning documents on design, heritage and character would help.

Reverse the current trend of increasing density of developments.

Emphasise the importance of “protecting and enhancing” individual village identities.

Increase the allocation of open space within developments to aid overall masterplanning.

Ensure new homes can be easily adapted to meet housing needs.

Allocations for housing development can ensure that necessary infrastructure is identified and required to mitigate planned development.

Double counting of SuDS attenuation/storage ponds and landscape buffers as open space should not be allowed. The calculation for population increase from new development requires revision as this varies considerably between settlements, therefore a district wide average is not appropriate for strategic developments in the East-West corridor where second/holiday homes form much lower proportion of total stock. The current calculation rate is lower than WSCC.

Ensure policies provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate rapid change to business needs.

Ensure that biodiversity is incorporated into developments and that any landscaping, biodiversity enhancements, open space and SuDS schemes are managed in the long term. Recommend policies promote mixed use developments that reduce the need to travel. Planning applications should be judged against an existing GI strategy and their ability to enhance the district's ecological network.

Require independent assessment of the designs of planned developments, which should be paid for by the applicant. Assessments should be given weight, and any identified shortcomings in design must be corrected or the application rejected.

To be sustainable, new housing should be on the basis of local employment requirements, not arbitrary national dictat.

Maintain strategic gaps; and open space, farmland, AONB and views should all be considered in planning.

The Plan ought to say about affordability. The definition is set nationally but besides lobbying for a more realistic take, there is more we can do at a local level. This is unlikely to mean directly subsidising developers, but local government could take the lead in promoting infrastructure development to make certain kinds of building more viable.

Make use of a standard measure, e.g. Building for Life 12, to aid in the Council's ability to ensure that developments and neighbourhoods are sustainable.

Ensure all new development of 5 dwellings or more are within 1km of fibre enabled cabinet.