

Chichester District Council

Local Plan Review

Preferred Approach (Reg 18) Consultation: Summary of representations received



Full representations can be viewed at www.chichester.jdi-consult.net/localplan

www.chichester.gov.uk

July 2019

Strategic Policies

Chapter/Policy	Respondents	Representations	Support	Object	Comment
Introduction	7	13	1	4	8
Characteristics of the Plan Area	11	21	1	5	15
Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	31	50	6	17	27
Local Plan Strategic Objectives	26	33	6	10	17
Spatial Strategy	4	4	1	1	2
Sustainable Development Principles	7	7	0	4	3
Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	10	11	2	7	2
Settlement Hierarchy	4	4	0	2	2
Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	51	63	29	17	17
Development Strategy	21	24	2	6	16
Policy S3: Development Strategy	95	117	14	49	54
Meeting Housing Needs	24	27	1	20	6
Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	114	127	6	76	45
Strategic Locations/Allocations	11	11	2	4	5
Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	196	203	11	153	39
Affordable Housing	8	8	0	4	4
Policy S6: Affordable Housing	35	37	7	13	17
Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	1	1	0	1	0
Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	11	11	4	4	3
Meeting Business and Employment Needs	11	11	3	4	4
Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	19	20	3	13	4
Addressing the Need for Retailing	8	9	4	5	0
Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	17	18	2	9	7
Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	9	9	2	4	3
Addressing Horticultural Needs	4	4	0	1	3
Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	13	13	4	3	6
Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	15	17	2	7	8
Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	57	57	15	24	18
East-West Corridor	5	5	0	3	2
Chichester City	1	1	0	1	0
Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	25	27	15	3	9
Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	44	49	10	25	14
East of Chichester	1	1	0	1	0
Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	21	22	5	13	4
Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	28	29	4	16	9
West of Chichester	7	7	1	5	1
Policy S17: Thorney Island	10	10	3	3	4
Manhood Peninsula	5	5	0	4	1
Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	32	35	8	13	14
North of Plan Area	1	1	0	0	1
Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	10	10	1	4	5
Design	4	4	1	0	3
Policy S20: Design	30	32	17	4	11
Planning for Health and Wellbeing	5	5	2	0	3
Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	11	11	4	2	5
Historic Environment	1	1	0	0	1
Policy S22: Historic Environment	14	15	7	2	6
Transport Infrastructure	37	40	3	22	15
Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	164	194	14	117	63

Countryside and Countryside Gaps	19	19	3	4	12
Policy S24: Countryside	40	44	7	20	17
The Coast	1	1	0	1	0
Policy S25: The Coast	13	13	3	3	7
Natural Environment	4	4	0	2	2
Policy S26: Natural Environment	29	30	7	11	12
Flood Risk and Water Management	1	1	0	0	1
Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	22	22	5	5	12
Pollution	2	2	0	2	0
Policy S28: Pollution	29	30	5	14	11
Green Infrastructure	4	4	1	1	2
Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	13	13	8	0	5
Strategic Wildlife Corridors	15	15	6	5	4
Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	64	72	28	22	22
Wastewater	4	4	0	2	2
Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	25	27	5	9	13
Strategic Site Allocations	1	1	0	1	0
Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	27	28	11	2	15
West of Chichester	5	6	0	4	2
Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	30	34	3	11	20
Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	3	3	0	1	2
Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	16	16	1	4	11
East of Chichester (Oving Parish)	4	4	0	2	2
Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	21	23	5	3	15
Westhampnett/North East Chichester	5	5	1	2	2
Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	23	28	6	8	14
Southern Gateway	1	1	0	0	1
Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	38	41	3	19	19
Apuldram and Donnington Parishes	4	4	0	4	0
Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	123	194	13	149	32
Bosham	11	11	1	9	1
Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	79	83	3	65	15
East Wittering	2	2	0	1	1
Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	39	41	3	30	8
Fishbourne	17	20	1	13	6
Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	87	93	9	61	23
Chidham and Hambrook	8	8	0	5	3
Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	45	51	5	33	13
Hunston	13	18	0	18	0
Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	107	145	4	121	20
Selsey	2	2	0	2	0
Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	27	30	2	16	12
Southbourne	8	8	0	3	5
Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	61	73	8	41	24
Tangmere	4	4	0	2	2
Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	24	27	9	8	10
Policy AL15: Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere	3	3	0	0	3
Totals	2399	2742	389	1444	909

Development Management Policies

Chapter/Policy	Respondents	Representations	Support	Object	Comment
Housing	5	6	2	2	2
Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	8	9	5	2	2
Policy DM2: Housing Mix	26	27	5	9	13
Policy DM3: Housing Density	14	14	5	3	6
Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	9	9	2	4	3
Accommodation For Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	1	1	1	0	0
Policy DM5: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	6	6	2	2	2
Policy DM6: Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers	6	7	1	4	2
Policy DM7: Local and Community Facilities	7	7	4	3	0
Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2	2	0	1	1
Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	20	20	1	4	15
Employment	3	3	0	2	1
Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	12	12	3	7	2
Policy DM10: New Employment Sites	5	5	0	3	2
Retail	1	1	1	0	0
Policy DM11: Town Centre Development	6	6	1	2	3
Policy DM12: Edge and Out of Centre Retail Sites	5	5	2	2	1
Built Tourist and Leisure Development	1	1	0	0	1
Policy DM13: Built Tourist and Leisure Development	7	7	1	1	5
Caravan and Camping Sites for Tourism	1	1	0	0	1
Policy DM14: Caravan and Camping Sites	5	5	2	1	2
Horticultural Development	1	1	0	0	1
Policy DM15: Horticultural Development	7	7	1	2	4
Sustainable Design and Construction	2	2	1	1	0
Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	25	25	4	11	10
Stand-alone Renewable Energy	1	1	0	0	1
Policy DM17: Stand-alone Renewable Energy	7	7	2	3	2
Flood and Water Management	2	2	0	2	0
Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	9	9	1	4	4
Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	3	4	1	1	2
Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	12	12	2	4	6
Development Around The Coast	1	1	0	1	0
Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	9	9	3	3	3
Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	1	1	1	0	0
Policy DM21: Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	6	6	1	4	1
Development in the Countryside	4	4	0	4	0
Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	10	10	2	3	5
Policy DM23: Lighting	5	5	3	0	2
Air Quality	2	2	1	1	0
Policy DM24: Air Quality	24	26	2	16	8
Noise	2	2	0	1	1
Policy DM25: Noise	3	3	1	1	1
Policy DM26: Contaminated Land	1	1	1	0	0
Historic Environment	5	5	0	1	4
Policy DM27: Historic Environment	6	6	1	0	5
Natural Environment	2	2	0	0	2
Policy DM28: Natural Environment	14	14	2	4	8

Biodiversity	1	1	0	1	0
Policy DM29: Biodiversity	15	15	6	3	6
Policy DM30: Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas	8	8	2	1	5
Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows	1	1	0	0	1
Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	9	9	3	2	4
Green Infrastructure	2	2	0	0	2
Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	18	18	6	1	11
Canals	1	1	0	1	0
Policy DM33: Canals	6	6	0	2	4
Open Space, Sport and Recreation	2	2	0	2	0
Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	11	12	6	4	2
Policy DM35: Equestrian Development	5	5	1	0	4
Totals	393	401	92	136	173

Appendices	Respondents	Representations	Support	Object	Comment
Glossary	7	8	0	4	4
Appendix A - Plan Area Sub-Area Maps	6	6	0	3	3
Appendix B - Designated Rural and Non-Rural Areas	2	2	0	2	0
Appendix C - Appropriate Marketing	3	4	1	2	1
Appendix D – Shopping Frontages	0	0	0	0	0
Appendix E - Monitoring Framework	5	5	0	1	4

Supporting Documents	Respondents	Representations	Support	Object	Comment
Sustainability Appraisal	17	17	0	2	15
Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	17	20	4	6	10
Habitats Regulation Assessment	0	0	0	0	0

Chapter	Page
Introduction	1
Characteristics of the Plan Area	2
Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	4
Local Plan Strategic Objectives	10
Spatial Strategy	15
Sustainable Development Principles	15
Settlement Hierarchy	17
Development Strategy	23
Meeting Housing Needs	36
Strategic Locations/Allocations	53
Affordable Housing	82
Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	86
Meeting Business and Employment Needs	87
Addressing the Need for Retailing	90
Addressing Horticultural Needs	95
Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	97
Sub-area Strategies	106
East-West Corridor	107
Chichester City	107
East of Chichester	117
West of Chichester	124
Manhood Peninsula	125
North of Plan Area	130
Strategic Policies	132
Design	131
Planning for Health and Wellbeing	134
Historic Environment	136
Transport Infrastructure	138
Countryside and Countryside Gaps	169
The Coast	177
Natural Environment	179
Flood Risk and Water Management	184
Pollution	187
Green Infrastructure	190
Strategic Wildlife Corridors	192
Wastewater	201
Strategic Site Allocations	206
Strategic Development	206
Design Strategies	206
Chichester City	210
West of Chichester	210
Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	216
East of Chichester (Oving Parish)	220
Westhampnett/North East Chichester	226
Southern Gateway	232
Apuldram and Donnington Parishes	239
Bosham	270
East Wittering	286
Fishbourne	292
Chidham and Hambrook	310
Hunston	317
Selsey	339
Southbourne	344
Tangmere	357
Development Management	366
Housing	366
Accommodation For Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	373
Local Community Facilities	377
Transport, Accessibility and Parking	377
Employment	380
Retail	382
Built Tourist and Leisure Development	383
Caravan and Camping Sites for Tourism	384
Horticultural Development	384
Sustainable Design and Construction	389
Stand-alone Renewable Energy	391
Flood and Water Management	392
Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	393
Development Around The Coast	395
Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	396
Development in the Countryside	397
Pollution and Contamination	399
Lighting	399
Air Quality	400
Noise	403
Contaminated Land	403
Historic Environment	404
Natural Environment	405
Biodiversity	407
Development and Disturbance of Birds in Special Protection Areas	410
Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows	411
Green Infrastructure	412
Canals	415
Open Space, Sport and Recreation	416
Equestrian Development	418
Glossary	419
Appendices	421
Appendix A - Plan Area Sub-Area Maps	421
Appendix B - Designated Rural and Non-Rural Areas	421
Appendix C - Appropriate Marketing	421
Appendix D - Shopping Frontages	422
Appendix E - Monitoring Framework	422
Sustainability Appraisal	422
Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	424
Habitats Regulation Assessment	426

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
a. Introduction						
1	Introduction	1295	The whole review needs to be redone. There are so many errors. CDC needs to be accountable for supplying incorrect & out of date information.	The whole review needs to be redone. There are so many errors. CDC needs to be accountable for supplying incorrect & out of date information.	Object	Mrs Caroline Butler [7104]
1	Introduction	2289	Suggest amendments to specific wording - para 1.5 and 1.16 Only historic evidence is Historic Environment Strategy which we do not consider forms an adequate evidence base. Should consider if archaeological evidence and significance of the city is understood and available. Expect the Council to have an adequate up to date and relevant historic environment evidence base.	Reword the first sentence of paragraph 1.5 as; "This Plan seeks to deliver the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development in mutually supportive ways". Reword the final sentence of paragraph 1.16 as: "The importance of significantly boosting the supply of new dwellings is reiterated, whilst ensuring provision for other development needs including economic growth and protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment". The historic environment evidence base for the Local Plan Review should be set out on the Council's Evidence Base webpage. If there are indeed gaps in that evidence base, then these should be filled and that evidence taken on board in preparing the Pre-Submission Local Plan Review document.	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
1	Introduction	2395	The Authority would appreciate reference to Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 being added to paragraph 1.31 of the draft Plan.		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
1	Introduction	2585	Welcome approach to SOCG - need to be made publicly available before LP is published for pre-submission consultation (para 27 NPPF)		Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
1	Introduction	2616	- Why is CDC not integrating the planning process with the area of SDNP that falls within the CDC area. - CDC need to understand where unmet need from SDNP is generated from. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
1	Introduction	2620	The evidence seen under FOI does not show that appropriate and effective cooperation has occurred, particularly with Highways England in regard to the development of the transport infrastructure. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
1	Introduction	2621	Statements of Common Ground not available as part of consultation. These much be re-consulted on at the next stage. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
1	Introduction	2797	Section 1.7 Local community involvement under the existing plan has been a travesty of what it should be.		Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
1	Introduction	2800	Section 1.10 - assertion cannot be sustained. Developments that have taken place under the existing Plan have not respected the character of Chichester; All recent proposals have urbanised Chichester and its setting, and have severely degraded the city's surrounds.	DELETE: "The Plan provides a direction for development based on the characteristic of the areas"	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
1	Introduction	2803	Section 1.26 Support the specific mention of the need for cross boundary cooperation over dark skies policy.		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
1	Introduction	3057	The Conservancy does not know whether the effectiveness of the current Local Plan has been evaluated, with the findings used to inform the Preferred Approach.	If an evaluation has taken place, to publish the results. If it has not taken place, the Conservancy would question how it is possible to review the Local Plan without an evaluation. Regardless, any completed review should be published, and form part of the evidence base for the next iteration.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
1	Introduction	3058	The Conservancy notes the absence of a Commercial Development Plan as part of the consultation.	That a Commercial Development Plan is prepared and published.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
1	Introduction	3059	The Foreword starts with "This is the next stage in the preparation of the Chichester Local Plan Review, for the Chichester plan area (outside the South Downs National Park)." Despite this, the Local Plan has excessive references to the South Downs National Park. It is unclear why the National Park is given such a high level of prominence in the Chichester Local Plan Review, when unlike the AONB, it is not actually part of the Plan area.	To remove as many unnecessary references to the South Downs National Park as possible. To concentrate on the environmental and historic assets actually within the Chichester District Local Plan area, especially the AONB, giving great weight to it.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
b. Characteristics of the Plan Area						
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2290	Historic England welcomes and supports the reference to the historic environment of Chichester district, and the heritage assets therein, in paragraphs 2.27 and 2.28 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2291	Historic England welcomes and supports, in principle, the identification of "Protect the area's valuable heritage and historic assets" as one of the challenges faced by the Plan. The Framework therefore requires local planning authorities, through their local plans, to do more than just conserve the historic environment i.e. to enhance it as well. This should be identified as a challenge (although it is also an opportunity).	Reword the last bullet point of paragraph 2.28 as; "Protect and enhance the area's valuable heritage and historic assets".	Object	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2420	Para 2.29 (challenges and opportunities facing the Plan Area): We suggest that the 7th bullet point should say 'Protect and enhance the character of the area including the Chichester Harbour AONB and the setting of the SDNP'.	Para 2.29 (challenges and opportunities facing the Plan Area): We suggest that the 7th bullet point should say 'Protect and enhance the character of the area including the Chichester Harbour AONB and the setting of the SDNP'.	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2444	Map page 16 - request clarification whether LP area includes Stedlands Farm and the Stable/Little Stedlands, Haslemere GU27 3DJ		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2489	The term East-West Corridor used with in regard to west of the City of Chichester is ill defined and the use of this term implies the focus of policy is on transport and through movement to the detriment of a more balanced focus on local settlement, existing residential, local countryside and amenity issues. There is a lack of vision, clarity and coherence of planning policy towards the Bourne Villages, their character and the surrounding countryside that lies between the South Downs AONB and Chichester Harbour AONB		Comment	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2586	Final bullet 2.4 not consistent with para 6.91	Revise text for consistency and to highlight opps to enhance amenities through policies of NP and LPR.	Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2622	The data in this plan should reflect the demographic data of the local plan area only. In particular the social and economic characteristics must reflect the plan area and not the district as a whole. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2804	Issues of rural setting and green access need to be better acknowledged and protected. Current accesses are fragile and easily disrupted or downgraded by new developments (a notable example being the downgrading of the southern end of Centurion Way).	INSERT New bullet point * One characteristic common to almost all the settlements is easy access to countryside for informal exercise and recreation.	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2806	Section 2.13 Insert Tourism as a significant employer.	Section 2.13 INSERT Tourism	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2809	Section 2.18 The end phrase "offers the best potential for attracting inward investment" is not substantiated. New jobs could drive out some of the existing "self employed" and some of the existing "micro, small and medium sized businesses". OBJECT To the phrasing "However, there is also a need to support and diversify economic activity in the rural parts of the plan area" on grounds that original wording is too unfocussed allowing any form of diversification. Only diversification that complements the area should be contemplated.	Section 2.18 DELETE "The sentence "This area benefits from good access to the main road and rail network and offers the best potential for attracting inward investment." Suggest rewording to: "However, there is also a need to support economic activity in the rural parts of the plan area, and diversify into areas that afford quality jobs without changing the character of the area".	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2813	Section 2.28 OBJECT To the phrase "... whilst recognising the need to accommodate new development" on grounds that this kind of phrase is too often used by developers to shoe-horn in inappropriate developments.	Delete phrase "... whilst recognising the need to accommodate new development"	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2838	Section 2.24 of the PAP references Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, we recommend that this is updated to reflect that sites are now referred to as Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). This is a national move to ensure that all locally designated sites are consistently referenced, especially within the planning system. In section 2.29 SWT recommends that the penultimate bullet point is revised both to include geodiversity and locally designated sites. Paragraphs 171 and 174 of the NPPF are clear that locally designated sites must be safeguarded in plans in order to protect and enhance biodiversity.	Section 2.24 of the PAP references Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, we recommend that this is updated to reflect that sites are now referred to as Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). This is a national move to ensure that all locally designated sites are consistently referenced, especially within the planning system. The PAP outlines in section 2.29 the challenges and opportunities facing the plan area. SWT recommends that the penultimate bullet point is revised both to include geodiversity and locally designated sites. Paragraphs 171 and 174 of the NPPF are clear that locally designated sites must be safeguarded in plans in order to protect and enhance biodiversity. The bullet point should be amended as follows: * Protect and enhance the area's biodiversity, geodiversity and habitats, including designated areas of international, national and local importance;	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2887	Para 2.2, 2nd bullet: the accessibility from the Manhood peninsula to the north is much worse than the Plan records. Para 2.5: The A27 is operating at more than double its original capacity. Improvements have not satisfactorily kept up with traffic increases. it is now one of the most dangerous, busiest, mot polluting major road in the country.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	2974	2.29 OBJECT due to omission Climate change is missing from this list.	Please add "Encourage businesses and individuals to adopt climate friendly lifestyles in order to prevent rising sea level rises and temperature increases which could harm our residents"	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	3060	Local Plan Map does not show Chichester Harbour AONB. If it did, it would help Chichester District Council, as the Local Planning Authority (LPA), to demonstrate the protected landscape constraints they are under when trying to identify land for new developments.	It is therefore suggested the AONB boundary is included in dark green shading, to indicate it is part of the Local Plan area.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	3061	Page 20, 2.23 Environment Characteristics: Chichester Harbour is important for its landscape value, as well as biodiversity, land and water-based recreation, and tourism. Furthermore, Chichester Harbour AONB should get a special mention and its own reference number under Environment Characteristics, especially considering that Medmerry is afforded this recognition, which does not have the same level of protection as Chichester Harbour.	Chichester Harbour is given its own reference number under Environment Characteristics.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	3062	Page 21, 2.24 SNCIs: The Conservancy was led to believe that Sites of Nature Conservation Importance had been renamed Local Wildlife Sites since the last Local Plan.	To clarify the correct name of these sites.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	3063	Page 21, 2.27 Environmental Characteristics: "Landscapes - the district has 86 conservation areas (of which 61 are in the National Park and 2 are shared between the District and the National Park), and 17 registered parks and gardens (2 of which are within the plan area)." The reference to 61 in the National Park is now irrelevant to this Local Plan and should be deleted.	Reword to: "Landscapes - the District has 86 conservation areas (of which 5 are within Chichester Harbour AONB), and 17 registered parks and gardens (2 of which are within the plan area)."	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	3064	Page 22, 2.29 Challenges and Opportunities: The LPA should state whether the list is in an order of importance. Nevertheless, it is felt that that the order should start by protecting the environmental and historic assets that are in Chichester District, i.e. the last bullet points, then those bullet points that support economic and social development, and then finally provision for new housing and business sites. This order would be more logical: (1) protect what is here; (2) support local people; (3) plan ahead.	Either: State the list is not in any order of importance. Or: Re-order the bullets in terms of environmental, social and then economic.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	3108	Page 166, 7.100 Sustainable Design and Construction: "A key issue for the plan area is accommodating the development needs within environmental and landscape limitations, whilst promoting more sustainable patterns of development through enabling improved accessibility to key services and facilities, public transport nodes and employment opportunities." This is central to the Local Plan and should be reproduced in 2.29 as a key challenge.	Making 7.100 more prominent near front of Local Plan. The Conservancy would also appreciate a separate point confirming that no major development will take place in Chichester Harbour AONB and all development must protect, conserve and enhance the landscape.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
2	Characteristics of the Plan Area	3146	The LPR does not recognise requirements of the District's established businesses for expansion and to build in resilience. RR factory will need to expand in future. No discussion of automotive sector/advanced manufacturing in this section.	Include discussion on automotive sector/advanced manufacturing	Comment	Rolls-Royce Motor Cars Limited [1784]

c. Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives

3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	113	3.7 "Maintain and enhance the countryside between settlements" - on the A259 between Emsworth and Chichester this vision/objective does not appear to have been adhered to.		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	155	Para 3.11 The Parish Council challenges the assertion that the provision of new dwellings will make the area more self contained. This needs more robust evidence. Currently the village of East Wittering has lost 4 banks, a holiday centre and a large pub and businesses rely heavily on seasonal tourism for trade. New homes without new local jobs will be a drain on current infrastructure. market homes are likely to add to the number of residents getting off the peninsular for work and will therefore not reduce the areas reliance on Chichester city centre.	Accept that tourism is a major business for this area and create local jobs. Market housing will not address the need to go to Chichester for work as local jobs tend to be seasonal and low paid. Need evidence that new market homes without local job creation will reduce the areas reliance on Chichester.	Object	West Wittering Parish Council (Mrs Susan Hawker) [6669]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	156	Para 3.12 is challenged by the Parish Council. Evidence that the recent 350 homes have contributed to the commercial and social well being of East Wittering is not provided. Infrastructure is overloaded (schools Medical facilities) Unemployment is higher so where are the jobs that are supposed to have been created as a result of new homes.	Evidence that market homes contribute to commercial and social activities need to be more robust here.	Object	West Wittering Parish Council (Mrs Susan Hawker) [6669]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	157	No evidence that jobs have been created by building more market homes	The evidence needs to be more robust. A policy to boost tourism, agriculture and fishing in seas side rural villages needs to be developed to provide local housing for local needs.	Object	West Wittering Parish Council (Mrs Susan Hawker) [6669]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	227	The East West corridor is proposed to take 80% of new housing. It is stated that it has good transport links: however this is not true for CYCLING.. This corridor between Chichester and Emsworth is also the route of NCN2 strategic cycle network route (currently A259), A MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENT for all new housing proposals, especially for Chichester, Bosham, Chidham and Southbourne must be to fund the necessary improvements to this route. Also various feeder cycle routes are needed to link in to NCN2 .	Require that all allocations in the East-West corridor comply with point 10 of the Policy, namely 'to Move around safely and conveniently with opportunities to choose alternatives to car travel in accordance with WSCC's Walking and Cycling Strategy'.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	260	"Move around safely and conveniently with opportunities to choose alternatives to car travel" I believe this should be strengthened to encouraging modal shift from car travel, which in turn would require interventions such as continuous cycle routes and increased frequency of bus routes		Comment	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	339	The focus on the Manhood and East/West will not allow local residents to pursue a healthy lifestyle. Nor is the premise that this plan will allow local communities to retain their distinctiveness is not true.Donnington will blend into Fishbourne and Appludram with Site AL6 The contention that Southbourne has good transport links is not true. The SDNP is becoming a monument of the past and not a vision of how it can grow. We need affordable properties in the SDNP for local people and stop them being priced out by retirees from London.	1. Engage specialists on the health impact of the plan on residents in the Fishbourne/Donningon/Apludram area 2. Hold a distinct consultation on the transport plans 3. Maintain existing parish boundaries to the area or the area just south of the A27 will get squished into a long thin amorphous blob 4. Don't accept the SDNP housing allocation. Affordable houses should be built in SDNP or it will die	Object	Mr Jim McAuslan [6602]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	421	In addressing the Manhood Peninsula over the past few years some 700 jobs have been lost leaving employment facilities empty or being replaced by housing. This Plan does not address the regeneration of large scale employment on the Peninsula thus requiring all new working residents to travel into Chichester and beyond, noting that junction upgrades to the A27 will not be completed for some 15 years.	In addressing the Manhood Peninsula over the past few years some 700 jobs have been lost leaving employment facilities empty or being replaced by housing. This Plan does not address the regeneration of large scale employment on the Peninsula thus requiring all new working residents to travel into Chichester and beyond, noting that junction upgrades to the A27 will not be completed for some 15 years.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	481	Laudable Vision Objectives but not seen through in the actual plan. Policies with an acute disregard for historic, nationally recognised views of Cathedral and natural landscapes, protected wildlife habitats and Grade 1 agricultural land in the Local Plan area. Huge increases in Air, Noise, Light and Soil Pollution. Chichester's main economies - agriculture and tourism on the Manhood Peninsula are snubbed in the Plan's objectives. Have key stakeholders including Chichester Harbour AONB, RSPB, CPRE and National Trust been consulted on this draft Local Plan prior to publication? It is obvious the SDNP have been.	Economy - Add Bullet point: Protection of Grade 1 Agricultural land to maintain, support and grow the rural economy working in partnership with West Sussex Growers Association Bullet point: Promote, Protect and Develop the Tourism economy on the Manhood Peninsula Environment Bullet point Reduce and protect against noise, light, soil pollution and improve air quality to surpass Government recommendations. Bullet point Protect, conserve and enhance landscape and heritage with a focus on views of the coast, cathedral and South Downs. 3.7 take out "carefully managed" and change to "will maintain and protect the countryside between settlements."	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	488	3.11 This implies that Selsey is a reasonably self sufficient dormitory town to Chichester. Does the plan refer to the 250 houses in Park Lane planned for 2029 which are outside the current Settlement area? There have been and will be more windfall developments and the nearly 10,00 residents plus 10,000 visitors can only come and go on only one already over-congested road. Moreover, Selsey is liable to coastal flooding and could get cut off. Any Emergency Resilience Plan would be stretched to cope.		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	489	3.12 Comment: Firstly, our unique position as a cul-de-sac makes Selsey unlikely ever to a focus for new commercial development. Our best chance of improving our economy is by tourism. Developing East Beach will be good start, but will CDC finance a scheme which will take us forward to 2029 and beyond. Secondly, RSPB is not designed to be easy to access for visitors, but to conserve the birds. Medmerry is largely inaccessible to all except the very fit. Thirdly, and most important, what can CDC do to facilitate good class hotel accommodation on the Manhood?		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	490	3.19: Our 'Vision' Exercise shows that there is a need for shoe shop and clothing for older people who cannot order on line. Such retail businesses are unlikely to be profitable unless we can increase visitor numbers throughout the year.		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	492	The quality and appearance of our most recent development, East Beach Walk (EBW), is not fit for purpose. This is because of previously known high level of ground water. The residents Facebook page relates houses have damp floors and carpets needing replacement and badly fitting doors and windows. All future developments should have real mitigation against becoming boggy. Finally, the design of most new estates, EBW among others, is boring being almost uniform red brick boxes with small windows. What has happened to modern architecture that is pleasing to look at, functional and is designed for the particular location?		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	509	east west corridor 3.7 This conflicts with 3.10 as large developments are indicated at Fishbourne (including the link road and roundabout changes), Bosham, Southbourne, Chidham and Hambrook The Plan and these two statements will have to be altered and amended in order to bring harmony		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	525	I support the methodology of the Strategic Policies and thank the Council for the comprehensive and thorough nature of the Plan.		Support	Mr Chris Coffin [6794]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	551	Flawed plan. Does not preserve the biodiversity or conservation of Chichester harbour AONB. No concrete information on infrastructure or protection of AONB from pollution, light pollution, flooding etc. Does not mention transport infrastructure or costings. Not enough information to give an educated response. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Needs to be a complete plan NORTH, SOUTH, EAST and WEST. Proper detail that has been provided with accurate and proven data.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	577	3.11 -3.13 Spatial Vision Manhood Peninsula. Pagham Harbour and Medmerry are each referred to twice as important wildlife habitats, but there is no mention of Chichester Harbour AONB with its series of national and international designations! This must be added here first before Pagham and Medmerry.		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	962	Far too little decent communication effort on the part of CDC to make the Local Plan Review process more understandable to the people of the district.		Comment	Liz Sagues [6982]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	1272	Support strategic objectives but clarification required as to how the objectives will be realised		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	1390	Broadly support; sceptical of delivery. 3.4 sustainable neighbourhoods and good non-vehicle transport links and views and landscape value are crucial. Ditto 3.7, the importance of countryside linking the downs and harbour, both for people and wildlife.		Comment	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	1442	Natural England supports the vision as it recognises the importance of biodiversity and unspoilt landscape, and access for people to those resources.		Support	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	1475	We are supportive of the proposed vision, in particular that it supports the enrichment of quality of life through opportunities to enjoy our local culture and arts.		Support	The Theatres Trust (Planning Policy Officer) [1009]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	1595	We wish to be called at the time of the Planning Inspection. This plan appears to have been created in a short time and therefore lacks cohesion. Information used in one area is different to that elsewhere. Points made for: Apuldram/Donnington/Bosham/Chidham/Hambrook/Fishbourne make it appear that they have been written in silos. Can you please look at each one and try and line the reasoning up. Our fear is that this document needs significant change for it to be fit and proper and presentable to the Inspector.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	1885	The spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives (section 3.6 local plan) and the sustainability appraisal in relation to Chidham and `ham brook are contradictory.		Object	Chidham Sustainability Network (Stephen Morley) [7226]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2094	It is requested that 'Joint' is added into the references for the Joint Minerals Local Plan through the document. Policy W23 of the Waste Local Plan applies to all Districts & Boroughs, regarding waste management within development and should be referenced in the Chichester Local Plan Review.	It is requested that 'Joint' is added into the references for the Joint Minerals Local Plan through the document. Policy W23 of the Waste Local Plan should be referenced in the Chichester Local Plan Review.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2100	The Local Plan Strategic Objectives offer further support to enhance off-road access, particularly to 'Encourage healthy and active lifestyles for all, developing accessible health and leisure facilities and linked green spaces'. However, the objective to 'Achieve a sustainable and integrated transport system through improved cycling networks and links to public transport' should recognise walking also as an important mode for many people; some strategic enhancements will significantly improve walkers' safety and convenience.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2242	Suggest amend para 3.1 Welcome inclusion of heritage in the Vision. Welcome ref to historic cathedral city in para 3.4 Welcome/support para 3.14	Reword the first sentence of paragraph 3.1 as; "It is the intention of the Council to enable the delivery of infrastructure, jobs, accessible local services and housing for future generations while conserving and enhancing the historic, built and natural environment".	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2346	Para 3.2 Bullets 5, 9, 10 - objectives are supported		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2458	Para 3.8 - Southbourne's transport links downgraded with loss of north-south buses.	We suggest that the Bourne villages area be considered a 'green / blue ladder' between the AONB and the National Park rather than an East-West transit corridor. Varied countryside views from the Bourne villages towards the SDNP and AONB should be protected, as should views from the A259 and railway of the local countryside and countryside gaps. This will require properly contoured development and good screening.	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2540	Welcome para 3.7 however plan proposals make this hard to achieve. W of Chichester should be treated holistically	We wish to see a re-evaluation of the distribution of housing allocations between Fishbourne and Chichester, a new policy on settlement gaps and strengthening of existing policies to prevent coalescence between villages (e.g. S30, S24) We urge for additional SPD guidance on development between Chichester and Emsworth to achieve this purpose.	Object	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2627	No mention of the development opportunities to the North of the city. Northern considerations will benefit the rural communities. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2702	Support the Vision and strategic objectives.		Support	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2741	Suggest that the vision specifies that more homes will be delivered in the places people want to live.		Comment	Gleeson Strategic Land (Mr Peter Rawlinson) [855]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2815	Section 3.2 Existing phrasing is looking complacent in the context of the recent IPCC report predicting 12 years to implement "urgent and unprecedented changes" to keep the global temperature rise down. It is a priority to further downplay the car. The Local Plan should be revised to better support the national commitment to combat climate change.	Bullet Point 10 CHANGE TO Move around safely and conveniently, prioritising alternatives to car travel, and reducing the need to travel in the first place.	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2817	Section 3.4 too economic focussed. Specific mention needed of quality of life issues not accounted for by paid-for activities; notably informal recreation in the rural surrounds and easy (non car-based) access to those surrounds. Simply stating "other parts of the city" could be taken to imply that wider access beyond the city is not important.	Section 3.4 CHANGE TO "with a range of opportunities for business, shopping, entertainment and leisure (including informal recreation in open spaces)". CHANGE TO "with good public transport, pedestrian and cycle links to other parts of the city and into the city's rural surrounds".	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2821	Section 3.5 OBJECT to phrasing "Most of the new development will be well located in and around the main settlement of Chichester together with Tangmere and Southbourne" on grounds that Tangmere does not have a railway station and cannot be said to be "well located"; Chichester is a small city - the sheer numbers being tacked on do not make Chichester "well located" for as much development as is proposed.		Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2823	Section 3.6 - The phrase following "whilst" opens the door to much development that is undesirable/inappropriate. The additional underlined text adds some redress; introducing the importance of local character as part of economic development. The areas to the east west and south of the city do not constitute a single "corridor".	CHANGE TO Strategic development to the east, west and south of the city will seek to conserve and enhance the local distinctiveness, character and cohesion of existing settlements, which attract residents, visitors and businesses to the area. A selective and sensitive approach to development will be taken whilst.. CHANGE FROM This highly accessible transit corridor TO The close proximity of these sites to the city	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2825	3.7 The cavalier treatment of the southern end of Centurion Way provides a salutary lesson of what may happen if the revised Plan fails to specifically mention the importance of green routes between the North and South.	ADD (at the end of the sentence) In particular, walking and cycling routes between the National Park and the areas to the south will be protected and enhanced for the benefit of both local residents and visitors.	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2827	3.8 fails to acknowledge that the introduction of (paid for) formal local facilities often come at the loss of (free) informal facilities.	Greater focus is needed specifying precisely what new facilities are desirable and what are not.	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2831	Nothing wrong with vision but much wrong with proposed implementation. Some of the bridges do not even qualify as cycleways, as they are designed only to footbridge standards.	ADD (at the end of the paragraph): "Cycleways between settlements should anticipate heavy use, and anticipate users travelling at significantly different speeds; with far more use of electric bicycles than at present. As such, they should take advantage of their relatively unconstrained greenfield location and should be built to wide width, relaxed turning circles and without compulsory dismounting".	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2832	3.12 - The term "regeneration" is too often used to promote inappropriate development. Clarity is needed that only sensitive regeneration is being looked for.	CHANGE TO Opportunities for selective and sensitive regeneration that arise in these settlements. INSERT (at the end of the paragraph) In particular, the Selsey Greenway (formerly known as the Selsey Cycle Route) should be prioritised, in order to provide significant opportunity not only for green tourism but also to extend the tourist season, while at the same time also helping to promote the transport objectives of this Plan.	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2842	Section 3.1 does not show a strong enough commitment to the natural environment as required by the revised NPPF, which is much more progressive in its approach. The term supporting should be strengthened to reflect the need to protect, conserve and enhance the natural environment. Section 3.2 includes the vision and we are pleased to see biodiversity and the wider natural environment recognised within this. Further opportunity to include net gains to Natural Capital and recognise the need for climate change resilience.	In Section 3.1 we propose the following amendment: 'It is the commitment of the Council to enable the delivery of infrastructure, jobs, accessible local services and housing for future generations while protecting, conserving and enhancing the historic and natural environment.' In Section 3.2 we propose the following amendment: Live in a district which safeguards its natural assets, adding to natural capital by creating net gains to biodiversity, enabling climate change resilience for the benefit of people and wildlife. In the SWT response to the Issues and Options paper (Aug 2017) we proposed that bullet point 8 of the vision demonstrate a precise commitment to all types of infrastructure, we reiterate this and propose the following amendments: 'Live in sustainable neighbourhoods supported by necessary grey, green and blue infrastructure and facilities'.	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2853	Section 3.3 of the PAP refers to good access to a range of employment opportunities and affordable housing, we seek clarity on what good access means? Does this vision reflect the requirement for development to be sustainable and in particular planning which limits the need to travel and offers a genuine choice of transport modes (NPPF paragraph 103)? A large amount of development is focused on the East-West corridor. No acknowledgement of the need for protection and likely need for growth of area's natural capital in order to deliver the ecosystem services required to support development.	The vision should be amended to acknowledge the role the environment will have to play to ensure that development in this area is truly sustainable (NPPF paragraph 171).	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2854	Manhood Peninsula SWT welcomes the amendments that have been made to this section of the plan following our 2017 comments. As a result the 'rural hinterland' is now included alongside the coast and surrounding countryside for protection. We still suggest that there is an opportunity to reflect the area's value in terms of ecosystem services delivery, in particular in relation to flood resilience.	We still suggest that there is an opportunity to reflect the area's value in terms of ecosystem services delivery, in particular in relation to flood resilience.	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2976	<p>Justification for suggested change to 3.2: IPCC report. Bullet point 10 - without more safe segregated cycle paths this vision will not be realised.</p> <p>Plan should draw upon ongoing work of Cycle Forum and the Chemroute's proposals and be coordinated with WSCC with the goal of introducing high quality and separated cycle links between villages along the A259 and between Westhampnett and Tangmere and Chichester.</p> <p>3.10 Timing of the 700 bus have been reduced from every 10 minutes to every 20 minutes - not reliable enough to provide an alternative to the private car.</p>	<p>3.2 add "Live protected from the worst risks of climate change; To live a low-carbon lifestyle". Delete "Move around safely and conveniently with opportunities to choose alternatives to car travel"; Replace with "Take advantage of a full network of joined up, safe, segregated, convenient, direct, and inclusive cycle and walking routes that enable people to chose to travel distances under 5 miles in complete safety without relying on the private car".</p> <p>3.10 add "by increasing the frequency of buses and trains"</p>	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	2977	<p>Section 3.17 Need to include another Strategic Objective - Justification for this is IPCC report .</p> <p>Strategic Objective 5: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change</p>	Strategic Objective 5: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	3065	<p>Page 24, 3.7 The East-West Corridor: "The relationship between the National Park and significant natural areas to the south, especially Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, will be carefully managed by maintaining and enhancing the countryside between settlements."</p> <p>This aspiration is not reflected in the policies in the Local Plan, with large development schemes proposed at Apuldram, Bosham, Fishbourne, Chidham & Hambrook and Southbourne.</p>	To remove the contradiction. The policies must reflect the ambition.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	3066	<p>Page 25, 3.13 Manhood Peninsula: "Local industries such as horticulture, agriculture, fishing and tourism will flourish with a particular focus on local food production."</p> <p>3.13 does not make sense. There is no evidence that building more dwellings will result in these industries flourishing.</p>	Provide evidence to back-up the statement or delete it.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	3476	Para 3.17. Object to allocation of 41 homes from SDNP.	Reject the 41 homes back from SDNP	Object	Mr Colin Hammerton [6709]
3	Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives	3517	A sound planning strategy can deliver ample development land within the district that will meet housing and employment needs while protecting the important transitional relationship offered by land between the urban edge and the SDNP boundary. This will involve being focussed more on evolving settlement hubs on good transport routes and allowing appropriate scales of development to sustain rural settlements. This will involve an on-going dialogue with adjoining authorities under the duty to co-operate to ensure future development is located in sustainable locations where it is most appropriate.		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	235	Support the Strategic Transport objectives.		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	378	Under Health and Well-Being add a bullet: "develop networks of paths and lanes to encourage NV travel/walking/cycling."		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	422	<p>Addressing facilities in the Witterings. Closures: 4 Banks hardware shop restaurant Pub Post Office convenience store More housing appears to bring about retail closures.</p> <p>Addressing environment. More commuting into Chichester and destroys landscape.</p> <p>Addressing Strategic Infrastructure. Access to and from A27, mitigation was to have been put in place by the time the housing completions were met under the adopted Local Plan. No work has yet been undertaken.</p> <p>Addressing Sewage. Sidlesham WTW Remaining capacity 64.</p> <p>Addressing Flood Risk. NPPF requires a 'Fall Back' area to allow for homes to replace those at flood risk due to rising sea levels.</p>	<p>Addressing facilities in the Witterings. 4 Banks have closed, Hardware shop closed, restaurant closed, Pub closed, Post Office closed, convenience store closed etc, etc. More housing appears to bring about retail closures. Addressing environment. More housing brings about more commuting into Chichester and destroys landscape. Addressing Strategic Infrastructure. Access to and from A27, mitigation was supposed to have been put in place by the time the housing completions were met under the adopted Local Plan, which has already been met, ref Jacobs Transport Study 2013. No work has yet been undertaken. Addressing Sewage. In 2012 the spare capacity at the Sidlesham WTW was 914 dwellings. To date new builds, under construction and with Planning Consent is already nearing 850. Remaining capacity 64. Addressing Flood Risk. NPPF requires a 'Fall Back' area to allow for homes to replace those at flood risk due to rising sea levels. This has been ignored.</p>	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	491	<p>Housing and Neighbourhood, 1st Objective: The quality and appearance of our most recent development, East Beach Walk is, by some resident, 'not fit for purpose'. Because of the high level of ground water, doors and windows do not fit. More important is the drainage issues. A few houses have damp floors and carpets. All future developments should have real mitigation against becoming boggy. Finally, the design of most new estates (EBW among others is boring red brick boxes with small windows. What has happened to modern architecture that is pleasing to look at and is designed for the particular location?</p>		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	494	<p>Strategic Infrastructure The planned population increases on the East West Corridor will make the proposals for the present A27 only a short term solution. The only long-term answer to segregate through and local traffic.. If the proposed roundabout improvements are done, during the 2 or 3 years that this will take the traffic and the air pollution will be much worse and children may die. The only sensible option is to first build a Northern option, then sort out the existing road, knowing that there will then be 45% less traffic on it.</p>		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	496	<p>Cycle Routes & Public Transport a) It is imperative that all potential cycle routes link up to make a commuter network. On the Manhood, these these have been identified and promoted by GLAM and MPP. Are the protocols in place to ensure that they can be given priority when future Planning Applications are lodged which might otherwise conflict. b) Is there a way that CDC can work with the bus providers to ensure lower fares, especially for those aged under 25's.?</p>		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	497	Water Resources a) Ensure Supplies by capturing rainfall that falls on the Downs and building reservoirs in the South Downs as opportunities arise. This will reduce coastal groundwater and can provide leisure facilities and enhance nature. b) SUDS are only a partial answer to flooding. Small ponds in boggy places are more effective, better for wildlife and they enhance the environment generally. There should also be rain water capture and re-use of grey water from houses to use in toilets and water gardens, hopefully planted with copious trees and shrubs. This should be a requirement of planning permission.		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	552	Housing must be affordable & majority for local connection not just 2 yrs but if people are born in area / have a local connections. Second home embargos in villages. Make it financial unviable for people to buy houses to rent out. Cap the rents so they have to be affordable to local families. No studies on the environmental damage due to A27 and air/light pollution.Mass development not sustainable because of lack of infrastructure.No mention of the North. Unless this is addressed in future iterations of the plan , I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	More detail required on infrastructure. Northern route needs to be included and explored. NOT EXCLUDED.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1003	No supporting evidence is offered for the glowing expectations for social activities and industry with less call on city centre services. The vision needs to be supported by an appraisal of the previous Local Plan. What are the facts?	Add evidence to support vision statements. Add review of current Local Plan performance.	Object	Mr Keith Martin [4610]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1035	The objectives of the Strategic Infrastructure should be more explicit in identifying the conflict between local traffic and through traffic on the A27. It is not enough to attempt to mitigate congestion on the A27 through improvements. The objective should focus on ways to separate through traffic from local traffic without cutting the Manhood Peninsula off from the City.	More emphasis should be put on exploring the possibility of a northern bypass.	Object	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1123	Under the heading of Objectives for the Local Plan (3.19) the document lists the need to 'achieve a sustainable and integrated transport system through improved cycle ways and links to public transport'. CDCF would endorse these statements.		Support	Chichester and District Cycle Forum (Mr Ian Smith) [7054]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1396	Broadly support. Consider in Health & Well-Being including reference to children, not just "the older population" - children who get out and about independently in their communities become healthy adults who value the same freedoms and interaction with the spaces and people around them and are a good "indicator species" for healthy, cohesive, properly-planned communities. Consider similar for people who have disabilities - the world around all of us needs to welcome all, not just our "dwellings", "leisure facilities and linked green spaces".		Comment	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1444	Natural England broadly supports the strategic objectives. However, we would urge the Council to be more ambitious in the greenhouse gas emissions objective, and amend 'minimise the net increase' to 'reduce greenhouse emissions'. Chichester District is at particular risk from the effects of climate change, in terms of sea level rise and cost of flood management infrastructure, but also loss of intertidal habitats (and the species that rely on them) that residents and visitors value.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1477	Under the economic objectives, we suggest that the fourth point might be strengthened/enhanced with the addition of reference to cultural uses alongside those already included. Cultural uses are compatible within this context, and would help ensure consistency throughout the document and help underpin delivery of the vision.		Comment	The Theatres Trust (Planning Policy Officer) [1009]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1581	Objectives should include support for the WSCC/CDC preferred scheme for a new A27 Chichester Bypass to the north of the City. These objectives are all well and good but the plan doesn't say how most of them are achieved e.g. "Encourage healthy and active lifestyles.....".		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1614	The strategic objectives housing makes no mention of renewable energy and up to date digital infrastructure. The proposal in this plan is only short term and therefore does not provide a deliverable solution for the strategic A27. Strategic infrastructure makes no mention of the mitigated Northern route. We must resist tinkering to the A27 that can be considered as community consensus and prevents us from getting our true requirement which is a strategic mitigated Northern Route.	Strategic objectives need to include renewable energy. Strategic objectives need to include a vision for modern digital infrastructure. Strategic infrastructure needs to mention the mitigated Northern route as a long term consideration.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1652	strategic objectives housing makes no mention of renewable energy and up to date digital infrastructure that should be built into any new development both for housing and employment space.	Strategic infrastructure makes no mention of the mitigated Northern route. We must resist tinkering to the A27 that can be considered as community consensus and prevents us from getting our true requirement which is a strategic mitigated Northern Route. You are obliged to look at short, medium and long term solutions where they impact the strategic road network. The proposal in this plan is only short term and therefore does not provide a deliverable solution for the strategic A27 and is a waste of valuable infrastructure money locally. It is also in direct conflict with the works proposed but not undertaken in the current adopted plan. You are obliged to meet those requirements before then considering new development impacts. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1657	The proposal in this plan is only short term and therefore does not provide a deliverable solution for the strategic A27. Strategic infrastructure makes no mention of the mitigated Northern route. We must resist tinkering to the A27 that can be considered as community consensus and prevents us from getting our true requirement which is a strategic mitigated Northern Route.	Strategic objectives need to include renewable energy. Strategic objectives need to include a vision for modern digital infrastructure. Strategic infrastructure needs to mention the mitigated Northern route as a long term consideration.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1973	Paragraph 3.4 omits development opportunities north of the city.	Including development opportunities north of the city would help reduce pressure to the south where there is a lack of appropriate space because of the flood plain.	Comment	Mr Anthony Tuffin [5052]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1977	Paragraph 3.7 How can allocation at Apuldram can be justified as it would remove the only view of a cathedral from the sea in the country and long-distance views of the downs?		Comment	Mr Anthony Tuffin [5052]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	1979	Paragraph 3.19 Strategic infrastructure excludes the Mitigated Northern Route. Tweaking existing A27 lacks local community consensus, would prevent a long-term solution; i.e., strategic northern route.		Comment	Mr Anthony Tuffin [5052]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2007	Raises concerns about insufficient publicity and lack of responses from people. Plan also too big and complex to fully understand. Longer should be taken to fully explain implications.		Object	Mr Graham Porrett [7251]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2235	Objects to the term East -West Corridor: these settlements including Southbourne have a distinct identity, and that is a perjorative term, and reflective of the CDC approach to this whole exercise to describe the villages that include Southbourne in this way. Questions how relationship between SDNP and Harbour can be maintained with scale of development proposed. Also concerned about reference to good transport links for Southbourne which does not reflect reality.		Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2243	Historic England welcomes and supports, in principle, the Strategic Objective "Conserve and enhance landscape and heritage" as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, we suggest that it could be rather more ambitious.	Include: "Conserve, enhance, increase appreciation and enjoyment of and access to heritage"	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2347	Health & Well-Being bullet point 1 - this objective is supported		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2794	Support objectives - plan has been positively prepared and justified.		Support	Hallam Land Management Limited [1696]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2843	3.19 Objectives Road-building programme not necessarily the solution - see "eways" proposal attached - concentrate on getting walking and cycling and public transport infrastrucutre sorted first; energy saving overlooked; failure to mention schemes such as park and ride, car clubs, car sharing and goods-consolidation centres; acknowledge SuDS only help with rainfall flooding; introduce minimum land height figure in order that development does not make things worse for future generations by building in flood risk areas.	Environment point 4 CHANGE TO Minimise the net increase in greenhouse emissions by, in the first instance, minimising energy requirements and, in the second instance, maximising use of renewable and low carbon energy sources; Strategic Infrastructure Point 1 CHANGE TO Transport improvements to mitigate congestion, especially on the A27. INSERT - between points 3 and 4 * Encourage new approaches such as park and ride, car clubs, car sharing and goods-consolidation centres Water Resource and Flood Risk Management point 3 CHANGE TO Minimise rainfall flood risk for new and existing developments INSERT a point 4 * Minimise risk of flooding from sea-level rise, by avoiding new build on land below 1.5 metres.	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2855	SWT supports the spirit of the objectives and are pleased to see a group of 'environmental objectives'. However we would like to see a stronger commitment to net gains to biodiversity and acknowledgement of the need for a growth in the natural capital of the district in order to support development, in line with paragraphs 171 and 174 of the NPPF. We recommend the inclusion of an additional bullet point	We recommend the inclusion of this additional bullet point: * Add to the Natural Capital of Chichester District by delivering measurable net gains to biodiversity	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2884	Support objectives, however question whether CDC has sought to increase housing supply to accommodate unmet need and employment.		Support	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2888	Para 3.19 Housing and Neighbourhoods: In this section there is no mention of the need for commensurate infrastructure to cope with all the new accommodation Para 3.19 Strategic Infrastructure: Highway improvements especially on the A27 are vital, not only to mitigate congestion on that trunk route, but to reduce the volume of traffic in the City		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2965	Section 3.19, Bullet point 4 SUPPORT for Encourage improved access to high speed broadband and new information; and communications technologies.		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	2978	Economy: delete the words "promote economic development" and replace with "Support shared prosperity for all to maintain quality of life" delete the words "and competitiveness." Environment Please insert "Reduce reliance on fossil fuels". Strategic Infrastructure: Please insert as the first bullet point "Reduce the need to travel through provision of onsite facilities, small shops, doctor's surgeries, within developments". Change the order of the bullet points - the "sustainable and integrated transport system" should come before the "Highways Improvements". Change the word Highways improvements to Highways works.	Economy: delete the words "promote economic development" and replace with "Support shared prosperity for all to maintain quality of life" delete the words "and competitiveness." Environment Please insert "Reduce reliance on fossil fuels". Strategic Infrastructure: Please insert as the first bullet point "Reduce the need to travel through provision of onsite facilities, small shops, doctor's surgeries, within developments". Change the order of the bullet points - the "sustainable and integrated transport system" should come before the "Highways Improvements". Change the word Highways improvements to Highways works.	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
4	Local Plan Strategic Objectives	3151	Strategic objectives should recognise RR and its possible expansion needs as the largest employer in the advanced manufacturing sector.		Comment	Rolls-Royce Motor Cars Limited [1784]
d. Spatial Strategy						
5	Spatial Strategy	2795	Spatial strategy accords with paras 20 and 21 of NPPF.		Support	Hallam Land Management Limited [1696]
5	Spatial Strategy	2860	Section 4.4 - expected to see a reference to ecological networks and green infrastructure influencing decisions. Little evidence relating to the need to 'identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks'. Expect CDC to incorporate more thorough evidence base. Very little information on state of District's environment. Concern about potential location of new settlement of up to 3,000 dwellings as no information provided to demonstrate this is a feasible option. No confidence the evidence base will be used to inform potential locations for a new settlement. Section 4.33 does'n include natural capital impacts and investment	Therefore as a minimum we recommend the following amendments to section 4.33: 'However, in order to progress the longer-term identification of a possible site for a new settlement, the following considerations are set out to guide potential discussions leading up to the preparation of a future review of this Plan: * Sufficient scale to support potential long term development needs arising and support the provision of key green, blue and grey infrastructure and community facilities; * Comprehensively planned in consultation with existing communities and key stakeholders; * A sustainable, inclusive and cohesive community promoting self-sufficiency and with high levels of sustainable transport connectivity; * Inclusion of on and off-site measures to avoid and mitigate any significant adverse impacts on nearby protected habitats, delivers a measurable net gain to biodiversity and a growth in natural capital; * Provision of a mix of uses to meet longer term development needs and contribute towards its distinctive identity; and * A layout and form of development that avoids coalescence with existing settlements and does not undermine their separate identity; respects the landscape character and conserves and where possible enhances the character, significance and setting of heritage assets	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
5	Spatial Strategy	2984	Section 4.3 Insert the word "natural environment" in the first sentence "...and meet the needs of places, communities and the natural environment across the plan area..."	Section 4.3 Insert the word "natural environment" in the first sentence "...and meet the needs of places, communities and the natural environment across the plan area..."	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
5	Spatial Strategy	3478	Para 4.84 Funding element is unclear. Consider spends on local roads such as A286 and roads on Manhood Peninsula	Clarity on funding sought	Object	Mr Colin Hammerton [6709]
6	Sustainable Development Principles	231	These Principles need to include the Strategic Objective 10 set out above; namely to move around safely and conveniently with opportunities to choose alternatives to car travel '	Add sentence to policy.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
6	Sustainable Development Principles	304	UKs environmental footprint is already 2.4 times it's land area. We can only produce enough food for about 60% of our population. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/food-statistics-pocketbook-2017/food-statistics-in-your-pocket-2017-global-and-uk-supply It is clear to me that in ecology terms NO new housing development on greenfield or agricultural land is sustainable. More housing, higher population numbers simply push our footprint higher and displace land use to other countries with their own environmental issues. The UK needs a population policy.	Add section 4.3 which recognises housing development on greenfield sites can never be sustainable. NPPF as it stands can only make the environmental impact "slightly less bad". Not sustainable.	Object	Mr Stuart Solliss [5180]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
6	Sustainable Development Principles	343	A principle of the National Planning Policy Framework is for a healthy and just society. By focussing more traffic on the existing A27 corridor the plan will not produce a healthy society. Stockbridge already exceeds the recommended air quality levels. The plan does not feel 'just' for those of us living south of the A27. the major point of discussion in my neighbourhood is the way that the area around Goodwood is so little impacted and that this must because of 'influence'	Return to the drawing board on the plan's focus of having to make do with the existing A27. Include Goodwood more fully in the plan - especially for its industrial capacity	Object	Mr Jim McAuslan [6602]
6	Sustainable Development Principles	1601	Not sufficiently supporting the environment		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
6	Sustainable Development Principles	2244	Suggest amendment to para 4.2 to more closely reflect NPPF. "New development must achieve sustainable development principles, must not adversely affect the history, quality, amenity or safety of the natural, built and historic environment and should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and establish or maintain a sense of place".	Reword the final sentence of paragraph 4.2 as ""New development must achieve sustainable development principles, must not adversely affect the history, quality, amenity or safety of the natural, built and historic environment and should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and establish or maintain a sense of place". (Alternatively, these could be set out as bullet points for clarity).	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
6	Sustainable Development Principles	2459	Reliance on national sustainable development principles is insufficient. The objective of the Local Plan should be to aim higher. While recognising that not everything is possible, we suggest referring to the principles set out in the Wildlife Trust's 'Homes for People and Wildlife' policy guidance and the World Health Organisation's 'Urban Green Spaces - A Brief For Action'		Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
6	Sustainable Development Principles	2981	Section 4.2 Insert the word "and natural" in the last sentence "...must not adversely affect the character, quality, amenity or safety of the built and natural environment"	Section 4.2 Insert the word "and natural" in the last sentence "...must not adversely affect the character, quality, amenity or safety of the built and natural environment"	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	106	Where there is a Neighbourhood Plan you should state that the policies it contains of prime importance as they reflect the views of the local residents who know the area concerned far better.	State that NP's are very important documents that should be adhered to.	Object	Mr Roger Newman [5488]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	553	As the local plan stands at present it does not take into account the environmental damage that some strategic areas included will suffer . Unless this is adequately addressed in the iterations of the plan, I will raise this with examiner at the appropriate time.	Proper research with upto date data needs to be used before the plan can be properly assessed.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	643	Does not give enough detail of sustainability. Need small scale developments whcih can be absorbed and not over whelm the infrastructure. Only large scale developments after infrastructure has been built and is working.	Infrastructure first then housing. Realisitic figures on developments. Chichester cannot sustain thousands and thousands of homes to the south, east and west at this time.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	860	In the context of SUSTAINABLE development that improves the environmental conditions in the area, given the threat of climate change, I consider it essential that all new developments should be truly sustainable ie use renewable energy(solar, wind, wave) rather than fossil fuels and be fully insulated to minimise the energy needed to heat or cool the buildings.	All new developments should only be allowed of they are truly SUSTAINABLE ie titally use renewable energy sources.	Object	Ms Valerie Briginshaw [6946]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	1210	We support the objective of this policy which follows the positive approach to planning and particularly the presumption in favour of sustainable development that is contained within the NPPF		Support	Mr Alan Hutchings [7035]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	2703	Support policy		Support	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	2757	Understand that requirement for this policy is no longer - as such it repeats national policy and should be deleted.	Delete policy S1.	Comment	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	3003	Policy should be worded to reflect wording of para 11 of NPPF.	Reword policy	Object	Danescroft Land Ltd (Mr Aidan Robson) [7342]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	3010	Policy should be reworded to reflect wording of para 11 NPPF.	Policy should be reworded to reflect wording of para 11 NPPF.	Object	Castle Properties (Michael Stephens) [7344]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	3014	Policy should be reword to reflect NPPF para 11.	Policy should be reword to reflect NPPF para 11.	Object	Sunley Estates Ltd [1789]
7	Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	3293	Draft Policy S1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) details a positive approach to development proposals which align with the National Planning Policy Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, as draft Policy S1 repeats the NPPF, we question if it is necessary to be included.		Comment	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
8	Settlement Hierachy	298	Settlement Hierarchy. Para 4.12 Your definition says that services and features included Medical Facilities and Public Transport but says nothing about their adequacy. Yes there is an excellent modern Medical Facility but it is already oversubscribed with many times a week being impossible to make an appointment. That's before the existing houses under construction are occupied let alone building any new ones. Yes there is public transport but at certain times it is quicker to walk from Chichester to Birdham - actual documented event in 2018	Drop Medical Facilities & Public Transport from the definition if you want to policy to be meaningful and accurate.	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
8	Settlement Hierachy	1243	It is not clear how may of the 'services and facilities' are required to designate an area as a 'Service Village'		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
8	Settlement Hierachy	1603	4.8/4.9 This plan does not enhance or maintain the vitality of some of the rural communities. More development in Fishbourne, Donnington, Chidham, Hambrook and Bosham will damage the communities. Other more rural communities do need more housing to ensure the shops and schools survive. Funtington and East and West Ashling are good examples.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
8	Settlement Hierachy	2844	Object to 4.9 on grounds that: overly simplistic; not borne out by real-life experience;	DELETE Generally the larger settlements ... are able to accommodate higher levels of growth without adversely impacting the character of the settlement.	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	238	For this hierarchy of centres to function for all users then there needs to be access by all sustainable meansot transport including a good cycling infrastructure,		Comment	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	297	In many places of the draft plan you rightly refer to various difficulties and issues but this policy does not acknowledge these difficulties. In particular the substantial traffic and other infrastructure issues in the Western Manhood Peninsula are already effecting Hunston, Birdham, Earnley, Bracklesham and the Witterings. To set minimum house numbers is asking for wholesale developments. Even the minimums are way too many particulalry when added to the 400 plus new houses recently added or under construction	Consult - as the Localism Act requires - with local communities in these parishes and agree a sensible maximum number of houses.	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	299	Policy S2. This policy takes no account of practical numbers. The HELAA, your draft plan and this policy in particular takes no overall account of the inability of the Western Manhood Peninsula to support the scale of building proposed. HELAA identifies over about 2,000 house building sites for the Western Manhood Peninsula. Is that sensible and practical? Further at the next round of Government "Requirements" could that stretch to 5,000 or more? The point is there must be a sensible maximum. The CDC have a duty of care to identify what that figure is.	Limit the maximum number of houses that it is practical and safe to build.	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	648	Again not enough detail. Nice to have these ideas of schools etc but they are put in the plan and never built (ie Graylingwell) just to get the plan accepted. Great in theory but services have to be put in first otherwise more people have to travel to access schools , doctors etc. Forward planning has to be used and instigated to make communities work and cut unnecessary traffic journeys.again no inclusion of villages in the north around Goodwood.Biased plan	Insist on heirarchy being built first.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	704	A review of the Settlement Boundaries for all sustainable villages should be undertaken, in order to provide more opportunities for windfall development. There is currently little scope for any windfall development to be delivered, and if it is the plans intention to use windfall to support housing numbers and housing delivery then more provision will need to be made as part of the plan review process.		Comment	Paul Newman Property Consultants Limited (Mr Paul Newman) [6906]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	734	I am concerned that East Wittering/Bracklesham have been classed as a "settlement hub". The definition of a settlement hub should include good access to the main road network, the rail network, employment and secondary and higher education facilities. These villages do not have easy access to these services, being situated in a "cul-de-sac", on the congested A286. They are essentially rural, seaside communities which rely heavily on tourism for their economy and it is their rural nature which attracts so many visitors.	Remove East Wittering/Bracklesham as a settlement hub	Comment	Miss sarah backhouse [6692]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	787	The notional link of the two settlements being classified as a combined 'service village' is, in reality, 'not reasonable', as householders in the Ifold settlement do not have comparable ease of access to facilities and services. Therefore, when evaluating sites for housing development across the entire Parish and with reference to the NPPF, a site in Plaistow village is more sustainably located than any site in Ifold, even within the limits of the 'service village' designation.	Ifold is not a combined service village with Plaistow. Plaistow is a service village in its own right. Plaistow should have a defined Settlement Boundary.	Object	Mrs C. Pierce [5886]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	788	The notional link of the two settlements of Plaistow and Ifold being classified as a combined 'service village' is, in reality, 'not reasonable', as householders in the Ifold settlement do not have comparable ease of access to facilities and services. Therefore, when evaluating sites for housing development across the entire Parish and with reference to the NPPF, a site in Plaistow village is more sustainably located than any site in Ifold, even within the limits of the 'service village' designation.	Plaistow and Ifold should not be combined as one service village. Plaistow should be a service village in its own right. Ifold has no facilities or services to justify it being a service village and remains too far a distance from Plaistow to be combined as a service village with Plaistow.	Object	Mrs C. Pierce [5886]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	793	The following statement should have been submitted at an earlier stage of the consultation. Comparing the ONS Population Data with GL Hearn OAN there is no correlation. It is also noted that GL Hearn stated an OAN for the District of 775. Take off the SDNP OAN of 125 (of which 81 have been adopted) this leaves the Plan Area at 650. There is no capping.	The following statement should have been submitted at an earlier stage of the consultation. Comparing the ONS Population Data with GL Hearn OAN there is no correlation. It is also noted that GL Hearn stated an OAN for the District of 775. Take off the SDNP OAN of 125 (of which 81 have been adopted) this leaves the Plan Area at 650. There is no capping.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	1098	The Policy should also refer to the role of Neighbourhood Plans in meeting the development requirements of the sub regional centre, settlement hubs and service villages.		Comment	Mr Alan Hutchings [7035]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	1186	We support the proposed settlement hierarchy and the designation of Southbourne as a 'Settlement Hub'. The settlement provides a range of existing facilities and services. It is also very well served by existing public transport which provides connections to larger centres such as Portsmouth, Southampton and Brighton.		Support	Nova Planning (Mr Patrick Barry) [1195]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	1273	The proposed settlement hierarchy is supported but should make provision for new housing developments in smaller rural settlements, where development can demonstrate meeting the specific social and economic needs of the individual community		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	1312	Earnley is a sustainable location capable of accommodating more development.	See attachment.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	1583	I don't think that devising a "settlement hierarchy" serves any real purpose. This just tries to give areas extra labels. Things aren't as simple as that. We already have settlement descriptions and they are villages, towns and cities. Anyway, no mention of Lavant; not all of it is in the SDNP.	Remove	Object	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	1661	No linkage is evident that consideration is made for improvements in infrastructure and public transport links to these settlement hubs that are already at breaking point. This linkage and consideration needs to be included in the local plan to adequately address current issues let alone compounding problems from further development.	In terms of infrastructure there are primary schools in the SDNP that are undersubscribed and development to the North is appropriate to meet housing need but also to maintain local viable public services such as school PANs. There is a need to sustain rural communities but whilst mentioned as a priority I can see nothing that addresses these needs in this plan.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	1990	Concerned about Fishbourne's designation as a service village given the facilities and services available.		Object	Mr Geoff Smith [7245]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2148	Question why Chidham and Hambrook are designated as a Service Village		Comment	Mr Tim Towers [7165]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2182	Object to East Wittering/Bracklesham being considered as a settlement hub and it should be removed.	East Wittering/Bracklesham should be removed as a settlement hub	Object	Erica Bryant [7270]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2245	Although the historic environment is not identified as a constraint or as an opportunity for enhancement in paragraph 4.12 as a factor in the definition of the Settlement Hierarchy, we note that paragraph 4.14 does explain that consideration has been given to other factors in determining whether a settlement is a suitable location for additional housing growth. We would like to think that these other factors include the potential effects on the historic environment.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2490	Chidham & Hambrook, among the other Bourne villages, is characterised as a 'service village' with no definition or explanation of what this means. This term does not reflect the special and unique character of any of these areas, it designates them as no more than utilitarian dormitory communities. "The largest level of growth is expected in the service villages and settlement hubs, able to accommodate higher levels of growth without adversely impacting the character of the settlement". An increase in growth of housing stock by 55% will undoubtedly negatively impact Chidham & Hambrook.		Object	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2608	Marina should be considered part of Birdham service village, or it's own service village in recognition of dwellings and floorspace at the site. Opportunity to provide housing on site is important to viability of Marina's future.		Comment	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2623	Support identification of Birdham as a service village.		Support	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne) [1147]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2628	Support Southbourne as settlement hub.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2691	Support settlement hierarchy and identification of E Wittering as a settlement hub		Support	Welbeck Strategic Land (IV) LLP [7303]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2704	Broadly support hierarchy but question whether account has been taken of sustainability/services in adjacent settlements and particularly those outside of the District.	Reassess whether some of the service villages should play bigger role in meeting needs	Support	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2742	Support the approach - the approach to housing delivery through assigning a housing figure to a number of parishes to be delivered through NPs or subsequent DPD worked well in the current plan period so it is hoped it work well again.		Support	Gleeson Strategic Land (Mr Peter Rawlinson) [855]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2771	Support identification of Fishbourne as a service village.		Support	Fishbourne Developments Ltd [1751]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2786	Support hierarchy and inclusion of Loxwood as a service village.		Support	Antler Homes Ltd [7320]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2796	Support allocation of Southbourne as a settlement hub and is suitable to serve as location for strategic allocations.		Support	Hallam Land Management Limited [1696]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2885	Support identification of Tangmere as a Settlement Hub.		Support	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2917	The Settlement Hierarchy Background paper sets out that the majority of development should be focused in Chichester.		Object	N/A (Mr D G Phillips) [7340]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	2975	Unsound - does not meet sustainable criteria; social , economic environmental. Unsound designation of Plaistow and Ifold as one service village. No settlement boundary, therefore in countryside. Consider following issues: * dwellings to suit incomes, needs, lifestyle, stages of life * environmentally friendly way of life * healthy lifestyle and benefit from sense of wellbeing supported by good access to ... health, leisure, open spaces.. sports and other essential facilities * does not allow residents in the Parish settlements to live in sustainable neighbourhoods supported by necessary infrastructure and facilities. - Sustainable transport modes		Object	Plaistow And Ifold Parish Council (Catheine Nutting) [1223]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3004	Support identification of Chichester as sub-regional centre.		Support	Danescroft Land Ltd (Mr Aidan Robson) [7342]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3015	Support identification of Chidham & Hambrook as a service village		Support	Sunley Estates Ltd [1789]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3221	Support strategic allocation at E of Chichester as Chichester in the sub regional centre		Support	Elberry Properties Ltd [7384]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3235	All service villages should accommodate a proportionate level of housing growth.		Comment	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land [1897]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3241	Support identification of Chichester as a sub-regional centre.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3268	The Settlement Hierarchy background paper forms the basis for the proposed distribution of growth by distinguishing between those settlements considered to be the most sustainable having the best range of facilities and accessibility from those with the least. Most development is focused on the former and development to meet local needs or no development whatsoever on the latter. We agree that Fishbourne is properly classified as a service village in the hierarchy ranking 9th in terms of population with 10 total facilities.		Comment	Landacre Developments Ltd [7392]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3270	Plaistow should have a settlement boundary.	Plaistow should have a settlement boundary.	Comment	Loxwood Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1126]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3288	The Settlement Hierarchy background paper forms the basis for the proposed distribution of growth by distinguishing between those settlements considered to be the most sustainable having the best range of facilities and accessibility from those with the least. Most development is focused on the former and development to meet local needs or no development whatsoever on the latter. We agree that Southbourne is properly classified as a settlement hub in the hierarchy background paper being the 3rd largest settlement behind Chichester & Selsey in terms of population and having 26 total facilities.		Support	Chichester Grain Ltd [7394]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3290	Bosham should be classified as a Settlement Hub.	Bosham should be classified as a Settlement Hub.	Object	Barratt Homes [1804]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3298	Support classification of East Wittering/Bracklesham as a Settlement Hub		Support	Barratt Homes [1804]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3309	We agree that Southbourne is properly classified as a settlement hub in the hierarchy background paper being the 3rd largest settlement behind Chichester & Selsey in terms of population and having 26 total facilities. We agree that North Mundham/Runcton is properly classified as a service village in the hierarchy.		Support	Domusea [1816]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3312	The Settlement Hierarchy background paper provides justification for the hierarchy in Policy 2 of the Local Plan. It forms the basis for the proposed distribution of growth by distinguishing between those settlements considered to be the most sustainable having the best range of facilities and accessibility from those with the least. Most development is focused on the former and development to meet local needs or no development whatsoever on the latter. We agree that Loxwood is properly classified as a service village in the hierarchy.		Comment	Landlink Estates Ltd [1541]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3315	- Settlement hierarchy has been defined in relation to the presence of certain services and facilities but no reference is made to employment. - The inter-relationship between employment and housing is fundamental for sustainable development as residents can work locally and limit travelling and out-commuting. - If employment opportunities were added, and a more sophisticated weighted system used that weighted key facilities such as train stations and secondary schools, a different picture would emerge and may call further into question the amount of development being proposed at East Wittering/Bracklesham in comparison to Selsey and Bosham/Broadbridge in comparison to Tangmere.	It is proposed that a more sophisticated, weighted and forward-looking analysis, that includes access to employment and leisure opportunities, is undertaken. In this way, the Council could really "achieve its vision for the plan area, meet the scale of development required and enhance the quality of the built, natural, historic, social and cultural environments, while sustaining the vitality of communities", as set out in the first paragraph of Policy S2, and reinforces the role of Settlement Hubs as centres providing a range of dwellings, workplaces, social and community facilities as set out in paragraph 4.17 of the Preferred Approach.	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3324	Support classification of Tangmere as a Settlement Hub.		Support	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3331	The Settlement Hierarchy background paper provides justification for the hierarchy in Policy 2 of the Local Plan. It forms the basis for the proposed distribution of growth by distinguishing between those settlements considered to be the most sustainable having the best range of facilities and accessibility from those with the least. Most development is focused on the former and development to meet local needs or no development whatsoever on the latter. We agree that Birdham is properly classified as a service village in the hierarchy.		Comment	Mr Samuel Langmead [7400]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3337	The Settlement Hierarchy background paper provides justification for the hierarchy in Policy 2 of the Local Plan. It forms the basis for the proposed distribution of growth by distinguishing between those settlements considered to be the most sustainable having the best range of facilities and accessibility from those with the least. Most development is focused on the former and development to meet local needs or no development whatsoever on the latter. We agree that North Mundham/Runcton is properly classified as a service village where development will be provided based on land being available in suitable locations.	Identify the provision of 25 dwellings at Runcton off Lagness Road. In the event that the plan maintains the provision of 50 dwellings at North Mundham, this allocation should be increased to 75 to take specific account of the site at Lagness Road being capable of accommodating a further 25 dwellings.	Comment	Mr and Mrs R Ellis [7401]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3352	Support identification of Chichester city as the sub-regional centre.		Support	CEG [7397]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3360	We agree that North Mundham is correctly identified as a service village in the hierarchy.		Support	Junnell Homes Ltd [7402]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3364	The Settlement Hierarchy background paper provides justification for the hierarchy in Policy 2 of the Local Plan. It forms the basis for the proposed distribution of growth by distinguishing between those settlements considered to be the most sustainable having the best range of facilities and accessibility from those with the least. Most development is focused on the former and development to meet local needs or no development whatsoever on the latter. We agree that West Wittering is properly classified as a service village in the hierarchy.		Comment	Mr Jeff Ferguson [7403]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3370	Suggest amend policy wording	Amend policy wording to:"Service Villages: North Mundham/Runcton Given the special needs of the agricultural / horticultural food cluster sector for much needed housing to accommodate workers, 3ha of land at Runcton is identified for the provision of a rural workers housing scheme." The settlement boundary of Runcton could be altered to accommodate the site allocation or, due the specialist nature of the allocation, it could remain within the HDA or a countryside designation.	Comment	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3380	Settlement Hierarchy background paper forms basis for proposed distribution of growth by distinguishing between settlements considered to be most sustainable, having best range of facilities and accessibility, from those with the least. Most development is focused on former and development to meet local needs or no development whatsoever on the latter. Agree that Hambrook is correctly identified as a service village. However, table in Policy S2 refers to Hambrook/Nutbourne yet list of Parish housing sites in S5 refers to Chidham & Hambrook parish. Policy AL10 also allocates 500 dwellings to Chidham and Hambrook parish.	For consistency, suggest that Chidham and Hambrook parish is used throughout. Hambrook/Nutbourne in policy S2 should therefore be amended to Chidham/Hambrook.	Comment	Mr and Mrs Tearall [7404]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3384	The Settlement Hierarchy background paper provides justification for the hierarchy in Policy 2 of the Local Plan. It forms the basis for the proposed distribution of growth by distinguishing between those settlements considered to be the most sustainable having the best range of facilities and accessibility from those with the least. Most development is focused on the former and development to meet local needs or no development whatsoever on the latter. We agree that Hunston is properly classified as a service village in the hierarchy.		Comment	Ms Rebecca Newman [7405]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3389	The Preferred Approach carries forward the Adopted Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 classification for Hermitage as one of the District's Service Villages. We welcome the focus in the supporting text (ref. para 4.18) on the services villages as locations for new strategic development, as part of the Council's strategy to disperse development across the Plan area in suitable locations.		Support	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3394	The Preferred Approach carries forward the Adopted Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 classification for Hermitage as one of the District's Service Villages. We welcome the focus in the supporting text (ref. para 4.18) on the services villages as locations for new strategic development, as part of the Council's strategy to disperse development across the Plan area in suitable locations.		Support	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3398	We support the Settlement Hub classification for Southbourne as the District's third largest settlement (in population size) after Chichester and Selsey and joint fourth highest ranking settlement in terms of number of key services and facilities.		Support	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3401	We support the Settlement Hub classification for Southbourne as the District's third largest settlement (in population size) after Chichester and Selsey and joint fourth highest ranking settlement in terms of number of key services and facilities		Support	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3407	We agree that Fishbourne is properly classified as a service village in the hierarchy ranking 9th in terms of population with 10 total facilities.		Support	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3408	Object on grounds that Sidlesham should be categorised as a 'service village' in hierarchy due to population and range of facilities.	Sidlesham should be included as a 'service village' in the settlement hierarchy of S2. The description of Sidlesham should recognise that this includes Highleigh.	Object	Greenwood Group Ltd [7406]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3415	The Settlement Hierarchy background paper provides justification for the hierarchy in Policy 2 of the Local Plan. It forms the basis for the proposed distribution of growth by distinguishing between those settlements considered to be the most sustainable having the best range of facilities and accessibility from those with the least. Most development is focused on the former and development to meet local needs or no development whatsoever on the latter. We agree that West Wittering is properly classified as a service village in the hierarchy.		Comment	Meadows Partnership [1879]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3420	We agree that Chidham/Hambrook is correctly identified as a service village in the hierarchy. However the table in the Policy S2 refers to Hambrook/Nutbourne and yet the list of Parish housing sites in policy S5 refers to Chidham & Hambrook parish. Policy AL10 also allocates 500 dwellings to Chidham and Hambrook parish. For consistency, we'd suggest that Chidham and Hambrook parish is used throughout.	Policy AL10 also allocates 500 dwellings to Chidham and Hambrook parish. For consistency, we'd suggest that Chidham and Hambrook parish is used throughout.	Support	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
9	Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy	3423	We agree that Bosham is properly classified as a service village in the hierarchy		Support	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
10	Development Strategy	295	S3 Development Strategy 4.13. How can "sustainable locations" include the Western Manhood Peninsula which is at the end of a single already congested road with a groaning infrastructure? So I support your aspirations but the policy S3 does not reflect these aspirations.		Comment	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
10	Development Strategy	498	4.17 : It is recognized by National Government that High Streets are no longer primarily retail. Selsey needs to improve visitor footfall . It needs tourist orientated facilities, restaurants, retail outlets that will meet visitors need,		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
10	Development Strategy	583	Vital that planning for these settlement hubs has proper safe transport infrastructure in place. That ordinary people will actually use in preference to using their cars.		Support	Julia Smith [6865]
10	Development Strategy	653	Needs to address lack of doctors/ dentist/ school places in Chichester. Yes Chichester can be a regional hub but it has to have increased funding. primary schools are almost full necessitating parents having to travel to get their children into a school. Local schools are already full with local children . New housing estates with no onsite schools/ doctors etc.The plan does not say how it is going to protect the countryside. NO MITIGATION. Unless this is adequately addressed in the iterations of the plan, I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Needs to address lack of doctors/ dentist/ school places in Chichester.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
10	Development Strategy	1244	It is not clear how the required expansion of Service Villages (4.18) is reconciled with protecting the countryside (4.20)		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
10	Development Strategy	1502	Wisborough Green Parish Council is concerned that the plan seems to turn the focus of development in Service Villages to be driven by opportunities. Villages do need to adapt and grow but to be successful this has to be sustainable - both in context of infrastructure as well as small scale in context to the community size. There seems to be no demonstration of why an opportunistic approach will better serve the service village communities than the more even distribution approach in the current plan.		Comment	Wisborough Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1064]
10	Development Strategy	1604	4.18 Service villages are not sufficiently defined. Comparing Fishbourne with Westbourne or Westhamnett with Wisborough Green fails to distinguish them. They are different.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
10	Development Strategy	1797	It is noted that this policy makes reference to the existing settlement hierarchy. We also note that the proposed strategic allocations (such as AL14 and AL7) are identified to reinforce the roles of existing centres in their current position in the settlement hierarchy. We would note that Plan paragraphs 4.30-4.33 (Longer Term Growth Requirements) may result in growth which would require reconsideration of the hierarchy. We would agree that this may not necessarily be a matter for this Local Plan period but the text should accommodate it if there was a preference to accelerate delivery within this Plan period.	Add paragraph in terms of Longer Term Growth Requirements so that any such proposal can be considered in terms of where it should "sit" within the Settlement Hierarchy having due regard for the established role and function of existing settlements.	Object	Heaver Homes Ltd [7183]
10	Development Strategy	1798	I object to the proposed development in Stockbridge for the building of a housing estate which will cause significant issues to local people such as traffic / congestion and environmental issues.	Do not build anymore houses	Object	Mr Andrew Rosier [7210]
10	Development Strategy	2845	Object on grounds that Chichester does not need any new supermarkets; distance travelled may be reduced by concentrating development in one place, but the need to travel will not; clarify what sort of development will help reduce need to travel.	DELETE (or CLARIFY) Locating a significant proportion of development in or around Chichester City reduces the need to travel to facilities.	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
10	Development Strategy	2987	4.21 There is still a need to travel to facilities even for people moving to developments close to Chichester City	Last sentence needs to be re-written: "Locating a significant proportion of development in or around Chichester City reduces the need to use the private car to travel to facilities. The provision of a safe and segregated cycle and walking network and an affordable and frequent bus service serving places such as WHF and Westhampnett are key.	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
10	Development Strategy	3377	Promoting site at Bramber Nursery West Wittering for housing. This is a previously developed site and could come forward as a windfall opportunity or as an allocated site in emerging West Wittering Neighbourhood Plan.		Comment	Mr Jeff Ferguson [7403]
10	Development Strategy	3382	Promoting site south of Yeoman's Field for housing.		Comment	Mr and Mrs Tearall [7404]
10	Development Strategy	3388	"Promoting site at Farmfield Hunston for housing.		Comment	Ms Rebecca Newman [7405]
10	Development Strategy	3413	Promoting site at Greenwood Nursery Highleigh Road Sidlesham for housing.		Comment	Greenwood Group Ltd [7406]
10	Development Strategy	3427	Promoting site at 98 Fishbourne Road for housing.		Comment	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
10	Development Strategy	3428	Promoting site at the former Burnes Shipyard, Bosham for housing.		Comment	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
10	Development Strategy	3429	Promoting site at Cox's Barn Farm, Chidham and Hambrook for housing.		Comment	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
10	Development Strategy	3431	Promoting site Land east of The Spinney, Runcton for housing.		Comment	Junnell Homes Ltd [7402]
10	Development Strategy	3432	Promoting sites at: Pigeon House Farm, North Mundham Wayside, Main Road, Nutbourne Inlands Road, Southbourne Land south of Gordon Road, Southbourne		Comment	Domusea [1816]
10	Development Strategy	3433	Promoting site at Chichester Grain, Priors Leaze Road for housing.		Comment	Chichester Grain Ltd [7394]
10	Development Strategy	3434	Promoting Land south of Clay Lane for housing.		Comment	Landacre Developments Ltd [7392]
10	Development Strategy	3494	Object on grounds that: lack of comprehensive guidance for east-west corridor and term implies ribbon development; strategy focusses majority of growth at Chichester and within east-west corridor.		Object	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
10	Development Strategy	3503	Appreciate the difficulty in balancing the requirements for new housing placed on the District Council against the need to protect sensitive and attractive areas.		Support	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	79	Chichester City has a small population for the wide range of services and facilities provided in the city which makes focussing major development in the city appropriate. In order to ensure the city thrives as a key destination and commercial centre more affordable housing needs to be built within the city and close surrounds, partially attracting young people and families. The east/west corridor has good access onto the A27, the main arterial road in the district, and public transport in contrast to communities in the Manhood Peninsula which have restricted access. Peninsula also contains important internationally designated habitat areas.		Support	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	207	The proposed plan to build a link road in Apuldram/Stockbridge to service employment and residential use is contrary to the council statement related to risk of flooding especially as this area is on flood plain level 3. Housing and Employment would be better placed around Lavant and West Broyle land outside of the SDNP especiaaly as (a) CDC are absorbing housing from the SDNP (b) siting affordable housing in this area, close to where it is needed, would be more sensible and would be in line with strategic objectives.	Allocate land on the Southern fringes of the SDNP for affordable housing to support the village communities resident in the SDNP. Makes no sense to build as far from the SDNP as possible. The same comment applies to the nonsense of not building employment/housing in the area SW of Goodwood. Both of these areas enjoy less risk of flooding. I and a number of others would wish to raise this with the Government Inspector if not adopted.	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	232	Sustainable growth of the scale proposed in the East-West Corridor can only be achieved if provision of good infrastructure for cycling and walking is achieved in conjunction with new strategic housing. The WSCC's Walking and Cycling Strategy should be complied with.	The provision of good Cycling and Walking infrastructure is a requirement for growth in this corridor.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	361	Air quality within the Stockbridge area is already lower than recommended levels. This plan will only increase the problem. This has serious health implications for local residents.	This overall plan MUST be scrapped and an alternative found	Object	Mrs Alison Balaam [6785]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	423	Sustainable development (Manhood Peninsula)requires: good road infrastructure - failed adequate Primary School place - failed Local Secondary Education facilities - failed Addressing education some 500 Secondary students have to travel into Chichester each day. Some 500 Sixth Form students have to travel into Chichester each day. All crossing the A27.	Sustainable development (Manhood Peninsula)requires: good road infrastructure - failed adequate Primary School place - failed Local Secondary Education facilities - failed Addressing education some 500 Secondary students have to travel into Chichester each day. Some 500 Sixth Form students have to travel into Chichester each day. All crossing the A27.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	425	The statement: Reinforce the role of Manhood Peninsula as a home to existing communities, tourism and agricultural enterprise. To uphold this statement the housing levels should be set as defined in the Adopted Local Plan.	The statement: Reinforce the role of Manhood Peninsula as a home to existing communities, tourism and agricultural enterprise. To uphold this statement the housing levels should be set as defined in the Adopted Local Plan.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	557	Stockbridge already exceeds recommended air quality levels and development in the scale outlined will increase the problem with serious health implications for residents.	Focus energies on securing a northern bypass	Object	Mr Jim McAuslan [6602]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	569	This policy does not have enough detail.All development seems to be focused on the east west corridor. Towns such as Petworth and Midhurst need new houses, including social housing to allow young people to stay in the area.. Villages such as Northchapel could each take at least ten houses without harming the SDNPA. The environment will b harmed and wildlife put at rick if the A27 corridor is so built up than no animals can cross from the Chichester Harbour AONB to the SDNP.	Allocate houses to Midhurst and some to each village depending on size.Do not put all the new housing in large estates, but spread it around the CDC area. Make larger strategic gaps between villages, and wide wildlife corridors.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	616	Does all the development need to be on or below the A27 corridor? Continued development below or along the A27 corridor, without the inclusion of supporting infrastructure, especially adequate provision for the vast number of additional vehicle movements that will result, just does not make sense. In addition, our local education system and our health services are at breaking point, but there does not appear to be any provision within your plans to not only provide additional facilities, but also to provide reasonable and sensible access to them.		Comment	Mr David Barty [6877]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	658	"seek to disperse development across the plan" This is a joke. The majority of houses 1100 along the Fishbourne /Chidham corridor. 1600 at Whitehouse Farm. 1000 at Tangmere. GOODWOOD, BOXGROVE, LAVANT, HALNAKER...NONE. This is not a local plan. Even local brown field sites around Rolls Royce are available but surprise surprise have been removed !!!! Flawed and biased plan.Manhood cannot sustain anymore large scale development. Already building on land liable to flood in the next 50 yrs !!! Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, i will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	See above. A local plan should include all areas.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	702	To the exclusion of Westbourne as one of the identified Service Villages to accommodate some of the District's Housing needs. Westbourne is not constrained, it is well located and it can deliver much needed housing in this part of the District.	That Westbourne either through a strategic approach or via the Neighbourhood Plan should be given a provision of housing to accommodate.	Object	Paul Newman Property Consultants Limited (Mr Paul Newman) [6906]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	716	Object to S3 due to conflict with S26 Natural Environment.	Complete removal of development along areas that border Chichester harbour.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1062	Plan would destroy historically/environmentally sensitive areas in south/east and west leaving north of city untouched. Chichester Harbour has the same protection afforded to as the SDNP and yet there has been absolute no regard to its preservation. The plan aims to build on the flood plain and right up to the Chichester Harbour boundary with no viable detail or acknowledgement of just how destructive this would be.		Object	Mr Brian Horn [7020]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1110	We support the acknowledgement that Service Villages are suitable places for new housing. In many instances such locations are dependent on population growth to support existing services so this approach is welcomed. We also support the strategy of dispersing development across the plan area. However, we do consider that the Service Village of North Mundham / Runcton is suitable for strategic scale development being located close to the A27 and south-east connections to Bognor Regis/Littlehampton, with good access to employment facilities; primary, secondary and sixth form education services; Chichester train station within 2.5 miles and regular bus services.		Comment	Mr Alan Hutchings [7035]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1167	There is no definition of what a service village is. It suggests a utilitarian dormitory suburb. This makes no attempt to recognise the special character of each of the different locations that make up the areas in the so called East West Corridor or to ensure that they are regarded as separate entities. The term should be used to designate a transport route.	Definition required of a 'service village'	Object	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1174	The new Local Plan requires us to accept a further minimum of 500 properties. This will increase our local housing stock by 50% and will undoubtedly increase the population area by a greater percentage given the age demographic of the area. Set a target increase of 25 houses.	Reconsideration needs to be given to the number of houses required in the so called Service villages.	Object	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1175	Planned developments along the A259 flood plain with also destroy the fragile and uniqueness of the AONB.	Remove AL6 and link road and reexamine the huge impact building near the AONB will have.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1314	Development should be better distributed across the District.	See attachment.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1327	Development proposals will cause further deterioration in the air quality for residents of Donnington and pedestrians.	Publish air quality measures for residents and how these are being improved by traffic management. Remove further development plans and A27 road access changes.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1350	Air quality in the Stockbridge area already exceeds the recommended air quality levels. Development on the scales proposed and with the resultant impact will only cause the problem to increase. This will have serious health implications for residents.	The overall plan needs to put the impact on air quality as an absolute priority and only consider alternatives that do have a detrimental effect on the air quality in the Stockbridge / Donnington area.	Object	Mr David Roue [7122]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1377	Air quality will further deteriorate as a result of the proposed plan. Stockbridge already exceeds the recommended air quality levels and development on this scale will increase the problem. This has serious health implications for the residents	Move the development A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1505	4.18 Wisborough Green Parish Council is concerned that the plan seems to turn the focus of development in Service Villages to be driven by opportunities. Villages do need to adapt and grow but to be successful this has to be sustainable - both in context of infrastructure as well as small scale in context to the community size. There seems to be no demonstration of why an opportunistic approach will better serve the service village communities than the more even distribution approach in the current plan.		Comment	Wisborough Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1064]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1506	Land at Raughmere Farm, Chichester should be allocated for 150 houses.	Please see attached document. It is low resolution due to size limits but I have emailed the full resolution version separately. Land at Raughmere Farm, Chichester should be allocated for 150 houses.	Object	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd. [7061]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1519	Birdham has a similar level of services and facilities (as defined in paragraph 4.12), to those found in the identified Service Villages of Bosham, Fishbourne and Hambrook/Nutbourne. Moreover, Birdham has a greater level of services/facilities than those in the other identified Service Village of Hunston (please see attached Settlement Comparison table). The Service Village of Birdham should therefore be considered as a larger more sustainable settlement suitable for a greater proportion of new residential development and should be included in the list of Service Villages identified in Policy S3.	Include Birdham in the list of service villages identified in Policy S3.	Object	Lewis & Co Planning (Mr Paul Burgess MRTPI) [7175]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1540	Housing allocations should primarily be focused around Chichester whilst there are suitable and deliverable residential development sites available. Proposed development in Settlement Hubs on the East-West Corridor should be proportionate to the village's size and should not be so large that new communities cannot integrate into the settlements.	Land in and around Chichester that is deemed to be suitable, available and achievable, such as HELAA sites HWH0009 and HWH0010, should be allocated for residential development.	Object	Pam Clingan [7180]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1554	It is ridiculous to be planning in detail for settlements when the major problem in the area (the elephant in the room the A27 upgrade) has not been agreed in any way and has not been funded. This must be resolved before progressing to the sort of detail included - for example -in the Transport Study of Strategic Development incorporated here as part of the Local Plan. It is also a nonsense that the Transport Study includes a road (the Fishbourne-Birdham road that was never included in any previous study of the A27 junctions. Remove it!	Decide on A27 upgrade.	Object	Mr John Davies [5359]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1633	Whilst Lavant itself is in the SDNP it should still be considered as a settlement hub or at least a service village for the purpose of the plan. Development can be considered South of the village and meets the remit of the requirements of the CDC strategy. Lavant itself can support the housing requirement and should be considered as a development area within the plan as it does not impact the SDNP if that development is outside the SDNP which it would be.	Lavant itself and south lavant can support the housing requirement and should be considered as a development area	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1643	AL7 Bosham could take significantly more housing to the North of the Railway alleviating pressures on Manhood Peninsula, Chidham, Hambrook and many other Parishes. As the Land Owner I would like to formally submit the entire 6ha site for development if required for up to 150 houses.		Comment	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1644	Promoting site at Bosham for housing.		Comment	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1662	Whilst Lavant itself is in the SDNP it should still be considered as a settlement hub or at least a service village for the purpose of the plan. Development can be considered South of the village and meets the remit of the requirements of the CDC strategy. Lavant itself can support the housing requirement and should be considered as a development area within the plan as it does not impact the SDNP if that development is outside the SDNP which it would be.	Lavant itself and south lavant can support the housing requirement and should be considered as a development area	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1715	Alter Fishbourne's designation as a Service Village and place in Rest of the Plan area. Ref my comments for AL9. Alter East Witterings designation as a Service Village and place in Rest of the Plan area. Ref my comments for AL4 Alter Hunston AL11 as a Service Village and place in Rest of the Plan area- agree with comments from Hunston Parish Council Remove AL6 - see my comments for AL6 Agree with CPRE's comments on Brownfield sites and development on the Manhood.	Alter Fishbourne's designation as a Service Village and place in Rest of the Plan area. Alter East Witterings designation as a Settlement hub and place in Rest of the Plan area. Remove AL6 Alter Hunston AL11 as a Service Village and place in Rest of the Plan area	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1846	I do not accept that 500 new dwellings should be built in Chidham and Hambrook. Currently there are 961 dwellings, 500 new makes a 55% increase. There is no evidence that 500 new dwellings are needed. Where has the number 500 come from?		Object	Mr Andrew Sargent [6362]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1886	The local plan review has failed to make a proper distribution of housing in the Parish. The so called comprehensive selection process undertaken by the planners in their strategic site allocation exercise and the subsequent approval by CDC is found to be wanting as it is based on developers estimates which have not followed the density benchmarks as per policy DM3 and has also not been modified for locations adjacent to sensitive locations.		Object	Chidham Sustainability Network (Stephen Morley) [7226]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1888	The SDNP (Policy S3, Policy S5 and Policy S19) should share some of the development or have a northern route around Chichester.		Comment	William Fleming [7227]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1894	No vision set out for housing and employment land		Comment	Mr Timothy C Kinross [4556]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1972	Selsey is not a hub, neither a centre nor central.		Comment	Mr Anthony Tuffin [5052]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	1993	To describe Fishbourne as a Service Village is blatantly wrong. It has very few facilities. Insufficient land has been identified on brownfield sites which places greater pressure on release of greenfield sites for development. the additional housing proposed for Fishbourne should be reduced from 250 to recognise there is limited land available in the village especially since the introduction of the East wildlife corridor.		Object	Mr Geoff Smith [7245]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2009	The old plan has not expired yet a more aggressive plan is being introduced. The intensity of build projects appear to have exceeded the current plan targets, why impose a greater plan ahead of requirement. A stronger opposition to building the large scale developments should be implemented.		Object	Mr Graham Porrett [7251]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2035	We need to build a town. Find a serious sized piece of land next to a major road and furnish it with shops, schools, light industry, surgeries etc. This is not a new idea, it's been done successfully in the past.		Object	Liz & Mike Dinnage [7216]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2042	General concern that the Local Plan as prepared will destroy large areas of Chichester's historic and environmentally sensitive areas in all but the northern part of the city. It doesn't protect Chichester Harbour, aiming to build on the flood plain and right up to Harbour boundary		Object	Ms Sarah Lambert [7257]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2188	The proposed noise buffer at Goodwood should be developed for a strategic employment site. The settlement boundaries shown on map SB1 should be redrawn to include employment space at Goodwood plus strategic housing land south of Lavant and west of Chichester as an exception site (100% affordable housing) for meeting the SDNP unmet housing need. The decisions on Chichester's housing, roads, employment areas and the infrastructure to support all of these cannot be done piecemeal.		Object	Debbie Leonard [7215]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2221	Strategic policy should be included to consider the area west of Chichester as a whole, and the relationship to Havant BC. Issues to be addressed in consider in-combinate impact of development include: waste water treatment, traffic congestion and management, landscape protection, Green Blue connection to AONB and SDNP, Housing types and a design code. The Services in and around Chichester are much better and thus the majority of development should be concentrated there, as much play is made of Chichester wishing to be a vibrant modern city.		Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2296	Allocations west of Chichester will need to be assessed for water supply and funding included in the Infrastructure Charging Scheme.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2402	Development in LPR, particularly along A259 has potential to have significant cumulative impact on the setting of National Park and relationship with AONB.		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2473	Need to include a strategy for the area west of Chichester as a whole rather than treating the E-W Corridor as unrelated settlements along a transport route. Dislike term East-West corridor. Suggest an SPD to cover this area.	<p>1 Chichester District Council should prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance on a vision for the Bourne Villages, comprising Westbourne, Lumley, Hermitage, Prinsted, Southbourne, Nutbourne, Chidham, Hambrook, Bosham and Fishbourne, the surrounding countryside and their relationship with neighbouring Emsworth/Havant, the City of Chichester, the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour AONB.</p> <p>2 The use of the term East-West Corridor with regard to west of the City of Chichester be restricted and only be used for transport issues and the A27 itself, and not be applied to the Bourne Villages and their surroundings..</p> <p>The above comments/representations also relate to the following Plan references:</p> <p>i) Page/para nos: page 22 §2.29 Policy reference: Character of the Plan Area.</p> <p>ii) Page/para nos: p24 - 25; §3.3 - §3.10 Policy reference: Spatial Vision & Strategic Objectives: East-West Corridor</p> <p>iii) Page/para p35 Policy reference: Spatial Strategy - Policy S3: Development Strategy</p> <p>iv) Page/para nos: p82 - 84; §5.34 - §5.42 & §5.44 Policy reference: Strategic Policies - Countryside S24: Coast S25</p> <p>v) Page/para nos: p 92; §6.4 - §6.6 Policy reference: Strategic Development - S32</p>	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2492	Rationale as to 500 allocation at Chidham and Hambrook wanting and evidence inconsistent. re. HELAA assessment and analysis in the Sustainability Appraisal.		Comment	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2529	<p>We object to the lack of comprehensive guidance for the east-west corridor. This should be provided by a new Local Plan Policy & subsequent Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).</p> <p>The development strategy seeks "to focus the majority of planned sustainable growth at Chichester and within the east-west corridor"(S3).</p> <p>The description "corridor" implies that it is little more than ribbon development along a transport route and a better term could be found. In reality, the Bourne villages are vibrant communities with quite different individual characters.</p>	The inclusion of a new Policy to provide some co-ordinated support for issues affecting all the Bourne villages, followed by details set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance.	Object	Mrs Sue Talbot [6219]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2541	This policy outlines the aim of focusing the majority of planned sustainable growth at Chichester and within the east west corridor. We feel this strategy is flawed in the context of the allocation between Chichester and Emsworth, which will irretrievably damage the landscape setting, context and character of the land between the AONB and National Park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * We wish to see a re-evaluation of the distribution of housing allocations for the East-West corridor, particularly between Chichester and Emsworth. * We urge a stronger policy on settlement gaps to protect the character and identity of these villages (Fishbourne, Bosham, Chidham & Hambrook and Southbourne) * We would welcome additional guidance on coalescence along the A259. * Policy S24 Countryside needs to be more robust * Policy S30 Wildlife Corridors requires strengthening 	Object	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2603	Promoting site Land south of Townfield, Kirdford for housing.		Comment	Welbeck Strategic Land IV LLP [7293]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2607	Promoting site Chichester Marina - encourage small scale leisure uses in site Use of word 'small scale' in policy is not effective - reword policy	Reword policy to: b. Local community facilities, including village shops, that meet identified needs both within the village, neighbouring villages and surrounding smaller communities, and also the wider needs of the District in relation to the strategic aims of the Plan, and will help make the settlement more self-sufficient in the immediate and long-term; and c. Employment, tourism or leisure proposals related to sustaining and enhancing existing sites and communities.	Comment	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2624	Promoting site Land to the west of Bell Lane, Birdham Unclear why Birdham not allocated similar levels of housing to Hunston given level of facilities or why an allocation of 125 is not considered strategic.	Any allocation of more than 100 dwellings should be identified as 'strategic'.	Object	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne) [1147]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2629	Support distribution		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2651	- Lavant should be included as a settlement hub and can support housing requirement. See attachment for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2652	Support spatial principle and objective to support villages/rural communities - urge this to be across District. Term settlement hub should apply to smaller rural settlements. Housing sites should be allocated within countryside in line para 68 NPPF. Policy should ref conversion of existing buildings in countryside given NPPF. Should be greater flexibility in plan		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2674	Promoting site Land south of B2166, North Mundham (Lowlands).		Comment	Devonshire Developments Limited [7116]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2692	Support development strategy, including distribution of housing in the Manhood Peninsula. However, concerns that some lower order settlements are required to take significant growth over those identified as settlement hubs.		Support	Welbeck Strategic Land (IV) LLP [7303]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2697	Promoting site Crouchlands Farm for housing.		Comment	Artemis Land and Agriculture Ltd [7306]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2705	Suggest amending policy Amend policy to ensure it is clear what quantum of development is being allocated at each tier	Amend policy to ensure it is clear what quantum of development is being allocated at each tier	Comment	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2735	We do not think that the evidence base for the PAP is sufficient in terms of assessing the ability of the District's natural capital to absorb the level and location of development proposed. in general, the level of greenfield development proposed is concerning. Little consideration of brownfield alternatives contrary to paragraph 117 of the NPPF. Little explanation of how the housing numbers were divided up between settlements of the same type (policy S2). No consideration of recreation disturbance for Chichester and Pagham Harbours. Green infrastructure requirements to be delivered before any new dwellings are occupied within a site.	Finally, the PAP aims to achieve more active and healthy lifestyles for the District's residents, along with better availability and use of sustainable transport. For this to happen, sustainable options such as using nearby facilities and active travel must be available before any dwellings are occupied. Otherwise unsustainable behaviours and in particular poor travel choices will be ingrained in the new residents. In order to achieve this, there should be a requirement for the green infrastructure requirements to be delivered before any new dwellings are occupied within a site.	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2744	Agree with strategy.		Support	Gleeson Strategic Land (Mr Peter Rawlinson) [855]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2783	Support proposed devt strategy although housing figure needs to be increased so strategic allocations should be increased		Support	Fishbourne Developments Ltd [1751]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2785	Promoting sites: Black Hall, Loxwood Land at Loxwood House, Loxwood		Comment	Antler Homes Ltd [7320]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2788	Support distribution and provision of small-scale housing development.		Support	Antler Homes Ltd [7320]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2798	Support distribution with greater level of development at Southbourne. Complies with NPPF - positively prepared and justified.		Support	Hallam Land Management Limited [1696]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2811	Promoting site Land south of Madgwick Lane, Westhampnett for housing.		Comment	Pam Clingan [7180]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2820	Promoting sites: Lansdowne Nursery, Oving Sherwood Nursery, Oving		Comment	Asprey Homes Southern [7322]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2833	Object that Camelsdale is not identified as one of the service villages in the table under para 1.	Include Camelsdale as one of the service villages in the table under para 1. Add another bullet under para 2 to say 'appropriate levels of housing development on other available, suitable and deliverable sites'.	Object	Casa Coevo [1734]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2836	Promoting site: Land to the rear of Sturt Avenue, Lynchmere		Comment	Casa Coevo [1734]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2846	Chichester's role as a tourist destination significantly underplayed; oversimplification to regard the larger settlements as inherently more sustainable for all forms of development;	CHANGE TO Focus the majority of planned sustainable growth at Chichester and within the eastwest area of the coastal plain, while minimising its impact on tourism CHANGE TO With a greater proportion of development in the larger settlements:	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2847	Section 2b SUPPORT Local community facilities, including village shops		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2865	Welcome approach but believe there is a missed opportunity in terms of role of lower order settlements - may be pertinent for Council to explore potential of E-W corridor to help meet unmet needs of the wider sub-region.		Support	Persimmon Homes (Mr Joe Maphosa) [1216]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2890	Policy S3 Development Strategy, 1st two bullets: Sustainable growth can only go ahead if improvements are made to the A27 and many on the minor roads in the east west corridor and Manhood peninsula. Even so, the Plan seems to be a recipe for an overpopulated conurbation from Southbourne to Bognor to Tangmere, while the area of the SDNP remains largely untouched. This is borne out in Policy S4, table 2, where it shows that the E/W corridor takes more than 12000 houses and the SDNP, three or four times the size, fewer than 500.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2919	Promoting sites: Land north of Brandy Hole Lane Land west of Plainwood Close		Comment	N/A (Mr D G Phillips) [7340]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	2936	Use of Green Spaces: We believe that the destruction of green spaces for housing and other development should be a policy of last resort. The document hardly mentions the use of brownfield sites, or the possibility of creative ideas to make brownfield sites available for housing development. No obvious policies within the document which show how that sequential test has been used in relation to brownfield sites, other than a general approach of guiding development towards larger towns. No reference is given to the Council's Brownfield register and unclear how this fits into the overall strategy for development.	CPRE has developed a 'Brownfield Toolkit' which local people can use to help identify brownfield sites (http://www.cprelancashire.org.uk/resources/housing-and-planning/item/2483-cpre-lancashire-brownfield-land-register-toolkit) We suggest that the plan needs greater and more explicit support for brownfield development and to plan for brownfield development in a "positive and creative way" (NPPF 2018, para 38.) We would like clarification as to how the strategy for the Manhood peninsula reinforces "its role as home to existing communities, tourism and agricultural enterprises"? We would like further evidence that the AONB and EU protected sites will not be harmed by this level of development as we disagree with the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3005	Support approach that Chichester is best location for strategic growth.		Support	Danescroft Land Ltd (Mr Aidan Robson) [7342]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3008	Promoting site Portfield Quarry		Comment	Danescroft Land Ltd (Mr Aidan Robson) [7342]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3012	Promoting site Loxwood Farm Place		Comment	Castle Properties (Michael Stephens) [7344]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3017	Promoting site: Land east of Broad Road, Hambrook		Comment	Sunley Estates Ltd [1789]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3019	Promoting site: 12 - 18 West Street and 51-55 Tower Street		Comment	Charities Property Fund [7349]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3020	Promoting site: Land West of Guildford Road, Loxwood		Comment	Thakeham Homes (Chris Geddes) [7350]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3025	Promoting site: Land at Blackboy Lane and Clay Lane, Fishbourne		Comment	William Lacey Group [1623]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3038	Promoting site: Land at Herons Farm, Kirdford		Comment	Mr G Rudsedski [7353]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3040	Promoting site: Land at Stoney Meadow Farm		Comment	Mr & Mrs Bell [7354]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3042	Promoting site: Land at Orchard House, Loxwood		Comment	Mr and Mrs Seymour [7355]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3043	Promoting site: Land south of Salthill Park		Comment	Mr and Mrs Sadler [7356]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3044	Promoting site: Land to the west of Chaffinch, Burlow and Florence Closes		Comment	Mr & Mrs Pick [7357]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3045	Promoting site: land west of Delling Lane, Bosham		Comment	Mr and Mrs Green [7358]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3048	Promoting site: Land east of Hermitage Close		Comment	Mr and Mrs Chitty [7359]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3056	<p>Above all else, Chichester Harbour Conservancy is concerned that CDC has not adequately discharged its landscape duties under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000). Major developments are proposed directly outside the AONB boundary at Apuldram and Bosham, with potential for further major developments, pending the provision of maps, at Fishbourne, Chidham & Hambrook and Southbourne.</p> <p>Conservancy raises a high-level objection to the overall Local Plan because there is insufficient evidence CDC has considered the potential cumulative effects these developments will have on the AONB.</p>	<p>Chichester District Council must properly discharge its landscape responsibilities.</p> <p>Furthermore, the absence of a discussion between the authors of the Local Plan and the Statutory Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) for the AONB is extremely disappointing. As a matter of respect and proper due consideration, these developments should have been presented to the JAC, by Council Officers, at the earliest opportunity ahead of the public consultation.</p> <p>For the JAC to only be made aware of these proposals during the consultation indicates a lack of thought and respect for the JAC and the AONB. It is also contrary to the spirit of partnership approach (the AONB Management Plan Memorandum of Agreement) which is essential to the management of this protected landscape.</p> <p>Trilateral discussions about the scope of Wildlife Corridors should now take place, between the LPA, SDNPA and Chichester Harbour Conservancy.</p>	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3121	Promoting site: Land at Barnfield Drive - should continue to be allocated through the LPR as part of the site does not yet have planning permission	Continue to allocate Land at Barnfield Drive	Comment	Brookhouse Group (Mr Andrew Brown) [763]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3122	Promoting site: Land at Whitestone Farm, Birdham		Comment	D R Pick Grandchildren's Settlement [7364]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3124	Allocation of Hunston is inconsistent with the development strategy in S3.		Object	D R Pick Grandchildren's Settlement [7364]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3142	Promoting site: Land south of Main Road, Hermitage		Comment	Obsidian Strategic SB Limited (Mr Philip Scott) [7370]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3144	Promoting site for Rolls Royce expansion - Land east of RR		Comment	Rolls-Royce Motor Cars Limited [1784]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3148	Policy does not take account of potential need for strategic scale employment in B2 use class to be accommodated outside of proposed strategic allocations.	New policy required to allocate adjoining land to east of RR to provide for possible future expansion of factory.	Object	Rolls-Royce Motor Cars Limited [1784]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3220	Promoting sites: Land at Sherwood Nursery Lansdowne Nursery		Comment	Elberry Properties Ltd [7384]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3228	Promoting site: Land north of Maudlin Farm, Westhampnett		Comment	J Pitts [6878]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3231	Promoting site: Land at Salthill Park, Chichester		Comment	Trustees of CL Meighar Lovett Will Trust [7390]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3234	Promoting site: Land at Chantry Hall Farm, Westbourne		Comment	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land [1897]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3236	Methodology for selection of service village allocations does not appear to be evidenced or consistent		Comment	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land [1897]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3242	Support distribution, the two sites in Chichester should have the ability to provide greater housing		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3271	Number of sites available in the north, outside of Loxwood, that could accommodate housing.		Comment	Loxwood Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1126]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3294	We support draft Policy S3 (Development Strategy) which seeks to disperse development across the plan area and to distribute development in line with the settlement hierarchy. To this end, we particularly support the identification of new residential development in the settlement hubs of Southbourne (Policy AL13), and Tangmere (Policy AL14), and the Service Village of Hunston (Policy AL11).		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3320	Promoting site at Loxwood House Guildford Road for housing.		Comment	Landlinx Estates Ltd [1541]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3325	Welcome dispersed distribution but object to final para of policy as this could lead to growth in less sustainable locations/weakening of plan-led approach.	Delete final para of policy.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3334	Promoting site Church Road Birdham for housing.		Comment	Mr Samuel Langmead [7400]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3353	Support development strategy		Support	CEG [7397]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3355	- SA and Preferred Approach is mute on HOW the number of dwellings/proportions of development proposed was arrived at. - The HEDNA states in the Key Points (page 99) that the identified affordable housing need of 285 dwellings per annum is 47% of the 609 OAN. This equates to 44% of 650 dwellings. It is recognised that the 30% requirement in Policy S6 is more appropriate and deliverable. - To achieve 30% of the need (422 affordable homes) so the population of the Manhood Peninsula is treated fairly, a minimum of 1400 new homes should be allocated instead of 750.	Policy S3 does not require changing as it merely refers to other policies for strategic development locations. These policies, however, should be amended and are considered in their relevant sections.	Comment	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3391	We object to the exclusion of Hermitage as a Strategic Development Location within the table in the policy and therefore its exclusion from the list of Service Villages identified for growth. We also object to the wording of the policy.	Suggest amending policy by including Hermitage in list of SDLs and removing the following wording: To ensure that the Council delivers its housing target, the distribution of development may need to be flexibly applied, within the overall context of seeking to ensure that the majority of new housing is developed at Chichester City and settlement hubs where appropriate and consistent with other policies in this plan. Any changes to the distribution will be clearly evidenced and monitored through the Authority's Monitoring Report	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3395	we object to the exclusion of Hermitage as a Strategic Development Location within the table in the policy and therefore its exclusion from the list of Service Villages identified for growth. Our objection is also relevant to the Settlement Hierarchy Local Plan Background Paper (December 2018) which is not considered to provide a robust evidence base to support the draft policy.	Policy wording is not positively prepared, nor will it be effective in delivering the District's full local housing need in sustainable locations, such as the Settlement Hubs and Service Villages. We therefore request; * the inclusion of Hermitage within the list of Strategic Development Locations; and * the following wording is deleted from the policy text, To ensure that the Council delivers its housing target, the distribution of development may need to be flexibly applied, within the overall context of seeking to ensure that the majority of new housing is developed at Chichester City and settlement hubs where appropriate and consistent with other policies in this plan. Any changes to the distribution will be clearly evidenced and monitored through the Authority's Monitoring Report	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3399	We welcome the policy objective to disperse development across the Plan area. We also support the location of non-strategic sites, community infrastructure and appropriate forms of commercial development within the Service Villages. However, we object to the following wording of Policy S3	The following policy wording is not positively prepared, nor will it be effective in delivering the District's full local housing need in sustainable locations, such as the Settlement Hubs and Service Villages. We therefore request the Council delete the following wording from the policy text. 'To ensure that the Council delivers its housing target, the distribution of development may need to be flexibly applied, within the overall context of seeking to ensure that the majority of new housing is developed at Chichester City and settlement hubs where appropriate and consistent with other policies in this plan. Any changes to the distribution will be clearly evidenced and monitored through the Authority's Monitoring Report.'	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3402	We welcome the policy objective to disperse development across the Plan area. We also support the location of non-strategic sites, community infrastructure and appropriate forms of commercial development within the Service Villages. However, we object to the wording of Policy S3	The above policy wording is not positively prepared, nor will it be effective in delivering the District's full local housing need in sustainable locations, such as the Settlement Hubs and Service Villages. We therefore request the Council delete the above wording from the policy text.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3511	It is a local plan why is the North repeatedly excluded?		Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3514	At the time of formulating the last local plan, there was a real threat unchecked urban expansion would undermine the essence of the District's local economy. That threat has been reduced by changes to strategic allocations but the threat remains from unscrupulous developers and landowners who will continue to exploit the 'loop hole' provided by a lack of housing supply. It is essential this plan makes provision to meet objectively assessed housing and employment needs and ensures that essential open areas, around and within the city are given long-term protection through specific policy designation.		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3540	There is additional land within the existing SDL boundary, to the east of the River Lavant, that is available and suitable for development as detailed in Appendix 1. This amounts to 7.1ha of land outside the 400m indicative buffer which could accommodate approx. 250 dwellings (35dph density).		Comment	CEG [7397]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3544	Promoting site at Lawrence Farm, for extension of development at AL6.		Object	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd. [7061]
11	Policy S3: Development Strategy	3549	Preferably, keep all developments in the North, where catastrophic coastal flooding is much less likely to occur. Why build south of the A27, which could all be flooded in 50 years because of rising sea levels? Please lobby the government to restrict housing applications in National Parks.		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	277	I do not support Chichester taking on any of the South Downs national park housing allocation	delete: plus an allowance for accommodating unmet need arising from the Chichester District part of the South Downs National Park.	Object	David Dean [6735]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	300	Try as I might I cant find the Chichester Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA). The need for affordable housing is undeniable but I am sure it relies on a central government formula that takes no account of local conditions. Anecdotal evidence, some from people who work for the current developers, report that as much as 40% of the CURRENT new homes under construction are being sold as second homes. And still you want to build more on the Western Manhood Peninsula?		Comment	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	325	Doubt about the need for a large number of houses that will completely destroy a once semi-rural and picturesque area.		Comment	Mr Richard Weavis [6494]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
12	Meeting Housing Needs	594	I object to the proposed building planned in manhood peninsula near Donnington. This will have a hugely negative effect on the local area concerning traffic, which is already very bad. The proposed idea to not be able to turn right at the Stockbridge area would be detrimental to local residents. And I don't see how it would help the traffic situation. The planned road building works would cause huge disruption. The area North of Chichester should be considered instead as this would have much less impact on existing residents and would not further add the the traffic on the A27.	Reduce the panned building in Manhood peninsula and stop the planned changes to the A27	Object	Mrs Joanna Earl [6866]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	724	The settlement strategy focuses predominantly on the East-West corridor which is closely aligned with the route of the A27 running to the south of Chichester. Given the severe congestion and delays currently on this route, to have considerable additional traffic generated by these proposed developments at these sites will severely exacerbate the situation. Also future road improvement plans which may be proposed by Highways England are not factored in.		Object	Mr Mike Harper [6564]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	790	Comparing the ONS Population Data with GL Hearn OAN there is no correlation. It is also noted that GL Hearn stated an OAN for the District of 775. Take off the SDNP OAN of 125 this leaves the Plan Area at 650. There is no capping. Attached is a comparison between ONS based estimate and GL Hearn	Comparing the ONS Population Data with GL Hearn OAN there is no correlation. It is also noted that GL Hearn stated an OAN for the District of 775. Take off the SDNP OAN of 125 this leaves the Plan Area at 650. There is no capping. Attached is a comparison between ONS based estimate and GL Hearn	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	987	Allready we are seeing affordable homes not being taken up locally because they are not required	The figures above must reflect the requirement and include the National Park	Object	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1178	CDC, whilst noting and complying with the duty to co-operate, should insist SDNP accept its allocation of 41 homes per annum. Without some provision for additional housing the communities located in the park will not thrive. Their facilities such as small schools/shops/doctors facilities will be lost to them as resident numbers decline. Housing allocation was specifically front loaded during the current Local Plan period to allow for infrastructure developments across the district and it is unfair to ask the Manhood Peninsula/Donnington to take a number on this scale given its allocations under the new plan.	Do not accept the additional allocation for SDNP. Reduce the allocation for Manhood Peninsula	Object	Mrs Nicola Swann [7052]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1242	Paragraph 4.2.2 states that Chichester is meeting the unmet need of the SDNP, however the national park should fulfil its allocation to ensure the communities there have sufficient affordable housing and growth to thrive. By adopting this unmet need, development is being squeezed into an increasingly smaller area of Chichester between the sea and the national park; the SDNP has sufficient land capacity to accommodate this development sympathetically and has a duty to support its rural communities.	The SDNP should meet it's requirement and therer should be no transfer of its development requirements to the constrained area of Chichester between the park and sea.	Object	Heather McDougall [6651]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1245	No justification is presented for the requirement to accommodate the unmet needs of the South Downs National Park, at the expense of an area already constrained by the need to protect the Chichester Harbour ANOB and the Pagham Harbour SPA	South Downs National Park should met its need	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1320	A number of land "parcels" (Sites) have been removed as apparently unsuitable yet a number of other have been retained or substituted, which have in some cases more reason for removal. ie Westerton Farm, North of Maudlin Farm, around Westerton House, South of Stane St all of which are detached from settlement boundaries. In addition land around Goodwood ie east and west of Rolls Royce and land underneath the flight path,which is a non valid CAA reason to not have housing/manufacturing development.	To ensure either an unbiased or, even uninfluenced, decisions were fairly made to take these sites out of the housing land use, the next iteration of the plan should further articulate and expand on justifications for officers coming to such conclusions. As it stands the integrity of decisions to reject these sites should be forensically examined by the Govt Inspector.	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1352	It is important that the South Downs National Park take its allocation of 41 dwellings per annum. Social housing in particular is required if communities are to thrive.	Ensure that the South Downs National Park take its annual allocation of new dwellings.	Object	Mr David Roue [7122]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1374	Housing provision should be allocated as a priority to occupiers with a provable local need; and prohibitive financial penalties need to be imposed on "second homes", of which the residents actually reside elsewhere for most of the year.		Comment	Rev. John-Henry Bowden [7126]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1379	The South Downs National Park should take its allocation of 41 dwellings per annum - without some low level development in the Park, particularly social housing, communities there will not thrive	Move the development A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1393	Whilst the District Council is the housing authority for the whole district it is accepting the National Park's housing allocation to be built outside of the National Park. This will mean that there will be no affordable housing provision made for local people growing up in villages within the National Park. This will turn the park into a museum full of expensive and second home housing which will ensure the communities wither and die as some National Parks have been found to their cost.	Do not accept the National Parks Housing requirement to be built outside of the Park	Object	Mr and Mrs A Martin [5053]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1584	I don't agree that the housing allowance should include "an allowance for accommodating unmet need arising from the Chichester District part of the South Downs National Park". I fail to understand the reasoning behind this.	Remove	Object	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1606	4.22 Are we meeting housing needs or delivering a government policy that we have no control over? Is this demand led? Do we need this level of housing here? Not proven. We accept we need more housing especially for our young but this policy fails to create a coherent plan that will satisfy local people.	We should be more robust with central government and plan ahead. Clearly houses are needed but people will object very strongly.	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1631	Housing development in North should be considered. There are undersubscribed schools in the SDNP.	There is a need to sustain rural communities but whilst mentioned as a priority I can see nothing that addresses these needs in this plan.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1634	I do not believe that we should be accepting 41 homes a year from the SDNP in the life of this plan. The agreement between CDC and SDNP needs to be revisited and the allocation handed back to SDNP.	I do not believe that we should be accepting 41 homes a year from the SDNP in the life of this plan. The agreement between CDC and SDNP needs to be revisited and the allocation handed back to SDNP.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	1660	The section states "It is recognised that growth in both urban and rural areas is required to meet the changing needs of the area's population." Growth in the SDNP is required and therefore the acceptance of 41 homes per annum should be overturned and the allocation sent back to SDNP within our area for them to consider and incorporate in their plan. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture.	the acceptance of 41 homes per annum should be overturned and the allocation sent back to SDNP within our area for them to consider and incorporate in their plan.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	2301	● The South Downs National Park should take its allocation of 41 dwellings per annum - without some low level development in the Park, particularly social housing, communities there will not thrive.		Object	Mr Mike Harper [6564]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	2612	Objection to CDC taking unmet need from SDNP. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	2988	It is predicted that sea levels will rise by 1m. This will severely impact on the south coast.	Section 4.22 Insert a sentence at the end of section "Allowance should be planned for future needs due to climate change displacing residents."	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	2992	The World Bank is predicting 140m migrants by 2050. As the District is close to Gatwick and has a long exposed coastline, we need to make some provision for refugees.	Insert a section on refugees.	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	3232	Spoiled Chichester area with absolute overdevelopment. Area is now urbanised. Loss of countryside. A27 impassable at times.		Comment	Sheila Strachan [7389]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
12	Meeting Housing Needs	3329	Para 4.22 refers to the housing need arising from the HEDNA. The housing requirement should be derived from local needs assessment based on standard methodology.	Amend the supporting text to Policy S3, including paragraph 4.22, to ensure that references are consistent with the language and approach required by the NPPF 2018 and the PPG.	Object	CEG [7397]
12	Meeting Housing Needs	3516	Paragraphs 4.30 to 4.33 recognise it is not sustainable to continue to rely on past sources of supply. We support this stance and encourage the council to take the initiative forward. This plan must set out a logical, precise and robust strategy that follows all up to date Government advice in a positive and sustainable manner.		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	25	We would strongly urge that the District Council drop the use of the word minimum or, if the Council really feels it has to use the word, then somewhere in the plan it should say what it understands by a minimum		Comment	Earnley Parish Council (Mrs Louise Chater) [16]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	65	The difference between Option 1 and 1A is said to be that option 1A reduces the scale of development on Manhood and redistributes it to Southbourne, Hunston and Tangmere. However for some reason Chidham and Hambrook allocation reduces from 600 in Option 1 to 500 in Option 1A and there is no explanation or justification for this reduction. The 600 unit allocation for Hambrook in Option 1 should have been carried forward in Option 1A as it has a railway station and the 700 bus route. Then reduce 200 unit allocation for hunston to 100 as it less sustainable location	Reduce housing numbers for Hunston to 100 and add additional 100 to Chidham and Hambrook which is more sustainable.	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	80	While I support the percentage allocations in general, the numbers in total are too high for the existing infrastructure and could result in a suburbanisation of the coastal plain, adversely impacting the area as a leading tourist destination. Without a long-term, robust solution to the A27 the area will face increasing gridlock. The City needs more affordable housing in the form of apartments and long term social rental.		Comment	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	145	I do not know of anyone locally who thinks that 12000 new dwellings, 25000 new residents and a similar number of vehicles, meets any needs of theirs. Prioritise brownfield sites. Your policy of developing Portfield and similar 'out of town' 'retail offerings' is gradually stripping the town centre of shops. Developments should be integrated not piecemeal Improvement in infrastructure		Comment	Jane Church [5904]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	200	The wastewater and sewage system is already groaning. Many, many times in the summer months huge MTS 30,000 litre tankers - sometimes two at a time - are pumping sewage out of the mains in East Wittering to relieve the already overloaded system - and still you want to build more houses. This makes no sense.	Halt any more large scale development approvals	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	301	Policy S4. There many things wrong with this policy, mainly the damage the numbers for the Western Manhood Peninsula will do but the biggest error is the basic presumption that the figures are correct. I repatedly hear Councillors, Planners and others say with a shrug " Oh those are the figures handed down by Government; there is nothing we can do about it" Has anybody actually tried to dispute or mitigate them?	Before adopting this policy go back to Government, tell them we have consulted with neighbouring authorities but there are limits as to how many houses we can build. Point out that only 23% of the CDC land mass is available to build on. There must be a clause in the legislation for "exceptional circumstances" and we must quillify.	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	344	I fail to see how, by accepting 41 house from the SDNP, this policy "will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities" - quite the opposite	Don't accept the 41 houses.	Object	Mr Jim McAuslan [6602]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	350	Section 7.1 states that the plan will give priority to previously developed land within urban areas. Why has the 'Apron' site at Tangmere not been allocated for housing in the Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan or the Draft Local Plan Review? This allocation would make the additional houses at the SDL unnecessary.		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	411	What about opportunities to build between the city and the SDNP, why is 'north of the city' not taking the area between the A27 and the SDNP into consideration?	Re-evaluate areas between A27 and SDNP	Object	david marsh [6809]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	426	609 houses per year, an uplift of 40% on the current annual delivery, which is the maximum allowed. HEDNA (GL Hearn) calculates increase in housing for demographic growth to be 517 houses including SDNP. 2016 based projections decrease housing required nationwide over the next 25 years by 24%. Projection growth over the plan period is likely to be in the order of 392 houses. The SDNP supply 84, leaving 308 needed in the Plan area. Adding 51.5% multiplier for earning/house price ratio is 466 houses per year. Unlikely that 609 houses are going to be needed every year until 2035.	This plan is based on a figure of 609 houses per year, an uplift of 40% on the current annual delivery, which is the maximum allowed, as Chichester District Council have an Adopted Local Plan. If an Adopted Local Plan had not been in place the HEDNA (GL Hearn) calculates the District increase in housing for demographic growth to be 517 houses p.a, based on the 2014 Household Projections. This figure includes the South Down National Park. There has been an updated 2016 based Household Projection, which decreases the forecast housing required nationwide over the next 25 years by 24%. This means that the latest available household growth projection growth over the plan period is likely to be in the order of 392 houses p.a. The South Downs National Park are planning to supply 84, leaving 308 needed for demographic growth in the Plan area. Even adding the ridiculous 51.5% multiplier for earning/house price ratio still only gets to 466 houses per year. It is most unlikely that 609 houses are going to be needed every year until 2035. The Plan should be more realistic and reflect this fact.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	457	There is no additional housing allocation for areas within the South Downs National Park. The SDNP should take its fair share of the allocation - otherwise, the villages in the SDNP will not thrive, more village schools will be closed and communities will suffer as a result. Also refers to S5 & S19	Ensure the South Downs National Park has a fair share of the housing development requirement. Also refers to S5 & S19	Object	Mr Neil Hipkiss [6831]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	530	Concerns over central government's directive to build more than 435 dwellings: - nothing to mitigate impact of housebuilding on infrastructure - CDC should challenge directive - strain on doctors, hospitals and schools. - no proposed investment		Comment	Cllr Henry Potter [6818]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	632	The South Downs National Park should take its allocation of 41 dwellings per annum - without some low level development in the Park, particularly social housing, communities there will not thrive.		Comment	Mr Philip Waters [6820]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	660	Housing figures need to be realistic with the land and infrastructure available and must include SDNP using their allocation within the SDNP otherwise the park becomes unsustainable to people living their. It becomes a museum. Small scale affordable local connection housing is vital to sustain the parks human viability		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	708	I strongly feel that the the housing targets set by the government should be reviewed. The A27 is at s stand still most day and at capacity. Even with any of these planned A27 improvements on line, we will reach capacity again immediately. The pollution through built up areas and several local schools surrounding the A27 is only set to get worse. We need a real solution to the pollution and congestion and strongly feel only a northern route is the solution. How can we approve all these new builds when we clogged with pollution?	stand up to the government regarding these targets. How can we build when we are already polluted and have no infrastructure in place. We are creating an unhealthy and impossible district to live and work in	Object	Mrs Deborah Hack [6717]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	714	That proposing 1933 new dwellings on the Manhood is excessive because of its dependence on only two access roads from the A27 and the distance of travel needed to schools, employment, retail, banking and other essential services in Chichester.	That proposing 1933 new dwellings on the Manhood is excessive because of its dependence on only two access roads from the A27 and the distance of travel needed to schools, employment, retail, banking and other essential services in Chichester.	Object	West Itchenor Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1036]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	732	For CDC to refer to the housing target numbers as minimums appears seriously flawed. This will surely encourage developers to submit plans for greater numbers than might otherwise be the case. It also makes it very difficult for local communities to resist further development when the "minimum" figure has been reached. The housing numbers imposed are already greater than the district can reasonably bear, so for CDC to set minimum targets is doing a great disservice on all counts, and particularly on environmental grounds.	I would like to see the minimum housing target numbers changed to maximum	Comment	Miss sarah backhouse [6692]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	744	Object to housing on Manhood for following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no jobs - houses sold to 2nd home owners/from London - traffic increase - air pollution - issue of cars in summer - tourism will be affected - cars at Stockbridge roundabout - water table issues - impact on Chi Harbour - loss of character - no banks on Manhood 		Object	Mrs Vivienne Barnes [6852]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	777	I do not understand the sense of absorbing 41 homes per annum into Chichester from the SDNP allocation. Surely the folks living within the SDNP would welcome affordable homes for their children/grandchildren and enable them to bring vitality into the villages, eg adequate schooling intake without the need for schools to remain functional by being dependant on absorbing kids from south of the SDNP boundary. I believe Chichester should not accept this allocation but with so many of the Councillors living north of the city, I really wonder how unbiased a vote would be to make this happen.		Comment	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	784	For Government to require CDC to raise its Local Plan allocation from 435 dwellings p.a. to 609 dwellings p.a. (i.e. by 40%) and then expect CDC to accommodate a further 41 dwelling p.a. from the SDNP is wholly unreasonable. This is particulary so when many Parishes in the SDNP have expressed concern about the sustainability of their communities due to the lack of housing for their younger generation.	The 41 dwellingsper annum, for the South Downs National Park should be rejected and absorbed within the SDNP where they are actually needed to ensure the sustainability of the communitees there.	Object	Mr K Martin [6938]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	802	Object to S4 allocation to Manhood on basis of poor infrastructure.	Addressing bullet 'place housing in locations which are accessible by public transport to jobs, shopping, leisure, education and health facilities' The Western Manhood lacks jobs, schools (in particular Secondary and Sixth Form), Health Centre over capacity and causing even more transport issues there has been a very significant increase in home deliveries. Para 7.5 refers to retirement housing on the Western Manhood there is a surplus of Retirement Flats and nursing homes have closed.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	835	Mention of housing needs must be in areas of need so that local connections can be maintained. so why is there no housing allocated for Lavant, Halnaker, Goodwood, West Dean etc. Even small developments need to take place in these areas to allow continuity and diversity of communities ie mixed demographics from all groups. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the the plan, i will raise it with the examiner at the appropriate time.	All villages need new housing even if they are very small developments which can be easily absorbed and keep villages alive. Not just in the south, east and west !!!	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	911	Is there any way of ensuring that the substantial housing developments which are proposed are used primarily for the relief of the local housing shortage rather than being bought as weekend residences? Also, given the projected aging population of the area, has there been adequate provision of affordable sheltered accommodation?		Comment	Mr Robert Carlisle [6969]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	916	Until there is some proper control over holiday home purchases we will forever be building homes for people who already have a house. What about a refusal to allow new homes to be sold to anyone not resident for the first year that said home is on sale? People should be able to have second homes but should not have them at the expense of those who have no home by artificially increasing the call for houses and thus their prices.		Comment	Mrs Teresa Carlisle [6968]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	961	1. This plan is based on building 650 houses per year, 609 for the Plan Area, and 41 from the South Downs National Park. This figure must be revisited. 2. This plan is based on a figure of 609 houses per year, an uplift of 40% on the current annual delivery, which is the maximum allowed, as Chichester District Council have an Adopted Local Plan.	1 - The South Downs National Park covers 1796 sq. km, has 39 villages and towns listed in its local plan, including substantial towns like Petersfield, Midhurst, Lewes and Petworth, The National Park needs to build its own share of houses, otherwise it will become fixed in a time warp. The Duty to Co-operate should work both ways. 2 - The adopted plan explained at length the difficulties of balancing the environmental and infrastructural constraints with the need to build houses. Considerable justification should be needed to increase the housing requirement so much, and none is provided. This figure must be revisited.	Object	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	978	We now know that Chichester is the 5th most expensive place in the country to buy a house compared with the gross average earnings. (The Independent) Therefore it is unlikely that these proposed houses will sell successfully. The Government needs to reconsider its local plan for this area.	Reduce the number of houses being built on the Manhood peninsular	Object	mrs Patricia Carroll [6964]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	982	Lack of housing north of Chichester smacks of undue influence. To state SDNP means no development can take place is absurd as Chichester Harbour has same protected status as AONB etc.		Object	Mrs Margaret Holdstock [6013]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1005	The figure of 1,933 dwellings for Manhood Peninsula does not match the sum of the respective areas. Mike Allgrove gave 950 as the figure when speaking to the Peninsula Forum. This is matched by the figures in para 4.126 plus 25 for West Wittering and 125 for Birdham. Why the discrepancy?	Correct the figure for dwellings on Manhood Peninsula.	Object	Mr Keith Martin [4610]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1058	Shocked to see the scale of development proposed on going on the road to Emsworth		Object	Mr Bernard Stoneham [5433]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1151	We wish to ensure that Chichester DC can achieve your housing target without the need to seek assistance from Waverley Borough Council. However, if indications are that you will not be able to accommodate all of the identified housing need within your borough, you will need an evidence base to demonstrate clearly that all possible options for meeting this need have been fully explored and that you will have active discussions with other authorities within your Housing Market Area to examine how any unmet need could be accommodated elsewhere within the HMA.		Comment	Waverley Borough Council (Mr Graham Parrott) [1033]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1158	Rein in the South Downs National Park Authority. Many communities in the South Downs would welcome small pockets of affordable housing so that younger people with families can remain and ensure the survival of local primary schools, village shop, real communities. Again get the Housing Associations involved with Government support and make it less of an attraction for 2nd home owners.		Comment	Mr Iain Dodson [6986]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1188	It is recognised that the current Preferred Approach Plan seeks to accommodate more than OAN, however this uplift is not sufficient to cover the unmet need from neighbouring authorities such as the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) or East Hampshire District Council.	It is recommended that an additional uplift is included in the housing policies to ensure that unmet need from neighbouring authorities is met, and that the employment growth contained within the plan is accommodated for.	Object	Mr Chris Pitchford [6432]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1246	Allocating 9,956 houses in the East-West Corridor and 1,933 houses on the Manhood Peninsula within the Plan period will significantly impact on Chichester Harbour AONB, Pagham Harbour and the coastal fringe.	Further consideration needs to be given to the impact of the housing in these sensitive areas and potential alternative locations	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1316	Housing should be better distributed across the District. The Plan places an over-reliance on Neighbourhood Plans to deliver housing.	See attachment.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1319	The concentration of the house building predominantly on the existing east west corridor will exacerbate the problems of access to the city and transport around the city without recourse to 'rat running' through villages and all its attendant problems and impact on tourism.	Distribute the planned house building around the city and incorporate areas outside the settlement boundary and inside the line of the northern relief road.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1353	The numbers are fictitious drawn up to satisfy the developers. The CDC has a very small area in which to build given the justifiable constraints of the Harbour and the South Downs. the SD should be taking more affordable housing if this can be demonstrated to be required	The numbers are fictitious drawn up to satisfy the developers. The CDC has a very small area in which to build given the justifiable constraints of the Harbour and the South Downs. the SD should be taking more affordable housing if this can be demonstrated to be required	Object	Mr David Leah [6440]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1382	The South Downs National Park should take it's allocation of 41 dwellings per annum - without some low level development in the Park, particularly social housing, communities there will not thrive	Move the development A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1423	Housing Need Assessment is just plain wrong and the Government even acknowledges this.	Look at the revised estimates published last year by Government and reduce the number of houses needed to be built across the district but most importantly in Loxwood.	Object	Miss Sarah-Jane Brown [7150]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1440	Allocations in Donnington, Hunston and North Mundham will lead to increased traffic on roads in Donnington. SDNP should take its allocation to prevent decline in its communities. Development on Manhood Peninsula was deliberately front loaded and it is unfair to ask the Peninsula to take further housing in these numbers as a result of this review.	Reduce the allocations for Manhood Peninsula.	Object	Donnington Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann (Parish Clerk)) [888]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1446	No attempt to justify increase in housing from 435 to 650. No houses should be accepted from the SDNP. Housing figure should be reduced to reflect 2016 ONS projections. Number of houses from strategic allocations should be revised to 2900 (if total houses to be 550dpa) - remove 2500 from number. Large number of houses proposed adjacent to AONB - remove those doing most harm.	Reduce housing figure to reflect 2016 ONS projects. Revise supply from proposed strategic allocations. Remove allocations adjacent to AONB.	Object	Graham Campbell [6915]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1462	Before MORE house are built I think the Council should carryout a comprehensive study of existing housing as to the current usage and occupancy. Some larger houses could become available if those larger houses were of single occupancy as elderly people move to a flat or bungalow. There are also houses that are unoccupied and appear abandoned by the owner.		Comment	Mr Graham Dipple [7162]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1467	No further development should occur in this area until the profound issues of the A27 are resolved		Comment	Ms Helen Boarer [5749]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1494	I am dissappointed in the attitude to the South Downs National Park. CDC has a major role in their area and are advised of planning being applied for. I believe CDC should have taken a much more decisive attitude and issue a requirement that they provide substantial land for both employment and domestic development. National directives do not prevent such an approach and I believe that many residents within the SDNP would support inner development to retain and expand accomodation. This approach would go a long way to alleviating the overdevelopment of the corridor along the A259.		Comment	Mr Richard Young [7109]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1542	Given that the Council is already not meeting its previously identified needs it appears contrary to the ethos of the NPPF and PPG to use the artificially low annual housing requirement of 435 dpa as the base figure and then final capped figure of 609 dpa to limit future need. There is also further unmet need in the neighbouring South Downs National Park. Therefore, it is proposed that the Council review their Housing Need figures.	Review the use of the cap and using the artificially low annual housing requirement of 435 dpa as the base figure. Total housing need figure will need to be revised up to meet the local requirements.	Object	Pam Clingan [7180]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1558	The document reads if it has been produced in order to respect a Government diktat to plan for X houses, even though many of important factors are unknown (eg A27), because if no plan update is supplied funding will be lost. Houses are just spread around the area (50 in a field here, 200 tacked on to that village) without aiming for a coherent plan that takes account of major development (WHF) or changes to the city (Southern Gateway)	Reduce numbers of houses to be built on the edge of existing habitation and incorporate within current settlements.	Object	Mr John Davies [5359]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1590	"Chidham and Hambrook" was also described in your plan as "Hambrook/Nutbourne". The plan should be consistent.		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1637	Policy S4 there is no mention of housing allocation in the area North of Chichester and South of the SDNP. This needs to be allocated as a strategic site in the plan. This site should be adopted as a strategic employment site.	Policy S4 there is no mention of housing allocation in the area North of Chichester and South of the SDNP. This needs to be allocated as a strategic site in the plan. This site should be adopted as a strategic employment site.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1641	Bosham has capacity and facilities to add further housing; for example far better transport facilities than Chidham/Hambrook which have been allocated twice as much. French Gardens site north of the railway can accommodate up to 200 houses, is next to larger train station, two different bus routes, two primary schools and several shops. Precedent already set by allowing houses on Highgrove, with French Gardens being an even better site as it limits coalesance and less flooding issues.	Increased capacity in Bosham utilising space by transport links and outside AONB. Ease the demand placed on areas nearby which have less facilities.	Object	Mrs Christina Procter [7200]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1667	There is no mention of housing allocation in the area North of Chichester and South of the SDNP. This needs to be allocated as a strategic site in the plan. This site should be adopted as a strategic employment site.	There is no mention of housing allocation in the area North of Chichester and South of the SDNP. This needs to be allocated as a strategic site in the plan. This site should be adopted as a strategic employment site.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1875	- SDNP to take back responsibility for the allocation of 41 houses per year - Unequal distribution of housing - New housing needs to be in smaller developments - Need sufficient affordable housing - Should be a ban on second homes - Consider the mix of housing types - Use brownfield sites for housing		Comment	Jennie Horn [7223]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1889	The SDNP (Policy S3, Policy S5 and Policy S19) should share some of the development or have a northern route around Chichester.		Comment	William Fleming [7227]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1915	Distribution for Chidham and Hambrook is based on developers' estimates; inconsistent with policy DM3; does not take account of sensitive locations. Distribution is not in line with standard methodology; 2018 projections lower than 2014 projections; affordability ratio in Chidham and Hambrook is lower.	Reduce allocation for Chidham and Hambrook by 50%	Object	Mr Andrew Kerry-Bedell [7238]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1939	Housing numbers proposed make no allowances for the following infrastructure: - Policing - Doctors - Schools - Transport		Comment	Mrs Sally Mountstephen [7239]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1964	Substantial increases in the amount of development in the East - West corridor along the A259 will affect the following: - Roads - increasing traffic, but crumbling roads, no A27 bypass solution. - Foul Drainage. Untreated sewage discharged into the harbour. - Increasing danger to public health. - Education - existing schools short of funding - Police - also short of funding - Hospitals - under pressure		Comment	Mr David Myers [4894]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	1974	Object on grounds that Manhood cannot cope with more development until a new A27 has been built north of Chichester. CDC cannot accept housing allocation for the Manhood Peninsula until A27 congestion is relieved. The Council should not import housing need that the SDNP refuses. Also questions why housing is not planned for area between city and SDNP to relieve pressure to south of city.		Object	Mr Anthony Tuffin [5052]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2026	What proportion of these houses will be for existing Chichester residents. If outside families move into the borough their children's requirements will only exasperate the future housing requirements. A rule should be in place to prevent outside occupation.		Object	Mr Graham Porrett [7251]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2053	We have no comment to make on the detail of your plan but we recognise the similar issues our two local planning authorities face in relation to planning for housing with regards to part of our districts lying within the South Downs National Park.		Comment	East Hampshire District Council (Planning Policy) [899]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2109	Object to model used to plan for housing numbers.	Start with lower numbers to reduce inevitable negative impact on natural habitats that any increase in human numbers will cause.	Object	Mr John Auric [7266]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2131	Objection to accommodating unmet housing need arising from Chichester District part of SDNP.		Object	Mr Mike Lander [5160]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2192	We note that a significant proportion of the housing numbers proposed through the Local Plan will be delivered by Neighbourhood Plans. We have highlighted key criteria for individual locations that we would wish to see considered by those Plans when allocating sites. Where possible we would wish to see these included within the Local Plan policy but as you will be aware we have produced a checklist for Neighbourhood Plan groups in your District which will guide the identification of sites and other key issues and opportunities to be addressed in their Plans.		Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2232	The Government figure of 300 thousand homes a year, has been questioned by the ONS and the figure is actually suggested to be 190 thousand homes a year, so the Council should look again at the basis for the allocation.		Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2438	The SDNPA welcomes the uplift to the housing target to address unmet need arising in that part of the SDNP within Chichester District (estimated at 44 dpa at the time the last Statement of Common Ground was agreed in April 2018). The provision of 41 dpa broadly meets this need. Note that the OAN is calculated only for the area outside the SDNP using the 'capping' method set out in the Government's standard methodology - this makes a clear distinction between the assessed need for Chichester District Local Plan area and that for the SDNPA, notwithstanding the Duty to Cooperate.		Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2445	Note that Plan seeks to provide 12350 dwellings including allowance for unmet needs from SDNPA. Appreciate delivery of devt dependent on infrastructure provision - recognise challenge to deliver additional devt given significant constraints. Worthing unable to meet full need, Adur is unlikely to meet all of own need or any of Worthing's. Looking forward to exploring how unmet need can be met in longer term through LSS2/LSS3.		Comment	Adur & Worthing Councils (Planning Policy Manager) [928]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2449	Support policy as it seeks to meet full need. Concerns over target of 4400 as differs from total number given for strategic locations in S3 (8,085). No explanation for difference. Would like to see evidence that number of neighbourhood plan sites can realistically be delivered within timescales given difficulty of making NPs and of bringing sites forward. Welcomes reference to WS&GB SPB and attempting to meeting other devt needs within wider area.		Comment	Horsham District Council (Mr Mark McLaughlin) [1092]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2518	Not clear breakdown of permissions/committed/implemented/windfall sites - unable to assess impact on Sidlesham. 32 approvals in Sidlesham/Earnley for PD agri-resi - inappropriate and unsustainable - needs to be addressed in the local plan.		Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2532	We have calculated that some 40% of the new housing proposals (S4 : total 5595 dwellings) are being allocated to this area (2250 dwellings). While Neighbourhood Plans will probably be reviewed to allocate particular housing sites there will be attendant problems that will be difficult for Neighbourhood Plans to deal with individually. These include:- - Traffic on the A259 - Wastewater Treatment - Coalescence - Green Space	The inclusion of a new Policy to provide some co-ordinated support for issues affecting all the Bourne villages, followed by details set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance.	Object	Mrs Sue Talbot [6219]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2542	Accept housing allocation but emphasis on E-W corridor is harmful to AONB	* We wish to see a re-evaluation of the distribution of housing allocations for the East-West corridor, particularly between Chichester and Emsworth. * We urge a stronger policy on settlement gaps to protect the character and identity of these villages (Fishbourne, Bosham, Chidham & Hambrook and Southbourne) * We would welcome additional guidance on coalescence along the A259. * Policy S24 Countryside needs to be more robust * Policy S30 Wildlife Corridors requires strengthening	Object	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2571	Object to meeting needs of SDNP		Object	Earnley Parish Council (Mrs Louise Chater) [16]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2572	Hard to see how plan's housing objectives can be achieved without building on agricultural land. Hard to see how a further 600 homes on Western Manhood Peninsula can be justified when the previously identified problems have not been mitigated and have been made worse by the development which has already taken place.		Comment	Earnley Parish Council (Mrs Louise Chater) [16]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2587	Support approach however no trajectory provided - requirement of para 73 of NPPF		Support	Countryside Properties [7291]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2604	Do not consider 1% buffer on housing supply to be sufficient to ensure robust HLS - should be 20% buffer as Council has not delivered on housing.		Comment	Welbeck Strategic Land IV LLP [7293]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2625	Support policy and meeting OAN.		Support	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne) [1147]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2631	No unmet need for neighbouring authorities proposed to be met. Exceptional circumstances exist for using OAN figure within HEDNA as opposed to standard methodology and CDC should be meeting higher figure e.g. 1000dpa		Comment	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2675	More contingency should be built into plan - make further allocations.		Comment	Devonshire Developments Limited [7116]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2693	Support level of housing proposed. However LPR should allocate sites in settlement hubs. Should not place so much emphasis on NPs delivering housing as have fewer resources/local politics make it difficult to get sites through locally. Some of the PCs express concerns over numbers in their reps to consultation - will impact deliverability.	LPR should allocate more sites instead of through NP process e.g. in E Wittering, allocate land at Church Road.	Comment	Welbeck Strategic Land (IV) LLP [7303]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2699	Agree with housing requirement but suggest that N of Plan area should accommodate minimum of 1000 homes, which would take pressure of E-W corridor		Support	Artemis Land and Agriculture Ltd [7306]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2707	Consider unmet needs of wider area - Brighton, Adur & Worthing, Crawley, Mid Sussex, Horsham and Hampshire authorities. Council should prepare housing and employment background paper to consider if both levels of growth are balanced. 1% buffer puts council at risk of undersupply - should seek to allocate 20% on top. Consider policy which sets criteria based approach to devt on edge of settlement boundaries (see Ashford)	Allocate additional land New policy re devt on edge of settlement boundaries	Comment	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2745	Pleased that the Council will deliver on the standard method. Consider that a 20% buffer should apply. Table in policy is confusing, suggest that category Parish Housing Requirements is relabelled "Non Strategic Parish Housing Requirements"	Table in policy is confusing, suggest that category Parish Housing Requirements is relabelled "Non Strategic Parish Housing Requirements"	Support	Gleeson Strategic Land (Mr Peter Rawlinson) [855]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2755	Do not disagree with use of standard method, but consider delivery of housing in neighbouring authorities and HMA to ensure needs are met in full. Suggest trajectory is provided in line with para 73. Suggest including buffer of 20% Aim should not be to prepare a plan with a stepped trajectory - the plan should allocate a range of sites to ensure provision is even across the plan period.	Provide housing trajectory. Suggest buffer of 20%. Allocate range of sites to ensure provision is even across plan period.	Comment	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2779	Should be seeking to deliver at least 14,800 dwellings over plan period (circa 780 dpa). Meet unmet = needs of Portsmouth. Review the proposed housing figure for Bosham, Fishbourne, Chidham & Hambrook and Hunston up in line with the increased figure. No trajectory included in plan		Object	Fishbourne Developments Ltd [1751]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2789	Policy should seek to deliver 14,800 homes in plan period.		Object	Antler Homes Ltd [7320]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2801	Plan meets need of standard method plus unmet need from SDNPA - shows the plan has been effective in working with other authorities and is positively prepared.	May wish to consider extending plan period as if plan not adopted til 2020 will not cover requisite 15 years	Support	Hallam Land Management Limited [1696]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2834	Object that the Parish Housing Requirement is only 500 and that the provision in the North of the Plan Area is only 489.	Increase the Parish Housing Requirement to at least 510 and increase the North of the Plan Area distribution to over 500.	Object	Casa Coevo [1734]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2866	As an unconstrained area, Chichester should seek to meet unmet needs of area or demonstrate that it has considered doing so. SoCGs are required - their omission at this stage means that policy is not effective nor has been positively prepared.	Consider ability to meet unmet needs outside District.	Object	Persimmon Homes (Mr Joe Maphosa) [1216]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2870	Do not wish to contest at present but expect the housing figure to be scrutinised given need to boost supply. Consider that a 25% uplift should be applied to OAN for affordability purposes.		Comment	Mr and Mis Butterfield and Waldron [7336]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2883	Object to figure as does not meet full need of SDNPA (81 dpa), plus does not meet unmet needs of neighbouring authorities. No uplift is proposed to account for proposed employment growth.	Increase housing figure e.g. through increasing West of Tangmere to 1500 units.	Object	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2918	Plan does not seek to meet unmet needs from neighbouring authorities. The plan should include a housing trajectory. Further housing allocations should be made to compensate for under-delivery on strategic sites in current LP.	Include trajectory. Review policy to take account of allocations in current plan not coming forward - and consider allocating further sites.	Object	N/A (Mr D G Phillips) [7340]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2937	Please can you confirm as to whether further stages of plan development will use the new national formula for calculating housing need?	We would like clarification on calculating housing need issue.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	2979	- Issues with identification of housing numbers for North of Plan area and distribution of new housing. - Allocation exceeds the amount to meet local need. - Limited local employment - Limited village services - Impact on infrastructure - Impact on roads - Impact on foul drainage - Impact on schools - Impact on medical service - Impact on rural character		Object	Plaistow And Ifold Parish Council (Catherine Nutting) [1223]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3002	Object - CDC should look to meet capped requirement based on baseline position (724dpa). Calculation of unmet need for SDNPA is not based on standard method and is therefore unreliable. Also SDNPA unmet need is 44 dpa and the plan only seeks to meet need of 41 dpa.	Housing requirement should be 724dpa plus 44 from SDNPA = 768dpa	Object	Danescroft Land Ltd (Mr Aidan Robson) [7342]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3009	Object - plan should seek to meet need 724dpa The method used for calculating unmet need from SDNP is not the standard one - is unreliable. The unmet need from the NP is 44dpa unclear why CDC only proposing to meet 41 dpa.	Plan to seek to deliver 724dpa plus 44 from NP = 728dpa.	Object	Castle Properties (Michael Stephens) [7344]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3013	Object - CDC should meet higher need 724dpa Concerns over SDNPA unmet need calculation. CDC not meeting all of NP unmet need	Meet need of 724dpa plus NP 44 = 728 dpa.	Object	Sunley Estates Ltd [1789]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3021	Give further consideration to unmet needs of neighbouring authorities/HMA Need housing trajectories Include buffer of 20% Allocate range of sites to ensure provision comes forward evenly.		Comment	Thakeham Homes (Chris Geddes) [7350]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3026	Support approach to meet Chichester's identified needs plus need from SDNP. Need to provide evidence of joint working with neighbouring authorities to establish whether unmet need elsewhere can be met.		Comment	William Lacey Group [1623]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3036	Plan does not reflect identified needs plus unmet need of the NP. Housing figure should not be capped as the current plan does not meet OAN. Rydon undertaken only SA to assess impact of 800 dpa and consider that the Council's SA is flawed. Plan should seek to meet full OAN of 775dpa	Increase housing requirement to 775dpa and meet NP figure in full	Object	Rydon Homes Ltd [1607]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3050	CDC should consider whether can meet unmet need within wider West Sussex and Greater Brighton Area. Consider scope for introducing policy trigger mechanisms Make supporting evidence clearer on capacity to deliver higher housing numbers Make supporting evidence clearer on imbalance between households/jobs Update SOCG between Chichester and Arun		Comment	Arun District Council (N/A N/A N/A) [6554]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3139	At present the plan is compliant with the NPPF as the housing target exceeds the standard method target		Comment	Obsidian Strategic SB Limited (Mr Philip Scott) [7370]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3222	OAN has potential flaws as cap on previous requirement already failed to meet need. Significant reliance on large sites - need a housing trajectory.	Include a housing trajectory	Object	Elberry Properties Ltd [7384]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3238	Council should plan for greater figure than 12,350. Object to use of HEDNA as opposed to standard methodology. No allowance for unmet need in wider HMA	Consider unmet need Use housing figure from standard method Identify small sites in service villages	Comment	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land [1897]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3243	<p>Council should plan for higher figure.</p> <p>No justification for use of HEDNA figure as opposed to standard method.</p> <p>No consideration of meeting unmet need from HMA.</p>		Comment	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3272	<p>Whilst we understand the need assessment was carried out in accordance with standard method set out in PPG we suggest it has potential flaws as 435dpa in adopted plan already fails to meet need. It should consider the un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just National Park.</p> <p>Out of the total 12,350 dwellings, 4,400 or 35% are proposed as new strategic allocations. Given this significant reliance on large sites and potential longer lead in times for housing delivery we suggest the plan includes a trajectory for them especially as this would better comply with Paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.</p>	The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	Object	Landacre Developments Ltd [7392]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3289	<p>Whilst we understand the need assessment was carried out in accordance with standard method set out in PPG we suggest it has potential flaws as 435dpa in adopted plan already fails to meet need. It should consider the un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just National Park.</p> <p>Out of the total 12,350 dwellings, 4,400 or 35% are proposed as new strategic allocations. Given this significant reliance on large sites and potential longer lead in times for housing delivery we suggest the plan includes a trajectory for them especially as this would better comply with Paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.</p>	The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	Object	Chichester Grain Ltd [7394]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3296	<p>Identifies a need for an additional 12,350 dwellings to be delivered in Chichester District. This is in accordance with the HEDNA and reflects the Government's proposed standard methodology for calculating housing need, which we support.</p> <p>Paragraph 11 of the NPPF is clear that sustainable development means that plans should be "sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change".</p> <p>At present Chichester's buffer equates to 1% which in our view is too low and should be increased to 20% to provide greater flexibility over the plan period.</p>		Comment	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3301	<p>Cap on adopted LP target resulted in artificial low housing figure as the adopted LP is not meeting full OAN.</p> <p>Stepped trajectory is unrealistic</p>	Increase housing requirement to 707dpa.	Object	Barratt Homes [1804]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3313	<p>Whilst we understand the need assessment was carried out in accordance with standard method set out in PPG we suggest it has potential flaws as 435dpa in adopted plan already fails to meet need. It should consider the un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just National Park.</p> <p>Out of the total 12,350 dwellings, 4,400 or 35% are proposed as new strategic allocations. Given this significant reliance on large sites and potential longer lead in times for housing delivery we suggest the plan includes a trajectory for them especially as this would better comply with Paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.</p>	The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	Object	Domusea [1816]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3317	<p>Whilst we understand the need assessment has been carried out in accordance with the standard method set out in PPG Suggest need assessment has potential flaws as the 435dpa in adopted plan already fails to meet need. It should also consider un-met needs of other adjoining authorities.</p> <p>Significant reliance on large sites and the potential longer lead in times for housing delivery.</p> <p>Welcome windfall small sites allowance and Parish sites allowance.</p>	The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	Comment	Landlinx Estates Ltd [1541]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3326	Use of standard method without sufficient adjustment to meet needs of adjoining authorities increases risk of failing to meet full local housing need. Housing need is greater than that set out in standard methodology.	Review approach towards meeting full local housing needs of District and plan for an increased supply of housing over plan period, particularly within early years of plan.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3332	Need assessment has potential flaws as the 435dpa in the adopted plan already fails to meet need. It should also consider the un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just the National Park. Given significant reliance on large sites and potential longer lead in times for housing delivery, suggest plan includes a trajectory for them. Welcome windfall small sites allowance and Parish sites allowance.	The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	Object	Mr Samuel Langmead [7400]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3338	Need assessment has potential flaws as the 435dpa in the adopted plan already fails to meet need. It should also consider the un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just the National Park. Significant reliance on large sites and potential longer lead in times for housing delivery - suggest plan includes a trajectory for them.	The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	Object	Mr and Mrs R Ellis [7401]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3354	Object to S4 - does not meet need, no flexibility and lacks clarity. Should be 775dpa. questions over deliverability of strategic allocations through NPs. Clarity is required to establish whether the Council is double-counting. No housing trajectory provided	Meet actual housing need Allow additional housing to provide flexibility Provide clarity as to double-counting/housing supply Include housing trajectory	Object	CEG [7397]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3357	As set out in representations to draft Policy S3, the population of the Manhood Peninsula should be treated equitably and fairly with the rest of the district.	Policy S4 should be amended so that the population of the Manhood Peninsula is treated as equitably and fairly as the rest of the district and reflect the need for 1400 new homes on the Manhood Peninsula, in order to provide 30% affordable housing for its residents.	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3361	Whilst we understand the need assessment was carried out in accordance with standard method set out in PPG we suggest it has potential flaws as 435dpa in adopted plan already fails to meet need. It should consider the un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just National Park. Out of the total 12,350 dwellings, 4,400 or 35% are proposed as new strategic allocations. Given this significant reliance on large sites and potential longer lead in times for housing delivery we suggest the plan includes a trajectory for them especially as this would better comply with Paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2	Object	Junnell Homes Ltd [7402]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3371	Need assessment has potential flaws as the 435dpa in the adopted plan already fails to meet need. Should also consider the un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just the National Park. As significant reliance on large sites and potential longer lead-in times for housing delivery, suggest the plan includes a trajectory. Welcome windfall small sites allowance and parish sites. Propose definition of windfall sites in the Local Plan glossary is clarified so that it meets the 'consistent with national policy' test of soundness.	The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2. Request definition of windfall sites in the Local Plan glossary is clarified to make clear that they comprise previously developed sites that have unexpectedly become available within settlements and in rural areas outside a settlement boundary.	Object	Mr Jeff Ferguson [7403]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3385	Need assessment has potential flaws as the 435dpa in the adopted plan already fails to meet need. It should also consider the un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just the National Park. Welcome both windfall small sites allowance and Parish sites allowance.	Given this significant reliance on large sites and the potential longer lead in times for housing delivery, suggest plan includes a trajectory for them especially as this would better comply with Paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	Object	Ms Rebecca Newman [7405]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3392	Consider the approach to meeting the District's local housing need and the development strategy is 'unsound'. The application of the Standard Method without sufficient adjustment to meet some of the needs of the adjoining authorities or the specific social and economic circumstances of the District increases the risk of failing to meet the full local housing need. The policy is therefore not considered to be positively prepared or consistent with national policy.	The housing need is greater within the District than is currently being planned for through the standard method of assessment. We request the Council review the approach towards meeting the full local housing needs of the District and plan for an increased supply of housing over the Plan period, in particular within the early years of the Plan.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3396	The application of the Standard Method without sufficient adjustment to meet some of the needs of the adjoining authorities or the specific social and economic circumstances of the District increases the risk of failing to meet the full local housing need. The policy is therefore not considered to be positively prepared or consistent with national policy	We therefore request the Council review the approach towards meeting the full local housing needs of the District and plan for an increased supply of housing over the Plan period, in particular within the early years of the Plan.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3403	The proposed policy wording is not positively prepared, consistent with national policy nor will it be effective in delivering the District's full local housing need in sustainable locations, such as the Settlement Hubs and Service Villages.	We therefore request the Council review the approach towards meeting the full local housing needs of the District and plan for an increased supply of housing over the Plan period, in particular within the early years of the Plan.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3409	Out of the total 12,350 dwellings, 4,400 or 35% are proposed as new strategic allocations. Given this significant reliance on large sites and the potential longer lead in times for housing delivery we therefore suggest the plan includes a trajectory for them especially as this would better comply with Paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3410	Need assessment has potential flaws as the 435dpa in the adopted plan already fails to meet need. Should also consider un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just the National Park. Given significant reliance on large sites and potential longer lead in times for housing delivery, suggest plan includes a trajectory. Welcome both windfall small sites allowance and Parish sites allowance.	Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2. This would benefit the Local Plan in better meeting the 'consistent with national policy' test of soundness.	Comment	Greenwood Group Ltd [7406]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3416	The Assessment confirms OAN is capped at 40% above the adopted housing requirement. The Local Plan was adopted on the basis of approximately 435 dpa. Capping the OAN to 40% above the adopted figure gives Chichester a housing need of 609 dpa. Whilst we understand the need assessment has been carried out in accordance with the standard method set out in PPG we suggest it has potential flaws as the 435dpa in the adopted plan already fails to meet need. It should also consider the un-met needs of other adjoining authorities not just the National Park.	Policy S4 - The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2.	Object	Meadows Partnership [1879]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3424	Promoting land at Burnes Shipyard Refers to windfall small sites allowance. We propose a settlement policy boundary amendment to Bosham to include land at Burnes Shipyard. We therefore propose the definition of windfall sites in the Local Plan glossary is clarified to make clear that they comprise previously developed sites that have unexpectedly become available within settlements and in rural areas outside a settlement boundary. This clarification would benefit the Local Plan in better meeting the 'consistent with national policy' test of soundness.	olicy S4 - The Plan needs to include a housing trajectory of the strategic allocations to assist future monitoring of housing delivery as suggested by paragraph 73 of the NPPF2. We suggest the definition of windfall sites in the Local Plan glossary is clarified to make clear that they comprise previously developed sites that have unexpectedly become available within settlements and in rural areas. Both amendments would benefit the Local Plan in better meeting the 'consistent with national policy' test of soundness. We propose a settlement policy boundary amendment to Bosham to include land at Burnes Shipyard. Consideration should be given to an additional small site allowance Bosham in Policy S5. Whatever allowance is agreed, an equal reduction to the housing proposed in AL7 as a strategic allocation should be made.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3495	Object on grounds that 40% of new housing proposed is allocated to east-west corridor without sufficient comprehensive planning guidance.		Object	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3529	Para 7.5 refers to retirement housing on the Western Manhood there is a surplus of Retirement Flats and nursing homes have closed.		Comment	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3532	The local plan review has failed to make a proper distribution of housing in the Parish. The so called comprehensive selection process undertaken by the planners in their strategic site allocation exercise and the subsequent approval by CDC is found to be wanting as it is based on developers estimates which have not followed the density benchmarks as per policy DM3 and has also not been modified for locations adjacent to sensitive locations.		Object	Chidham Sustainability Network (Stephen Morley) [7226]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3534	New homes along A259 westwards will add to FB roundabout vehicle numbers and so pollution from standing traffic		Object	Ms Lynda Hunter [6740]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3538	The wish of the South Downs National Park for 41 dwellings to be provided within the Chichester plan must be refused. Building within the National Park, given the number of towns and villages within, need to be undertaken to maintain the viability and prosperity of the Park.		Object	Mr Timothy Firmston [6945]
13	Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs	3551	In summary, the main concerns are that the housing needs for Chichester District have been wrongly assessed (for example, the baseline and affordability factors are out-of-date, the cap has then been incorrectly applied, market signals have not been fully considered) and the unmet needs from neighbouring authorities have not been sufficiently catered for.	The requirement of, at least 12,350 dwellings should be increased to 'at least 13,015 dwellings'. This is in accordance with our analysis of the relevant local housing need identified in section 3 of this report. The subsequent sources of supply will need to be reviewed to include an additional 665 dwellings plus appropriate buffer to provide flexibility. Given that 1,178 dwellings of this figure is required to meet the unmet needs of the SDNP it is recommended that a significant proportion be provided near to the SDNP boundary, in areas such as Lavant.	Object	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd. [7061]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	327	There should be an increased housing allocation to site AL6 and an additional site south of the A27 next to the new school.	An additional policy for housing south of Chichester.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	362	4.33 In six bullets this sets out aims for a potential future settlement that may well be irreconcilable in our confined space between two protected and designated areas without offending against several important requirements, in addition to transport and other considerations. it will be premature at this stage to give an indication that CDC is already giving thought to identifying a location for a new settlement within its Plan area. It should indicate no more than that there is discussion through the Strategic Planning Board, aimed at identifying wider area issues and strategic priorities.		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	480	4.3.3 Surely this is premature when the Plan Review period of 2019-2035 hasn't already been fully decided upon. Why are CDC offering up more of South Chichester district's land to Westminster by identifying a new Settlement for a further 2,000 - 3,000 dwellings within its post 2035 future Plan area!! We only have 40% of the whole district available to build in and your offering up more of our prized agricultural land?!!	Rephrase and don't be so keen to address what is actually a national problem and should be shared nationally. With the restrictions of the SDNP refusing to take on any housing quotas and CDC agreeing to this; the land availability in the South is limited by space and flooding. Discussions should be had on a South East regional basis.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	1418	Longer Term Growth Requirements. Transport is a key consideration with regards location of potential new settlement. Immediate proximity to existing rail stations and need to minimise effects on the road network in and around Chichester City should be specifically highlighted in this section given the current lack of a strategic solution to the A27 at Chichester. A reference to the need for a scale of development that would justify a new access onto the A27 away from the City and related to the PUSH area should be considered.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	1629	Too many new houses,no promise of a new northern road to support all the extra traffic,too much loss of green fields and wildlife habitat.	If no new northern route road is to be provided We must refuse to build this massive amount of new houses	Object	Mr and Mrs Mr and Mrs Liney [6402]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	1821	<p>Full support of the recommendations of paragraphs 4.30 to 4.33.</p> <p>The promoter has identified a parcel of land at Broadbridge that can support 3000 homes as part of a well considered scheme close to a public transport hub and capable of delivering very significant infrastructure to mitigate effects and provide tangible betterment.</p>		Support	Heaver Homes Ltd [7183]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	1848	<p>I have the following three comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The increased traffic will be too much for the A259 and A27 between Emsworth and Fishbourne. - There is considerable risk of surface water flooding on a number of identified sites. - A convenience food shop is essential. 		Comment	Mr Andrew Sargent [6362]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	2246	<p>Historic England welcomes and supports "where possible enhances the character, significance and setting of heritage assets" as one of the considerations to guide potential discussions on a possible site for a new settlement in paragraph 4.33 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	2949	<p>P38/para 4.30:</p> <p>We are very concerned by the indication here of a future plan to create a major new settlement in the area. The District has 75% of its area as designated land and any such development could not be achieved without creating an unsustainable level of damage to the natural environment, as well as creating an unsustainable car-dependent development.</p>	Remove from the plan and challenge the housing targets on the basis of having a special case because of high levels of designated land.	Object	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	2989	<p>Section 4.28 I don't think Chichester City Council has been consulted on the Development Plan Document.</p>		Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
14	Strategic Locations/Allocations	3515	<p>Plan must ensure suitability of a location to accommodate additional growth; not apply the developer-led approach that the next piece of available land nearest the centre must be sustainable and developed for housing; look at all sites within the district; development sites further from the city centre can often prove more sustainable than sites that comprise the next undeveloped site on the urban edge. Any development promoted must ensure it demonstrates not just meeting housing need, but provides for the infrastructure needs of the housing to be provided and for the community as a whole.</p>		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	31	<p>The apportionment of housing is not balanced. Loxwood (125) versus Kirdford (0), Wisborough Green (25) and Plaistow/Ifold (0). 125 of the 500 proposed total is 25%. How can that assigned apportion/ratio for Loxwood be classed as fair?</p>	The suggested housing figure needs to be revisited and revised for Loxwood Parish.	Object	Miss Karin Jones [6559]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	39	<p>The Draft Local Plan housing provision for Loxwood does not meet the test for sustainability and this has to be considered to be unsound on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - flooding - sewage capacity - school capacity - poor public transport - over subscribed medical surgery - unsafe roads - lack of employment - housing only for older people - traffic - lack of shop - capacity of village hall may be insufficient. 		Object	Ann Smith [6578]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	40	I must register an objection to the proposed plans at Loxwood on the following grounds - issues of drainage and sewage - limited road access		Object	Han Wachtel [6579]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	41	I wish to object on the following grounds to the addition of 125 houses that it lists on top of what is already allocated for Loxwood: limited employment, limited public transport, sewage capacity, surface water runoff, housing distribution, capacity of doctors and school.		Object	Christopher Kershaw [6570]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	42	I strongly object to a further 125 at Loxwood on the following grounds: - sewage - lack of employment opportunities - minimal public transport		Object	Helen Kershaw [6581]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	43	Please see below my objections to the allocation of new sites and houses in Loxwood: - much higher housing allocation than other service villages - lack of employment - history of flooding - damage to wildlife		Object	Mr Matthew Hayward [6568]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	136	In summary I believe that the proposed Local Plan cannot be considered Sound in terms of sustainability and that CDC has not followed national planning guidance in the development of this plan. Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds - local infrastructure cannot support 125 houses - public transport is poor - waste water/sewage capacity is exceeded already - little or no local employment		Object	Mr Richard Keates [6654]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	138	My conclusion is that this development plan for Loxwood is totally unsustainable and unnecessary on following grounds: - no improvement of local facilities with previous 60 homes - housing distribution		Comment	Mr Vivian Diggins [6550]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	139	I am writing to object to the current proposal to allocate a further 125 dwellings in Loxwood between 2019 and 2035 on the following grounds: - no need nor demand for additional housing - no employment - wastewater infrastructure cannot cope - housing distribution		Object	Mr Roger Marshman [6655]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	140	I wish to object to the draft Chichester DC Local Plan on the basis of soundness and process in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. Loxwood is not a sustainable location nor the proposed housing allocation. It fails on numerous environmental, employment and infrastructure issues. Uneven housing distribution		Object	Mr Nigel Simmonds [6633]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	141	<p>I would like to offer my comments on the Draft Local plans for Loxwood.</p> <p>I am somewhat concerned that so many dwellings are planned for a single village, where so many villages exist in the area, yet have negligible building works planned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - capacity of sewage already reached - traffic generated by additional development - impact on environment created by dormitory town - impact on character of Loxwood - procedures followed e.g. desk top studies/consultations - unequal housing distribution 		Comment	Dianne Bobb Jackson-Wachtel [6657]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	142	<p>I would like to object on the grounds that this proposed development is not sustainable due to infrastructure capacity constraints, in particular relating to waste water treatment, roads and transport.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loxwood sewerage infrastructure has no more capacity for any more development and Southern Water have stated they do not have any plans to update the infrastructure in its 2020 to 2025 spending plans. 2. Loxwood does not have any viable transport system, only one bus a day going to Guildford. 3. Loxwood does not have any employment opportunities therefore residents have to commute to work by road. 		Object	Mrs Gina Moore [6989]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	143	<p>I do not believe that the suggested development of a further 125 houses in Loxwood for the period 2019 to 2035 is sustainable in a village that will, if this proposal goes ahead mean more than 200 houses will be added to a small village in less than 20 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sewage capacity - no demand for open market housing in Loxwood - unequal distribution of housing across northern villages 		Object	Mr Graham Moore [5194]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	153	<p>There are sites in all villages which are available for sustainable development and which can contribute to the overall housing needs.</p> <p>Many of the villages have suitable services to allow for sustainable development.</p> <p>Allocation of a fixed number of houses (as a % of existing dwellings) will encourage improved neighbourhood planning ('neighbourhood plan -lite') in villages who will have sufficient time to prioritise low density developments in their village (and which will not have a detrimental impact on their village)</p>	Set a defined number for each village (% of existing dwellings not zero) which a village can realistically work towards and achieve over the plan period to 2035. In this way all villages can be seen to be contributing to the Chichester Housing needs rather than development dominated in certain villages	Object	Mrs Paula Fountain [6667]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	174	<p>The plan for 125 new houses in Loxwood does NOT meet the tests of sustainability as defined in the draft local plan and thus the plan cannot be considered to be sound as defined in the NPPF</p>	<p>The plan for 125 new houses in Loxwood does NOT meet the tests of sustainability as defined in the draft local plan and thus the plan cannot be considered to be sound as defined in the NPPF.</p> <p>CDC have NOT followed national planning guidelines in developing its draft local plan</p>	Object	Mr Andrew Black [6641]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	183	<p>I wish to register my objection to the CDC Local Plan for Loxwood for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unequal distribution of houses - sewage issues - little local employment - lack of public transport - school capacity 		Object	Ann Kersey [6689]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	185	Objects to the allocation of 125 houses at Loxwood on following grounds: - unequal distribution of houses - sewage issues		Object	Mr Derek Cooper [6645]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	186	Objects to allocation of 125 houses in Loxwood on following grounds: - unequal distribution of houses - pressure on services - lack of sewage capacity - flooding - traffic issues		Object	Mr Simon Taube [6691]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	212	objects to allocation at Loxwood on grounds of: - traffic - school capacity - sewage - public transport - unequal housing distribution		Object	Mrs Helen Diggins [6990]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	214	Object to allocation at Loxwood on following grounds: - unequal housing distribution - little employment - overcrowded roads - flooding - sewage capacity - no demand for additional housing		Object	Mr & Mrs Maureen and John Lewis [6707]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	223	I object to the allocation of an additional 125 houses to Loxwood Parish under this draft plan on the grounds of :- 1). Flawed Process - lack of prior consultation and community involvement 2). Disproportionate allocation - The Current Local Plan equitably allocated housing between the 3 service villages in the North of Plan Area. This new plan should do the same irrespective of Developer and Land owner led site submissions 3). Sustainability - Loxwood is not a sustainable village as defined by the NPPF and the Local Plan for reasons of Lack of sewage capacity and transport capability	Re-allocation on a more equitable basis between the three Service Villages in the North of Plan Area. Reduction or deferment of any housing requirement in Loxwood Parish until such time as Southern Water upgrades the sewage infrastructure.	Object	Mr Chris Agar [6155]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	228	The housing numbers allocated to Loxwood parish under S5 of the local plan review document are disproportionate and unfair as well as being unsustainable given the rural Nature of the village, its transport and waste water infrastructure. Neighbouring villages should be required to take more of the housing requirement and Loxwood's be reduced accordingly	Reduce Loxwood housing requirement Defer any housing until a sustainable sewage infrastructure ins in place Redistribute the housing requirement evenly between the 3 Service Villages in the North of Plan Area	Object	Mrs Elizabeth Agar [6730]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	282	Plan does not meet tests of sustainability at Loxwood: 1 The sewage infrastructure has no more capacity 2 The only public transport is one bus a day 3 Residents have to commute to work 4 Loxwood has no demand for open market housing		Comment	Mr David Robson [6736]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	283	Object to allocation at Loxwood on following grounds: - lack of sustainability - traffic generated by additional development - sewage - lack of public transport - lack of employment - unequal distribution of housing - school capacity		Object	Mr Peter Hyem [6737]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	293	4.33 indicates new settlements must 'support the provision of key infrastructure and community facilities' - our infrastructure and facilities are overloaded with roads, school and facilities already full and overflowing. Be 'comprehensively planned in consultation with existing communities and key stakeholders' - we have offered sites 200 homes which are sustainable and achievable but you have slammed at last minute a 'wildlife corridor' across those areas. 'does not undermine their separate identity' - Fishbourne already has building to our North, South and East boundaries so building on Bethwines would further erode our separate identity.	Remove the wildlife corridor designation and accept the equally good wildlife corridor identified by recent survey to the west of the village to allow build on land identified in Clay Lane for 200 homes. Do not build on Bethwines Farm	Object	Ms Lynda Hunter [6740]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	302	A minimum of two hundred more houses between Birdham and West Wittering on top of the hundreds already built in this area makes no logical sense.	Reduce the numbers for Birdham and West Wittering to zero.	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	305	Loxwood. Not sustainable, concerns over drainage and numbers of properties allocated is out of balance with the size of village, particularly given the lack of public transport and limited employment in the area.	Reduce the number of proposed properties allocated.	Object	Mrs Caroline Norman [6750]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	310	As a local resident of Loxwood I am concerned about the proposed allocation of additional housing within the village on following grounds: - lack of public transport - capacity of school - lack of demand for housing - lack of capacity of sewage system - unequal distribution of housing		Comment	Mr Edward Norman [6756]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	375	The allocation of a further 125 houses in the village of Loxwood is not considered sustainable in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and CDC's own draft LP page 35. The process used by CDC to develop the housing allocations in the Housing and economic land availability assessment for the NEP of the district did not meet the requirements of Planning Practice Guidance.	I accept that Loxwood needs to accept more housing but the other Service Villages should also take an equal share of the housing need for the NEP. If this is not possible then the housing allocation for Loxwood must be reduced to a more sustainable level. The Housing and economic land availability assessment for the NEP must be redone in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance nd that the Housing and economic land availability assessment for the NEP must be	Object	Loxwood Society (Mr Tony Colling) [1127]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	427	Birdham is already providing significantly more home than the adopted Local Plan requires. The village has one shop and a petrol station and NO other retail facilities. The further 125 in this Plan is totally inappropriate.	Birdham is already providing significantly more home than the adopted Local Plan requires. The village has one shop and a petrol station and NO other retail facilities. The further 125 in this Plan is totally inappropriate.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	476	HB10022 not suitable for development as would harm the AONB and goes against the Birdham neighbourhood plan.	Remove HB10022 as "achievable" developable sites	Object	Mr Richard Hutchinson [6455]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	523	A Second home policy should be introduced to prevent an over dominance of new homes being sold to non-residents.		Comment	Sam Pickford [6841]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	533	Object to allocation at Loxwood on following grounds: - risk of flooding - sewage capacity - unequal housing distribution		Object	Mr Howard Barnes [6788]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	535	Objects to allocation at Loxwood on following grounds: - sewage capacity - no demand for housing - lack of public transport - no employers - unequal distribution of housing - CDC not followed process		Object	Mr John King [6844]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	537	Concerns over allocation at Loxwood: - sewage problems - flooding - dangerous roads - use CPO to get land in other villages		Object	Mrs Patricia Breakell [6787]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	567	The Plan is not Sound as it does not meet the tests of sustainability, and the Council's process in drafting the Plan is not in accordance with national guidelines. Loxwood allocation excessive on grounds of inadequate infrastructure, wastewater, lack of employment, no public transport.	The Council should evaluate all potential sites taking into account sustainability issues, particularly with regard to infrastructure, and should allocate new housing fairly across the local Service Villages.	Object	Mrs Tamsin Farthing [6634]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	571	There need to be small scale developments in each parish, not just the ones listed here. There is no mention of a second home policy to prevent these houses being bought for use as holiday or second homes. There is already a high proportion of second /holiday homes in CDC. They contribute little to the area in terms of life, jobs, local schools etc. Our valuable agricultural land is being built on partly so people with enough money can enjoy a second home which they will occupy for a few weeks of the year only. This is not sustainable development.	Introduce a second homes policy to prevent new hoes being sold to non-residents and those who have no connection to the area. This can be done, as demonstrated in St Ives, Cornwall. Second homes do	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	614	Object to allocation at Loxwood on following grounds: - unequal distribution of housing - failure to accord with NPPF - ignored sustainability issues - sewage capacity poor - flooding - poor public transport - few employment opportunities - school at capacity		Object	Mr Len Milsom [4877]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	642	Concerns about allocation at Loxwood: - proximity to other large scale developments and number of cars that will result - capacity of infrastructure to cope - sewage, no public transport, no employment, flooding - unequal distribution of housing		Comment	Lynis Nash [6897]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	661	Small scale housing has huge benefits. It can be absorbed within village settings and dose put too much of a burden on the infrastructure already in place . But houses must not be 5 bedroom 'yuppie' homes for londoners who want to live the country dream. They should be 2/3 bedroom family homes for people who live and work in the immediate area.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	703	The proposed distribution of housing has been made without any consideration to the issues that affect the delivery of some of the proposed strategic allocations. In particular Westbourne should be allocated more housing. This is required not only to sustain village facilities, such as schools, shops etc but also that it will meet a need a housing in this part of the District.	That Westbourne be allocated additional housing as part of the Local Plan Review.	Object	Paul Newman Property Consultants Limited (Mr Paul Newman) [6906]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	715	A further 125 dwellings at Birdham is considered to be excessive on traffic grounds because of congestion along the A286 into Chichester at morning and evening peak times.	A further 125 dwellings at Birdham is considered to be excessive on traffic grounds because of congestion along the A286 into Chichester at morning and evening peak times.	Object	West Itchenor Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1036]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	731	Objection to allocation of 125 houses at Loxwood and unfair allocation of housing in the North of Plan Area		Object	Mr Mirus Kuszel [6913]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	741	Object to allocation of 125 houses in Loxwood		Object	Mrs Kerry Kuszel [6916]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	748	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds - no employment in village - sewage at capacity - flooding - traffic - unequal distribution of housing		Object	Mr & Mrs A H R Walker [6917]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	767	CDC have not followed national planning guidance nor consulted locally with residents and parish councils, so much for democracy. The provision of 125 houses does not meet the sustainability as defined in the draft local plan. Loxwood has major problems with sewage, flooding and a laughable transport system. Tankers are needed to clear the sewage from the nursery site. There is little demand for housing in Loxwood as those being built are unaffordable for local people and are bought by those from large cities. all the villages, especially, Kirdford and Wisborough Green should share the burden.	If it is deemed absolutely necessary that more houses need to be built in the area, the burden should be spread between Kirdford, Wisborough Green and Loxwood. CDC needs to address the severe problems regarding sewage, flooding and transport in Loxwood. They also need to consult with local residents and the parish council. CDC need to follow national planning guidance.	Object	Mrs Linda Colling [5204]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	849	The number of dwellings identified for Birdham parish is too high for the current infrastructure and road network and well beyond the current requirement of 50 dwellings. This figure has been met and/or is in the process of being built. Some mitigation is required given that half the parish lies within the AONB. The wish of the South Downs National Park for 41 dwellings to be provided within the Chichester plan must be refused. Building within the National Park, given the number of towns and villages within, need to be undertaken to maintain the viability and prosperity of the Park.	Reduce the number of dwellings required within Birdham parish as more has already been built than has been required. All the numbers within the Plan are minimum numbers although this is not openly stated.	Object	Mr Timothy Firmston [6945]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	933	Given the current constraints on the roads between Pagham and Chichester the level of housing proposed for Hunston and Mundham is too high. The road network has insufficient capacity to accept more traffic generated by these developments.	Review these housing allocations.	Object	Pagham Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann) [6976]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	963	The Adopted Local Plan 2014-2029 states in Para. 4.9 "More limited new development is proposed for the Manhood Peninsula, in recognition of the significant transport and environmental constraints (including flood risk) affecting the area. Policies for the peninsula follow the principles of Integrated Coastal Zone Management, which seeks to protect the area's sensitive environment and adapt to climate change."	Re-examine the environmental impact of the changes and make the required adjustments. If there is no quality of life then any amount of new homes will be wasted.	Object	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	979	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concerned over sustainability of proposal - lack of sewage capacity - flooding issues - lack of public transport - houses not sold to locals - lack of employment opportunities - increase in car useage/traffic - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Mr Peter Hughes [6984]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	983	Concerns of allocation at Loxwood on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need and demand for housing in area - infrastructure capacity - flood risk - unequal distribution of housing 		Comment	Rosemary Chapman [6996]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	995	It seems to us as unreasonable that Birdham should accept more than its share of the District burden, especially as these houses would have to be built within a few hundred metres of the Chichester Harbour AONB, a very small AONB already under enormous pressure. It seems to us that a reasonable number of houses for Birdham to be allocated in the review period would be 50, as that would keep our village's growth in line with the district as a whole.		Comment	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1013	I would like to express my concern at the number of additional houses that have been allocated to Loxwood. 125 additional houses in a small rural Parish with some 600 houses and 1200 residents is excessive. I believe the allocation is unfair given that the neighbouring Parishes of Kirdford and Wisborough Green have been allocated 0 and 25 houses respectively. The allocation appears to have been dictated solely by land owners or developers offering sites rather than any assessment of housing need.	Each of the 3 Northern Parishes should be allocated 50 houses each. This would be a fair allocation.	Object	Concillor Peter Wilding [7006]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1053	Loxwood doesn't have the infrastructure for 125 additional houses, particularly in terms of sewerage capacity and waste water treatment. There were terrible floods a few years ago due to blocked drains and culverts. There is no public transport in Loxwood and roads are generally very poorly maintained. There are also no employment opportunities, so residents have to commute by road. There is little local demand for open market and affordable housing, most people move from outside the locality. 125 houses are clearly developer led, contradict Loxwood's current Neighbourhood Plan and are not needed or sustainable as defined by NPPF.	Allocate a higher number to other parishes. Wisborough Green is a similar size, but has an A road running through it and better facilities. Redress the balance by adopting the existing local plan where the North Eastern parishes were all allocated 60 houses. Loxwood is a beautiful rural village. Don't turn it into a sprawling soul-less conurbation.	Object	Mr Simon Bates [7015]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1054	Strong OBJECTION to proposal - Loxwood	Distribute the 125 houses to the south of the borough where the location is much more sustainable in terms of transport and infrastructure. Also remember that Loxwood is rural - it won't with another 125 houses!	Object	Mr Daniel Kuszel [7016]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1055	Object to Loxwood allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no demand for market housing - lack of employment - lack of infrastructure - traffic impacts - sewage capacity - flooding - unequal distribution of housing - does not meet sustainability tests 		Object	Denise Boyes [7017]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1056	Object to Loxwood on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - development would ruin village - impact on services - sewage issues - poor road conditions and traffic impacts - lack of employment - lack of public transport - no demand for market housing 		Object	Aurelie Richard [7018]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1063	Object to allocation in Loxwood on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - flooding - sewage capacity - unequal distribution of housing - road capacity and traffic 		Object	Charlie Cox [7021]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1064	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no demand for market housing - lack of employment - no public transport - traffic impact - sewage capacity - flooding - impact on services - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Juliet Robertson [7022]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1070	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impact on sewage capacity - flood risk - lack of housing built for older people - no public transport - unequal distribution of housing - lack of environmental protections 		Object	Mary Mansson [7024]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1071	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of employment - sewage capacity - destruction of village character - unequal distribution of housing - lack of public transport - traffic issues - pollution - road safety 		Object	Mrs S A Cross [7025]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1073	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic impacts - road noise - services at capacity - no demand for market housing - no available sites in village which would not impact residents/green belt - flooding - sewage capacity - lack of public transport. 		Object	Mr Simon Eaton [7026]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1074	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sewage capacity - lack of public transport - unequal distribution of housing - fails on sustainability grounds - lack of infrastructure 		Object	Alison Anderson [7027]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1075	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CDC not followed NPPF - unequal distribution of housing - sewage capacity - no public transport - lack of demand for housing - no employment - flooding - detriment to character of village 		Object	Mr Andrew Spencer [7028]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1076	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NP being overruled - sewage issues - unequal distribution of housing - lack of public transport - traffic - school at capacity - surgery could deteriorate 		Object	Ann Holmes [7029]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1077	Object to Loxwood allocation following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unsustainable - lack of demand - sewage capacity - no public transport - flooding - change character of village - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Caroline Spencer [7030]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1078	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unsustainable - sewage capacity - lack of public transport - lack of employment - flooding - no demand for housing - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Catherine Thomas [7034]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1079	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - soundness - sewage capacity - no public transport - no employment - flooding - no demand for housing - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Fiona Gibbons [7036]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1080	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fails sustainability tests - lack of sewage capacity - lack of public transport - no employment - lack of demand for housing - flooding - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Mr Howard Thomas [5187]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1081	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unequal distribution of housing - no public transport - lack of employment - school capacity - sewage capacity - flood risk - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Mr J L Pocock [7037]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1082	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unequal distribution of housing - lack of parish consultation <p>Development should be approved by parish councils as developers don't consider wellbeing of residents</p>	Allocation of new houses should be shared equally across the villages in the area, as were the first tranche of new houses.	Object	Mrs Jan Butcher [6587]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1084	To prevent new homes being sold to non-residents a policy should be introduced to prevent this happening.		Comment	Mrs Claire Wilton [6733]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1088	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unequal distribution of housing - sewage capacity - no public transport - no employment - flooding - no demand for housing 		Object	Sarah Matthews [7043]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1094	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unequal distribution of development - sewage issues - flooding issues - lack of public transport - traffic 		Object	Sarah Hounsham [7044]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1100	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sewage issues - school capacity - traffic - doctors at capacity - infrastructure at capacity - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	T G Fox [7046]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1103	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no employment - no public transport - sewage capacity - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Sue Hyem [6738]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1107	Object to Loxwood allocation on grounds of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unequal distribution of housing - sewage capacity - lack of public transport - no employment 	allocate a lower number of houses to Loxwood	Object	Mr Hugh Kersey [7048]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1118	The policy should be amended to allow for the consideration of sites in suitable locations where a Neighbourhood Plan has not been submitted for examination within 6 months of Local Plan adoption. The policy should also confirm that the housing numbers are minimum requirements to ensure a flexible approach as required by the NPPF.	The policy should be amended to allow for the consideration of sites in suitable locations where a Neighbourhood Plan has not been submitted for examination within 6 months of Local Plan adoption. The policy should also confirm that the housing numbers are minimum requirements to ensure a flexible approach as required by the NPPF.	Object	Mr Alan Hutchings [7035]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1184	Objection to 125 homes in Loxwood - infrastructure unsuitable - lack of capacity for sewage - lack of employment in the area - housing numbers distributed unequally		Object	Mrs Jean Lightman [7062]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1189	Overall Millwood seek to object to the housing numbers proposed at Wisborough Green as these are too low compared with the affordability of the area, and the housing numbers in similar settlements such as Loxwood. It is therefore recommended that the housing figures for Wisborough Green are increased to a more sustainable figure, reflecting positive planning within the area.	Increase housing figure for Wisborough Green to more sustainable figure.	Object	Mr Chris Pitchford [6432]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1233	Objection to Loxwood: Housing allocations likely to fall within the Brewhurst Mill foul water pumping station catchment in Loxwood should be restricted due to over capacity and which affects Loxwood, Alfold, Ifold and Plaistow. There is no surface water drainage infrastructure in place in this area. Excessive 'Windfall' development in recent years have exacerbated this issue.	Suggest no further strategic housing development is permitted unless a developer is able to demonstrate that such development can provide and fund sufficient additional foul and surface water infrastructure to service the proposed development and enhance the existing services to the extent that no detriment is passed to existing residents	Object	Mr and Mrs W Townsend [4823]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1274	Parish estimates are conservative and should not be viewed as a target. Greater flexibility and production of neighbourhood plans is encouraged. See attachment for promoted sites.		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1280	Object to the allocation of 125 houses in Loxwood based on the following reasons: - Lack of sewage capacity - Transport inadequate - Flooding - Unequal distribution of houses between settlements - Housing mix not proportional		Object	Lars Mansson [7099]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1285	Objection to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: - Unsustainable - Lack sewage capacity - Lack of public transport - Lack of employment - Lack of capacity for local school		Object	Mr Phil Pinder [4888]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1288	Object to Loxwood allocation on the following grounds: - Unequal distribution of housing - Sewer system inadequate - Lack of employment - Lack of public transport - Lack of capacity for school		Object	Mr Frederick Kelsey [6660]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1293	Loxwood allocation of 125 houses is unsustainable on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of public transport - Lack of employment - Lack of capacity in doctors surgery - Lack of sewage capacity - Lack of local shops - No current demand for affordable housing - Lack of school capacity 		Comment	Mr Roger Newman [5488]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1317	Land South of Clappers Lane, Earnley is available for development and is achievable and deliverable within the Plan period.	See attachment.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1332	The allowed development of 125 houses in Birdham does not seem to be that small scale for a very small community. Donnington has no provision indicating that the plan envisages larger scale developments on the 85Ha land already proposed.	Remove policy S5.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1348	It is unjustified to increase the Boxgrove parish allocation from 25 to 75 plus another potential 65. The area is already gridlocked with traffic without any concrete provision for alternative sustainable transport solutions. the parish will also be adversely affected by the massive proposed developments in Shopwyke Lakes and Tangmere. The SDNP needs to take a significant number of affordable houses into the area. Infrastructure improvements such as the A27 need to be in place before any further houses are allocated of planned.	It is unjustified to increase the Boxgrove parish allocation from 25 to 75 plus another potential 65. The area is already gridlocked with traffic without any concrete provision for alternative sustainable transport solutions. the parish will also be adversely affected by the massive proposed developments in Shopwyke Lakes and Tangmere. The SDNP needs to take a significant number of affordable houses into the area. Infrastructure improvements such as the A27 need to be in place before any further houses are allocated of planned.	Object	Mr David Leah [6440]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1383	Further housing at Loxwood and the immediate villages will not benefit this area. there is no road capacity for cars, the area is already heaving with traffic and there is no immediate rail service The Sewage system is at full capacity already and many houses have been flooded due to this, surely this is a notable health hazard and the infrastructure should be made to handle more capacity before more houses are built. if the infrastructure can't cope then the developers should have to pay to improve before they build or they can't be allowed to build	To review the housing numbers allocated to Loxwood, this village has been allocated 125, while neighbouring villages have a zero allocation, this number of houses will affect every village in the area and the area will become unmanageable.	Object	Mr steven parsons [7130]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1424	OBJECT to Loxwood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs to be fair an equitable, planning-led NOT DEVELOPER-LED allocation. Loxwood must not shoulder all the housing - Sustainability of Loxwood as a location for more housing should be looked at again. Very limited bus routes 92 a day). Speeding cars on B2133 and sheer volume has increased massively. - Don't forget Loxwood will have to deal with Dunsfold Aerodrome fall out as well in terms of traffic and congestion. - Our sewers cannot even cope with the houses we have now - it floods people's gardens and drain lids have had to be bolted down. 	Simple. 125 homes will have a massive impact on Loxwood, but not in a built up area in the south of the district where there is good public transport links and their infrastructure has the necessary capacity. I am quite frankly staggered that Loxwood was included.	Object	Miss Sarah-Jane Brown [7150]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1427	Concerns over 125 houses at Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic impact - no public transport - flood risk 		Comment	Annabelle Scofield [7154]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1430	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impact on infrastructure/services - sewage capacity - lack of public transport - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Mr Christopher Hadden [7120]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1431	Concerns over Loxwood allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sustainability - sewage capacity - flood risk - no employment - lack of public transport - unequal distribution of housing 		Comment	Mrs Catherine Osborne [7144]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1432	Object to Loxwood allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no employment - sewage capacity - roads cannot cope with large vehicles - lack of deliverability - flood risk - detrimental to village character - impact on school/doctors - traffic - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Mr Christopher Smalley [7142]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1433	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unequal distribution of housing - school capacity - no employment - traffic congestion - lack of public transport - sewage capacity - flood risk - destroy village character 		Object	Mrs D J Pocock [7157]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1451	As there is a huge oversupply of development sites, no housing should be allocated to Birdham, Bracklesham or West Wittering in this plan cycle, or until infrastructure improvements are complete.		Object	Graham Campbell [6915]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1470	Object to Loxwood allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sewage capacity - flooding - public transport - no employment - traffic - impact on services - availability of sites - loss of character of village - no demand for housing - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Mr James Harrup-Brook [7168]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1486	Object to Loxwood allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sewage capacity - no public transport - no employment - flooding - no demand for housing - unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Mr and Mrs D Reeves [7171]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1499	125 homes at Birdham by the side of the A286 will change the landscape character from rural to urban to the detriment of our tourist industry.	remove 125 housing requirement on Birdham	Object	Mr Laurence Pocock [5781]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1509	4.27 WGPC is concerned that 6 months to get an updated NP to examination could be punitive to communities. If CDC overtake community NP progress with imposed sites this would wholly undermine the good work of NPs. We don't think 6 months is realistic. Assuming all communities were able to synchronise updating their NPs simultaneously, we seriously doubt that CDC has considered its ability to engage with all at the same time. Surely this target is set up to fail? WGPC recommends this time limit is removed or extended as it is unrealistic and risks undermining principles of NPs.		Comment	Wisborough Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1064]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1511	4.30 Wisborough Green Parish Council is, in principle, supportive of the concept of creating a new settlement, with appropriate infrastructure, as alternative to continuous growth of existing villages.		Comment	Wisborough Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1064]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1524	The housing allocation of 125 new dwellings in Birdham as set out Policy S5 is welcomed. However, the village has the potential to accommodate a higher level of growth (as demonstrated by the HELAA which identifies sites for 262 'Achievable' dwellings) in the event that the overall Parish Housing Requirement were to increase.		Support	Lewis & Co Planning (Mr Paul Burgess MRTPI) [7175]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1568	Object to Loxwood allocation: - failure to meet sustainability criteria - sewage capacity - flooding - no public transport - no employment - traffic issues - unequal distribution of housing.		Object	Alison Laker [7193]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1585	No mention of Lavant (not all of it is in the SDNP).		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1607	We believe some of the smaller village should take an allocation. Funtington as an example	More housing in Funtington and Ashling	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1627	More support needed for parishes in developing neighbourhood plans and assurances that communities can rely on those plans already made. Adding a large number of homes to parishes with made neighbourhood plans through strategic site allocations is likely to dramatically reduce that confidence and greater collaboration is needed. Consider more proactive support of Community Land Trust schemes. Attention should be given to traffic mitigation for the A259 both sides of the city in regards to housing figures. Consider more concentrated development to avoid building on greenfield sites.		Comment	Anna Khoo [7196]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1703	Bosham Parish could take approx 100 additional houses through the Parish Housing Requirements alleviating stress elsewhere. I have re-submitted the French Gardens site for development if it s required.		Comment	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1760	<p>The proposed housing requirement for the parish of Birdham can easily be achieved across sites that can be assimilated into the existing settlement.</p> <p>The resultant increase in population over the plan period will be beneficial in supporting and sustaining the local shops, businesses and services throughout Birdham.</p> <p>Without an increase in housing (of at least the 125 homes proposed) and resultant population increase there is a danger that some of Birdham's excellent facilities and services could cease to be viable and stop trading (as happened with The Bell Inn in 2014) which would be a terrible shame for the village.</p>		Support	Mr Nick Way [5110]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1807	<p>Policy S5 is drafted to identify residual Parish requirements having regard for strategic allocations. If a strategic allocation were to fail to be delivered or would realise a lower yield, this mechanism would provide no opportunity to deliver those latent requirements in other sustainable locations within the Parish boundary.</p> <p>This is a fatally flawed approach. The policy should be restructured to identify the Parish requirement (i.e. 1300 for Tangmere) and then say that this amount is proposed to be delivered on an allocation site. In the event that the allocation under-delivers, then consideration should be given to alternate locations.</p>	Policy should identify the whole Parish requirement. Policy should then identify the "preferred location" in the Parish but include a mechanism wherein other sites can be considered if it is agreed that the allocation will not realise Plan objectives.	Object	Heaver Homes Ltd [7183]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1857	<p>Object to Loxwood allocation on grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unequal distribution of housing - 45% increase in proposed dwellings - impact on infrastructure - Brexit and loss of industry to Europe 		Object	Dana Dean [7219]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1901	<p>Concern over lack of a development plan for Earnley based on the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aging population as young villagers move out - A need for affordable housing in the area - Closure of Earnley Concourse has led to a lack of venue for parish council meetings, lectures, garden parties, events and polling station - Loss of social activities leading to lack of connection to the neighbourhood for the young and elderly - No way to fund replacement village facilities without development within Earnley 		Comment	Celia Barlow [7005]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1902	<p>Object to Loxwood allocation on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unsustainable - National planning guidance not followed in preparation of Local Plan - Inadequate sewage infrastructure - Inadequate public transport - Lack of employment - Prone to flooding - Lack of parish consultation - Unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Mrs Clare Ford-Wille [7229]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1903	Object to Loxwood allocation on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of sewage capacity - Parts of village prone to flooding - No viable public transport - Lack of employment opportunities - School at full capacity - Lack of health facilities - No consultation on development sites - Unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Clare Schooling [7176]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1905	Object to Loxwood allocation based on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unequal distribution of housing - Inadequate sewage system - Increase in road congestion - Unsafe for pedestrians - Increase in vehicles causing unsafe parking at village shops 		Object	Howard J H Pullen [7230]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1908	Issues relating to additional housing proposed in Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Road congestion - Lack of public transport - Sewage 		Comment	Mrs Elizabeth Lancaster [5165]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1909	Unsustainable Loxwood allocation due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilities - Traffic - Parking - Congestion - Large number of developments in close proximity 		Comment	Natalie Cox [7233]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1910	I am objecting to the allocation of 125 houses to Loxwood as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - firstly, it will not be sustainable as the infrastructure cannot support that level; and, - secondly, national planning guidance has not been followed in the process so far. 		Object	Nigel Gibbons [7234]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1911	Allocation of home in Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of sewage capacity - Unequal distribution of housing - Contrary to national policy 		Comment	Mr George McGuinness-Smith [5201]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1912	Object to Loxwood allocation of housing on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of sewage capacity - Inadequate public transport - Lack of employment - Flooding - Lack of consultation - Unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Dr Peter Shahbenderian [7236]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1913	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unequal distribution of housing - Prone to flooding - Sewage capacity - School capacity - Public transport - Employment 		Object	Peter Tait [7237]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1967	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current state of sewage infrastructure not suitable 		Object	Graham Tarrant [7243]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1969	Current allocation for Loxwood unsuitable on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure insufficient - Lack of public transport - Limited local employment opportunities - Road network insufficient to support new development - Sewage system at capacity - Site selection and allocation not followed national guidance 		Object	John Lane [7244]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	1982	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flooding - Environmental designations - Landscape quality - Historic environment - Settlement characteristics - Wastewater infrastructure at capacity - Roads - Lack of public transport - Demand for housing - Employment - Site availability - Doesn't meet soundness tests - Unequal distribution 		Object	Jonathan Harden [7246]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2023	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of sewage capacity - Lack of road capacity - Lack of employment - Lack of school capacity - Doctors surgery already full - Unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Mrs Miranda C Fox [7252]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2048	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic and transport - Child safety (including the elderly) - with respect to car parking, additional traffic and crossing the road - Capacity of local preschool - Local primary school is underfunded - Lack of demand for new housing in the area - Lack of sewage capacity 		Object	Mrs T P Swann [7253]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2052	Object to allocation at Loxwood on grounds that additional houses will put further pressure on local roads with increased traffic and pollution; new residents will need to drive to place of work as limited employment opportunities in surrounding areas and current public transport inadequate; inadequate sewage treatment infrastructure; unfair allocation since other villages have avoided allocations.		Object	Ms Elizabeth Badman [7259]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2058	Object to Loxwood allocation on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity of sewage infrastructure - Capacity of local roads - Lack of public transport - Local school underfunded - Unequal distribution of houses 		Object	Pierre Venter [7262]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2063	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unequal distribution of housing in North of plan area - Sewage infrastructure at capacity - Lack of public transport - Lack of employment opportunities - Local school at capacity 		Object	Richard Badman [7265]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2155	Current allocation for Loxwood unsuitable on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure insufficient - Lack of public transport - Limited local employment opportunities - Road network insufficient to support new development - Sewage system at capacity - Site selection and allocation not followed national guidance 		Comment	Mrs Sarah Lane [5186]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2234	Object to Loxwood allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sewage infrastructure at capacity - No viable public transport system - Lack of employment opportunities - Area prone to flooding - Lack of demand for housing in the area - Unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Simon Laker [7271]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2328	Object to Loxwood allocation on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in traffic - Demand for housing - Lack of employment - Flooding - Sewage - Unequal distribution of housing - Lack of school capacity - Lack of public transport - Wildlife impact - Mix of housing 		Object	Kathy Cook [7276]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2352	Object to Loxwood allocation on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of public transport - Lack of employment opportunities - No secondary school - Little demand for new housing - Prioritise development on brownfield sites - Unequal distribution of housing 		Object	Dr Denis Cook [7279]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2439	We support identification of parish specific housing requirements providing certainty to local communities. This is the same approach as we have taken in the South Downs Local Plan.		Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2446	Horsham Council notes and supports Policy S5, which allocates parish housing requirements for small sites between 2016 and 2035.		Support	Horsham District Council (Mr Mark McLaughlin) [1092]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2543	The allocations for 125 houses at Birdham and 25 at West Wittering should be located and designed so as not have a negative impact on the landscape of the AONB		Comment	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2605	The LP should be more flexible and ambitious in allocating sites for individual parishes - Kirdford has a housing need for 100-136 new homes, Council should be aiming to deliver 76 new dwellings in the parish (via site Land south of Townfield)	Amend policy S5 to identify housing requirement for 75 dwellings in Kirdford	Comment	Welbeck Strategic Land IV LLP [7293]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2626	Any allocation over 100 dwellings should be considered strategic and allocated through LPR. Land west of Bell lane should be added to LPR.	Request that site Land west of Bell Lane is added to LPR to deliver Birdham housing.	Object	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne) [1147]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2653	Support approach to identifying small sites. Support approach of intervening in NPs if not reach sufficient stage but concern that NPs take time and this could prevent sustainable devt coming forward - status of NPs/other DPDs should not prevent new housing. Revisions to housing numbers should only be to increase figures.		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2677	No explanation as to why North Mundham has non-strategic requirement compared to Hunston. Housing figure should be increased and the LPR should allocate sites within the LPR - Land south of B2166.	Housing figure should be increased and the LPR should allocate sites within the LPR - Land south of B2166.	Comment	Devonshire Developments Limited [7116]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2682	Object on basis it leaves significant degree of housing to be identified through NPs - may be issue as PCs are likely to object/be unwilling to bring forward devt which may lead to uncertainty/delays Number proposed for Loxwood should be increased.	Plan should allocate sites for villages where significant development is proposed - Loxwood e.g. Land at Hawthorne Cottage, Loxwood.	Object	Reside Developments (Andrew Munton) [1246]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2686	Object on basis that significant level of devt to be allocated through NPs - unlikely to come forward and the Council should allocate sites.	The Local Plan should identify sites or locations that the Council consider to be suitable for housing, including land at Reedbridge Farm (Hunston) which is considered to be suitable, available and achievable to deliver housing.	Object	Spiby Partners Ltd (Chris Spiby) [7302]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2689	Building an additional 50 houses in Boxgrove (culminating in a total of 115 new homes over the period of the Plan) will be detrimental to the village environment, the resident population and to local biodiversity; it will add to the existing infrastructure problems, particularly the A27 and the A285; and does not meet a proven need.		Object	Alice Beattie [7300]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2690	Objection to Loxwood allocation: * Loxwood sewage infrastructure has no more capacity to such an extent that holding tanks have had to be installed on the new nursery site . * Loxwood is prone to surface water flooding * There are no employment opportunities in the local area, therefore the traffic on the roads will vastly increase. * Loxwood does not have a public transport system - not even linking it to local railway stations. * The village school is already full to capacity. * Loxwood surgery would be more than stretched with such a large increase in population.		Object	Mr Stewart Holmes [7304]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2694	Supportive of inclusion of NP housing requirement. However, reliance may be problematic e.g. in parishes where settlement straddles parish boundary (E Wittering)	Policy should be amended to refer to settlements rather than parishes	Comment	Welbeck Strategic Land (IV) LLP [7303]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2696	Loxwood. My principal reasons for objecting are; * The sewage system is already inadequate and causes problems for some residents. * The B2133 and Station Road are extremely busy roads used by commuters as well as local people. The number of Lorries and cars driving through the village is continually increasing. * Despite a 30 mile speed limit through the centre of the village Loxwood is becoming a more dangerous place for pedestrians to walk round. * Parking outside the local shop/post office, butcher and hairdressers is very inadequate and dangerous. Parked vehicles frequently obstruct visibility.		Object	Sue Pullen [6789]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2701	Objection to Loxwood: - The sewerage system is unable to handle any increases in demand. - The local school is unable to handle an increase in pupil numbers due to lack of funding. - No public transport to support an external increase in Loxwood population. - Traffic from developments already under construction or planned at Alford, Billingshurst, Dunsfold will overload an already very busy thoroughfare. - No effort by CDC to spread load for new buildings to other villages. - CDC is inconsistent by refusing permission for developments in other sites, eg. Foxbridge Lane.		Object	Mrs Joyce King [7307]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2708	No evidence why certain parishes are not subject of proposed allocations.		Object	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2716	Object to Loxwood: 1) The village infrastructure is inadequate, particularly the wastewater system which is up to full capacity with no prospect of improvement; there is virtually no public transport. only a derisory Bus service; the A281 is overloaded, especially in rush-hours on the approaches to Guildford. 2) Loxwood does not have any significant employment opportunities so residents must commute to work by road. There is little demand for open-market housing and the need for local and affordable housing would easily be met by the present Neighbourhood Plan.		Object	Mr T C Walker [7309]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2746	Should be made clearer that the same deadline should apply to all NPs, including those that have been identified as strategic development locations.		Comment	Gleeson Strategic Land (Mr Peter Rawlinson) [855]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2753	Objection to Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Driven by developers - Allocation higher than neighbouring villages - Lack of employment - Lack of natural gas supplies - Wastewater treatment requires upgrade - Public transport inadequate - School and medical services at maximum utilisation - Flooding 		Object	Shelley Woodage [7314]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2762	Objection to Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No requirement for surrounding villages - Sewage system at capacity - Little or no job opportunities 		Object	Mr Peter Winney [5118]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2765	Objection to Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Driven by developers - Allocation higher than neighbouring villages - Lack of employment - Lack of natural gas supplies - Wastewater treatment requires upgrade - Public transport inadequate - School and medical services at maximum utilisation - Flooding 		Object	Mr Glyn Woodage [6653]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2774	Objection to Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not sustainable. Developer lead. - Local services at peak - medical centre and school - Limited employment - vehicles commuting - Losing village charm - Many existing properties not on mains waste water - No gas supply - No public transport 		Object	Lorraine Tytherleigh [7318]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2775	Objection to Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not sustainable. Developer lead. - Local services at peak - medical centre and school - No employment opportunities - Flooding - Many existing properties not on mains waste water - No gas supply - No public transport - Electricity supply frequently dipping 		Object	Mr A Tytherleigh [7319]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2780	The number of parishes which are proposed to deliver through NPs is high and could prove difficult to ensure supply - should increase housing figure to ensure deliverability.		Comment	Fishbourne Developments Ltd [1751]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2790	Support allocation of housing figure for Loxwood but consider whether it could accommodate additional growth.		Support	Antler Homes Ltd [7320]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2792	Objection to Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developer led - Unfair distribution with surrounding villages - Sewage and wastewater treatment at capacity - No mains gas - No employment opportunities - No public transport 		Object	MRS ELIZABETH DUGDALE [7129]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2835	Object that Lynchmere does not have a proposed housing figure - can be delivered through Land to the rear of Sturt Avenue	The housing requirement of at least 10 units should be reinstated into the Local Plan Review and the table to draft policy S5 amended.	Object	Casa Coevo [1734]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2849	Objection to Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disproportionate allocation - Developer led - Existing infrastructure at capacity - medical and schooling facilities - Critical issue of wastewater disposal. 		Object	Mr Howard Lovenbury [7327]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2850	Objection to Loxwood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic flow has already increased significantly since NP was first mooted. - No change to the availability of public transport. - Inadequate sewage capacity. 		Object	Mr Iain Robertson [7328]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2916	comments on allocation at Loxwood on grounds of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic - school capacity - sewage - public transport - unequal housing distribution - no demand for housing - lack of sustainability 		Comment	Bruce Frost [7339]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	2980	- Issues with identification of housing numbers for North of Plan area and distribution of new housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocation exceeds the amount to meet local need. - Limited local employment - Limited village services - Impact on infrastructure - Impact on roads - Impact on foul drainage - Impact on schools - Impact on medical service - Impact on rural character 		Object	Plaietow And Ifold Parish Council (Catherine Nutting) [1223]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3006	Unclear why Chichester has allocation of 50 dwellings.		Object	Danescroft Land Ltd (Mr Aidan Robson) [7342]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3011	Support allocation of 125 dwellings in Loxwood, however if further sites are available that would deliver above the minimum requirement the PC should seek to allocate them. if the NP does not reach appropriate stage, the Council must take back the allocation and do so through a DPD. If housing figure for district is increased, the figure for Loxwood should also be increased.		Comment	Castle Properties (Michael Stephens) [7344]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3023	Support proposed 125 allocation at Loxwood.		Support	Thakeham Homes (Chris Geddes) [7350]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3027	Welcome commitment in wording to allocate sites through subsequent DPD if NP do not progress. Unhelpful that strategic allocations are not shown in table - recommend requirement is written in table for every parish inc strategic sites.		Comment	William Lacey Group [1623]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3039	Kirdford should have a parish housing figure as it is a service village - approx. 75 dwellings. This can be accommodated on Land at Herons Farm	Amend S5 so that Kirdford has a parish housing requirement.	Object	Mr G Rudsedski [7353]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3041	The parish requirement for N Mundham should be increased - 225 units could be accommodated on Land at Stoney Meadow Farm	Increase parish requirement for N Mundham	Object	Mr & Mrs Bell [7354]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3046	Housing figure for Bosham should be increased		Comment	Mr and Mrs Green [7358]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3047	Housing figure for North Mundham parish should increase		Object	Mr and Mrs Chitty [7359]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3052	Objection to Loxwood: - undemocratic and not a due process for CDC to override NP - no employment opportunities - commuting using A281 - more congestion with Waverley development. - increased pressure on school and GP surgery. - no bus service. - developments in Loxwood have been congested by inadequacy of parking spaces. - Sewage system cannot take further connections without large capital expenditure. - EA has recently rejected proposals to alleviate the flood risk as not cost effective.		Object	Mr James Jewell [6721]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3125	The Council should consider a more proactive approach to delivering smaller allocations as this policy places significant pressure on PCs to review their NPs.		Object	D R Pick Grandchildren's Settlement [7364]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3141	Significant reliance on strategy sites which may impact upon deliverability particularly as Council has record of under-delivery. A balance should be struck between large and small sites.	Frontload sites which can demonstrate early delivery. Consider allocating a greater number of smaller sites to reduce the reliance placed on NPs to allocate sites. Produce a housing trajectory.	Comment	Obsidian Strategic SB Limited (Mr Philip Scott) [7370]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3157	Objections to Loxwood: - no employment opportunities - inadequate sewage infrastructure - virtually non-existent public transport - certain areas prone to flooding		Object	Neville Dutton [7373]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3227	Land is available in Westhampnett for development	Housing requirement for Westhampnett should be increased	Object	J Pitts [6878]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3233	Housing requirement for Chichester should increase - land available at Salthill Park for approx. 750 units (approx. 32 ha)		Object	Trustees of CL Meighar Lovett Will Trust [7390]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3237	The HELAA 2018 for Loxwood village has both the field to the rear and to the front marked as 'achievable for development'. This would destroy my environment.		Comment	Mr Roland Butcher [6580]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3239	Object to lack of housing figure at Westbourne - should have housing number of at least 90.		Object	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land [1897]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3264	Land at Tangmere Apron available for housing if housing requirement is increased. Site is PDL, approx. 5 ha and could accommodate 120 houses	Remove HDA designation covering part of site. Site comprises concrete and this is considered inappropriate for horticultural use. If Tangmere requirement increases, consider allocating Tangmere Apron for housing.	Comment	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3265	Land available at West Wittering for housing development (Land at Ellanore Lane) for approx. 25 dwellings. Greater number of new homes can be provided within service villages		Comment	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3269	Object to Loxwood allocation: - unequal distribution of housing - inadequate process for determining housing figure - assumption of sustainability - school capacity - lack of public transport - flooding - lack of employment - sewage - environmental impact		Object	Loxwood Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1126]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3273	<p>Parish housing allocations comprise 500 dwellings distributed amongst the settlements in accordance with their ranking in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Concerned that Fishbourne given a nil allocation in S5 and 250 dwelling allocation has been included in policy AL9 as a parish strategic allocation. We believe that as Fishbourne parish is preparing its own Neighbourhood Plan, it should be given flexibility to choose how it allocates sites. A nil allocation in S5 could be interpreted to mean all 250 houses have to be found on 1 single site rather than on several smaller sites as part of a dispersed strategy.</p>		Object	Landacre Developments Ltd [7392]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3280	Support 0 housing requirement for Westbourne.		Support	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3297	<p>We support Parishes and Neighbourhood Groups being positively involved within the Local Plan Process, as detailed in draft Policy S5 (Parish Housing Requirements). We also support the Council's approach explaining that failure to submit a draft Neighbourhood Plans for examination within 6 months of the adoption of the Local Plan will result in the Council allocating sites for development within a Development Plan Document.</p> <p>See attached for site submission at Birdham.</p>		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3304	<p>CCE owns significant land surrounding the village of Oving and in the wider area, around Colworth.</p> <p>Some of this land was promoted as part of the HELAA process in 2018. HELAA site ref. HOV0016 was assessed by the Council and not considered to be acceptable for residential development because it was "detached from the settlement boundary". CCE strongly disagrees with this assessment as this land abuts the settlement boundary to the west and is close to its existing shops and services.</p>		Comment	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3314	50 units for Chichester is very low and does not encourage development of appropriate PDL. Land is available at the Tannery site, Westgate to accommodate 30 units - it is a strategic site for Chichester	Plan should identify the Tannery site as a strategic site for the delivery of approx. 30 units.	Object	West Sussex County Council [1416]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3318	<p>Promoting site at Pigeon House Farm, North Mundham with access from B2166 Lagness Road which has capacity for 125 dwellings.</p> <p>Unequal distribution of housing between Hunston and North Mundham/Runcton.</p>	<p>We therefore propose a more equal distribution between Hunston and North Mundham/Runcton with 125 dwellings each in Policy S5.</p> <p>The housing distribution amongst the parishes needs to be reconsidered to reflect the ranking of settlements in the Hierarchy background paper. In our view a more equal distribution for Hunston and North Mundham/Runcton would be justified given their similar performance in the hierarchy of population and available facilities. We believe each settlement could accommodate 125 dwellings.</p>	Object	Domusea [1816]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3319	<p>Allocation of 125 dwellings to Loxwood far outweighs other settlements in the NE part of district.</p> <p>1.9ha of land with a capacity of around 33 dwellings is available on land at Loxwood House Guildford Road. This site is located adjacent to the Loxwood Nursery Neighbourhood Plan allocation under construction for 43 dwellings. Land at Loxwood House is not constrained by any access, infrastructure, biodiversity or landownership constraint.</p>	The housing allocation for Loxwood could be reconsidered and possibly part redistributed to the other settlements in the NE part of the District. Loxwood should however have an allocation of at least 60 dwellings which is the allocation in the adopted Key Policies Local Plan.	Object	Landlinx Estates Ltd [1541]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3333	Support allocation of 125 dwellings to Birdham. 2.1ha of land with a capacity of around 25 dwellings is available at Church Road Birdham. Believe 25 units within the AONB with the remaining 100 outside the AONB represents a reasonable distribution.	The wording to S5 could usefully clarify that the identification of sites will need to pay regard to the locational sustainability of a settlement as well as environmental designations.	Support	Mr Samuel Langmead [7400]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3339	North Mundham has been allocated a figure of 50 dwellings, Contend that proposed settlement boundary extension to the north of the settlement off School Lane, north of the B2166 is discordant and remote from the settlement and would not be an appropriate extension of the settlement. Also inconsistent in its relationship with the settlement as a whole and extends excessively north.	Site appended to this submission at Lagness Road, Runcton would make a more logical and consistent extension of the settlement boundary, adjacent to the settlement of Runcton and capable of accommodating up to 25 dwellings. Settlement boundary around the site north of the B2166 could be reduced to accommodate 25 dwellings instead of 50, and the amount of development shared equally between the two settlements. Approach would still deliver necessary affordable housing and contributions towards local infrastructure, but impact of development would be more evenly spread across settlement area. Site at Lagness Road has housing on three sides, is well contained, better related to existing development and sustainably located.	Object	Mr and Mrs R Ellis [7401]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3356	Policy misleading as to extent of allocations being passed to NPs and no justification for difference in housing figures being attributed to different parishes. Title misleading as implies that parishes with strategic allocations have a 0 number to meet.	Amend policy to present allocations to parishes via NPs in clearer way. Provide justification for rationale for the allocation of different amounts of housing at various parishes.	Object	CEG [7397]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3358	For the reasons set out in representations to draft Policies S2 and S3, the allocation at Birdham should be more appropriate to its size, services and facilities. As such the allocation should be reduced to 60 dwellings, with the remaining 65 dwellings allocated to Selsey. This is still significantly greater than the 25 dwellings allocated at West Wittering, which is almost twice the size of Birdham. By doing this the main settlements on the Manhood Peninsula will be given the appropriate support and made more sustainable as a whole to better provide for all its residents.	Birdham allocation should be reduced to 60 dwellings.	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3363	Promoting site on land east of The Spinney, 0.23ha of land with a capacity of around 8 - 9 dwellings Unequal distribution of housing.	Policy S5 - The housing distribution amongst the parishes needs to be reconsidered to reflect the ranking of settlements in the Hierarchy background paper. In our view a more equal distribution for Hunston and North Mundham/Runcton would be justified given their similar performance in the hierarchy of population and available facilities. We believe each settlement could accommodate 125 dwellings.	Object	Junnell Homes Ltd [7402]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3376	Concerned that proposed distribution for West Wittering is not in accordance with ranking in settlement hierarchy. Allocation of 25 units under represents service village ranking in Hierarchy background paper of 6th largest of all settlements Suggest West Wittering take a greater share of housing than is currently proposed. A figure of 50-100 dwellings would be appropriate. Plan attached shows land at Bramber Nursery West Wittering. This is a previously developed site and could come forward as a windfall opportunity or as an allocated site in emerging West Wittering Neighbourhood Plan.	Housing distribution amongst the parishes needs to be reconsidered for settlements which score more highly in the settlement hierarchy background paper. Up to 50-100 dwellings would be more appropriate for West Wittering.	Comment	Mr Jeff Ferguson [7403]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3381	Object to nil allocation for the parish in policy S5; implies all new housing has to be found on new strategic sites within the parish; overlooks potential capacity for unidentified sites to come forward. Central part of Broad Road offers opportunity for further windfall sites to come forward; settlement policy boundary amendment to include area would facilitate this. Attached plan shows vacant plot south of Yeoman's Field to be suitable for housing. If included within new settlement policy boundary, could count against 'windfall allowance' or towards parish allowance.	Consideration should be given to an additional small site allowance for Chidham/Hambrook in Policy S5. Whatever allowance is agreed, an equal reduction to the housing proposed in AL10 as a strategic allocation should be made.	Object	Mr and Mrs Tearall [7404]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3386	Paragraph 4.26 of the Plan says housing allocations have been distributed amongst the settlements in accordance with their ranking in the settlement hierarchy. Concerned that proposed distribution for Hunston and North Mundham/Runcton does not do this as Hunston has 9 facilities compared with 8 at North Mundham/Runcton. Hunston is however, allocated 200 units as a strategic allocation and North Mundham has only 50 as a parish housing allocation.	The housing distribution amongst the parishes needs to be reconsidered to reflect ranking of settlements in the Hierarchy background paper. Propose a more equal distribution for Hunston and North Mundham/Runcton given their similar performance in the hierarchy of population and available facilities. Each settlement could accommodate 125 dwellings.	Object	Ms Rebecca Newman [7405]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3411	We are concerned that Fishbourne has been given a nil allocation in S5 and instead the total 250 dwelling allocation has been included in policy AL9 as a parish strategic allocation. We believe that as Fishbourne parish is preparing its own Neighbourhood Plan, it should be given the flexibility to choose how it allocates sites for development. In our view, a nil allocation in S5 could be interpreted to mean all 250 houses have to be found on 1 single site rather than on several smaller sites as part of a dispersed strategy.		Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3412	S5 should allocate some housing on parish sites to Sidlesham in the order of 25-50 dwellings as this has been deemed suitable for the other service villages in S5. Land is available at Greenwood Nursery Highleigh Road Sidlesham for around 35 dwellings. Site is outside the designated horticultural development area, within flood zone 1 (least liable to flood) and has no biodiversity or heritage interest. It is located outside the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It has a footpath link to the nearby school.	Sidlesham should be allocated up to 50 dwellings as Parish housing sites.	Object	Greenwood Group Ltd [7406]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3418	Parish housing allocations comprise 500 dwellings and they have been distributed in accordance with their ranking in the settlement hierarchy. We are concerned that the proposed distribution does not do this for West Wittering. For instance it is only allocated 25 units which under represents its service village ranking in the Hierarchy background paper of 6th largest of all settlements in terms of population with 16 facilities, second only to Bosham and Broadbridge with 21. We suggest that West Wittering should therefore take a greater share of housing than is currently proposed. A figure of 50-100 dwellings would be appropriate.	Policy S5 - The housing distribution amongst the parishes needs to be reconsidered for those settlements which score more highly in the settlement hierarchy background paper. We believe West Wittering is justified for more than 25 dwellings given its position in the hierarchy as the 6th largest settlement and second in terms of number of facilities. Up to 50-100 dwellings would be more appropriate. A plan is attached showing land West of Church Road East Wittering with a capacity in excess of 100 dwellings. It was considered immediately deliverable in the last 2018 HELAA. This could accommodate the entire allocation for West Wittering either for 25 dwellings or the higher figure proposed in these representations both in full.	Object	Meadows Partnership [1879]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3425	At present the entire 250 housing allocation for Bosham parish is set out in policy AL7 as a strategic allocation to come forward at Highgrove Farm. There is a nil allocation for the parish in policy S5. We Object as it implies all new housing has to be found on new large strategic sites within the parish and overlooks the potential capacity for unidentified sites to come forward within and adjoining the existing built up area due to modest settlement policy boundary adjustments. Disagree that any site within the AONB of Bosham should be ruled out for development in principle.	There are existing previously developed sites in the AONB including land at the former Burnes Shipyard which adjoins the settlement boundary of Bosham. Its redevelopment for a modest scheme of dwellings would secure the removal of the existing unsightly buildings and bring net benefits to the appearance of the AONB. A simple settlement policy boundary amendment to include the boatyard would facilitate this. It could then either count against the 'windfall allowance' of 695 dwellings in policy S4 or towards a new parish allowance for small sites in S5. Any new parish allowance in S5 should show an equal reduction in the strategic site allowance in AL7.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3457	Proposals for this Local Plan: - no initial funding for Stockbridge Link Road - no provision for walkers or cyclists - impact on roads - impact on schools	It would seem fair to have low level development in South Downs National Park to help maintain the communities in these diminishing areas.	Object	A + D Lygo-Baker [7425]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
15	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035	3552	Lavant should have a housing number. The Lavant Neighbourhood Plan also underrepresents the actual housing need and has not planned suitably for the required growth and around 206 dwellings should be delivered in Lavant over the Plan period.	Based upon the information contained within our analysis it is recommended that the housing figure for Lavant be amended from zero to circa 206 dwellings.	Object	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd. [7061]
16	Affordable Housing	1108	'Affordable' housing is not affordable in real terms. 80% of an already high market price is beyond many people's ability to buy. How will the council address this problem? New build homes are more expensive than existing properties. Many elderly people want to downsize and young people want small starter homes. More small homes should be built to accommodate all this. A mix of sizes and types on any development is good, but is not good if the majority are larger homes that are lucrative for the developer but too expensive for local people to buy.		Comment	Mrs Ruth Keeley [5401]
16	Affordable Housing	1176	Not strong enough. There needs to be mention of social rented housing whose stock had diminished considerably. This would be an opportunity for CDC to transform housing for low income families/ single people by taking out loans to build up and replace social housing stock which would more than pay for itself..Affordable housing is not affordable for a great number of local families. There is too much flexibility in allowing developers to not fulfill their required quota.	Much stronger requirement on developers to deliver on affordable housing. Commitment from CDC to embark on their own building programme of social housing building	Object	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
16	Affordable Housing	1247	The aspiration that affordable housing should be indistinguishable from market housing in terms of external appearance etc is difficult to reconcile with the existing practice which means that affordable housing is distinguished by not having garages		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
16	Affordable Housing	1347	If affordable housing is required then this should be built by and maintained in the public sector. It is counter productive building 70 non affordable just to build 30 affordable homes.	If affordable housing is required then this should be built by and maintained in the public sector. It is counter productive building 70 non affordable just to build 30 affordable homes.	Object	Mr David Leah [6440]
16	Affordable Housing	1533	Whilst the Plan addresses affordable housing no provision is made or needs identified for specialist housing for disabled and the elderly, including care and nursing homes. It is important for the District to identify the needs for such housing.		Comment	Elizabeth Lawrence Ltd (Mrs Elizabeth Lawrence) [906]
16	Affordable Housing	1608	4.34 Affordable housing is not defined in this document. Typically "affordable Housing" in this Council areas is unaffordable to many people. Policy S6 A 30% provision is unacceptably low. We recommend a minimum of 35%.	We recommend a 35% affordable housing level	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
16	Affordable Housing	2440	Support approach of taking opportunities from new residential development to contribute to AH supply. Important that whole plan viability testing reflects PPG. Support positive approach to CLTs.		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
16	Affordable Housing	2991	Councils sometimes secured as little as 13% affordable housing when their stated targets were as high as 50%. Other Councils still have a large housing stock enabling them to provide for young people and key workers.	Insert "Council should build its own affordable housing to meet its housing need. In this way there will be fewer large, executive style houses and more houses available for key workers, young people who we need to keep in the area." Section 4.39 Insert these words "including the council itself" at "approved Bodies" .	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	81	The percentage of affordable housing needs to be higher in and around Chichester City than in the villages and communities without easy access onto the A27 or rail network. A one size all policy for housing density and affordable housing provision is not suitable for the district. More social housing is needed for Chichester City.		Support	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	108	This does not go far enough. Southbourne is being inundated with large, expensive homes which are bought by people moving down from London or Surrey. This does not assist local housing needs in any way.	We need bungalows, we need affordable starter homes and flats for young people, we need social housing and assisted living for older people. Make this 40% social housing.	Object	Mrs Alice Smith [5409]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	428	Affordable (Social) Housing has is more in need than Market Housing and the % should be 40%. However, in the Witterings the community has exceed the 'in need' demand for Social Housing.	Affordable (Social) Housing has is more in need than Market Housing and the % should be 40%. However, in the Witterings the community has exceed the 'in need' demand for Social Housing.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	663	It MUST be affordable.Very small amount now are affordable.Developers provide the bear minimum. Chichester although appears affluent, a large proportion of the population are actually earning below the national wage average. affordable is relative.£400k house is not affordable to someone earning £25k a year. Developments need to be majority affordable housing with local connection. Locals cannot now afford to stay in the city they were born in.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	879	I think greater use could be made of existing empty properties in Chichester to provide affordable housing . My flat overlooks Chapel Street and 2 floors of the office block opposite have been empty for many years. Priority should be given to those without a car to reduce parking needs and reduce pollution		Comment	Ms Pamela Smith [5631]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	913	I am concerned that the affordable housing is beyond the reach of those who really need it. How do we make sure that those who attain it are local people?		Comment	Mrs Teresa Carlisle [6968]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	956	There must be insistence on a higher proportions of affordable housing. It's downright silly to turn 'fractions' of homes into money - round up the requirement to whole homes. Do not allow developers to wriggle out of responsibility for the percentage of affordable units they build - schemes must be properly costed initially and should not be approved if there is any doubt over whether they are viable.	As in 'representation' above.	Object	Liz Sagues [6982]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	989	Regarding new housing and its location: developments outside the immediate environs of Chichester - namely Tangmere - struggle to be filled: transport and access to schools, medical facilities and shops hinder these developments. Affordable dwellings have been prioritised for residents from outside the local area through the developers links to other counties. There needs to be clearly documented evidence of who occupies these new affordable homes, and whether they work in the local area.		Comment	The Hon Susan Barnes [6999]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1248	The aspiration that affordable housing should be indistinguishable from market housing in terms of external appearance etc is difficult to reconcile with the existing practice which means that affordable housing is distinguished by not having garages		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1330	In view of the pressure on land for development of housing and its consequent affects on the environment for existing residents, the level of affordable housing for local people should be increased to avoid the situation whereby the land is developed for those wishing to move into the area affecting property values and disadvantaging local residents trying to buy their first homes.	Increase significantly the provision of affordable homes.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1400	Does there need to be reference to CLT in the policy as well as in para. 4.45 for this intention to be effective?		Comment	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1512	The draft policy DM1 maintains a requirement to provide 30% affordable housing, and it is not clear whether this takes account of additional viability burdens and the national policy shift towards assessing viability at local plan preparation stage.	See representation.	Object	Linden Homes & Miller Homes [6783]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1609	4.34 Affordable housing is not defined in this document. Typically "affordable Housing" in this Council areas is unaffordable to many people. Policy S6 A 30% provision is unacceptably low. We recommend a minimum of 35%.	We recommend a minimum of 35%.	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1642	Paragraph 4.39 conflicts with the 2018 NPPF definition of affordable housing which identifies various types of affordable housing which do not require that they "should be provided or managed by Registered Providers (RP), and preferably by one of its development partners or an incorporated Community Led Housing group. However, in exceptional circumstances, the Council may use its discretion to allow other 'Approved Bodies' to deliver affordable housing units. This will, at all times, be strictly in line with the NPPF." Examples include Build to Rent, Self Build, Starter Homes, Discounted Market Homes etc.	Modify Paragraph 4.39 to read that "Affordable Housing must be delivered in accordance with the most current NPPF"	Object	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1646	My objection is to section 4.40 "The Council requires affordable housing to be provided on-site, unless there are exceptional circumstances that mean off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities." The should be no exception. All developments MUST offer affordable housing IN that development. We are building houses so people can live in them and have a home. There is NO exception to ensuring that happens.	Remove 4.40. No exceptions. All developments offer a proportion of affordable housing in all cases.	Object	Mrs Christina Procter [7200]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1713	Policy S6 A 30% provision is unacceptably low. We recommend a minimum of 35%.	We recommend a minimum of 35%.	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1921	Housebuilders should be made to publish their viability assessments if they wish to justify providing fewer affordable homes.		Comment	Mr Andrew Kerry-Bedell [7238]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	1947	Numbers of affordable housing not being delivered; developers frequently break promises about affordable housing numbers they will deliver using "viability" loophole. Where the developer claims an exemption, this should be thoroughly scrutinised.	Insert "Where the authority has been satisfied that a proposal is genuinely unable to meet the requirements" at start of paragraph 5.	Comment	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2224	"affordable " housing must truly reflect local income levels. Local people cannot afford local housing. Developers must deliver "affordable" housing requirement. More social rented housing needed. Starter homes and LCHO will not be sufficient. On greenfield sites, there should be no issues of viability and therefore the use of the word "appropriate" in subsection 1 should be removed. Policies that mitigate against second and holiday homes that are left empty most of the year need to be developed so that these are penalised with financially punitive measures.	Affordable Housing SPG strengthened.	Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2378	Support policy S6: - To resolve homelessness - Provide housing for young families, single households and aging population		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2454	Developers must deliver their "affordable" requirement if sufficient housing to meet local needs is to be provided. This should not be a problem if proper account is taken of the cost of land acquisitions and development at a sufficiently early stage. Subsections 1 and 5 in Policy S6 allow too much flexibility, especially the use of the word "appropriate" in subsection 1 which is too subjective. Affordable housing should relate more closely to local income levels. The Parish Council intends to commission a Local Housing Needs Survey which could help identify the quantity and type of need in the Parish.	Delete or amend subsections 1 and 5, as appropriate. (add to end of para 4.34) This means housing is unaffordable to many people in the Plan area and why income levels will be taken into account in establishing house prices and rent controls. 80% of the local market rent is the maximum, but lower rents are likely to be justified in some instances.	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2496	There is a disproportionate number of detached and 4 bed houses currently in our housing stock. We would like to see a commitment for Social Housing in addition to Affordable Housing, which many local people cannot afford to rent or buy. This means many young people leave the area. There is too much flexibility given to developers here in delivering the housing need for the area. They must deliver their "affordable" requirement if sufficient housing to meet local needs is to be provided.		Support	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2519	Policy too flexible in terms of economic viability. Economic viability needs rigorous independent assessment and if unviable should be reassessed for appropriateness of site or consideration of acquisition by CLT or CPO.		Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2578	To use the term "affordable housing" is a deception. In an area with such high market-rate housing, "affordable" is simply not affordable. In a holiday area, the rental market is limited and distorted by the high number of holiday lets; there is no guarantee that new housing would not benefit tourists rather than prospective residents.		Comment	Earnley Parish Council (Mrs Louise Chater) [16]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2588	Proposed affordable housing target has not been viability tested therefore uncertain as to whether it will prove to be achievable.	Revise policy to "The provision of affordable housing will be required at a target level of at least 30% of all new dwellings as set out in the criteria below:"	Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2632	Support policy but not sufficient consideration to other benefits provided by development where 30% AH is unviable. NPs should not be able to increase AH level required.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2655	Policy should not be too restrictive Affordable housing not always sought in small villages		Comment	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2758	Concerned that CDC not published viability evidence. Approach of ensuring AH is indistinguishable not effective to delivery - AH is a different product and may be designed differently and use different materials. Provided the proposed devt is in keeping with design policies than differential appearance should not be an issue for consideration.	Remove ref to AH being indistinguishable from market housing.	Comment	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2871	Significant AH shortfall in district - increasing overall housing figure would give rise to increase in number of AH units		Comment	Mr and Mis Butterfield and Waldron [7336]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2886	Object to policy on basis of lack of viability evidence.		Object	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	2982	The Parish Council welcomes the Policy on affordable housing and the more detailed requirement for open book valuations on viability. Hopes that the practice of 'bench marking' land values and high profit margins of developers are robustly challenged by the District Council. Recently these practices have resulted in land owners and developers receiving excessive returns at the expense of the provision of affordable housing. A return to residual valuations to determine land value, including adequate calculation and financial provision for the known affordable housing element and the housing mix, so that these planning obligations can be met, would be beneficial.		Support	Plaistow And Ifold Parish Council (Catheine Nutting) [1223]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	3029	No viability evidence has been published at this stage - important that this is done.		Comment	William Lacey Group [1623]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	3218	The required numbers of affordable housing are simply not being delivered.	Insert: "Where the authority has been satisfied that a proposal is genuinely unable to meet the requirements"	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	3278	Support policies that encourage CLTs.		Support	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	3299	The 2018 NPPF places greater emphasis on viability testing of development through local plans rather than on a site-by-site basis. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF indicates that decision makers can assume that a policy compliant development will be viable. We cannot support 30% affordable housing (as detailed within draft Policy S6 (Affordable Housing)) at this stage in the absence of the Council's viability evidence and we reserve the right to comment on this further at a later stage of the plan process.		Comment	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	3486	Increase in population above average 65+ should be addressed, and provide an opportunity for increasing the number of those in work and a higher percentage of social and low cost home ownership dwellings provided. No more market housing is built except that with extant permission. Affordable rented housing and low cost home ownership dwellings including specialist housing should be encouraged and actively pursued and to a high design standard.		Comment	Mrs Sarah Headlam [7441]
17	Policy S6: Affordable Housing	3548	Support housing for people who cannot afford to buy.		Support	Mr Frederick Rowland [6598]
18	Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	429	Each pitch should have a maximum size to bring it in line with the settled community. Housing density for the settled community can be around 40 homes per hectare. A similar constraint should be applied to the Travelling Community.	Each pitch should have a maximum size to bring it in line with the settled community. Housing density for the settled community can be around 40 homes per hectare. A similar constraint should be applied to the Travelling Community.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	30	We were promised the GTAA would be published on 14 December. I can not find it Please advise when it is uploaded and can be studied so that meaningful comments can be made		Comment	mrs alison heine [6551]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	82	Sites for more than 6 units should be within easy reach of the A27 and all allocated sites should be proportionate in size and scale to the existing settlement.		Support	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	364	Policy S7 as worded is open to misinterpretation: the start of the final sentence should be amended to read: Existing PERMITTED traveller sites will be safeguarded...		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	430	There has been no national evidence that the number of plots should be more than that defined in the adopted Local Plan. The new numbers were derived from the G&T Community, which could be biased.	There has been no national evidence that the number of plots should be more than that defined in the adopted Local Plan. The new numbers were derived from the G&T Community, which could be biased.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	482	This policy has too many loopholes and will be easily abused.	Change last sentence to include Existing LAWFUL traveller sites will be safeguarded.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	852	Ensure the people claiming to be of traveller and gypsy heritage are genuine in a direct line of descent.		Support	Mr Timothy Firmston [6945]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	2345	Object to policy: - need cannot be met through approach set out in Policy S7 - restricting site selection is unrealistic, sites will need to be found inc consideration of those outside of settlement boundaries - criteria based policy required and must be flexible		Object	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (A R Yarwood) [7278]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	2441	Support principle of policy - not clear whether intention is to allocate sites to meet need in a DPD. Policy wording should be clearer on this. Limited capacity within the NP to allocate sites for G&Ts given significant landscape constraints. Suggest that coastal authorities and SDNPA work closely in this regard.		Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	2447	Horsham Council notes and supports Policy S7, which identifies a need for 91 additional permanent residential Gypsy & Traveller pitches and 28 additional plots for Travelling Showpeople, and states that where there is a shortfall in provision, a Site Allocation DPD will be prepared to allocate sites.		Support	Horsham District Council (Mr Mark McLaughlin) [1092]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	2522	Concerns over "special treatment" as many gypsies who qualify under definition do not actually fit definition. Issues of resentment esp in communities with social housing need/pressure on school places. Criteria for assessment must be reviewed together with the transition to settled status and additionally the degree to which concentrations of gypsy and other travellers are occurring in specific areas.		Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
19	Policy S7: Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples' Needs	3287	Concern that policies are based on inadequate/flawed evidence base. CDC should challenge GTTS needs survey to avoid over provision. Policy should be included to avoid overconcentration of GTTS dwellings in one location e.g. Westbourne, Funtington Policy wording should also refer to existing sites. Concern that Westbourne NP will not carry so much weight if this policy is made.	Additional intensification should be resisted where there are large groups or considered up to maximum number of 18. Use criteria based approach to extension of sites. New pitches/plots should be enforced. Include ref to state any existing NPS that have been made with specific GTTS policies will retain their validity above this new LP.	Object	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	666	Alot of work in Chichester is low paid, service/industrial work/part time or seasonal.Chichester needs a variety of smaller business/ industrial opportunities rather than large scale which does not suit the area. Plenty of land already available on existing brown field site without concreting more. Priority to regenerate the city centre which is dying because of too much out of town retail parks. Encourage cheaper parking, lower business rates etc.	See above	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	776	Why no site designated for employment north of the city centre . Residents living within the SDNP would need to travel to the city, or south of the city, for work putting extra onus on local roads and adding to the current congestion. Allocating land outside of the SDNP for employment , but close enough to residents living within the SDNP , would seem sensible. This is especially so close to the Rolls Royce factory and in land SW of Goodwood Motor Circuit. Why was this removed from the previous Local Plan. Seems non logical.		Comment	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	926	Para 4.56 quotes the 2035 HEDNA requirement in Policy S8 for 231,835 sq.m or 23.2 hectares of new employment space; Para 4.57 shows this is to be achieved through combination of additional space at AL 1 (6 ha), AL 2 (4 ha), and AL15 (2.4 ha), this leaves 11 ha at AL6-not 33 ha as quoted in AL6 Section. AL 5 will also have 0.9 ha of employment space. 11 ha can be accommodated spread over other sites with better connections and not requiring a costly environmentally damaging link road; AL 6 should be disregarded for employment space.	delete AL 6 (land SW of Chichester) as a source of employment space from Para 4.57	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	1275	Support - additional employment sites offered. Compliance criteria should be reviewed to ensure control when planning policy might have limited influence.		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	1586	These sites are all in the south. Why no area to the north of the plan area?		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	1639	Consideration needs to be made for employment sites to the North of the city.	Consideration needs to be made for employment sites to the North of the city.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	1670	no mention of employment site to the North of the city. This should be included in the plan to facilitate employment sites for those residents of CDC area outside of the local plan area that are likely to move to Chichester to become economically active. Only focusing on the other peripheral areas and in particular the South West means increased traffic journeys for staff or prospective staff to get to the workplace. Building employment space outside the SDNP but to the North of Chichester is essential to unlock access to employment opportunities from residents of the SDNP.	Consideration needs to be made for employment sites to the North of the city.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	1717	4.52 We support the need for business and employment. This must though be well paid high quality jobs. Developing land for warehousing is not acceptable.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	2892	Para 4.57 Allocations of Land: such allocation must take into account the need to safeguard production of food		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	2966	Strong support for improvements to "telecommunications" (particularly with the advent of 5G now on the horizon).		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
20	Meeting Business and Employment Needs	2993	The interspersal of flexible working space close to housing reduces the need to travel.		Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	431	As mentioned on an earlier comment sheet there has been a loss of some 700 jobs on the Peninsula: Southern Yachts Itchenor Cobham Microwave East Wittering Earnley Concourse Earnley South Down Holiday Park Bracklesham Check-a-Trade Selsey. Thereare no plan to regenerate employment on the Peninsula	As mentioned on an earlier comment sheet there has been a loss of some 700 jobs on the Peninsula: Southern Yachts Itchenor Cobham Microwave East Wittering Earnley Concourse Earnley South Down Holiday Park Bracklesham Check-a-Trade Selsey. Thereare no plan to regenerate employment on the Peninsula	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	458	Why restrict this policy to employment in classes B1-B8? Why not include retailing and leisure and other institutions as sources of employment? This has led to unnecessary inflexibility (e.g. in turning down gym applications), and has encouraged employers to move out of the district e.g. to Portsmouth.	Add classes A2, D1 and D2 to the B use classes covered by this policy. As automotive retailers are already widely permitted in areas of employment land, consider whether wording is possible to permit some restricted retail activities, which by their nature need a warehouse-style or garage building instead of a shop.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	602	Land allocation under AL6 of 33 hectares is 3 times the HEDNA requirement when added to the three other sites identified in 4.57. By redistribution of the shortfall, business site AL6 can be removed alongside the need for developers to spend exorbitant funds on a raised link road which impedes into the AONB, over 2 and 3 Flood plains (parts are covenanted to National Trust) destroying prized landscape views of the Cathedral. AL4 within the noise buffer zone not in a zone 2 or 3 flood plain, with 5 easy road access points and is in the current area plan.	4.57 Remove Land South-west of Chichester (Policy AL6). Add Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester (Policy AL4) 4.54 Remove the last part of the sentence after "...which will encourage tourism".	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	725	Support the flexibility embodied in the penultimate paragraph regarding retention of existing employment sites, which states that "exceptionally, other leisure or community uses may be supported on employment sites. " This would not only provide opportunities to create diversity for church and community uses but also facilities such as gyms. It is better to have buildings occupied than left vacant.		Support	St Pancras church (Mr Derek Mumford) [6909]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	814	Propose Goodwood as an alternative employment location to AL6 as less conflict with DM25 Noise.	Now is the obvious opportunity to buffer the noise around Goodwood by developing an industrial facility between the track/airfield and housing. This would be by far more appropriate the A286 Southern Link Road development.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	1203	Policy S8 needs to be updated to reflect the Council's viability evidence, particularly in relation alternative uses.	Introduce provision within the policy supporting the mixed use development of existing employment sites where proposals result in the protection of existing employment provision.	Object	Nova Planning (Mr Patrick Barry) [1195]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	1513	It is recommended that added flexibility is provided in both policy S8 and in the allocation of 6 hectares of employment space at West of Chichester via policy AL1 to recognise the uncertainty associated with employment provision. It is recommended that instead the allocation of employment space at West Chichester be made more flexible by allocating the areas for mixed use employment and residential uses, with the final amount of employment to be determined by market evidence submitted at the time of the application.	See full representation.	Object	Linden Homes & Miller Homes [6783]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	1636	Section 4.24 states "These include new strategic allocations made in this Plan, retained allocations from the adopted Local Plan 2014-2029, existing commitments," in the adopted plan there is a strategic site to the South of Goodwood aerodrome. This has been removed from the strategic site list and no consideration has been made for its adoption as an employment site which would have the benefit of "place" and interaction with a high tech business (Rolls Royce) good transport links and unaffected by the noise issue (Goodwood buffer) for residential housing. The site must be included in the employment site allocation.	The strategic site to the South of Goodwood aerodrome should be included in the employment site allocation.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	1666	The plan states "These include new strategic allocations made in this Plan, retained allocations from the adopted Local Plan 2014-2029, existing commitments," in the adopted plan there is a strategic site to the South of Goodwood aerodrome. This has been removed from the strategic site list and no consideration has been made for its adoption as an employment site which would have the benefit of "place" and interaction with a high tech business (Rolls Royce) good transport links and unaffected by the noise issue (Goodwood buffer) for residential housing. The site must be included in the employment site allocation.	The strategic site to the South of Goodwood aerodrome should be included in the employment site allocation.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	2448	Horsham Council notes and supports Policy S8, which sets out the identified employment floorspace requirement for 2016-2035 (231,835 sqm) and which seeks to meet it through an identified supply of 235,182 sqm.		Support	Horsham District Council (Mr Mark McLaughlin) [1092]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	2494	Limited employment opportunities and no demand for existing premises in parish.		Object	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	2633	Concerns that no clear vision as to type of place being created/where employment fits in - should be overall vision. More flexible approach to employment (like retail) should be taken. Need for updated Employment Land Review.		Comment	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	2700	Support employment land policy - land at Crouchlands Farm could contribute to provision of floorspace and should be allocated for mixed-use development		Support	Artemis Land and Agriculture Ltd [7306]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	2709	CDC need to consider interrelationship of housing and employment and whether planned employment provision will require uplift in housing requirement		Comment	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	2852	Object on grounds that; failure to acknowledge need for only low-carbon growth; failure to resist loss of green fields; transport links can be damaging; failure to acknowledge inherent values of landscape and heritage assets; no evidence that new office development can be compatible with other existing commitments ie; protecting historic assets.	4.54 CHANGE TO "The Local Plan Review also seeks to maintain an attractive environment through protecting the landscape and heritage assets. These are recognised as being important assets for wildlife biodiversity and sense of wellbeing, and to hand down to future generations. They will also encourage tourism and inward investment from such businesses as are able to locate here without adversely impacting the assets. Either delete following wording or specify more clearly where suitable sites are likely to be: "Proposals for significant new office development will be encouraged in Chichester City centre".	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	3150	Object to omission of proposed RR strategic expansion land at Goodwood.	Include employment land allocation providing for future possible expansion of RR guided by criteria based policy.	Object	Rolls-Royce Motor Cars Limited [1784]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	3244	Amount of floorspace proposed feels optimistic given lead in times and economics. Policy should reflect flexibility on differing opportunities for employment floorspace beyond B use classes		Comment	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	3316	Policy wording is overly rigorous and could prevent appropriate development from coming forward.		Object	West Sussex County Council [1416]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	3477	Para 4.24 Site to the south of Goodwood airfield has been removed from the strategic site list for housing but there is no reason why it should not be considered for an employment site.	Include the site to the south of Goodwood airfield as an employment site.	Object	Mr Colin Hammerton [6709]
21	Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs	3553	We believe that total floorspace provision in Policy S8 might be overly ambitious for a couple of reasons. Firstly because the rate of future loss of employment is likely to slow down compared to the rate experienced by the Council when permitted development rights first came into effect and secondly, given the current and emerging economic uncertainties.		Comment	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd. [7061]
22	Addressing the Need for Retailing	668	Chichester city centre is dying. Too many eateries and no shops . Need to encourage small retailers back. do like Bognor..2 hrs free parking If nothing to buy people will not just come for coffee as parking is too expensive and there is no real move to "sustainable modes of transport " as mentioned. No detail. What sustainability ? what modes ? Just words ..no substance. Remove the Southern Gateway scheme until A27 is sorted...would be destructive to Canal area.	See above	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
22	Addressing the Need for Retailing	1276	Retail should extend further than traditional High Street interpretation		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
22	Addressing the Need for Retailing	1416	<p>These paragraphs do not mention local retail parades (such as The Ridgeway in Parklands) which are important for social interaction and sense of place/community and community support.</p> <p>Nor are the Trade Parks mentioned, e.g. near the Bognor roundabout, which include important diversity such as Falcon Fabrics, Dyson King, Tri-It and Game Set and Match, as well as chains such as Screwfix.</p> <p>N.B. As a Committee member of Parklands' Residents' Association (PRA), please note that PRA may wish to pursue the subject of local parades with CDC and with the Inspector at Examination in Public, if it is not adequately addressed.</p>	<p>Identify and add local parades to the Centre Hierarchy - they are important to Strategic Objectives, including Health and Well-Being. (Consider also the function of individual shops like the One-Stop at St Paul's Road and the Summersdale shop.)</p> <p>Review the function of Trade Parks and how they fit into the retail strategy of the Plan.</p>	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
22	Addressing the Need for Retailing	1441	<p>It is not clear to me whether this section refers to all Class A uses (i.e. https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/9/change_of_use).</p> <p>It would benefit from clarification.</p>	Please acknowledge which Class A uses this section is about and expand on the importance of retailing mix for sustainable places.	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
22	Addressing the Need for Retailing	1640	Section 4.65 makes no mention of Lavant as a village centre and as there is space for residential development outside of the SDNP this needs to feature in the local plan as a village centre to support the new settlement boundary that should be in the local plan as a strategic site outside of the SDNP.	Lavant as a village centre and outside of the SDNP needs to feature in the local plan as a strategic site .	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
22	Addressing the Need for Retailing	1720	<p>4.6 We do need to retain and expand our retail offering This needs to be flexible as peoples requirements change. Young people now wish to live, work and play in Cities. Chichester currently does not offer this as a serious opportunity. This plan does little to address this.</p> <p>4.62 We do not support the development of retail warehouse parks. This does damage to our city centre. We need to encourage the iconic stores into the City.</p> <p>4.63 We support the enhancement of the local centres in Selsey, Wittering and Tangmere</p>	No additional retail warehouse sites. This damages our city	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
22	Addressing the Need for Retailing	2589	Support para 4.63, however table following para 4.65 misleading as defines Tangmere as 'village centre'	Insert footnote to clarify that Tangmere anticipated to transition to become a local centre during plan period	Support	Countryside Properties [7291]
22	Addressing the Need for Retailing	2967	<p>Section 4.60 SUPPORT Final bullet point (referring to "Improving access ... by sustainable modes of transport ...")</p> <p>4.66 Strongly support the statement "it is important to promote the city centre and restrict further developments in out of centre locations".</p>		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
22	Addressing the Need for Retailing	2994	Support "restrict further developments in out of centre locations"	Insert "It is key that this Plan promotes the growth of shops near to where people live to reduce the dependency on the private car and give people local places and amenities to walk to."	Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	432	There has been a significant decline in facilities in East Wittering whilst we have seen a very significant growth in the Witterings housing stock, as mentioned earlier. A further point there is only one 24 hour free cash point in the area which regularly runs out of cash.	There has been a significant decline in facilities in East Wittering whilst we have seen a very significant growth in the Witterings housing stock, as mentioned earlier. A further point there is only one 24 hour free cash point in the area which regularly runs out of cash.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	444	what is the council planning to do about the changing city centres? There will be more opportunity in the city centre as retail changes. Maybe use some of the empty shops for housing or reduce the rates to encourage shops back in. Whatever is decided the council needs to be proactive in responding to the changes to ensure this is still a desirable place to live and visit.		Comment	karen phillips [6604]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	455	Whilst the objective, to ensure a lively retail scene in the city centre, is commendable, we should also support local citizens with larger more affordable shops, not just expensive independent boutiques. This especially applies to clothing. Currently I drive to adjacent districts (Bognor, Havant and beyond) to buy clothes, when I would much prefer to be able to buy clothes in Chichester. This could mean allowing a strictly limited number of large clothing shops in edge-of-town locations, to complement the expensive boutiques in the city centre.	Add a statement that flexibility will be shown in Chichester retail warehouse parks, subject to overall limits (to be proposed by the planning officers), to permit a limited number of large clothing shops in edge-of-town locations.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	510	CDC seem to be way out of step regarding the diversity of the city centre. The number of restaurant and cafe outlets are already excessive with few other reason for visitors to come into the city centre.	Call a halt to further permissions for more hospitality outlets in the city. Encouragement and incentives should be given to attract a much wider diversity of retail outlets.	Object	Mr Stephen Page [6591]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	880	I am concerned about the number of empty shops in Chichester. More needs to be done to support small businesses. With the number of residents in the City centre increasing, specialized food shops selling fresh local produce would be beneficial. The old butter market was a missed opportunity. I welcome the proposal to restrict further out of town retail development.		Comment	Ms Pamela Smith [5631]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	969	We support this policy and commend the six bullet points in para 4.60. We strongly support in 4.66 the promotion of the city centre's retail offer and the restriction of further retail development in out-of-centre locations.		Support	Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (Mr Alan Green) [788]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	988	Retail purchasing is changing very rapidly towards an online focused experience. There was only one department store in Chichester City centre which closed earlier this year. Overall footfall has decreased. High costs (rent/rates/maintenance) in the city centre lead to repeated store vacancies. To view the city centre as being able to cope with retail expansion would require an increase in vehicle parking facilities as there is currently insufficient frequent local alternative transport across the south coast. Proposals for expansion outside the city centre must again take into account increased traffic load.		Comment	The Hon Susan Barnes [6999]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	1153	Chichester centre. Online shopping is destroying secondary/tertiary retail areas. Grasp the nettle and use these areas for apartments. Stop the influx of Charity shops the usual death knell of shopping areas. Incentivise change of use to residential. Get the Housing Associations involved with Government support.		Comment	Mr Iain Dodson [6986]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	1172	Policy S9 and S10 both refer to local and village parades and village centres interchangeably which is confusing.	<p>The policy wording needs amending to make clear that additional retail will be supported at local centres and village centres including shopping parades and standalone shops.</p> <p>For consistency the policy should either refer to village centres in the hierarchy instead of local village parades.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to elevating Bosham to a local centre especially given the significant planned additional growth of 250 dwellings proposed at Highgrove Farm in policy SA7. If this is accepted the impact threshold should also be raised to over 500m2.</p> <p>Importantly, the village centre (or local centre if Bosham is elevated to this in the hierarchy) must be defined in the next Submission version Local Plan and not left to a future Neighbourhood Plan or Site Allocations DPD. According to the local Development Scheme (2018-2021) the next DPD is not due to be adopted until July 2022. We understand the Bosham Neighbourhood Plan is not being reviewed.</p> <p>Without this amendment allowing the definition of the Bosham village or local centre there would be no retail policy in place for Bosham until 2022 and potential retail development which would otherwise be welcomed by policy would be prevented from coming forward.</p> <p>The Co-op at Broadbridge Business centre is larger than the store at Station Road. The business centre has other facilities including a doctor's surgery and some of the business units there already have an ancillary retail offer. It has ample ground level parking and is better suited as a retail destination than the Station Road parade.</p> <p>We therefore recommend the Broadbridge Business Centre is defined in the Submission Plan as the retail centre of Bosham as shown on the attached plan edged blue. The centre should be at least a village centre although, with the potential 250 dwellings at Highcroft Farm, the centre would better be suited as local centre in the retail hierarchy.</p> <p>The proposed amendments would benefit the Plan in meeting the tests of soundness, namely the positively prepared, effective and consistent with national planning policy tests.</p>	Object	Rawleigh Property Management Ltd [1832]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	1417	<p>See Objection to para.s 4.60-4.71. Shopping parades and stand alone shops should be distinguished from Local Centres. And policy is needed for Trade Parks.</p> <p>N.B. As a Committee member of Parklands' Residents' Association (PRA), please note that PRA may wish to pursue the subject of local parades/shops with CDC and with the Inspector at Examination in Public, if it is not adequately addressed.</p>	These will flow from amplification of para.s 4.60-4.71 with new paragraphs on shopping parades and stand alone shops, and on trade parks. I look forward to considering CDC's proposed amendments.	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	1445	<p>This Policy introduces the concept of "comparison floorspace". It is not clear to me whether the subsequent references to retail provision/use refer to all Class A uses (i.e. https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/9/change_of_use) or simply to A1 shops. It would benefit from clarification. Dependent on how it is clarified, I may have further comments.</p>	Please tighten wording so policy is clear on how different A class uses are viewed.	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	1669	Cultural anchors could replace retail earlier than we think. There is over-stock of brick and mortar shopping.	Reduction in construction of new retail premises in favour of other built attractants.	Object	Chichester BID (Mr Colin Hicks) [7190]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	1673	No mention of Lavant as a village centre and as there is space for residential development outside of the SDNP this needs to feature in the local plan as a village centre to support the new settlement boundary that should be in the local plan as a strategic site outside of the SDNP.	Lavant as a village centre and outside of the SDNP needs to feature in the local plan as a strategic site	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	1856	The issue is the proposal to release areas within the Primary category, where no more that 25% of shop frontages can be in non-A1 retail uses, to the Secondary category whereby up to 75% of the shop frontages can be in non-A1 retail use - particularly South Street (less concerned about Southgate/Eastgate/Crane Street).		Comment	Mr Christopher Tod [4954]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	2590	Policy unhelpful in application to Tangmere where there is a close proposal for transition of Tangmere village centre to local centre	Clarify policy to ensure it will not inadvertently stifle retail development. Final paragraph should be applicable to Tangmere	Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	2634	Supportive of policy to protect existing retail but concerned that does not make provision for scale of retail which could be supported by new strategic development	Should be further provision made for strategic devts where greater retail provision can be supported without having negative impact on main centre	Comment	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	2856	Object on grounds that: nighttime economy creates problems; health of city centre retail has not been resilient through recent recession; widening area of retail centre would make centre less easily walkable and impact upon car parks; edge-of-centre shops would encourage hollowed out city centre.	4.60 Either remove any reference to the night time economy, or introduce more discernment into what aspects of the night time economy are desirable. 4.66 "The health of Chichester City centre retail has been resilient through the recent recession" - Review situation and delete if appropriate. Policy: Reduce 9,500 sqm (gross) of comparison retail floorspace; change "at Chichester City" to read "in Chichester City centre". In the final paragraph, change the wording to "will be welcomed by the Council only if it adds to the range and accessibility of goods and services".	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
23	Policy S9: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach	3281	Support retail hierarchy to safeguard Westbourne as village centre.	Include policy requirement to actively encourage physical improvement or enhancement of public realm in Village Centres. Also additional wording to allow development of car parks to enhance village centre.	Support	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
24	Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	538	This Policy does nothing to enhance East Wittering centre	This Policy does nothing to enhance East Wittering centre	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
24	Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	670	It is essential that services and shops are vigorously encouraged. post offices and banking services along with a variety of shops are essential for smaller communities to survive. Incentives should be actively given .		Support	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
24	Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	1173	Policy S9 and S10 both refer to local and village parades and village centres interchangeably which is confusing.	As a corollary to our comments on S9, Policy S10 should be renamed Local Centres and Village Centres. The policy wording should confirm that within the defined centre loss of employment would not be a reason for allowing a change of use of an existing B1 use to A1 retail. The proposed amendments would benefit the Plan in meeting the tests of soundness, namely the positively prepared, effective and consistent with national planning policy tests.	Object	Rawleigh Property Management Ltd [1832]
24	Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	1460	Policy is not clear for local parades (e.g. The Ridgeway in Parklands) and stand-alone shops (e.g. One-Stop shops at St Paul's Road and The Broadway, Chichester). These are important community hubs/assets. N.B. As a Committee member of Parklands' Residents' Association (PRA), please note that PRA may wish to pursue the subject of local parades/shops with CDC and with the Inspector at Examination in Public, if it is not adequately addressed.	Please clarify the application of para.s 4.72 to 4.74 and Policy S10 to these parades/shops that form a focal point for their communities and for passing trade, or recognise them in a separate policy provision.	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
24	Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	2591	The second paragraph within Policy S10 refers to "town centre uses". It is recommended that this is revised to "main town centre uses" to be consistent with the terminology used within the NPPF and within Policy S9. The final paragraph within Policy S10 states: "Other uses will be granted where it has been demonstrated that all the following criteria have been met:" This is ambiguous and it would benefit from additional clarity to confirm that the policy here is referring to proposals for a change of use at existing retail premises.	Revise second para to "main town centre uses" Clarify last para of policy to confirm policy is referring to proposals for change of use at existing retail premises	Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
24	Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	2636	Should be further provision for large scale/strategic developments where a greater retail provision can be supported without having a negative impact on the main centre. Policy does not correlate with S9.	The wording of the policy should be revised to allow for appropriate scale retail provision to support the expansion of a settlement.	Comment	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
24	Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	2858	4.72 OBJECT to the phrase "Proposals which provide quality places for eating, drinking and fashion retailing would enhance the roles of these settlements." on basis that there is nowhere to accommodate new provision other than green fields. Provision on green fields is at odds with the Plan policy to enhance the District's rural character as a tourist and local amenity asset.		Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
24	Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	2995	For a community to be vibrant, community activities need to be shared and well communicated - it is important that we don't neglect the "real world" of notices, signs and posters.	4.7.3 Insert in last sentence: "Eating, drinking, fashion retailing, and community noticeboards would enhance the roles of these settlements".	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
24	Policy S10: Local Centres, Local and Village Parades	3282	Support policy.		Support	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
25	Addressing Horticultural Needs	1249	It is acknowledged that Runcton HDA is almost at capacity including current extant permissions. But paragraph 4.79 also states that land adjacent to the HDA can also be considered suitable for development. Bearing in mind the comment about lack of capacity within the Runcton HDA (4.78.2), what is the justification for the reductions in area in the north of the HDA (4.78.4) shown on the policies map?		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
25	Addressing Horticultural Needs	1723	4.75 Our view is that we could be doing more in this area. More thought is probably needed to help develop the area at a business level. We believe there is scope for innovative horticulture especially in the Sidlesham and Almodington area.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
25	Addressing Horticultural Needs	2894	Para 4.78 Addressing Horticultural Needs: This article contradicts itself, talking about 'land being required at the Runcton HDA which is almost at full capacity'. No proper reason is given, other than a reference to Policy DM15, which is a catch-all get-out to permit development on HDA land		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
25	Addressing Horticultural Needs	2996	4.76 OBJECT Horticulture need not only include glass houses. Orchards should be encouraged throughout the plan area to increase our food security.	Insert the following "The Council will also encourage and support community projects to plant up grass verges or use redundant land for community orchards or growing vegetables".	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	85	Large scale horticulture should be encouraged within easy access to the A27. Retaining Almodington and Sidlesham as small scale HDA sites makes sense. While these locations have significant transport/accessibility issues demand for small scale/sustainable/organic growing may increase in the future. There is also potential for combining green/environment/food related tourism activities in the peninsula with small scale food growing		Support	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	321	Has the Tangmere HDA boundary been reviewed? The concrete 'Apron' needs to be re-designated for housing to reduce the pressure on the SDL. It will not be possible to build glass houses at this location ,now that the hangers have been developed for housing, because of light pollution. It should be noted that the new glasshouse access road has been set back from the housing line to prevent disturbance.		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	600	Large scale horticulture should be encouraged within easy access to the A27. Retaining Almodington and Sidlesham as small scale HDA sites makes sense. While these locations have significant transport/accessibility issues demand for small scale/sustainable/organic growing may increase in the future. There is also potential for combining green/environment/food related tourism activities in the peninsula with small scale food growing		Support	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	671	But infrastructure and monitoring of the welfare of workers must be included. Light pollution/ pollution must also be monitored so it does not have a detrimental affect on the area.		Support	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	1228	This horticultural sector policy means small scale nurseries outside of the Horticultural Development Area are increasingly adversely affected and can no longer compete against the benefits of economies of scale afforded by the large scale horticultural development sites. This should irecognise an opportunity for small scale horticultural sites to provide housing given the pressure on housing for our communities. This opportunity should always take precedence compared to digging up greenfields which often takes prime agricultural land.I believe CDC planners are mindful of this - the promotion of development on brownfields is a well recognised policy and for good reason.		Comment	Miss Sandra James [7079]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	1250	The wording of the policy which makes provision for glasshouses and polytunnels development has been interpreted to allow packhouse development on the Runcton HDA which is far in excess of that required to handle the produce grown on the HDA. This has led to a loss of valuable high-grade agricultural land which has been acknowledged as being in short supply, and has a severely detrimental effect on the landscape.	The policy should be amended to make it clear that no further packhouses should be permitted expect those required for produce grown locally.	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	2524	Weakening distinction of 'hub' HDA sites at Runcton/Tangmere and smaller sites in Sidlesham/Almodington. Concerns over intentions of scale of industry outside hub sites. Issues of subdivision of land within HDAs for resi and use of land for gardens - inefficient		Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	2577	Earnley Parish Council is pleased that small-scale Horticultural Development will still be focussed on the two former LSA sites in Almodington and Sidlesham, and applauds DM21, which sets out the conditions for redevelopment of buildings in the countryside, where currently there seems to be a presumption in favour of housing.		Support	Earnley Parish Council (Mrs Louise Chater) [16]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	2724	The PAP commits to delivering significant growth of the horticultural industry within this policy. In addition to this we highlight that CDC have made commitments to water savings in Policy S31. We seek clarity on how this significant growth by the horticultural industry will support commitments to water efficiency in an already water stressed area? We recommend that this issue is addressed in future versions of the plan.	We seek clarity on how this significant growth by the horticultural industry will support commitments to water efficiency in an already water stressed area? We recommend that this issue is addressed in future versions of the plan.	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	2861	The proposal to allocate "a maximum of 228,000 sq/, of additional floorspace for glasshouse, packhouse and polytunnel development" is in conflict with aspirations to make Chichester's rural hinterland a driver for tourism as well as the quiet enjoyment of rural landscapes by locals.	Sentence to be inserted (after last paragraph): "Aware that Chichester's rural surrounds serve not just horticulture but also drive tourism and foster local quiet recreation, horticultural development will be expected to be highly sympathetic to its surroundings. In particular, all horticultural developments will be expected to respect the Dark Skies policy of the adjoining South Downs National Park".	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	2938	This policy supports a large amount of new glasshouse development (in excess of 200,000 square metres) over the plan period. This activity is particularly exposed to the impacts of Brexit (both +ve and -ve) and the overall amount of new development required will need to be kept under review. We are concerned about the impact of light pollution on the AoNB arising from such developments. This topic has been the subject of research by CPRE, See CPRE 'nightblight maps' (www.nightblight.cpre.org.uk page 153).	We would like clarification on this issue and an amendment to the Policy, for example, linking the amount of glasshouse development to the identified need, which could change following a review. We would seek proper investigation into the light pollution implications of all these developments.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	3378	As drafted, policy does not provide enough land within the HDAs, esp. Runcton. Suggest amend policy wording and enlarging HDA	Amend policy wording to; "Policy S11: Addressing the District's Food Cluster Needs To support the growth of the agricultural, horticultural and food industry within the plan area, including future provision of Research and Development for which specific provision will be made for a maximum of 500,000sq.m of additional floorspace for research and development, grainstore, glasshouse, packhouse, polytunnel development, together with other related industries through the following sources of supply: (See attachment for amendments to table) Large scale horticultural glasshouses will continue to be focused within the existing Horticultural Development Areas at Tangmere and Runcton together with other related facilities to encourage diversification within the emerging Food Cluster at Chichester. The Sidlesham and Almodington Horticultural Development Areas will continue to be the focus for smaller scale horticultural glasshouses. Policy DM15 sets out the detailed considerations for applications in these areas. The anticipated residual requirement of 68,000 of the maximum floorspace requirement will be kept under review during the plan period. Policy DM15 provides the framework within which applications outside of the HDA will be considered."	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
26	Policy S11: Addressing Horticultural Needs	3523	It is not clear that the water demands of the Horticultural Development Areas have been assessed.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	114	4.85 When will the secondary school capacity forecasts be reviewed next?		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	408	Do not change the exiting transport infrastructure but force central government to adopt the northern bypass by starting to build as outlined with the new traffic in the north being routed via local roads east and west.	Delete changes to stockbridge and whyke roundabouts from report. Delete connection from new road to connect to the whitterings road, only connect to the Fishbourne roundabout initially.	Object	david marsh [6809]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	679	Infrastructure should be as standard not dependant on funding. No evidence in report of funding source.No Detail. No funding then no development ! 4.83 no funding identified.4.84 where is the evidence that A27 funding has been obtained. No evidence of statutory meeting with HE in the Local Plan.HE not consulted.Existing schools already expanded unsatisfactorily ie Parklands closed to pupils in the summer due to excessive heat ! Schools need to be built near developments. Unless these issues are adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	See above .A27 needs to be removed until correct consultation with HE has taken place and included in the plan correctly with detailed facts and upto date data so that we can comment correctly with all facts.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	942	Questions on Plan viability with regards cost of A27 Works Package and contributing developments to that package.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	952	Comment on location of Primary Education provision needing to be adjacent/within growth areas as opposed to relying on existing capacity within City.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1122	Insufficient account has been taken of the cumulative effect of over 1000 homes on the Manhood Peninsula and the need for primary schools. Additionally, keeping the need for a secondary school "under review" is inappropriate. The Inspector needs to understand the situation including current permissions. The time taken to identify and deliver a site for a secondary school could delay the delivery of the plan.		Comment	Mrs Nicola Swann [7052]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1251	The difficulty of finding funding for the necessary infrastructure provision is difficult to reconcile with the need for affordable housing in the district, particularly in the parishes identified as Service Villages. Without a viability study it is difficult to justify the projected housing figures in the Plan		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1386	There are no proposals for any new primary schools in the Manhood Peninsula. This will only increase pressure on current schools to provide more places and lead to increased traffic on the roads as parents are forced to commute to schools outside their local area where places may be available.	Move the development A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there This will then not have any knock on effect on local schools	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1399	This does not cover enough detail. Local communities have requested a new strategic route for the A27 and have quite clearly vetoed the proposed changes at Whyke, Stockbridge and Fishbourne roundabouts. Local road users should not be forced to take longer routes to go about their daily life.	No changes to existing use of roundabouts.	Object	Mrs Hayley Spencer [7137]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1588	This mentions "the A27 junctions package of improvements" as if this is some preferred solution for the A27. It is not. The plan should be supporting the preferred WSCC/CDC scheme for a new northern bypass. S106 and 278 money can be used towards the DfT northern bypass.	Support the preferred WSCC/CDC scheme	Object	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1589	Paragraph 4.98 confuses me. WSCC is the Highway authority for non motorway and non Trunk Roads so who are Peter Brett Associates employed by? Why is this in CDC's local plan? Regarding the A27 (Trunk Road, the responsibility of the Department for Transport), the statement "...improvements to the A27 junctions are discussed further on pages 79-83" is not helpful when reading the plan on-line. There are no page numbers. This policy of tinkering with the junctions will not resolve the issues of the A27. This approach was rejected by the public at Highways England's formal consultation.		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1649	The population of Chichester have asked for a new strategic route for the A27 endorsed by both CDC and West Sussex County Council (WSCC) in a democratic process. This needs to be incorporated into the plan. CDC should go back to government and state that the allocation of housing numbers within a very constrained area is not deliverable unless an acceptable solution to the A27 is provided within the life of this revised plan.	The population of Chichester have asked for a new strategic route for the A27 endorsed by both CDC and West Sussex County Council (WSCC) in a democratic process. This needs to be incorporated into the plan. CDC should go back to government and state that the allocation of housing numbers within a very constrained area is not deliverable unless an acceptable solution to the A27 is provided within the life of this revised plan.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1671	Support paragraph 4.91. The city centre is the historic heart of Chichester and the main location for shopping, entertainment, visitor attractions, and a large proportion of the city's employment. In order to maintain and enhance the vitality of the centre, it is desirable to plan to accommodate a mix of uses including some new retail, other business uses such as offices, and residential development...		Support	Chichester BID (Mr Colin Hicks) [7190]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1724	4.8 No mention is made of supporting the Marine Industry within the confines of Chichester Harbour. This is essential and a new paragraph must be added. There is pressure on Northshore, Dell Quay and other smaller sites. The old Burnes site is left in ruin. This could be run as a successful business maybe with a few week-end retreats to help fund. All sites can thrive with clear policies by CDC. We must retain and encourage our marine industry. We lost Coombes many years ago due to CDC inability to support local business.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	1976	para 4.84 Object on grounds that money should not be spent to improve a road that is Highways England's responsibility; they should provide a suitable trunk road for the south coast and it is the Government's responsibility to fund it. Chichester District cannot accommodate future housing or employment space until the A27 uncertainty is ended.		Object	Mr Anthony Tuffin [5052]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	2592	Broadly supported but developer contributions yet to be subject to viability testing. Important to understand potential viability impacts of S106 obligations on scheme deliverability esp as in addition to other policy/contribution requirements.	Include commitment to review CIL in parallel with preparation of LPR	Support	Countryside Properties [7291]
27	Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services	2895	Paras 4.80 - 4.83 Providing Support Infrastructure and Services: no intended public funding for any infrastructure improvements. It places the provision of Support Infrastructure and Services clearly as a desirable consideration, but subsequent to any approval for development. Para 4.84: Many, particularly in the south of the City, do not see the proposals to modify traffic flow on the A27 as 'improvements'. The measures provide some relief to the longstanding congestion on the A27 by penalising the residents of the Manhood peninsula, and others by major restrictions on access to the main road and access to and from out City		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	88	Chichester District already suffers from insufficient road capacity.CDC plans for the A27 junctions and link road will not solve the problem.Without a long term,resilient, robust solution to the A27, CDC should resist the government's housing numbers.A27 has no diversionary route in the event of congestion, accidents or roadworks.Directing local traffic off the A27onto the A286 is illogical and not a solution. Spending CIL money on improving the road infrastructure, when a dysfunctional A27 is the cause of the problem, is not justifiable.	Reduce housing number allocations until the government agrees to finance a long term, robust solution to the A27.Do not spend CIL monies on solving the A27 problems.	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	109	I am concerned that infrastructure currently goes in last, ie not provided by developers until the last home has been sold.	Planning approval must detail WHEN the infrastructure has to go in, which is ideally before any homes have been sold. Also there need to be repercussions when required infrastructure is not provided, ie Southbourne has a site where the developer has not provided the sewage infrastructure that was required, and nothing is being done to make them adhere to the original planning requirements.	Object	Mrs Alice Smith [5409]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	115	Policy S12, paragraph 3, add a bullet point "waste-water treatment"		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	198	S12. Infrastructure provision No new large developments on the Western Manhood Peninsula should be allowed at all and certainly none until infrastructure is in place.	Alter the policy to reflect common sense	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	239	Point 4 of this policy should refer to Sustainable transport forms including cycling.	Add Sustainable Transport to policy.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	287	The Plan takes no account of the increased number of children of school age. Many of these children will have to driven by their parents to schools that are in Chichester, north of the A27. This will generate yet more traffic in the area on the south side of Chichester.	Either move the proposed housing development to elsewhere or provide a new primary school.	Object	Mr Peter Balaam [6739]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	322	A new Regional sewerage solution is needed to replace the unsustainable use of Aldingbourne Rife for sewage disposal. With large housing allocations to the north of Chichester Harbour it will not be possible to discharge effluent from Thornham WWTW and Bosham WWTW in future. Tighter standards for Nitrates and Phosphates will make these works redundant and the only sustainable solution is to treat all the flows at Apuldram and discharge at Bracklesham. A regional solution will allow future effluent re-use if this becomes desirable.	A Regional sewerage solution needs to be agreed within the proposed statutory sewage disposal 25 year plan.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	365	Policy S 12: the requirements expressed are laudable: however the track record so far in relation to f.i. local highways and sewage networks does not inspire confidence. To leave it to condition this within planning permissions demonstrably does not work. In recent years one water company has managed to ignore such conditions and subsequently have these lifted or discharged on two occasions on the Peninsula. Undertakers and LPAs must be engaged as early as possible and requirements for the funding and provision of new infrastructure must be much tougher and stringent. There is no reference to sewage treatment works	include tougher requirements on undertakers to provide in a timely manner add sewage treatment works	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	433	Even though the Manhood Peninsula has nearly provided its allocated number of new homes against the adopted Local Plan 2014-2029 the following bullet point has yet to be undertaken: Phase development to coordinate with the delivery of necessary infrastructure, facilities and services. Until the mitigation has been put in place to meet the current supply of new homes additional numbers must be withheld. Already we have issues with: School Places Medical Centre Sewage infrastructure Access on and off the Peninsula, in particular during the holiday periods	Even though the Manhood Peninsula has nearly provided its allocated number of new homes against the adopted Local Plan 2014-2029 the following bullet point has yet to be undertaken: Phase development to coordinate with the delivery of necessary infrastructure, facilities and services. Until the mitigation has been put in place to meet the current supply of new homes additional numbers must be withheld. Already we have issues with: School Places Medical Centre Sewage infrastructure Access on and off the Peninsula, in particular during the holiday periods	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	483	What do you actually mean by "safeguarding"- the word itself means a measure taken to protect someone or something or to prevent something undesirable? What measures will you take? This needs to be clearer as it is a woolly statement especially with a focus on educational facilities, considering Westminster's policy on new school provision. In addition there is no mention of a requirement here of constructing new sewage infrastructure provision.	Be more precise in setting requirements on new infrastructure provision as listed in para 3	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	584	It is vital that this is done to the letter of the policy, and on that basis I support. CDC must learn the lessons from other developments and poor infrastructure provision.		Support	Julia Smith [6865]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	635	There are no proposals for any new primary schools in the Manhood Peninsula. This will only increase pressure on current schools to provide more places, and lead to increased traffic on the roads as parents are forced to commute to schools outside their local area where spaces may be available.		Comment	Mr Philip Waters [6820]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	683	"timely adequate infrastructure" where is the detailed evidence. Where is the details of funding? What are the transport modes ? Very little evidence so far that developers contribute to infrastructure on new developments other than odd football pitch or play park !4.88 There are not good transport links all traffic has to go west to Emsworth or east to Fishbourne roundabout.Already at capacity.Trains only stop at small stations now once an hour. Insufficient bus service out of peak hours & unaffordable. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations,i will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Need proper data and details as to how much funding and specifically where it is coming from. Proper transport study. Anyone can have a list of wants. These need to be backed up with concrete facts and figures.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	938	This plan should be revised in order to avoid to get the infrastructure matters on the Manhood Peninsula resolved before any further housing development is started.	Matters that need to be addressed include roads, Health Centre and dentistry facilities, schools, policing,and parking.	Object	Mr Barrie Allsop [6972]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	955	Cuts to the Sussex Police budget have resulted in a significant reduction in Officers involved Neighbourhood and Roads policing and the closure of local Police Stations. Simply put, there are not enough police officers to cope effectively with current population numbers. This plan, which is only one of the proposals for the area, will exacerbate this problem and place both public and Officers in greater danger. The same can be said of Fire and Ambulance Services	Immediate funding from central government to pay for the recruitment, training and maintenance of emergency services in line with the proposed increase of population.	Object	Mr Robert Lock [6978]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	981	Vague lipservice on how infrastructure will be funded or implemented.		Object	Mrs Margaret Holdstock [6013]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	993	Whilst Birdham Parish Council, in the main, supports Policy S12 there is no indication as to how this will be implemented. We are continually told that the infrastructure will follow the development, in our opinion if the infrastructure is required to support the development than this must come first and enforced.		Support	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1010	Safeguarding the requirements of infrastructure providers includes a list of providers in a curious order. It's not alphabetical which suggests that maybe it is in priority, Broadband surely does not come top of such a list. Although addressed elsewhere, roads should be included in the list.	Explain order of listing infrastructure providers. If priority, broadband should not be first. Add roads to the list.	Object	Mr Keith Martin [4610]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1156	Put in required infrastructure especially sewage disposal before development.		Comment	Mr Iain Dodson [6986]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1160	<p>Thames Water support the policy in principle where it refers to water supply and foul sewer infrastructure, but consider that it can be improved with more detailed reference to wastewater/sewerage infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The new Local Plan should therefore seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Thames Water will work with developers and local authorities to ensure that any necessary infrastructure reinforcement is delivered ahead of the occupation of development. Where there are infrastructure constraints, it is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure.</p>	<p>we consider that the New Local Plan should include a specific reference to the key issue of the provision of water and sewerage/wastewater infrastructure to service development proposed in a policy. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs). We recommend the Local Plan include the following policy/supporting text:</p> <p>PROPOSED NEW WATER/WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE TEXT "Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades."</p> <p>"The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development."</p> <p>"The development or expansion of water supply or waste water facilities will normally be permitted, either where needed to serve existing or proposed development in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan, or in the interests of long term water supply and waste water management, provided that the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact that any such adverse impact is minimised."</p>	Support	Thames Water Utilities Ltd [1397]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1252	Past performance and evidence from the local foul sewer performance indicate that the local planning authority has been far too ready to accept the assurances of the utility provider that adequate capacity exists.		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1277	Policy S12 should go further to provide a clear expectation on developers of large sites to plan and provide for their full infrastructure impacts, before or in parallel with implementation.		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1308	It should be noted that following the District Council proposal to work with stakeholders - Bosham Football Club; should be engaging with us and co-ordinating on providing support to develop the plan. Co-ordinating a working group that is elected by the Parish/Parishes of the Bournes' to identify a site and have a facility that is for multi-sport use.		Support	Bosham Football Club (Mr Neil Redman) [748]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1341	Schools development in the area as housing has increased, would avoid the need for primary school pupils in particular to commute to schools in the city of Chichester.	Increase the provision for local schooling.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1450	Environmental, and infrastructural constraints were recognised when allocating housing on the Manhood Peninsula in the adopted Plan. Additionally, building on the Manhood Peninsula was front loaded because of capacity limitations at the Tangmere Water Works. The Manhood's requirement until 2029 has already been exceeded by a large margin. The environmental, and infrastructural constraints remain unchanged, with the A27 improvements seemingly further than ever from resolution. As there is a huge oversupply of development sites, no housing should be allocated to Birdham, Bracklesham or West Wittering in this plan cycle, or until infrastructure improvements are complete.		Object	Graham Campbell [6915]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1454	There are no proposals for any new schools in the Manhood Peninsula. This will only increase pressure on current schools to provide more places, and lead to increased traffic on the roads as parents are forced to commute to schools outside their local area where spaces may be available. Specific provision needs to be made if the Manhood Peninsula is to take the number of houses proposed. Specific provision must also be made for additional doctors and other medical services if this level of housing on the Peninsula is to be considered.		Comment	Donnington Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann (Parish Clerk)) [888]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1480	It is really important that development sustains existing infrastructure assets and comes with the necessary additional infrastructure to support this Plan's Strategic Objectives for all of our communities. Thank you for a Policy that I can unreservedly support. Should it change as a result of consultation, I may wish to object.		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1635	Consider adding EV charging facilities as a key infrastructure requirement for developments. New cars from 2040 will have to be hybrid at least. Particular pressure exists on GP surgeries to meet demand in a typically older demographic. Dementia care provision will also need to increase and should be given policy protection to ensure communities are not left without provision due to development (see West Sussex County Council's representations on the Whyke Lodge care home planning application 17/01712/FUL - objection dated 26 Jul 2017)		Comment	Anna Khoo [7196]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1648	Make effective use of existing infrastructure, facilities and services, including opportunities for co-location and multi-functional use of facilities THIS is vital, but requires working closely with existing stakeholders.		Support	Mrs Christina Procter [7200]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1679	I mostly support the principle. The infrastructure must be shown on maps of future developments and started before any development		Comment	MRS MIREILLE ANNICK [7156]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1881	- Most schools already at capacity - No provision for schools for future development in Witterings/Bracklesham area - Funding for schools to be considered - Doctors already at full capacity - Dentists already at full capacity		Comment	Jennie Horn [7223]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1944	The minimum number of houses the CDC proposes to build are: the Manhood 1,933, an east-west corridor of 10,056, with a token number of 489 for north of the area plan make no allowances for the inadequate number of police, doctors, schools and transport we already have in place.		Comment	Mrs Sally Mountstephen [7239]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	1962	Proposals in the plan will affect the following: - Roads - increasing traffic, but crumbling roads, no A27 bypass solution. - Foul Drainage - denials by Southern Water that there are problems. Proposal to run a sewer from Whitehouse Farm around north of Chichester to Tangmere instead of upgrading Apuldram WW treatment works. Sewer pipe problems at Bosham and elsewhere. Untreated sewage discharged into the harbour. Increasing danger to public health. - Education - existing schools short of funding - Police - also short of funding - Hospitals - under pressure		Comment	Mr David Myers [4894]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2013	No provisions for education have been met on previous large sites. How can we be assured that planning for education will in fact be carried out.		Object	Mr Graham Porrett [7251]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2105	<p>Support the requirement that all development must provide or fund new infrastructure, facilities and services required, both on and off-site (including full fibre communications infrastructure) as a consequence of the proposal.</p> <p>Support the reference to safeguarding educational facilities under section 3 of the policy.</p> <p>This Policy, also Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles, should aim to encourage cycling and walking access to be the natural and preferred modes of access.</p> <p>Remove reference to Strategic Infrastructure Package and replace with WSCC wording.</p>	The supporting text, paragraph 4.81 makes reference to the Strategic Infrastructure Package (SIP). It is requested that this wording is removed and replaced with West Sussex County Council identifies service infrastructure requirements necessary to support new and existing communities, where strategic development and growth is proposed in Local Plans. These are required to deliver the County Council's statutory responsibilities, strategic objectives and current policy and feed into the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Support	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2194	Overall we support the policy. We would recommend that paragraph 3 be amended to include reference to flood risk management infrastructure.	Amend para 3 to include ref to flood risk management infrastructure	Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2297	<p>PW agree that the siting and timing of development can assist with the economic provision of water resource infrastructure. It also states that safeguarding existing infrastructure, such as water mains and aquifers, is important. Portsmouth Water would urge developers to check for existing infrastructure and for source protection zones that may limit development options.</p> <p>Water infrastructure is not funded through CIL but a separate 'Infrastructure Charge' payable for each individual house. This is designed to pay for all off-site water infrastructure such as mains reinforcements, service reservoirs and supply. Development to an agreed program will help this system work effectively.</p>		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2379	Support policy S12 in general		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2521	Policy S12 is welcomed, but the range of provision to be supported, especially if whole life costs are to be met will place great demands on funding streams such as S106, CIL and other funding streams and there must be doubt as to whether your council's Infrastructure Development Plan can be fully met.		Support	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2539	We support Policies S1, S2 and S3 in principle. However, we are concerned about the impact that 1250 new dwellings could have on Southbourne and its residents. Infrastructure in the Parish is already inadequate.	We request the word "address" in line 5 of the first paragraph (Policy AL13) be replaced by the word "deliver" in order that it dovetails better with Policy S12.	Object	Mrs Sue Talbot [6219]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2544	It is essential to increase the capacity of water treatment works at all facilities in Chichester Harbour to ensure no additional storm discharges of untreated waste water into the Harbour, which could adversely impact the status of the SSSI designation.	We would wish to see a dedicated item on wastewater treatment in this list.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2593	<p>Criterion 4 - laudable but should be recognised not always achievable in practice - provide further guidance.</p> <p>Final part of policy - insert new bullet (between first and second) to indicate that CDC will work with the applicant to explore/agree alternative forms of infrastructure that would address identified viability concern.</p>	Final part of policy - insert new bullet (between first and second) to indicate that CDC will work with the applicant to explore/agree alternative forms of infrastructure that would address identified viability concern.	Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2637	We support this policy however additional provision should be made to allow for significant infrastructure improvements to be part funded by the Council or through grant funding where they are of wider benefit than simply being required to make a development acceptable. e.g. Highways England and Housing Infrastructure Fund.	Detailed study should be carried out reviewing the infrastructure provision in this area as a whole.	Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2654	<p>- Consideration must be made for improvements in infrastructure and public transport links to settlement hubs already at breaking point.</p> <p>- Work should already be being undertaken, not just to mitigate future development.</p> <p>- There are primary schools in SDNP that are undersubscribed.</p> <p>- IDP must be available for consultation prior to examination.</p> <p>See attached for full detail.</p>		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2725	<p>We support this policy recognising green infrastructure within its provision in line with paragraph 171 of the NPPF. However, we do note inconsistencies within the PAP and seek clarity on whether the term 'green infrastructure' in this policy also captures blue assets. For example, the glossary for the PAP does not refer to blue assets within the definition of Green Infrastructure. Yet the supporting text (5.61) for Policy S29: Green infrastructure does recognise the blue aspect of green infrastructure.</p>	<p>For clarity, we recommend the inclusion of the term blue alongside green infrastructure in this policy as follows:</p> <p>'The Council will work with neighbouring councils, infrastructure providers and stakeholders to ensure that new physical, economic, social, environmental and green/blue infrastructure is provided to support the development provided for in this Plan'</p>	Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2738	Until infrastructure has been addressed, CDC should not accept additional housing.	Refuse the increased numbers until the infrastructure proposals have been implemented	Object	Boxgrove Parish Council (Ms Imogen Whitaker) [752]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2867	<p>4.80 fails to distinguish between high carbon/carbon light infrastructure; fails to distinguish between infrastructure which does/does not impact landscape and/or historic environment, facilitates particularly car dependent housing developments and fails to insist on low-car developments.</p> <p>4.86 Where infrastructure costs might jeopardise a development, Plan should impose on developers a duty to re-plan for less impactful development as low-car housing would lessen the need to pay a share of expensive new roadworks.</p>	<p>Change to "If the requirement to provide new or enhanced infrastructure looks likely to be so onerous as to render development unviable, developers will be expected to examine how their plans could be revised so as to impose less on infrastructure. In particular, this may involve planning for less car-reliant housing developments that impose less new traffic on roads."</p> <p>Policy Para 1 CHANGE TO "The Council will work with neighbouring councils, infrastructure providers and stakeholders to minimise the need for new physical, economic, social, environmental and green infrastructure. After this step has been taken, the council will work with the above bodies to ensure necessary infrastructure is provided to support the development provided for in this Plan."</p> <p>Policy S12 (2.) Delete "(including full fibre communications infrastructure)".</p> <p>Policy S12 (3.) After the last bullet point add three more:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lines of former transport routes (notably the old Selsey Tram, and the Midhurst Railway) * A site for Park and Ride * A site for a goods consolidation centre <p>Policy S12 (5.) CHANGE TO "Where applicable"</p> <p>Policy S12 Final paragraph</p> <p>Before the first bullet point, insert an earlier one, and amend the start of what now becomes the second bullet point as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * prioritise minimising infrastructure requirements (in particular lowering car dependency if the cost of road-based infrastructure is a hurdle) * after that, look to developer contributions made through CIL 	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2889	<p>Policy should include text to clarify level of provision required and supported by viability evidence.</p> <p>Make criterion 2 clearer in that it only relates to infrastructure required specifically to make devt acceptable.</p> <p>Remove ref to "full fibre communications infrastructure" as may not be in control of developer or development site.</p>	Remove ref to "full fibre communications infrastructure"	Object	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2939	We are concerned that there is a real risk that development and supporting infrastructure will continue to be out of step in some places.	We will be monitoring the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	2997	Object on grounds that new development is not coordinated with the infrastructure it requires; new development will put huge strain on existing provision; CIL system for providing infrastructure is patchy; lack of cooperation between councils re; safe linking paths and cycleways; failing to prioritize sustainable modes of travel; developers are able to deliver housing and not infrastructure.	Policy S12 Second paragraph Insert "Trigger points for sustainable travel infrastructure eg walking and cycling provision must be earlier in the development timeline. Walking and Cycling links are just as important for access to the development as links by motorised vehicles." Section 5 delete "Where appropriate" delete and insert "Phase development must always coordinate with the delivery of necessary infrastructure". Delete section "If infrastructure requirements could render a development unviable....". Delete "defer part of the developer contributions requirement to a later date".	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	3054	Central Government needs to be made to realise that simply fulfilling their number requirements will (i) need central funding - e.g. improving the A27, and (ii) be impracticable if leading to overloading of existing local sites/infrastructure.		Comment	Mr and Mrs L.G. Cooper [5027]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	3240	Support policy but consider than further housing should be delivered to ensure deliverability of infrastructure		Support	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land [1897]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	3245	Support policy but consider that current proportions of housing/employment figures could restrict delivery of infrastructure. To ensure deliverability, further consideration should be given to viability of delivering infrastructure required to support site allocations through the IDP.	To ensure deliverability, further consideration should be given to viability of delivering infrastructure required to support site allocations through the IDP.	Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	3274	Support policy S12. However the Local Plan Policy or the IDP should make clear, for at least the first five years, what infrastructure is required, who is going to fund and provide it, and how it relates to the anticipated rate and phasing of development. Not set out in either S12 or the IDP (paragraph 15.9) which specifically deals with the Fishbourne AL9 allocation. Paragraph 15.9 of the IDP should state that 'the parish is allocated for residential development of 250 dwellings' rather than 'the site is...' in recognition that more than 1 location should be selected for the allocation.		Comment	Landacre Developments Ltd [7392]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	3292	Support policy S12. However the Local Plan Policy or the IDP should make clear, for at least the first five years, what infrastructure is required, who is going to fund and provide it, and how it relates to the anticipated rate and phasing of development. Not set out in either S12 or the IDP (paragraph 15.4) which specifically deals with the Southbourne allocation.	Paragraph 15.4 of the IDP should state that 'the parish is allocated for residential development of 1250 dwellings' rather than 'the site is...' in recognition that more than 1 location should be selected for the allocation.	Comment	Chichester Grain Ltd [7394]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	3321	Support Policy but should add in the following: Southbourne - Paragraph 15.4 of the IDP should in addition state that 'the parish is allocated for residential development of 1250 dwellings' rather than 'the site is...' in recognition that more than 1 location might be selected for the allocation. Mundham -	Paragraph 15.4 of the IDP should in addition state that 'the parish is allocated for residential development of 1250 dwellings' rather than 'the site is...' in recognition that more than 1 location might be selected for the allocation. Mundham -	Comment	Domusea [1816]
28	Policy S12: Infrastructure Provision	3414	The Local Plan Policy or the IDP itself should make clear, for at least the first five years, what infrastructure is required, who is going to fund and provide it, and how it relates to the anticipated rate and phasing of development. This is not set out in either S12 or the IDP (paragraph 15.9) which specifically deals with the Fishbourne allocation. Paragraph 15.9 of the IDP should in addition state that 'the parish is allocated for residential development of 250 dwellings' rather than 'the site is...' in recognition that more than 1 location should be selected for the allocation.		Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
29	Sub-area Strategies					

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
30	East-West Corridor	2467	E-W - considered as whole instead of settlements along transport route. Issues would benefit from collective attention e.g. wastewater, traffic, landscape, wildlife, coalescence Pressures of devt exacerbated by AONB/NP and new devt in adjacent county	Supplementary Planning Guidance is required to address the issues specific to this area, provide clarity of guidance for developers and enable co-ordinated solutions.	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
30	East-West Corridor	2777	Object on grounds that: development in this area has a high impact on the natural environment; green links to South Downs and Chichester Harbour have already been degraded (4.90); new retail and offices should be "new" only in the sense of replacing vacating retailers and offices.	Rename "East West Corridor" to "plain south of Downs"; Change 4.88 to "Development along this plain also provides the opportunity to minimise the impact of development on currently less spoiled natural environments". Delete from 4.90 "Development at the edge of the built area provides opportunities to achieve additional green infrastructure in and around the city, particularly linking towards the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour." Change 4.91 to "it is desirable to plan to accommodate a mix of uses, including conversion to residential of under-used upper floor spaces. It is particularly important to try to ensure that any vacating retail and office space is replaced with new." Change 4.92 to ".. better cycling and pedestrian access to the city centre from the south, and across the site generally"	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
30	East-West Corridor	3480	Chichester Vision unsuitable to be incorporated within this Local Plan		Object	Mr Colin Hammerton [6709]
30	East-West Corridor	3539	development proposed in the East - West corridor along the A259 is likely to have an adverse impact on the wild life in the Chichester Harbour AONB, with increased public use of the shoreline footpaths.		Comment	Mr David Myers [4894]
30	East-West Corridor	3546	The decision to develop along the East West corridor is short sighted and damaging to the area and will not enhance the villages. The infrastructure is not present. It will develop land too close to the AONB and create a housing corridor.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
31	Chichester City	3308	Plan should acknowledge role of former Tannery Site in delivering housing in Chichester city.	Plan should acknowledge role of former Tannery Site in delivering housing in Chichester city.	Object	West Sussex County Council [1416]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	90	Generally support but consider increasing housing numbers in the city and adjacent surrounds by allocation of more social housing and higher density housing, including more apartments.		Comment	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	125	The Chichester Society welcome the minor changes proposed which include the protection of views of the cathedral. Please note the duplication of the policy on the city's existing heritage, arts and culture.		Support	Chichester Society (Mr Christopher Mead-Briggs) [802]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	216	The policy relating to Chichester city centre was generally supported as relevant and positive.		Support	Chichester City Council (Parish Clerk) [786]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	605	Policy S 13 Third bullet is in part a repeat of the second bullet:.delete third bullet There is no mention in the Policy or in the accompanying paragraphs of funding and support by others on which S 13 depends heavily-experience so far with Homes England is not encouraging		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	717	The minor changes proposed which include the protection of views of the cathedral is welcomed.		Support	West Itchenor Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1036]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	726	Support in general with specific support for the paragraph relating to the provision of "..... improved facilities for other social and community uses."		Support	St Pancras church (Mr Derek Mumford) [6909]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	972	<p>What faith can we have that the SPD and DPD docs will be adhered to? Recent developments have been poor design and not adhered to previous Southern Gateway Development Framework.</p> <p>Policy should make point that city centre is a conservation area.</p> <p>Map showing Conservation Area boundary should be appended to LP.</p>	The Council must undertake to enforce the provisions of their SPDs etc otherwise they are worthless. The policy should make the point that the whole of the city centre is a conservation area and should be respected as such. A map shewing the Conservation Area boundary should be appended to the Local Plan	Comment	Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (Mr Alan Green) [788]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	1271	Development to meet the growing needs of the City must be accommodated if the District is to prosper and grow but this should not mean a free-hand for developers on undeveloped 'greenfield'. Development of undeveloped land adjacent to the city's boundaries does not mean it is the most sustainable approach. It is too easy for landowners to promote sites as the next closest to available services providing housing quickly to meet need. The north and north-eastern edges of the city are vulnerable, the maintenance of openness is essential for the sustainable interrelationship of Chichester with the neighbouring national park.		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	1278	Paragraph 4.88 should make it explicit that although it is a focus for growth to 2035, the corridor does not mean that any site within its parameters is suitable for development. The setting of the city, particularly its relationship with the National Park, is to be protected and Policy S13 must be given more strength in this respect to ensure this matter is at the forefront of planning decisions.		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	1405	Southern Gateway for offices, commerce and more dwellings? Really? We have a half empty high street and empty industrial units (Terminus Road). We do not need these or the traffic and associated pollution that they bring.	This area would be better used as green areas/playpark and leisure areas due to proximity to schools and housing.	Object	Mrs Hayley Spencer [7137]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	1481	We support these principles, in particular support for enhancement of Chichester's arts and cultural facilities and entertainment and leisure uses.		Support	The Theatres Trust (Planning Policy Officer) [1009]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	1498	<p>Para. 4.88 needs to recognise significant movements of people by non-road means. (An evidence base may be needed to inform the Plan.)</p> <p>I broadly support Policy S13, including the recognition of local neighbourhoods as places of character and distinctiveness (as is Parklands, the community where I live). I would like the green infrastructure bullet point also to recognise the importance of nature in a utility setting, such as street trees and verges.</p> <p>Duplication to be corrected.</p> <p>Public art provision needed.</p> <p>Parklands Residents' Association and Chichester Tree Wardens may wish to follow up relevant points.</p>	<p>Para. 4.88 needs to recognise significant movements of people by non-road means. (An evidence base may be needed to inform the Plan.)</p> <p>Policy S13:.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - include nature in a utility setting, such as street trees and verges, in the green infrastructure bullet point; - correct duplication of "enhance the city's existing heritage, arts and cultural facilities"; - add bullet point along the lines of "Enhance the street scene with public art appropriate to the setting". 	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	1575	Para 4.88 should recognise the significant number of people who travel on foot and on bikes along this corridor.	Policy 13 should value street trees and verges. There should be a policy on Public Art to enhance the street scene.	Object	Mrs Lynne Friel [4991]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	1674	Policy S13		Support	Chichester BID (Mr Colin Hicks) [7190]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	1730	This area (Southern Gateway) must be fully redeveloped with Hotel, Multi use centre for exhibitions, concerts and conferences with a site for community use. An area must also be created for young business leaders with gigabyte connectivity. Space should also be found for the University to incubate businesses. Housing should focus on young people wishing to live in the city.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	1840	I support the protection of the views of the Cathedral		Support	Mr Andrew Bain [7217]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	2031	We strongly support protecting the views of the cathedral.		Support	Summersdale Residents Association (Mr Roger Hobbs) [5435]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	2106	This policy should aim to encourage walking and cycling access to be the natural and preferred modes of access, thereby helping achieve the benefits previously described. It is noted Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy, does acknowledge cycling and walking and lends support to their improvement.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	2247	Would like to see a reference to heritage impact assessments to underpin development proposals. We also wonder if it would be helpful to have a specific policy to protect important views, allied to or combined with a policy for tall buildings in the historic city ?	Reword Policy SP13 to read "Development proposals should be underpinned by historic characterisation assessment and a heritage impact assessment.....".	Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	2292	Historic England welcomes and supports "it is acknowledged that new development needs to be planned sensitively with special regard to the unique character of the city's historic environment and setting, and should be underpinned by historic characterisation assessments" in paragraph 4.90 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Support para 4.91. Nevertheless, we suggest that reference should also be made to heritage impact assessments to underpin the planning of new development.	Reword paragraph 4.90 to read; "it is acknowledged that new development needs to be planned sensitively with special regard to the unique character of the city's historic environment and setting, and should be underpinned by historic characterisation assessment and heritage impact assessments".	Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	2380	Support policy S13 in general		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	2726	Acknowledge the positive steps this policy is taking to ensure provision of an enhanced network of green infrastructure and access to natural green spaces. We feel that this bullet point is vital if CDC is to uphold its environmental objectives against backdrop of significant development in and around Chichester City. CDC acknowledges the possibility of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Support an approach that will ensure opportunities to deliver natural capital and measureable net gains in biodiversity are planned for at an early stage. Will embed the requirements as a realistic and expected part of sustainable development in the area.		Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	2872	In order to better protect local character and rural character (which in turn feed into economic development via tourism, and into local quality of life), the issues need to be more fully teased apart.	Change Policy S13 point 9 into TWO SEPARATE BULLET POINTS * Provide or contribute towards enhanced access to natural green space; * Provide or contribute towards an enhanced network of green infrastructure, including additional parks and amenity open space, outdoor sport pitches and recreational routes, insofar as such infrastructure does not detract from access to more natural green space	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	2940	We support the requirement to protect views of the Cathedral (but please see response to AL6).		Support	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	2998	Make sure pavements are safe as a priority due to aging population; SPD essential.	Include in the list of bullet points: "Enhance and improve the paving in the City Centre". Last paragraph - Change "may" to "must", Delete "If necessary,".	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	3140	Support paragraph 4.93, and S13, but propose that these should also apply to the need for affordable housing within the city's urban area and within reach of all facilities by foot and cycle. Poor quality employment uses should be relocated to locations on the periphery of the city.	The addition of the words affordable housing as detailed in the attached.	Comment	Mr John Templeton [7371]
32	Policy S13: Chichester City Development Principles	3246	Support policy approach.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	92	Without a long term robust solution to the A27, Chichester will continue to act as a rat run for traffic avoiding the southern ring road. The junction changes will not solve the lack of road capacity for through and local traffic and restricting right hand turning at junctions will make local journeys more difficult. More traffic caused by more housing in the area (especially in communities away from the rail network) with no increase in road capacity will make an increase in sustainable travel such as cycling more difficult to achieve.	Persuade government that housing numbers cannot be materially increased unless, and until, sufficient funding is provided for a robust A27 solution	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	121	The delivery of strategic cycle routes (bullet 7) should preserve and enhance Centurion Way, Salterns Way, the Bognor Regis Way and the South Coast Cycle Route		Comment	Mr Ian Bartle [4921]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	126	On Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy * The Chichester Society propose the following additional measures are included: * Replacement of the level crossings in Basin Road and Stockbridge Road by an underpass or bridge * Safeguarding of land to enable the expansion of the Chichester railway Station, its tracks and platforms, from 2 to 4 to enable a fast train service * Safeguarding of land close to the A27 for a future "park and ride" * Safeguarding of land close to the A27 for a "consolidation centre" for break bulk delivery to city retail units.	On Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy * The Chichester Society propose the following additional measures are included: * Replacement of the level crossings in Basin Road and Stockbridge Road by an underpass or bridge * Safeguarding of land to enable the expansion of the Chichester railway Station, its tracks and platforms, from 2 to 4 to enable a fast train service * Safeguarding of land close to the A27 for a future "park and ride" * Safeguarding of land close to the A27 for a "consolidation centre" for break bulk delivery to city retail units.	Object	Chichester Society (Mr Christopher Mead-Briggs) [802]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	217	There was significant concern about reduction of town centre parking provision. Concerns were that this may affect the vitality and viability of the city centre and that any parking changes may disproportionately affect older and less mobile residents as well those encumbered by purchases all of whom rely on close and convenient access to parking. Park and ride should be looked into, although it was noted that it had been investigated as part of the District Council's background documents. It was also noted that any changes to parking provision or restrictions should tie in with the road space audit.		Comment	Chichester City Council (Parish Clerk) [786]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	240	Support this policy where it makes specific reference to Cycling		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	263	Specifically supporting: Introducing bus lanes and bus priority measures along key routes (including the A259 Bognor Road approaching its junction with the A27); Also to ensure that any future development in the Southgate area of Chichester must not reduce facilities for bus users (i.e. the ability to interchange between all routes at once central location).		Support	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	434	All the work defined in the Peter Brett Report was clearly laid out in the Jacobs 2013 Transport Study of which none of the recommendations have been undertaken to date even though we are now 5 years into the adopted Local Plan period with nearing all of the committed build on the Peninsula being met.	All the work defined in the Peter Brett Report was clearly laid out in the Jacobs 2013 Transport Study of which none of the recommendations have been undertaken to date even though we are now 5 years into the adopted Local Plan period with nearing all of the committed build on the Peninsula being met.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	468	The planning officers at the exhibition assured me that there would be no further public consultation on these proposals. I object to this process, which seems designed to force through significant developments without proper consultation and regard to the views of local residents.	Add a final sentence to ensure effective consultation on all planned transport measures takes place, separately from the Local Plan Review.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	469	Despite the proposed changes to the city centre junctions, in practice more and more traffic is being routed into the city's inner ring road. This should be addressed by peripheral relief roads, particularly from the A27 (west) to the A286 (between Summersdale and Lavant) in line with work already done by WSCC to identify a route for such a road. This would remove much through traffic from Orchard Street. A similar relief road is needed between the A27 (east) and the A286.	Add plans to create peripheral relief roads, covering west-to-north and east-to-north.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	471	Introduce Park & Ride, at least for the two A27 junctions and possibly for the A259 from Bognor. The Road Space Audit is opposed to the interests of local residents, by making commuters take parking places which local residents need. At the same time it is negative towards employees travelling from outside Chichester, making them park far outside the city centre (15-25 minute walking distance or more). Park & Ride is not only about car park capacity, it is more importantly about reducing the numbers of cars travelling into the city centre from outside the city.	Add a commitment to introducing Park & Ride schemes convenient for the A27 Portfield and Fishbourne junctions, and for the A259 from Bognor.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	514	1. Why is there no mention of any Park and Ride plans? 2. Street parking still relies on coins! This is one of the few uses of coins in today's world. 3. The principle of "pay as you park" is not visitor friendly.	1. Investigate small park and ride options 2. All Chichester and District parking should be made available with cashless payments. 3. Car parking in the district to be converted to "pay as you leave". This could raise the average spend by visitors during their stay in the city.	Object	Mr Stephen Page [6591]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	585	There should be a commitment here to protect and enhance existing infrastructure in place. For example specifically:- National Cycle Route 2 along Westgate (set to be downgraded under new WHF s106) Centurion Way Leisure Walking and Cycling Path		Comment	Julia Smith [6865]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	586	Delivering key strategic cycle routes must be an honoured commitment not just an aspiration. I moved to Chichester 5 years ago and have experienced excellent cycling provision in Cambridge, Switzerland and Dublin, where everyone cycled where it was flat. Yet along Westgate, a national cycle route, we see 00s of cars dropping and collecting from Bishop Luffa, local residents driving to the town, station and shops, because they are frightened to cycle. Able bodied and schoolchildren should be encouraged to cycle, and a real commitment to strategic cycle routes that follow desire lines for cyclists must be made.		Comment	Julia Smith [6865]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	718	It is proposed that the following additional measures are included: * Replacement of the level crossings in Basin Road and Stockbridge Road by an underpass or bridge. * Safeguarding of land to enable the expansion of the Chichester railway Station, its tracks and platforms, from 2 to 4 to enable a fast train service * Safeguarding of land close to the A27 for a future "park and ride"	It is proposed that the following additional measures are included: * Replacement of the level crossings in Basin Road and Stockbridge Road by an underpass or bridge. * Safeguarding of land to enable the expansion of the Chichester railway Station, its tracks and platforms, from 2 to 4 to enable a fast train service * Safeguarding of land close to the A27 for a future "park and ride"	Object	West Itchenor Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1036]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	755	I support some of the aspirations but not the pace of change that is envisaged. For the delivery of strategic cycle routes, the speed of change needs to be much faster. RTP1 is good but needs to be extended. Car parking provision, especially in St Pauls and Bognor Roads needs to be restricted to allow for bus and cycle lanes. Too much aspiration and not enough definite dates for actions. Air quality management areas need to do something rather than just report. There are no suggestions of actions such as fining drivers for idling, especially near schools.	Put target dates for action on air quality instead of just monitoring it. The word management seems meaning less. It has not been managed in that it has not improved. There are no dates for introducing bus and cycle routes, and imposing parking restrictions. Put dates and targets into the plan. Where it mentions opportunities, replace that with action to be taken to make travel sustainable.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	855	Reduce car parking in city centre to reduce pollution. Put in bus routes and safe cycle routes especially in Bognor Road and St Pauls Road. Upgrade bus/rail interchange facilities. cycle routes need to be direct, convenient, joined-up, segregated, clear and safe. Improve paving to reduce accidents for pedestrians and wheelchair users.		Support	Ms Valerie Briginshaw [6946]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	875	Policy and preceding text in paras 4.94 to 4.102 will in large part depend on funding by others- very aspirational. Congestion and Air Quality: there is no mention of previously hailed 'to-not through traffic' aspirations, requiring quantum improvement in the surrounding highway network beyond the modest and short term Peter Brett measures There is now an imminent fourth AQMA at Westhampnett Road. Behavioural change considered by SYSTRA to have limited effect; PBA omits to summarise any benefits in its Section 11; indicates limited week day use and high cost of P&R provision and operation. Safeguarding P&R space a waste.	add 'to-not through' traffic measures to Policy S 14 as its first bullet; move current first bullet (behavioural change) last as in Policy S 23	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	896	Rather than increasing car parking provision in the city it should be decreased and Park and Ride should be introduced. This will reduce congestion in the city, help air pollution and allow easy and cheap access for shoppers. Sustainable modes of transport should be encouraged and specifically there should be cycle lanes along St Paul's Road as well as Bognor Road. Cycle lanes in general should be direct, convenient, joined-up, safe and clear and segregated from other traffic.	Reduce car parking in city centre. Introduce Park and Ride all year round. Introduce cycle lanes in St Paul's Road and Bognor Road. Cycle lanes should be direct, convenient, joined-up, clear, safe and segregated (not just paint on the road) Please add these adjectives to qualify what sort of cycle lanes are needed.	Object	Mrs Lynne Friel [4991]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	898	This policy is aspirational. 4.94 to 4.102 will greatly depend on funding from developers and government "shooting star" funding streams! Again as in so much of this Plan there is no real mention of quantifiable relieving of air pollution and congestion by "to-not through traffic" aspirations so regaled at Chichester Vision meetings. Worryingly and skirted over in this Plan is the now imminent fourth AQMA area at Westhampnett Road. Chichester has the most AQMAS in the whole of West Sussex. Behavioural change has been found in studies to have a limited effect examples being Mott MacDonald and Systra.	Add as first bullet point - 'to-not through' traffic measures .	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	900	Please add the following to the text "Delivering strategic cycle routes linking the city centre, residential areas and key facilities, including proposed areas of new housing, employment and greenspace within and close to the city"...(existing text) (additional text to add)....and extending existing cycle routes into the city centre. Particularly linking cycle ways Centurion Way (National Cycle Route 88), Salterns Way, Chichester to Bognor Regis (National Cycle Route 2) and Chichester to Emsworth (National Cycle Route 2), directly into Chichester city centre.		Support	Mr Mark Record [6963]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	904	Faze out use of Little London and Baffin's Lane car parks so we can extend the pedestrian precinct. Similar ideas were explored in the Chichester Vision document. Similar changes implemented in cities like York have been very successful.		Support	Mr Mark Record [6963]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1085	I support the reduction of car parking in the city centre to reduce the currently excessive air pollution. Removing car parking and adding extra bus routes and cycle lanes will make the city centre much more attractive to shoppers and visitors. Good quality bus and rail facilities at the interchange are needed with toilets, a waiting room, staff and tourist information so that public transport is a preferable option to private cars.		Support	Mrs Claire Wilton [6733]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1111	The only way to solve the current and future travel congestion on A27, A259, Salthill Road rat run to avoid Fishbourne Roundabout, Funtington Road, etc. is to provide more cheap and easy public transport including park and ride schemes all year round. Cycle paths, footpaths, buses, trains, walking routes are far more essential than currently accepted. Current traffic pollution, congestion etc. will fast become a crisis if other alternatives are not		Comment	Mrs Ruth Keeley [5401]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1124	4.99 - analysis of the impact of junction improvements on A27 needs to be undertaken before adoption of the plan. Considerable impact expected on the journeys of those in Donnington - effectively reducing access from A27 from 4 to 2 access points for those turning right from A27 means more congestion on routes into the city.		Comment	Mrs Nicola Swann [7052]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1220	The policy should underline that the support for pedestrian and cycle networks will include new links between existing settlement areas, for example residents of Donnington have for many years been pressing, without success for local authority intervention to initiate provision of a direct footpath and cycle route between Donnington Village and the Stockbridge area of Donnington where the Parish/Community Hall and local; shops are located. It should be recognised that with an ageing population there are many with impaired mobility dependent on mobility scooters and footpaths/cycleways should be suitable to enable them to get around retaining independence.		Comment	Mr and Mrs A Martin [5053]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1355	This is good policy but doubt very much than any of it will be in place before the development is allocated and built.		Support	Mr David Leah [6440]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1401	Is this not just a re-run of the failed HE consultation? This will not resolve the traffic problems and will disadvantage local residents, the A27 and its proximity to the city are the problem.	The council must liaise with HE to deliver a new strategic route. We have all campaigned for the mitigated Northern route, this must be considered and our existing junctions left as they are.	Object	Mrs Hayley Spencer [7137]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1548	The amendments proposed to the A27 roundabouts have already been rejected by local communities in previous consultations because they will drastically reduce accessibility and will increase traffic in residential areas in the southern part of the city.	A more thorough review of long-term transport options around Chichister is needed which does not rely on an easy recycling of old ideas and is not effected by vested interests elsewhere around the city.	Object	Mr Ian Knight [7184]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1561	Support overdue inclusion of traffic lights in junction designs. Planners should realise that many objections by motorists, young and old, to changes such as the removal of the Oving lights, are because the existing roundabouts are so dangerous.		Support	Mr John Davies [5359]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1564	Inadequate and premature Policy in the context of "the forthcoming ... Transport Feasibility Study" being unavailable to review, not even Terms of Reference, timeline, etc. This aspect of the Plan should be re-opened for public consultation when CDC can evidence the Transport Feasibility Study and respondents are able to consider the full picture. More needs to be done to support non-vehicular transport for all, not simply reducing traffic congestion and improving safety at key junctions for vehicles. Communities must be considered "relevant organisations". Parklands Residents' Association and Chichester Tree Wardens Parklands Residents' Association may wish to follow up relevant points.	Review entire Policy in the context of the mentioned Transport Feasibility Study and my representation; reword and re-consult when the Policy wording is not incomprehensible due to uncertainty. Include local communities in CDC's commitment to working with others to deliver an integrated transport study for Chichester City - we see what happens on the ground every day, and know what encourages/discourages us from walking/cycling/using public transport.	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1582	The forthcoming Chichester Vision - Transport Feasibility Study is not yet available so how is it possible to comment effectively on this Policy? Without the study there is no detail of the interventions proposed. Why is a Park and Ride Scheme not considered necessary.?It would cleanly alleviate congestion in the city and reduce pollution.	This aspect of the Plan needs to be re opened when the Study is available so the proposed interventions can be judged against the proposals made . Park and Ride needs to be re considered	Object	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1618	Lack of information as to what the Chichester Vision Transport Feasibility Study or the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan will contain. This makes this policy unclear. There are no earmarked resources for this vital walking and cycling infrastructure- there are no plans and no guarantee that WSCC has to ability or political will to implement the necessary infrastructure. Most detailed planning has gone into the PBA report focussing on A27 but there are no coherent plans for a network of joined up, direct segregated and safe cycle routes. Plan needs to be re-examined when these details are made public.	Organisations that the councils will work with need to be named - please insert Chichester Cycle Forum, Chemroute, Chichester Cycle Campaign, ChiCycle and Sustrans as well as local residents' associations as local residents who walk and cycle here know best what changes are needed to make routes safe. More needs to be done to support non-vehicular transport and safety of NMUs, not simply reducing traffic congestion and improving safety at key junctions for vehicles. Communities must be considered "relevant organisations".	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1656	4.98 (junction improvements) will not resolve the issues of the A27.	We must (as described in planning legislation) plan for an integrated solution which addresses the immediate, and future transport requirements. The council must integrate with HE and deliver a new strategic route and use the SIL and 106 money to provide our local integrated transport plan utilising the old A27. Furthermore if this plan where considered it would be unaffordable and wasteful of CIL and 106 money.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1675	I object to road works taking place along the A27. Traffic on this road is regularly described as 'miserable' by radio stations. Any road works on the junctions would make it even more miserable. This affects buses crossing the A27, cost money to businesses and makes life difficult for all. The only solution is the logical building of a northern bypass, no interference with traffic while being build, no unexpected extra costs since using mostly inhabited territory.	No road works on the A27. A northern by pass to take east-west traffic away from the city and the inadequate A27.	Object	MRS MIREILLE ANNICK [7156]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1676	Support Policy S14		Support	Chichester BID (Mr Colin Hicks) [7190]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1682	4.98 (junction improvements) will not resolve the issues of the A27.	We must (as described in planning legislation) plan for an integrated solution which addresses the immediate, and future transport requirements. The council must integrate with HE and deliver a new strategic route and use the SIL and 106 money to provide our local integrated transport plan utilising the old A27. Furthermore if this plan where considered it would be unaffordable and wasteful of CIL and 106 money.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1731	4.98 We have read the Transport Study. The costings appear to be incorrect. We do not accept this study.	Rewrite study with correct costings	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1827	Currently identified measure "Delivering strategic cycle routes..." should be modified to call out integration with the existing cycle routes of Centurion Way, Salterns way, the Bognor cycle way and the south coast cycle route.		Comment	Mr Bruce Brechin [7213]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	1841	Propose some amendments to policy: a) Replacement of the level crossings in Basin Road and Stockbridge Road by a height limited underpass, accommodated between the Kingsham Road junction and extended Avenue de Chartres junction on Basin Road. b)Safeguarding of land to enable the expansion of Chichester Railway Station from its present 2 platforms to 4. c) Safeguarding of land close to the A27 for a future "park and ride". d) Safeguarding of land close to the A27 for a "consolidation centre "for break bulk delivery to city centre retail units. See 'Change to Plan' for full policy wording.	I propose the following aspects are added in:- a) Replacement of the level crossings in Basin Road and Stockbridge Road by a height limited underpass capable of taking single decker busses and being accommodated between the Kingsham Road junction and extended Avenue de Chartres junction on Basin Road. This would also incorporate a grade separated cycle and footway. b) Safeguarding of land to enable the expansion of Chichester Railway Station from its present 2 platforms to 4 as envisaged by Network Rail to enable a faster service from Portsmouth to Brighton, and to allow for a fully integrated transport hub for bus and rail services. c) Safeguarding of land close to the A27fora future "park and ride". d) Safeguarding of land close to the A27for a "consolidation centre "for break bulk delivery to city centre retail units.	Comment	Mr Andrew Bain [7217]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	2033	- Welcome the concept of improving the A27 at grade rather than as grade separated monoliths. - The comment on CDCs willingness to revisit park and ride if the parking level reach a certain occupancy is welcomed but it is an expensive option. - Underpass or bridge over railway crossings would be a detrimental solution to queuing problems and likely would move problems elsewhere.		Comment	Summersdale Residents Association (Mr Roger Hobbs) [5435]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	2199	Policy S14 is insufficiently developed to be meaningful. There is nothing in the evidence base to justify it with the Chichester Vision - Transport Feasibility Study yet to be published. When the study is finalised, this part of the Plan should be re-consulted upon.		Object	Debbie Leonard [7215]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	2381	Comments on policy S14 relate to: - Car parking - peripheral car parks unsuitable for those with heavy shopping - Public transport - bus lane at Bognor roundabout will cause queues - Road network - need to address issue of level crossings		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	2443	Request the SDNP is included in penultimate bullet as destination for strategic cycle routes.	Request the SDNP is included in penultimate bullet as destination for strategic cycle routes.	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	2727	SWT is very supportive of any initiative to deliver an integrated transport strategy for Chichester City which conforms to the Government's transport hierarchy that sets the clear priorities of: * Reducing the need to travel * Switching to sustainable modes * Managing existing networks more effectively * Creating extra (car-related) capacity only when alternative methods have been fully explored CDC must invest in innovative and modern strategies that focus on local journeys, air pollution and the production of sustainable transport options.		Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	2874	Objections and comments incorporated into changes proposed below. 4.102 Local Plan proposes to channel a substantial amount of money into infrastructure with no visible new benefit to existing communities.	4.97 Delete "Addressing these transport issues is critical to enable the city to remain ... commercially competitive as a business location." Add: "It is recognised that over the period of the Plan until now, such opportunities have not been exploited to their fullest. Hence, standards accepted over the period of the present Plan should not be regarded as precedential of standards that will be accepted over the period of the Revised Plan." Section 4.101 After the final sentence, insert the wording: "To this end, suitable sites for Park and Ride will be identified and secured against future loss". Policy point 2 CHANGE TO "Reviewing car parking provision, tailoring parking fees to dampen peak time demand and discourage unnecessary car journeys,, and encouraging use of peripheral car parks to reduce traffic in the city centre and giving consideration to the introduction of parking restrictions along some arterial routes to improve traffic circulation (particularly for buses)". Move this bullet point down to the bottom of the list: * Exploring potential options to provide an improved bus / rail interchange; * Delivering strategic cycle routes linking the city centre, residential areas and key facilities, including proposed areas of new housing, employment and greenspace within and close to the city; and * Improvements to the pedestrian network within and around the city, including proposed areas of new development and greenspace. These two bullet points should be moved to the top of the list.	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	2896	Policy S14, Chichester City Transport Strategy: The first article in this section should be the permanent solution to the eternal traffic problems caused by the inadequacy of our existing A27. It is these that result in extra congestion in the City centre, and result in the serious pollution problems in Chichester. A City our size needs a proper by pass, i.e. a road that separates through from local traffic. the current road is inadequate in both roles.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	2941	Welcome plans to improve public transport, walking and cycling, and to protect existing footpaths and cycleways, do not feel these proposals are strong or clear enough to contribute to much needed reduction in private car use in Chichester area. Assurances needed that well established routes will be protected and improved, e.g. Centurion Way adjacent to Western development. Clear cycleway routes need to be identified and safe for general use. These routes must enable people to cycle and/or walk from developments on the fringe of the city into the City Centre as well as giving easy access to the countryside	Assurances are needed that well established routes will be protected and improved, such as the Centurion Way adjacent to the Western development. Clear cycleway routes need to be identified and these need to be safe for general use. These routes must enable people to cycle and/or walk from developments on the fringe of the city into the City Centre as well as giving easy access to the countryside	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	2999	Road Space Allocation policies must be reviewed to prioritize sustainable means according to the transport hierarchy; new approach required due to historic character of city and need to enable sustainable travel modes to combat climate change; on-street parking acts to slow traffic - if relocated, road space could be allocated to bus lanes/cycle routes; Eastgate Square junction and Sainsbury's roundabout omitted; diverse funding sources result in piecemeal infrastructure; behavioural change initiatives should follow providing safe links for people walking and cycling; A Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Programme needs to be developed.	<p>4.95 Delete this phrase "Due to the historic character of the city, there is limited space for road widening or engineered junction improvements". Rewrite "on-street parking slows traffic flows to improve safety on many radial routes."</p> <p>4.96 Insert "Other areas of the city are also under scrutiny and could be declared Air Quality Management Areas".</p> <p>4.97 Change to "the city presents good opportunities to enable more sustainable travel patterns and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel "provided safe, segregated and joined up cycle routes are provided". Change "offers potential" to "must be used to".</p> <p>4.98 Insert 2 more junctions: "Eastgate Square and Westhampnett, (Sainsbury's) roundabout".</p> <p>4.99 Delete "Encouraged", Insert "enabled".</p> <p>4.100 Delete "whilst this plan is not depended". Change to "This plan must be viewed and constructed in close collaboration with the outcomes of these studies...."</p> <p>4.101 Insert "Introduction of a work place parking levy should be started to gain extra revenues to invest in sustainable travel means". Delete "increase", Insert "decrease".</p> <p>4.102 "Insert Funding for these transport measure is expected to be drawn from development contributions and work place parking levy".</p> <p>Policy S24 Bullet point 1 should be lower down the list; Bullet point 2 Delete "giving consideration", insert "prioritising"; Change to "Reduce including closing of the inner city car parks.... This policy can be started with a car free Sunday once a year, then several times a year leading to once a month. This should lead to the gradual phasing out of the inner city car parks and the reallocation or space for community events and people-centred places for example more green space, community orchards, play areas for children and young people, a covered market space."</p> <p>Bullet point 3 Insert St Paul's Road and St Pancras and Westhampnett Road; last 2 bullet points should be moved higher up. Bullet point 7; Delivering joined-up, coherent, direct, segregated, comfortable, attractive, adaptable and safe cycle routes; Last bullet point: Insert "repaving and repair of the city centre pavements"; Insert at end of final sentence: "This Feasibility Study and the LCWIP (Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan) will need to have earmarked reserves to implement the recommendations."</p>	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
33	Policy S14: Chichester City Transport Strategy	3479	Concerns over options put forward in the transport study	Integrate the A27 northern mitigated bypass	Object	Mr Colin Hammerton [6709]
34	East of Chichester	3330	Presentation of LPR document is unclear as this paragraph references strategic allocations		Object	CEG [7397]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	91	Because of the severe traffic gridlock caused by Goodwood more effort needs to be made between CDC,HE and Goodwood to enable an A27 scheme that separates local and through traffic and ensures that event traffic does not cause gridlock throughout and around the city and A27.The noise buffer zone could be better utilised with well designed commercial development, instead of allocating it on a zone site adjacent to Chichester Harbour.	a noise buffer zone around the motor circuit could include provision for well designed commercial/industrial development	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	276	Goodwood events cause a lot of disruption to Chichester and the benefits to the local economy are overstated. I believe that a Northern bypass (as recommended by the BABA27 process) to limit the amount of traffic queuing through Chichester on event days would be the only solution. I am also not supportive of the airfield being supported it if impacts upon Chichester's economic growth - it takes up a lot of space for very little benefit for the local community.		Comment	David Dean [6735]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	366	Policy S 15 Comment: Goodwood is a Limited Liability commercial undertaking and should be treated as any other 4.106 'The economic and cultural benefits afforded to the wider area from such events are well documented': -there are no cultural benefits. - economic benefits have been much publicised by the Company.and have become unquestioned folklore -wider area economic harm caused by the traffic congestion associated with major events is not mentioned Policy makes no reference to light pollution visible from elsewhere, including the Downs, by future development within the site-e.g. area, building, or any other facilities lighting	4.106 -delete reference to 'cultural. ' -'economic benefits.... are well documented': either remove or change to ANY BENEFITS NEED TO BE INDEPENDENTLY REASSESSED AND DEMONSTRABLY BALANCED AGAINST ANY ECONOMIC HARM TO THE AREA. .Policy S15 should include restrictions or controls on light pollution. Policy S15: the second sentence should be amended to read: The Council will permit proposals,etc.....PROVIDED ECONOMIC BENEFITS TO THE AREA ARE BALANCED AGAINST ECONOMIC HARM and the proposal does not conflict etc.	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	409	Consider exploiting the 400 meter zone around Goodwood for the industrial expansion advocated elsewhere in this document with additional provision of access to the A27 east and west of the city via a new link road. The impact of noise from goodwood is associated with increased use of th existing A27 by owners of cars with exemption from environmental upgrades due to age or by owner choice. The character of the area is undermined by the presence of goodwood race track and airfield and therefore protection of change due to impact of local character should be less important	Add in section on exploitation of unused land in this area and remove 'local character' exclusions	Object	david marsh [6809]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	484	No reference to light pollution visible from the Dark Skies area within SDNP. Evidence is required to balance out the economic benefits v the actual economic harm to the district to justify the statement.	Remove reference to economic and cultural benefit or provide actual evidence not just urban myth. Include a provision to control or condition lighting.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	526	I thoroughly endorse the Council's policy of qualified support for this important local attraction and its development as it produces a huge net benefit to the area.		Support	Mr Chris Coffin [6794]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	688	4.106 Goodwood has 2 events a year that grind the city to a halt ! Manhood provides far greater income and sustained employment.4.109 Why should Goodwood have a 400mts buffer? They have noise.Other areas suffer from noise from A27. Why do they not have a 400mtr buffer? What is so unique about Goodwood apart from undue influence !! You buy a house knowing about the area. Should not be an excuse not to build houses near the Airfield.Unless this is addressed in future iterations of the plan, then I will raise it with the examiner at the appropriate time.	All areas should be included. Goodwood suffers noise from self inflicted activities ie racing so is not a justifiable reason to exclude it from housing or industry especially as it already has the same infrastructure as anywhere else. AL6 is closer to sensitive area of AONB (within 100mtrs), SDNP over 1 km away from Goodwood and yet AL6 has been included and Goodwood has not. Again alleged undue and unfair influence.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	712	I recognise that Goodwood provides some employment, however it's events cause congestion and pollution to the overwhelming majority of residents who gain nothing from Goodwood itself. The Motor Circuit and Airfield create noise and pollution. It makes no sense that a northern route has not been considered clearly because we have to protect Goodwood. It is to the detriment of the people of Chichester and their children who are forced to endure pollution simply because Goodwood has to be protected. Why does the council allow this to continue?		Comment	Mrs Deborah Hack [6717]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1028	This is ideal land for industrial development. Develop this land, it's already been developed, it's already suffering from noise pollution.	Develop this land.	Object	Mr Mark Hitchin [7008]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1039	Everyone has to make sacrifices. Development around the Airfield would take the strain off other areas around the town. It's essential to utilise this land for industrial applications. It's a perfect fit - put all the noisy stuff together.	Develop the land around the Airfield/Racing Circuit.	Object	Mrs Louise Hitchin [7012]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1221	The major visitor attractions and events at Goodwood, whilst bringing economic benefits to some, cause significant travel disruption and lost time/costs to many others going about their business. It should be a stated policy, as with any other developer, that any further development at Goodwood will be expected to contribute funding towards the cost of highway improvements and access routes to mitigate the effect on traffic levels/congestion in the surrounding area and back to the A27.	ADD: Further development at Goodwood will be required to contribute funding towards the cost of highway improvements and access routes to mitigate the effect of traffic/congestion in the surrounding areas and back onto the A27.	Object	Mr and Mrs A Martin [5053]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1253	Current experience indicates that a policy that requires "Any anticipated additional demand for traffic movements should be appropriately mitigated with opportunities for non-car based travel options secured and additional private vehicular traffic confined to utilising the existing access" has been less than effective.	The policy needs to be stronger to reduce the traffic issues caused by events held at Goodwood	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1281	The plan's acknowledgement of the importance of Goodwood Motor Circuit and airfield and the formal establishment of a 400m noise buffer is welcomed and supported. The policy is broadly acceptable to the Estate but we believe it can be strengthened to provide greater robustness as well as flexibility.		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1338	It should be noted that any planned development may not encroach areas that are in the line of strategic interest for future road development.	Add the specific point to this policy that zones the boundary road (s) for strategic development.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1572	I am unclear why Goodwood motor circuit and airfield require a new, separate Policy in the Local Plan Review and why other generic policies would be considered inadequate to rely on? Please explain. I may come back to this after reading other policies.		Comment	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1733	4.108 to 4.11 Policy S15/S16 This area should be used for additional commercial development. It is close to Rolls Royce and the roads can be improved to accommodate new high grade businesses. The building can be built to avoid concern over noise from the airfield and motor circuit. This site could take some if not all of the proposed building from the site at AL6	Use this area for employment land	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	2248	Historic England welcomes and supports "Any development proposals within the vicinity of the site must clearly demonstrate how the development would protect, and where possible enhance, the operation and heritage of the site as a motor-circuit and airfield" in Policy S15 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	2382	Support policy S15: - Weekend noise from un-silenced racing		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	2875	Policy point 4: Insert final paragraph to the effect "The council will work with Goodwood to ensure greater spill-over benefits into the wider business community from Goodwood events, and explore the possibility that the "non car based travel options" of section 4 above include options for walking and cycling."	Policy point 4: Insert final paragraph to the effect "The council will work with Goodwood to ensure greater spill-over benefits into the wider business community from Goodwood events, and explore the possibility that the "non car based travel options" of section 4 above include options for walking and cycling."	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	3000	Insert acknowledgement of the noise and disturbance due to traffic chaos	4.106 Change to: "The economic and cultural benefits afforded to the wider from such events and the noise and congestion experience by locals"	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	3461	Use buffer zone at Goodwood for industrial development	Use buffer zone at Goodwood for industrial development	Object	A + D Lygo-Baker [7425]
35	Policy S15: Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	3522	New policies such as those proposed for the Goodwood Motor Circuit and Aerodrome provide a positive response to the above objectives and are to be supported. Provision of a "Whole Estate Plan" for Goodwood, as required by policies contained in the emerging National Park Local Plan, will provide a planning policy context that straddles the District/National Park boundary. The District Local Plan should acknowledge this approach and ensure that its policies do not conflict.		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	93	The noise buffer zone would be an excellent location for the commercial development currently allocated to an entirely unsuitable and unsustainable site to the west of Donnington and north east of Apuldram. As the 400 m buffer zone to the north of the motor circuit includes the only part of a proposed Northern Bypass that would lie within the SDNP, this would weaken the park's objections to a Northern Bypass, thus making a long term, robust solution to the A27 more feasible in the future.	The noise buffer zone would be an excellent location for the commercial development currently allocated for land to the west of Donnington and north east of Apuldram.	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	224	As someone who lives 800m from Goodwood motor circuit I am pleased to see that the noise report undertaken by MAS Environmental Ltd and mentioned in section 4.110 identified "the potential for noise disturbance arising from activities at the Motor Circuit and Airfield to be a significant issue beyond the 400m buffer." This is indeed my experience from living here for nearly 20 years. The noise is heavily wind/weather dependent from the motor circuit, and the noise from aircraft, especially helicopters, which generate downward noise more than aeroplanes, can be significant well beyond the 400m buffer.		Support	Iain Burgess [6720]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	315	As I live just outside of the 400 metre Goodwood Circuit Buffer, I am pleased that you agree with the MAS study that no development should be allowed within this boundary. I appreciate the Circuit from a personal point of view and also the fact that it benefits the local area and businesses and would not wish that any development should place restrictions on the Circuit. The removal of land from the existing allocation in Policy AL4 hopefully ensures the future of the Circuit.		Comment	Mr Ken Burgess [6759]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	367	Policy S 16 . In 4.109 there is reference to a presumption against allowing residential development within the 400 metre noise buffer. 4.110 as worded is broad brush and vague in relation to off airfield development and should be amended to read that there is a general presumption against RESIDENTIAL development proposals...etc The first sentence of Policy S16 should be amended to read the same.		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	485	4.109 this section needs to state that the buffer zone is for residential development only. A new bullet point is needed to state that the buffer zone does not restrict the building of industrial/business developments. Policy S16 is slippery. Are CDC protecting any business infill around the Goodwood Aerodrome and Motor-circuit within the huge 400m wide noise shadow? see map in Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map.	Add to this the fact that industrial/business developments can be built within the noise shadow.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	502	GOODWOOD: Surely the same planning rules should apply to Goodwood as everywhere else. Moreover, if and when the Goodwood Estates submit future planning applications, a condition should be that they agree to a Northern A27 by-pass and, if required, making land available for it. This is in the overall public interest		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	690	WHY ? WHY ? Goodwood generates noise of their own making. Why should this exclude them from housing development. The A27 generates noise and pollution and yet it is perfectly acceptable to build even more houses around it and the villages to the east and west. Double standards !!	We want a level playing field with all areas taking their fair share of development where the land is suitable. Goodwood land is more suitable than many included in the local plan as it is not on a Flood plain zone 3 ! and much of the development can be mitigated with landscaping.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1027	There should be no buffer zone. Land in the buffer zone is ideal for Industrial development.	The buffer zone should be made available for industrial development.	Object	Mr Mark Hitchin [7008]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1038	The buffer zone around the Airfield is ideal land for Industrial development.	Develop this land which is ideal for industrial development.	Object	Mrs Louise Hitchin [7012]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1168	The noise pollution caused by Goodwood activities limits a large amount of land from development. However industrial sites operating on normal working week schedule would not be subject to the same level of nuisance. Therefore this area could be used as industrial sites instead of land to the south west as proposed in AL6. The 400m exclusion would also include the proposed route for a northern relief road so no objection is sustainable about road noise!!		Comment	Mr Roger Baynham [5456]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1254	This policy has missed the opportunity for encouraging development that is not noise-sensitive, such as commercial employment opportunities, within the buffer zone.		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1282	Policy supported with minor changes		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1337	It is unclear what the council is trying to protect with this policy either the residents of Summersdale or the owners of the Goodwood airfield. The area would be most useful as an extra industrial development zone.	Zone for industrial development.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1356	No development should be planned that could in the foreseeable future be detrimental to the operation of the airfield, motorcircuit or the Goodwood events.	No noise sensitive development should take place regardless of mitigation measures	Object	Mr David Leah [6440]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1550	<p>Only a small proportion of my clients land (1.3ha of a total 3.75 ha) is within the Goodwood noise buffer. The remainder of the site is outside of this buffer and should therefore be considered for a residential allocation.</p> <p>The adjacent Strategic Development Location has planning permission for 9 dwellings within this buffer, therefore a number of dwellings should be acceptable in my clients land.</p> <p>Furthermore, much of the land in this buffer can be used as open space.</p> <p>The site should be allocated with any incursion into the buffer needing to be justified with technical work.</p>		Comment	Pam Clingan [7180]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1624	Local residents need to be considered when future developments are proposed.	There is a viable alternative site available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there.	Object	Mrs Philippa Hook [7195]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1651	This is a huge area to almost arbitrarily protect due to noise (which is not continuous!). Several business looking for storage or workshop space can utilise this area with minimal impact on traffic for events.	Reconsider stance on development within 400m to become a presumption that business with minimal impact on traffic is allowable.	Object	Mrs Christina Procter [7200]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1665	<p>Goodwood should be brought forward as a strategic site for employment buildings close to current development and accessible for the SDNP.</p> <p>Land South west of chichester is wholly and totally unsuitable and the A259 is not a suitable road to support it. That and the flood plain makes this site unviable.</p> <p>West Broyle and South of Lavant must include these areas to be considered for strategic development sites.</p>	<p>Goodwood should be brought forward as a strategic site for employment buildings close to current development and accessible for the SDNP.</p> <p>Land South west of chichester is wholly and totally unsuitable and the A259 is not a suitable road to support it. That and the flood plain makes this site unviable.</p> <p>West Broyle and South of Lavant must include these areas to be considered for strategic development sites.</p>	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1684	4.110 The noise abatement area does not affect employment space and this site around Goodwood should be brought forward as a strategic site for employment buildings close to current development and accessible for the SDNP. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture.	4.110 The noise abatement area does not affect employment space and this site around Goodwood should be brought forward as a strategic site for employment buildings close to current development and accessible for the SDNP.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1687	<p>Goodwood should be brought forward as a strategic site for employment buildings close to current development and accessible for the SDNP.</p> <p>Land South west of chichester is wholly and totally unsuitable and the A259 is not a suitable road to support it. That and the flood plain makes this site unviable.</p> <p>West Broyle and South of Lavant must include these areas to be considered for strategic development sites.</p>	<p>Goodwood should be brought forward as a strategic site for employment buildings close to current development and accessible for the SDNP.</p> <p>Land South west of chichester is wholly and totally unsuitable and the A259 is not a suitable road to support it. That and the flood plain makes this site unviable.</p> <p>West Broyle and South of Lavant must include these areas to be considered for strategic development sites.</p>	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1736	4.108 to 4.11 Policy S15/S16 This area should be used for additional commercial development. It is close to Rolls Royce and the roads can be improved to accommodate new high grade businesses. The building can be built to avoid concern over noise from the airfield and motor circuit. This site could take some if not all of the proposed building from the site at AL6	Use this are for employment land	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	1995	Concerned that definition of noise-sensitive properties includes reference to educational establishments. The existing noise study does not referenced educational establishments. School playgrounds are assumed to have an average decibel level of about 71dB when in use which is a lot higher than that recorded within 200m of race track during race days. Therefore there is no need to prevent primary schools from being developed within this area. Recommended change: remove educational establishments from definition of noise sensitive development		Object	March C of E Primary School (Rod Hague) [7248]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	2030	We believe that the 400m buffer should be maintained from now onwards, without exception. We strongly support the motor circuit as we appreciate the enjoyment a lot of local people get from visiting the events and also the benefits it brings to the local economy.		Support	Summersdale Residents Association (Mr Roger Hobbs) [5435]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	2187	Objects to Policy S16 on the grounds that the area should be reallocated for employment development.		Object	Debbie Leonard [7215]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	2383	- Housing development close to Goodwood Airfield should not be allowed - Un-silenced racing should not be allowed		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	2876	After final paragraph, insert text "Also, mindful that this area is one of few surviving truly quiet "green routes" from Chichester into the downs, and currently has a largely rural aspect, any development in this area (whether noise sensitive or not) will be sympathetic to this rural character and will enhance views from nearby paths."	After final paragraph, insert text "Also, mindful that this area is one of few surviving truly quiet "green routes" from Chichester into the downs, and currently has a largely rural aspect, any development in this area (whether noise sensitive or not) will be sympathetic to this rural character and will enhance views from nearby paths."	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	2898	Policy S16: The statement about a general presumption against development within 400m of Goodwood is not understood. The airfield and motor circuit are noisy but intermittent, but the noise along the existing A27 is constant and relentless. If development is to be allowed near the A27, then there should be the possibility of development close to Goodwood.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	3462	Use buffer zone at Goodwood for industrial development	Use buffer zone at Goodwood for industrial development	Object	A + D Lygo-Baker [7425]
36	Policy S16: Development within vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield	3481	Consider employment use at Goodwood airfield site.	As this area is in a noise abatement area, it does not affect this as a future employment area so therefore it should be adopted for this use.	Comment	Mr Colin Hammerton [6709]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
37	West of Chichester	116	4.112 Add "while maintaining separation of the Service Villages." 4.118 When will the existing military use of Thorney Island next be reviewed?		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
37	West of Chichester	410	The report seems to imply that the northern part of the city is excluded from consideration as it is near to the SDNP and because it is expensive - surely building on this land with its lack of flood plain considerations is more economically and environmentally more viable than building on the floodplains on the Fishbourne to Emsworth road south of the A27?	Delete northern exclusions from policy. 4.115.	Object	david marsh [6809]
37	West of Chichester	829	Para 4.113 There is a tendency to underplay the cumulative impact of all the individual proposals in the document. Taken alone, each proposal seems comparatively reasonable but add together the proposals in policies SA7, SA9, SA10 and SA 13 and you get a very different CUMULATIVE EFFECT of the proposals on the infrastructure. Fishbourne (250), Bosham (250 at Highgrove + 50 allocated in the existing Site Allocation DPD (2018), Chidham and Hambrook (500) and Southbourne (1,250) = 2,300 homes. Fishbourne and its Roundabout will be affected not by traffic from 250 homes but by that from 2,300 homes.	Ensure that cumulative data is shown throughout where this is relevant. Referring to individual parish numbers gives a misleading implication of the outcome of the action. Under the Plan, Fishbourne would place cars from 250 homes on the A.259 whereas the cumulative effect as traffic approached Fishbourne Roundabout would be traffic from 2,300 homes.	Object	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mr Geoff Hand) [34]
37	West of Chichester	1591	Para. 4.115. Totally disagree with this statement. The reasons given for no development in this area could be applied to anywhere. The area should be considered for some development.	Remove statement	Object	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
37	West of Chichester	2840	Agree with approach of directing significant proportion of growth towards E-W corridor.		Support	Gleeson Strategic Land (Mr Peter Rawlinson) [855]
37	West of Chichester	2877	Allocations are disastrous to character of largely rural settlements. Effect could be mitigated by insisting on measures including low-car housing, home working and ensuring small-scale shopping and schooling facilities on site. Plan is weak in all areas.		Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
37	West of Chichester	3482	None of these service villages can be considered for a significant proportion of housing development because of the poor accessibility (not a high level of accessibility) unless a new junction to the A27 near Southbourne.	A new access on and off A27 near Southbourne	Object	Mr Colin Hammerton [6709]
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	691	If the military leave then it would be a good use of a brown field site but Infrastructure must be put in place first and transport must be addressed before any building is undertaken. Must be affordable housing and not detrimental to the residential area already there.		Support	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	1592	Para. 4.118. What is meant by "noisy sports" and what is the objection?		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	2005	This policy appropriately highlights the environmental sensitivity of the location within the Chichester Harbour AONB and the proximity of the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar, however, there is no mention of the Core and Supporting Areas on the Thorney Island which are within the SWBGS.	As per the SWBG strategy, Core Areas are considered essential to the continued function of the Solent waders and brent goose ecological network and have the strongest functional-linkage to the designated Solent SPA in terms of their frequency and continuity of use by SPA features. We strongly urge that development proposals which are likely to affect these non-designated sites are referenced within the policy.	Comment	RSPB (miss Chloe Rose) [6981]
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	2195	We are currently exploring opportunities for habitat creation in an area on Thorney Island. This is part of our Habitat Creation Programme which seeks to create new habitat to offset losses elsewhere as a result of sea level rise and implementation of coastal and flood risk management infrastructure. Whilst the policy as drafted, along with other policies in the Plan, would not restrict this opportunity we would like you to consider whether further wording could be included to provide specific support for habitat creation.		Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	2249	Historic England welcomes and supports "All proposals must ensure that the cultural and historical significance of the military facilities (and any other significant archaeological assets) located on the site, are understood and inform the scope of future development of that site" in Policy S17 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, we would prefer "significant archaeological assets" to be retained in situ.	Reword Policy S17 as; "All proposals must ensure that the cultural and historical significance of the military facilities (and any other significant archaeological assets) located on the site, are understood and inform the scope of future development of that site, with any significant archaeological assets retained in situ".	Object	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	2460	Should Thorney Island cease to be required for military purposes, the island should receive at least equal protection to other areas within the AONB, including the presumption against new development. Any proposed development should follow the principles laid out in the Chichester Harbour Conservancy's Planning Principles policy. While not seeking anything that would compromise the base's security, the policy should be to expand the Dark Skies sites and, where necessary, to take additional steps to support the existing ones e.g. by upgrading or redirecting street lighting. It should be possible to reduce vertical light pollution.		Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	2545	We welcome the support for the continued military use of the barracks, and the MOD are good environmental custodians for the unique environment of Thorney Island. However in the event that the military should leave the island, the case for masterplanning for development is clearly worrying; the historic, cultural and natural environment of the Island is unique and fundamentally worth preserving.	We wish to see removal of the second paragraph which proposes a masterplanning process should the island cease to be a military base.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	2879	Seems a sound approach to Thorney Island (Give or take the currently unquantifiable possibility that electric planes may change the noise implication of aircraft movements).		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	3001	Climate change poses a major risk to this area as well as Pagham and the whole of the Chichester Harbour. With 1 m sea level rise predicted, we need to reduce our carbon footprint.	4.116: Insert at end of paragraph: "To ensure climate change risks are kept low climate change adaptation and mitigation is essential."	Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
38	Policy S17: Thorney Island	3067	Thorney Island is entirely within Chichester Harbour AONB. However, Policy S17 provides unprecedented support for developments on Thorney Island for military use, if they have regard for the range of environment designations. Chichester Harbour Conservancy objects to the wording of "have regard" because it is weak terminology and open to misinterpretation, i.e. what the Conservancy considers "have regard" to mean may be different to what the Ministry of Defence considers "have regard" to mean.	The policy wording is changed to: "Proposals for new development and changes of use at the military base and airfield at Thorney Island which help enhance or sustain its operational military capability, and do not detrimentally impact the AONB/SAC/SPA and Ramsar designations, will be supported."	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
39	Manhood Peninsula	288	The proposed development is far too near the AONB, the Special protection Area and the Site of Special Scientific Interest. There would be adverse impact on the special ecology of the area and mitigation is not sufficient to alter this fact.	Delete the proposed development.	Object	Mr Peter Balaam [6739]
39	Manhood Peninsula	360	Chichester Harbour and the surrounding area are designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. it seems to me totally inappropriate that such high levels of development should be considered in this area. Green tourism, a very important part of the Manhood Peninsula's economy, would be seriously affected by over-development on this scale.	Make some low-level development within the South Downs National Park, which would also benefit the small communities there. A site within the buffer zone at Goodwood has already been identified as suitable for industrial development. Use that instead of these proposals	Object	Mrs Alison Balaam [6785]
39	Manhood Peninsula	905	Any housing built on the Manhood peninsular should be carbon neutral to reduce pollution and save energy. I cannot find any mention of this in the documents	Ensure all house builders build carbon neutral, well insulated houses to reduce pollution and maintain a better quality of life for residents.	Object	mrs Patricia Carroll [6964]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
39	Manhood Peninsula	2373	So in summary the plan talks about congested rural roads and such phrases as discouraging HGV's there but the plan to build hundreds and maybe thousands more houses on the Manhood Peninsula does not represent these points. Highways West Sussex have no mechanism to look at the combined effect of multiple sites.	CDC should use the Localism Act and any other statutory instrument to quantify the ACCUMULATIVE damage done by the hundreds of houses already built and in the pipeline. Additionally they should then study what additional impact new developments would have in increments of 250 up to 2,000.	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
39	Manhood Peninsula	2899	Para 4.121: 3rd bullet: While acknowledging the poor accessibility and congestion caused by the A27 to those on the Manhood peninsula, the report makes no reference to another major problem, that of the Chaos caused to people in the south during the increasing number of events at Goodwood, which result in the peninsula being virtually cut off for several individual days.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	84	The area covered by the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 lies within the South Marine Plan Area therefore, it is recommended to ensure your plan is 'sound' that it includes a reference to the South Marine Plan. There are policies within the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 that have marine relevance and so it is recommended that the South Marine Plan and specific policies are referred to in these sections. See full submission	The marine planning remit is directly for coastal and marine waters up to the mean high water spring mark where Chichester district council extends to the mean low water spring mark (we can supply a GIS layer of the spatial extent for any policy maps if you wish). The area covered by the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 lies within the South Marine Plan Area therefore, it is recommended to ensure your plan is 'sound' that it includes a reference to the South Marine Plan. There are policies within the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 that have marine relevance and so it is recommended that the South Marine Plan and specific policies are referred to in these sections. For example, policies: S18, S25, S27, S31. See full submission	Comment	Marine Management Organisation (Stakeholder and Networks Officer) [1144]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	94	The peninsula is one of the last remaining rural hinterlands on the south coast plain. It also contains several internationally designated habitat sites which are among the most important wildlife areas in the district. CDC should consider strengthening the ICZM to recognise the international importance of the peninsula, safeguarding its environment and associated green tourism base further. The provision of wildlife corridors are probably more important here than anywhere else in Chichester District.		Support	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	191	Policy S18 does not take sufficient account of the distinctive area, poor roads, poor public transport and relative lack of employment referred to in 4.121 & 4.122 by advocating the building of hundreds and maybe thousands of new houses. The word SUSTAINABLE appears more than 150 times in this document but in the case of the WEstern Manhood Peninsula is completely meaningless.	Reword policy S18 to more strongly reflect the uniqueness of this area and limit house building to a more modest and sensible levels. Remove the word "sustainable" where the policies concerned are anything other than "sustainable".	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	241	Agree with Policy especially point 5		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	368	There is no specific mention of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy,	The first sentence should be amended to read 'The Council will prepare plans strategies, projects, and other measures, in partnership with the CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY, and other organisations...etc'	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	435	The ICZM has totally been ignored in the development of the draft Local Plan. The statement in paras 4.121 and 4.122 clearly explain why an increase in the new housing allocation above the adopted Local Plan figures is inappropriate.	The ICZM has totally been ignored in the development of the draft Local Plan. The statement in paras 4.121 and 4.122 clearly explain why an increase in the new housing allocation above the adopted Local Plan figures is inappropriate.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	475	A dedicated super highway loop for cyclists connecting Chichester to Birdham, West Wittering, East Wittering and Selsey would have massive benefits in reducing vehicle traffic and subsequent environmental benefits, as well as boosting tourism, physical health and recreation benefits. Many people who live on the peninsul would cycle in to Chichester if there was a safe, clean and pleasurable route.		Comment	Mr Richard Hutchinson [6455]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	503	All good in theory. Please make it happen! Support to Selsey Fishing Industry and its Visitor related Diving business is important for many reasons (improve local industry and attract visitors. A simple extension to an existing ramp in the sea at East Beach, to convert it to a pier on stilts would help enormously. The Victorian built their piers to last 250 years ago - and many still have survived! If they can do it then, can we not do it now?		Support	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	559	I welcome the commitments made to protect the special nature of this area, but the Plan does quite the opposite and there will be a significantly adverse impact on the ecology of the area with mitigation being insufficient. Green tourism will also be adversely affected	Direct your planning for industrial development to the buffer zone at Goodwood with its existing infrastructure.	Object	Mr Jim McAuslan [6602]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	634	Impact on ecology - It is wholly inappropriate to consider development on this scale in such close proximity to an area with this status. There will be a significantly adverse impact on the ecology of the area and mitigation is not sufficient. Green tourism is a very important part of the Manhood Peninsula economy and to overdevelop and spoil the natural environment which attracts this trade would be inappropriate and hugely detrimental		Comment	Mr Philip Waters [6820]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	693	Must promote the uniqueness of Manhood peninsula. Must support the infrastructure all year round not just in the summer. Have to improve the transport infrastructure and promote local traffic movement over through traffic. No evidence of any options so far explored have been acceptable to achieve this. they have all been detrimental to local traffic movement.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	739	CDC should consider strengthening the ICZM to recognise the international importance of the peninsula, further safeguarding its environment and associated green tourism. The provision of wildlife corridors are probably more important here than anywhere else in the district. In addition, the AL6 proposed link road and commercial development would be adjacent to internationally designated habitat sites, cross two flood zones, and impair significant views of the cathedral and the Downs, contrary to CDC's ICZM policy. This proposed road appears to fail on all counts.		Comment	Miss sarah backhouse [6692]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	792	The Majority of the Manhood Peninsular is below or at the 5 meter above sea level contour. It is subject to poor drainage due to insufficient attention to drainage systems by land owners. The Heritage Lottery Funded FLOW project performed under the direction of the Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group has improved the situation. This has been conducted by volunteers. The Local plan should contain strategies for sustaining this initial volunteer/Lottery funded work,	Acknowledge the work done by FLOW and integrate this work into the future plan	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	991	Global climate change alongside global global climate future predictions should preclude further development on this significantly high risk land mass. Improving cycle access will enhance visitor experience, but will fail to address the high levels of pollution and congestion experienced along the Stockbridge Road as workers and children commute to their end-point. Cost of implementing any coastal work should be carefully considered as to whether it will remain future-proof in the context of global weather changes altering the coastline.		Comment	The Hon Susan Barnes [6999]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1127	It is encouraging to see that Policy 18 acknowledges that there is a need to 'improve the infrastructure to support sustainable modes of transport, especially cycle ways, bridleways and footpaths'.		Support	Chichester and District Cycle Forum (Mr Ian Smith) [7054]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1130	Support objective 5 of this policy. We would suggest the best way to do this is to ensure that at least one multi-use route (bridleway) is provided through, or around the fringe of developments, which can also serve as a green corridor for leisure and recreation and, and benefit health and well-being, wildlife and biodiversity. These routes can form the basis of a safe non-motorised user (NMU) network and link with existing public rights of way (prow) where possible.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1219	For the avoidance of doubt the Policy should describe and define the area covered by the Manhood Peninsular and acknowledge that it commences immediately to the south of and abutting the A27 and includes the whole of the Parishes of Appuldram, Donnington and Hunston.	ADD: definition and description of area covered by the Manhood Peninsular acknowledging it commences immediately to the south of and abutting onto the A27 and includes the Parishes of Appuldram, Donnington and Hunston.	Object	Mr and Mrs A Martin [5053]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1223	There is no specific mention here of Chichester Harbour and its status as AONB, Special Protection Area, SSSI and Ramsar site. It is not appropriate to consider further development, particularly light industrial dev, so close to the harbour, mitigation is very unlikely to avoid significant adverse impact on the ecology of the area.		Comment	Ms. Lynda Marsh [7074]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1255	All development proposals must take account of relevant Surface Water Management Plans, Catchment Flood Management Plans and related flood defence plans and strategies. Add "Improve infrastructure for the removal of foul drainage"	Add "Improve infrastructure for the removal of foul drainage"	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1256	The Manhood Peninsula is not suitable for large scale development due the significant constraints	4.121 add "The flat nature of the landscape and the high water tide table present particular challenges for drainage of surface and foul sewers. This brings with it the increased risk of polluting existing watercourses".	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1335	As the peninsula is recognised for its tourist and leisure attractions it should be protected and further industrial and housing kept to a minimum especially as there is obvious danger due to flooding.	Reduce potential development of the peninsula.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1357	Green tourism is a vital part of the Manhood Peninsula economy. Overdevelopment spoiling the natural environment would be hugely detrimental. Chichester Harbour and surrounding area are designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and have the status of being a Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation, Site of Special Scientific Interest and is a Ramsar site. To consider development on the scale proposed in such close proximity to such an area is wholly inappropriate.	Any developments should take account of the impact on the ecology of the area and ensure that there is no adverse outcome and that there is no loss of green tourism in the region.	Object	Mr David Roue [7122]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1387	The impact on Ecology- Chichester Harbour and surrounding areas are designated as an Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty and have the status of being a Special Protection Area, Special Area Of Conservatiion, Site Of Scientific Interest and is a Ramsar site.	Move the proposed development It is WHOLLY INAPPROPRIATE to consider development on this scale in such close proximity to an area with this status. There will be a SIGNIFICANTLY adverse impact on the ecology of the area and MITIGATION IS NOT ENOUGH. A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the Buffer Zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1389	Green tourism is a very important part of the Manhood Peninsula economy and to over develop and spoil the natural environment which attracts this trade would be inappropriate and hugely detrimental	Move the proposed development site A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1456	Impact on ecology of proposals in the plan are unacceptable in terms of damage to the environment. Green Tourism is important part of the Peninsula's economy and these proposals risk damaging it.		Comment	Donnington Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann (Parish Clerk)) [888]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1580	Re. "4.124 The Council has adopted a plan titled 'Towards Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) on the Manhood Peninsula', which identifies management options for the coastal zone. It is an aspirational plan that reflects the views and objectives of the communities on the Peninsula. The document has been subject to public consultation and therefore has some weight as a material planning consideration." Please include this document in the Supporting Evidence (maybe a Background Paper?): http://www.chichester.gov.uk/article/30928/Supporting-evidence---Local-Plan-review		Comment	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1587	I specifically support: "5.Improve infrastructure to support sustainable modes of transport, especially cycle ways, bridleways and footpaths, including the National Coastal Footpath". As a resident of Parklands in Chichester city, new safe, convenient, attractive infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists would bring more of the Peninsula within reach without a car, promoting Health and Well-Being and social cohesion between local communities.		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	1593	What is the 'Towards ICZM' document? Policy S.18 includes "nice" aspirations but does not state anything particularly specific.		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	2103	Policy gives regard to ambition to encourage cycling as a natural alternative to car use.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	2196	We support the continued inclusion of this policy and the specific references to key Plans. We also support the intention that financial contributions should be sought to deliver both flood risk management infrastructure as well as improvements to the quality of watercourses in the area.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	2348	Objective 5 - while the objective is supported it should apply to all Non-Motorised User (NMU) activity. This could best be achieved by ensuring at least one multi-user route is provided around and through developments linked to the existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) and wider access networks.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	2880	Policy Point 5 Change to "... including the canal footpath and the National Coastal Footpath"; After point 5, insert a new point 6 (and change the existing point 6 to point 7). New text to read something like: "6. Preserve the current relatively dark skies of the Manhood, in order to preserve the present character of the peninsula and to reduce power consumption, and in the interests of tourism and cooperation with the Dark Skies policy of the National Park."	Policy Point 5 Change to "... including the canal footpath and the National Coastal Footpath"; After point 5, insert a new point 6 (and change the existing point 6 to point 7). New text to read something like: "6. Preserve the current relatively dark skies of the Manhood, in order to preserve the present character of the peninsula and to reduce power consumption, and in the interests of tourism and cooperation with the Dark Skies policy of the National Park."	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	3068	Suggest rewording opening paragraph of Policy S18	Reword to: "The Council will prepare plans, strategies, projects and other measures, in partnership with Chichester Harbour Conservancy and other organisations and local communities, to ensure that the Manhood Peninsula is planned for in a coordinated and integrated manner, whilst recognising the individual needs of the communities within the area."	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	3130	4.121 Third bullet-point to read: "Poor road accessibility and problems of traffic congestion result from lack of a safe cycle route and limited road connections to the north. Safe cycle routes, separate bus lanes funded by Work Place Parking Levy and improved bus services are needed to offer residents real and attractive choice in the way they travel." 4.122 Insert after first sentence "The whole Plan area needs to become carbon neutral by 2030 to prevent catastrophic climate impacts affecting the Manhood." Insert bullet-point 7 "Support the Plan area to become carbon neutral to prevent sea level rises by 2030."	4.121 Third bullet point to read: "Poor road accessibility and problems of traffic congestion result from lack of a safe cycle route and limited road connections to the north. Safe cycle routes, separate bus lanes funded by Work Place Parking Levy and improved bus services are needed to offer residents real and attractive choice in the way they travel." 4.122 Insert after first sentence "The whole Plan area needs to become carbon neutral by 2030 to prevent catastrophic climate impacts affecting the Manhood." Insert bullet point 7 "Support the Plan area to become carbon neutral to prevent sea level rises by 2030."	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
40	Policy S18: Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula	3459	Concerned about impact of development on ecology and Chichester Harbour AONB		Object	A + D Lygo-Baker [7425]
41	North of Plan Area	2250	Paragraph 2.2 of the Plan notes that the North of the Plan Area has "rich cultural and heritage assets". We are surprised, therefore, that paragraph 4.128 has no mention of these assets.	Reword paragraph 4.128 "This part of the plan area is predominantly rural with few sizeable settlements, characterised by undulating countryside with a high proportion of woodland, typical of the Low Weald landscape. Conserving the rural character of the area, with its high quality landscape and natural and historic environment, is a key objective".	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	95	The North of the district is probably more accessible to other areas than much of the southern part of the district. There is a need for more affordable housing throughout the SDNP and in villages and communities on its periphery		Comment	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	111	The north of chichester should take a larger share of the required housing, instead of stuffing it all in Southbourne and Tangmere. These were once rural areas too.	The north of chichester should take a larger share of the required housing, instead of stuffing it all in Southbourne and Tangmere. These were once rural areas too.	Object	Mrs Alice Smith [5409]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	694	If the north is generally excluded from development. Is it right that councillors who have no real insight into the uniqueness of the south have undue influence when voting on issues that are not going to affect their area? Seems very unfair.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	786	Plaistow village should have a defined settlement boundary that takes into its conservation area and with consideration of the many other housing development sites brought forward by Plaistow landowners.	A Settlement Boundary will be established for Plaistow village.	Object	Mrs C. Pierce [5886]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	1331	This policy does not go far enough to ensure that housing provision is balanced for various parts of the city and to include the provision for limited development within national park villages where housing is needed for those working locally and requiring affordable housing.	Clarify the extent and nature of allowed development.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	1877	Unequal distribution of housing between north of Chichester and along the A259		Comment	Jennie Horn [7223]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	1890	The SDNP (Policy S3, Policy S5 and Policy S19) should share some of the development or have a northern route around Chichester.		Comment	William Fleming [7227]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	2251	Historic England welcomes and supports "Conserve and enhance the rural character of the area, the quality of its landscape and the natural and historic environment;" in Policy S19 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	2837	The policy wording is too restrictive and does not allow flexibility for small scale housing that is not included in policies S3 and S5.	The first sentence should include the following wording at the end: ', as well as other small scale development on suitable, available and deliverable sites'.	Object	Casa Coevo [1734]
42	Policy S19: North of the Plan Area	3132	Last bullet point isn't compatible with WSCC's decision to cut bus services.	Insert "Improve accessibility by safeguarding bus services to facilities".	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
e. Strategic Policies						
43	Strategic Policies					
44	Design	377	Design 5.1 refers to...in beautiful countryside close to the SDNP which is outside the Plan area but omits reference to the Chichester Harbour AONB which is within it .in 5.1 insert 'which includes the Chichester Harbour AONB and its special designations'... and then followed by 'and close to the SDNP outside the Plan Area'		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
44	Design	1211	Under Para 5.1 'The Chichester plan area is a desirable place in which to live with an outstanding historic environment and attractive villages in beautiful countryside close to the South Downs National Park (SDNP)' AMEND TO ADD 'and Chichester Harbour AONB'		Comment	Ms. Lynda Marsh [7074]
44	Design	2252	Historic England welcomes paragraph 5.1 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Strictly-speaking, historic parks and gardens are registered for their special historic interest rather than their protection per se, but one of the purposes of Registration is to encourage appropriate protection and inclusion on the Register is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Historic England welcomes paragraph 5.5.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
44	Design	2594	The ninth line of paragraph 5.3 should be worded: "...establish or maintain a strong sense of place..."	The ninth line of paragraph 5.3 should be worded: "...establish or maintain a strong sense of place..."	Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
45	Policy S20: Design	117	5.8 Are garages necessary? Very few owners of garages use them to store their cars. Perhaps storage facilities would be more acceptable and less expensive.		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
45	Policy S20: Design	127	On Policy S20: Design * The Chichester Society welcome this additional policy and support its purpose in the Plan		Support	Chichester Society (Mr Christopher Mead-Briggs) [802]
45	Policy S20: Design	242	Agree with Point 12 .		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
45	Policy S20: Design	380	Add to point 3 "foot/cycle paths" before "streets, routes and spaces".		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
45	Policy S20: Design	446	There should be a requirement for new buildings to be carbon neutral	All new buildings will be required to be carbon neutral in line with the need to massively reduce carbon emissions in the next 12 years.	Object	Ms Rachel Ritchie [6830]
45	Policy S20: Design	486	5.1 A whole paragraph submitted about the SDNP which is outside this plan area!! This should be all about the Chichester Harbour AONB, RAMSAR, SSI, SPA which is within the Local Plan Area and is most affected by the majority of the policies! The Tourism alone within Chichester Harbour, Medmerry and Pagham brings in on last count £141M in tourism revenue to the District!!!	Take out SDNP and put in the Chichester Harbour AONB, Pagham and Medmerry Harbours which are within the plan area!	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
45	Policy S20: Design	587	Chichester is a flat small but growing city and community. This is a plea to learn from larger city infrastructures for non-car traffic eg Cambridge, Brighton, Bristol, Copenhagen, Switzerland to create cycle routes that are safe to use.		Comment	Julia Smith [6865]
45	Policy S20: Design	695	Not always the case though. Often existing communities views are ignored. They are a valuable resource and their experience and knowledge should be involved at the planning stages to ensure well balanced integrated developments that don't then impact on existing neighbouring areas ie Graylingwell where the punitive parking system has had a huge negative knock on effect on existing residential areas, now clogged with over spills car parking from new development.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
45	Policy S20: Design	719	We welcome this additional policy and support its purpose in the plan.		Support	West Itchenor Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1036]
45	Policy S20: Design	728	Support the aims embodied in this policy.		Support	St Pancras church (Mr Derek Mumford) [6909]
45	Policy S20: Design	973	Policies need to be adhered to by CDC when determining applications and there is little evidence of this happening at present. Policy S20 introduces the concept of 'Sense of Place' and the importance of getting scale, height density right. This is a laudable aspiration which has been ignored in the past.	Ensure the policy is enforced when determining all planning applications	Comment	Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (Mr Alan Green) [788]
45	Policy S20: Design	1131	Bullet point 5 - wording is supported "incorporates and/or links to high quality Green Infrastructure and landscaping to enhance biodiversity and meet recreational needs, including public rights of way." However, it is important as mentioned above that this includes 'multi-use' public rights of way for the benefit of all.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
45	Policy S20: Design	1257	The scale of development that is planned for the rural and coastal areas will effect change of character of the peninsula and thereby defeat the first policy objective that development 'responds positively to the site and its surroundings' ...	Further consideration needs to be given to alternative site allocations	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
45	Policy S20: Design	1321	Public Art can be used as part of economic regeneration as well as contributing to the amenities of an area. I cannot see a policy which covers this in this document. Please add a Public Art Policy.		Comment	Mrs Lynne Friel [4991]
45	Policy S20: Design	1615	Generally strongly support but needs explicit reference to trees, as increased tree planting is a Government policy objective and there is an increasing body of evidence in relation to the benefits of trees. Cycle parking needs to be referenced in the same terms as car parking in para. 5.8. Chichester Tree Wardens may wish to follow this up. Parklands Residents' Association may wish to support Policy S20 more generally, if changes are proposed.	In Policy S20, suggest an additional bullet point along the lines of: "incorporates trees" (this could reference increased tree planting is a Government policy objective; and/or acknowledge the benefits of tree that complement many of the other bullet points). In para. 5.8. Add "and cycle" to read "Car and cycle parking spaces should therefore be an integral part of the layout and design of the new dwelling."	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
45	Policy S20: Design	1678	Support Policy S20		Support	Chichester BID (Mr Colin Hicks) [7190]
45	Policy S20: Design	1842	I welcome this proposed additional policy to be used positively to protect our City against the creep of dumbing down with the poor design quality of new housing estates and ill-considered extensions and alterations to existing housing.		Support	Mr Andrew Bain [7217]
45	Policy S20: Design	2104	Support S20 as it recognises requirements of NPPF.		Support	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
45	Policy S20: Design	2197	We support the specific requirements of this policy in point 5 and 8 with regard to green infrastructure and enhancing biodiversity and climate change resilience.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
45	Policy S20: Design	2253	Historic England welcomes and supports Policy S20, particularly the references to history, historic character and local identity in clause 1, sense of place in clause 2, character in clause 8 and high quality public realm in clause 11 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, we would also like to see a specific clause relating to heritage assets.	Add a new clause; "conserves or enhances the significance, special interest, character and appearance of heritage assets".	Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
45	Policy S20: Design	2349	Bullet point 5 - the objective is supported but should recognise that this includes multi-use PRoW for the use and benefit of all.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
45	Policy S20: Design	2384	Agree with policy S20 and would add: - Need for public transport that does not end in the evening - Need for good bicycle access		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
45	Policy S20: Design	2422	We consider that the wording of this policy could be more proactive by including wording to direct people to 'respect and respond to the National Park landscape, its setting and purposes prior to development design'.	Include wording to direct people to 'respect and respond to the National Park landscape, its setting and purposes prior to development design'.	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
45	Policy S20: Design	2638	Support policy.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
45	Policy S20: Design	2728	We are supportive of the 5th bullet point within this policy which highlights the importance of Green Infrastructure and landscape to enhance biodiversity and meet recreational needs, including public rights of way. This is in line with paragraph 20d and 91c of the NPPF.		Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
45	Policy S20: Design	2881	Support5.1-5.7. Points2-13. Point1: Delete "whilst not preventing innovative responses to context;" Object5.8: Change to- Car parking requires careful consideration. Parking requires inefficient land take, given over to expensive assets that depreciate fast and, on average, remain parked 90% of the time. In suitable locations, developers should therefore consider reducing land take by offering alternatives to car parking, notably car clubs and public transport, and making walking & cycling easier than the car for short journeys. Otherwise parking spaces should be an integral part of the layout and design of the new dwelling. Care is required to ensure that parking is convenient.	CHANGE TO 5.8 Car parking requires careful consideration. Parking requires inefficient land take, given over to expensive assets that depreciate fast and, on average, remain parked for 90% of the time. In suitable locations, developers should therefore consider reducing land take by offering alternatives to car parking, notably car clubs and public transport, and making walking and cycling easier than the car for short journeys. Otherwise parking spaces should be an integral part of the layout and design of the new dwelling. Care is required to ensure that parking is convenient POLICY S20 - Point 1: Delete "whilst not preventing innovative responses to context;"	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
45	Policy S20: Design	2968	Sections 5.1 to 5.7 SUPPORT - But why does so little of this sentiment show through on the ground at (1) Whitehouse farm, (2) Shopwhyke Lakes, (3) Odds Farm, and in so much of the infilling currently going on (notably in Summerdale on Lavant Road - where is the sense of place in the outsized new builds going in there, and the loss of hedges). POLICY S20 - Points 2 to 13 SUPPORT		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
45	Policy S20: Design	3069	It is unclear whether all of 1-13 need to be met in order to satisfy the policy.	It is suggested that the following text is used instead: "Applicants shall demonstrate they have given consideration to the following:" To insert the word "and" after 12, to read ..."external storage; and"	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
45	Policy S20: Design	3133	Need design to support modal shift to prevent climate change and reduce overreliance on car use. 5.8 Change to read: "Spaces should be away from houses to encourage people to walk and cycle first. Housing should be decided in community focussed people centred places where social interreaction and neighbourliness comes before ease of getting to your car." Policy Point 13: Insert "...taking into account landform, layout, building orientation for solar panels, massing..."	5.8 Change to read: "Spaces should be away from houses to encourage people to walk and cycle first. Housing should be decided in community focussed people centred places where social interreaction and neighbourliness comes before ease of getting to your car." Policy Point 13: Insert "...taking into account landform, layout, building orientation for solar panels, massing..."	Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
45	Policy S20: Design	3181	Policy '4' - Prioritising pedestrian and cycle movements... ensuring that the needs of vehicular transport does not dominate..... I am in favour of this prioritisation of alternative and sustainable modes.		Support	Martyn Chuter [7380]
45	Policy S20: Design	3248	Support policy.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
45	Policy S20: Design	3512	Suburban housing growth promoted without a true recognition of infrastructure needs and a consequential increase in car borne journeys and loss of greenspace. Often, bland design and over-developed sub-urban layouts, tacked on to urban edges, meet local needs and offer people an opportunity to own or rent a home, but consequentially erode the community and character of locations to the long-term detriment of its economic base, identity and community distinctiveness; this is particularly true of cities such as Chichester, where the overall character and ambience underpins much of its economic success.		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
46	Planning for Health and Wellbeing	696	Much more needs to be included to encourage healthy living such as all facilities being within walking distance.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
46	Planning for Health and Wellbeing	950	5.9 to 5.11 and Policy S21 should include that proposals that worsen conditions or detract from the aims will be unacceptable		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
46	Planning for Health and Wellbeing	1800	Dementia care provision through care homes or other safe green spaces should be considered as part of wellbeing planning. Need for such services is expected to increase and communities should not be left without adequate provision for want of a specific policy - there is no specific planning policy protecting or necessitating dementia care facilities and this has caused issues in the past.		Comment	Anna Khoo [7196]
46	Planning for Health and Wellbeing	2350	Para 5.9 - this objective is supported but should encourage all NMU activity not limited to walking and cycling.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
46	Planning for Health and Wellbeing	3136	Insert as last paragraph Safe, segregated cycle facilities that enable children from the age of 8 up to elderly residents of 80 should be included. Quote Mayor of Bogata.	Insert as last paragraph "Safe, segregated cycle facilities that enable children from the age of 8 up to elderly residents of 80, should be included."	Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	493	Health & Well being: There is no mention of young people. Youth Centres are vital not only to help the students achieve their potentials, but also because it is safer for the older people if the kids are off the streets!		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	1000	There is no provision shown to increase access/availability to GPs. St. Richard's hospital is not a major trauma centre and lacks many key departments. There is no mention of provision of care for elderly/dementia sufferers - a large proportion of local residents are already retired/elderly.		Comment	The Hon Susan Barnes [6999]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	1258	The impact of the unprecedented scale of development is likely to have a detrimental impact on health and wellbeing because of extreme traffic congestion, loss of natural environment and recreational spaces to existing communities, increased pollution, higher strain on infrastructure such as schools, health and social facilities.	The policy needs to specify in much more detail what measures are required,	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	1309	All proposals that are for new development are strongly supported by Bosham Football Club. Where appropriate the new development should meet the contribution to a healthier community and for the football club to meet the needs of children, young people and older people. The policy can only be implemented over time if it is written within Policy S12, S32 It is worth noting that this policy will not count for nothing unless the Infrastructure delivery plan is actioned as current restriction inhibit inclusive use for current members.		Support	Bosham Football Club (Mr Neil Redman) [748]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	1622	<p>Strongly support, but would love you to lose the "where appropriate" at the end. I am struggling to imagine why such measures would not be integral to any development.</p> <p>N.B. As a Committee member of Parklands' Residents' Association (PRA), please note that PRA may wish to expand on this support, including with the Inspector at Examination in Public, if material changes are proposed during the Local Plan Review process.</p>		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	2017	<p>I note that this policy states:</p> <p>All proposals for new development should improve and promote strong, vibrant and healthy communities. Measures that contribute to healthier communities and support health, social and cultural wellbeing, must be incorporated in a development where appropriate.</p> <p>Sport England broadly supports this and is of the view that this policy could be strengthened through reference to Sport England's Active Design guidance.</p>		Comment	Sport England (Ms Laura Hutson) [1308]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	2639	Support policy.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	2942	This policy is pretty bland and it is difficult to see how it would be applied in a way which makes a real difference to health and well-being.	<p>We would like greater alignment with Government Guidance: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p> <p>At the very least , this policy should indicates the types of development where some health and wellbeing issues might arise , such as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Provision for walking and cycling in larger housing developments * Avoiding some forms of development (health and education) in areas with poor air quality * Fast food outlets near schools * Mitigating the impacts of climate change 	Object	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	3070	The wording of S21 is very general. The commitment from the LPA towards this new policy does not come across.	There is an opportunity to highlight the health benefits of sailing and boating, walking, cycling and enjoying nature. These activities help to reduce stress and improve mental wellbeing. Special reference could be made to Chichester Harbour as destination to participate in those activities.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	3217	Insert in policy "Due to the increasing numbers of people in the local Plan Area, increased health care provision in surgeries and the hospital must be planned for".	Insert in policy "Due to the increasing numbers of people in the local Plan Area, increased health care provision in surgeries and the hospital must be planned for".	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
47	Policy S21: Health and Wellbeing	3249	Support policy.		Support	WSSC (Estates) [6889]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
48	Historic Environment	2254	<p>Supports paragraph 5.12</p> <p>Welcome in principle 5.13.</p> <p>There is, therefore, a clear onus to be placed upon the applicant/developer to identify and describe the significance of any heritage assets affected.</p> <p>Paragraphs 193, 194, 195 and 196 of the Framework set out how local planning authorities should consider the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset. We believe that this could usefully be summarised in the Plan.</p>	<p>Reword paragraph 5.13;</p> <p>"Where development proposals might affect a heritage asset the Council will identify and assess the particular significance of the heritage asset and take that significance into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal".</p> <p>Add new paragraphs;</p> <p>"For applications which affect, or have the potential to affect, heritage assets the applicant will be expected to describe the significance of the asset and its setting, using appropriate expertise; at a level of detail proportionate to its significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal; using appropriate references such as the Historic Environment Record and, if necessary, original survey (including, for assets of archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation)";</p> <p>"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Council will give great weight to the asset's conservation. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), will require clear and convincing justification"; and</p> <p>"The Council will refuse proposals that would lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the circumstances in paragraph 195 of the National Planning Policy Framework apply. For proposals that would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Council will weigh this harm against the public benefits of the proposal".</p>	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	729	Support in principle, especially acknowledgement of the need for enabling development in some circumstances.		Support	St Pancras church (Mr Derek Mumford) [6909]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	915	This all sounds so very good but actually tells us nothing concrete - basically the council say it believes heritage assets are a good thing but given the lack of Conservation Staff and reduction of archaeologists etc the evidence suggests that it is just lip service. The District Council's flagrant blind eye to the damage in Priory Park by the Ice Rink says all we need to know about their stance.		Comment	Mrs Teresa Carlisle [6968]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	974	With no Conservation Officers on the staff preparation of CACAs is falling woefully behind. The revision to the Chichester CACA is still not completed over two years on.	Commit to filling the Conservation Officer posts and completing all the CACAs as a matter of urgency	Comment	Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (Mr Alan Green) [788]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	1170	Need to be concise in the Plan about the importance of preliminary evaluation (following NPPF 187 and 189 etc) so that the resource implications (time as well as financial) of new housing development upon hitherto unknown, below ground archaeological remains are fully factored in to the proposals and irreplaceable data about the Plan area's heritage is not lost.		Support	Mr Mark Taylor [7057]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	1482	We support this policy.		Support	The Theatres Trust (Planning Policy Officer) [1009]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	1628	I am completely unsure on this one! I like the wording of para.s 5.12 to 5.14, but am not convinced by the Policy wording - it feels very different to Policy 47 Heritage and Design in the current Local Plan. There is no supporting evidence at http://www.chichester.gov.uk/article/30928/Supporting-evidence---Local-Plan-review - has the Historic Environment Action Plan/Strategy been done?		Comment	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	2256	Support policy. Improve supporting text to explain more about approach to heritage at risk e.g. from Chichester HES and Action Plan. Consider that the Plan sets out an adequate positive strategy for conservation and enjoyment of historic environment.	Add a new paragraph explaining what "heritage at risk" is and the Council's approach to assets at risk e.g. "Unfortunately, heritage assets can be at risk from neglect, decay or other threats. Designated assets at risk, with the exception of Grade II secular buildings and Grade II places of worship used less than six times a year, are identified on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register. Within the district outside the South Downs National Park, six assets are on the Register (February 2018): three scheduled monuments, two listed buildings and one conservation area. The Council will actively seek to address threats to heritage assets by recording and monitoring Heritage at Risk in Chichester District, publishing it on our website and working with the owners of heritage assets at risk to find solutions and secure repairs to bring them back into active use, including where appropriate viable new uses and/or proposals for enabling development so they are preserved for future generations."	Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	2582	Heritage assets should also include all historic routes be they pedestrian, cycle, or vehicular (eg Stane Street, Centurion Way, and 'twittens').		Object	Lavant Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1116]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	2658	Support policy but request addition to criterion 5 to encourage the Council to take a positive approach to improvement of heritage assets which are at risk or vulnerable to risk.	Specific ref to supporting development proposals which bring disused or redundant designated and non-designated heritage assets back into meaningful use, such as underutilised agricultural barns. Addition to criterion 5 to encourage the Council to take a positive approach to improvement of heritage assets which are at risk or vulnerable to risk.	Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	2969	POLICY S22 SUPPORT Last paragraph - Can the same message be written more clearly?		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	3071	There is a lack of evidence supporting this important policy.	Some facts and figures would be useful in S22, for example number of HER sites, number of Grade I, II and II* Listed Buildings, number of Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, etc. The wording of the last sentence in the policy could be clearer.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	3138	Object on grounds that definition of "heritage" is too narrow and leads to loss of buildings.	Insert a new point: "Heritage should be widened to consider buildings of later dates. To limit our Climate change risks, an analysis should be carried out to ascertain whether it is better for the Plan area's carbon footprint to demolish older buildings and replace with new carbon neutral build or to retrofit and to preserve examples of 20th century architecture"	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	3250	Support policy.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	3506	Only historic evidence is Historic Environment Strategy which we do not consider forms an adequate evidence base. Should consider if archaeological evidence and significance of the city is understood and available. Expect the Council to have an adequate up to date and relevant historic environment evidence base.		Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
49	Policy S22: Historic Environment	3513	The "Cathedral Cities Initiative", seeks to recognise the economic and heritage importance of protecting the form and context of the country's important cathedral cities and historic market towns. By providing clear, precise and 'joined up' planning policy protection, that directs new development and associated infrastructure appropriately to sites best able to accommodate it in terms of benefits to the community as a whole, it will prevent inappropriate inner-urban and sub-urban development that will cumulatively destroy the true character and distinctiveness of the city.		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
50	Transport Infrastructure	33	Paragraph 5.22 states that 'Furthermore, the A27 and many local roads are often significantly over capacity.' There is no evidence that the A27 as a road is over capacity. Within previous reviews by HE, Atkins and others no conclusion was ever drawn that the road was over capacity. The reports all concluded that the junctions were over capacity but the road itself has adequate capacity. The recent Peter Brett report again makes reference to junction capacity but NOT to road capacity. This is a clear difference and the wording of para 5.22 is misleading.	This paragraph should be amended for clarity The last sentence of Paragraph 5.22 should read 'Furthermore, the A27 with the current junctions design, and many local roads are often significantly over capacity.'	Object	Mr Ben Kirk [6563]
50	Transport Infrastructure	193	So in summary the plan talks about congested rural roads and such phrases as discouraging HGV's there but the plan to build hundreds and maybe thousands more houses on the Manhood Peninsula does not represent these points. Highways West Sussex have no mechanism to look at the combined effect of multiple sites.	CDC should use the Localism Act and any other statutory instrument to quantify the ACCUMULATIVE damage done by the hundreds of houses already built and in the pipeline. Additionally they should then study what additional impact new developments would have in increments of 250 up to 2,000.	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
50	Transport Infrastructure	265	With reference to park and ride sites for Chichester: would a more sustainable alternative be to enhance bus service frequencies, perhaps with new peak-time only routes?		Comment	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
50	Transport Infrastructure	278	No online changes to the A27 and no relief road.	Start again!	Object	David Dean [6735]
50	Transport Infrastructure	319	5.24 At a meeting of the Council in June 2018, it was resolved that in the event of a future opportunity to apply for central government funding for new road schemes becoming available, support is given to a northern alignment for the A27 as a PREFERRED OPTION .. It is stated that this decision was made after a LONG PROCESS OF LISTENING to the views of the community, attending the Build a Better A27 group meetings and considering the views of SYSTRA and select committee.	THE NORTHERN ALIGNMENT FOR THE A27 SHOULD NOT BE THE PREFERRED OPTION. It is clear that the majority of people in Chichester do NOT support the northern alignment for the A27. In fact, the number of people who supported a northern option were in a MINORITY in both the original public consultation and the subsequent survey managed by the Chichester Observer. It is also important to note also that the BABA27 group is a non-elected body that does not necessarily represent the views of the wider population of Chichester	Object	Mr Brian Hebblethwaite [6762]
50	Transport Infrastructure	342	Concerns re: road infrastructure in Southbourne around railway crossing. Already can't cope with volume of cars which are often gridlocked at school start/finish times particularly. There is insufficient evidence that this has been tackled in the plan. Trains will be no less frequent (so barriers will be down regularly), and increased volume of cars sitting in traffic jams will result in increased pollution also. We are also very concerned about the knock-on effect in terms of traffic in nearby Westbourne village.	Review of number of houses proposed - I can't see how the roads could be improved when there is the issue of the railway crossing. Certainly mini roundabout near farm shop will be no where near sufficient but there is not enough space for anything more substantial	Object	Dr Christine Bowen [6780]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
50	Transport Infrastructure	505	5.19. : Pollution from cars is much worse when the traffic is stationary. 12,390 additional houses will add to the already overloaded A27. Any roadworks designed to mitigate this will make the situation ten times worse during the construction phase. That is why the Northern route should be done first as it would alleviate a lot of the current pressure and provide a diversion for later improvements to the existing road.		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
50	Transport Infrastructure	564	This is a large document, so perhaps I have missed this part: What is the policy regarding asking Network Rail to invest in 21st Century signalling systems to improve delays at the Level Crossings in Chichester. These cause unacceptable delays to traffic, and works on the A27, and the resulting changes to some of the existing roundabouts will send more local traffic into the town, making these delays worse than they are now.		Comment	Mr Richard Openshaw [1949]
50	Transport Infrastructure	591	The emphasis on sustainable transport is not borne out in practice. 5.16 and 5.17 must specifically support cycle routes within the city and build more, they must protect national cycle route 2 and Centurion Way, and enhance these routes to make them safe for people to use.		Support	Julia Smith [6865]
50	Transport Infrastructure	698	It is very nice to include what should be done to A27 junctions but this cannot and should not be included in the plan as nothing has been decided. Infact it is all very much undecided. HE have not been consulted/or given an opinion in this plan, therefore there is no funding for any route . Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, i will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Any mention of upgrades, whether they be A27 or northern bypass should be removed from the plan and discounted until firm funding/ decisions have been secured. And now decisions on developments that rely on these should be considered until such time as proper studies and consultations have been concluded.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
50	Transport Infrastructure	866	Comments on Air Quality assessment and implications of cost of proposed A27 works on Plan viability. Comments on long term strategic solution. Question on Chichester City road junction schemes. Minor wording amend - Line 2 (in printed doc.) - delete second "be" and after "S278" insert "Agreements" for clarity.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
50	Transport Infrastructure	883	Proposed Fishbourne roundabout improvements are inadequate to accommodate proposed developments which access Chichester along the A259 as evidenced by assessments carried out by highways England and West Sussex County Council.	No new developments which result in increased traffic through Fishbourne roundabout should be permitted before grade separation of the A27 Fishbourne roundabout or a A27 Northern bypass is built.	Object	Ms Sylvia Radford [6957]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
50	Transport Infrastructure	894	Peter Brett's recycled concepts have had public consultation on several occasions and have been roundly rejected each time. As agreed by a clear majority consensus at the BABA27 workshops, what is needed is to separate 48% through traffic from local via a proper bypass to the North. This will bring the current A27 back to 1990 levels and would mean its capacity will continue well after 2035 and the proposed housing in this plan. Wasting money on this short term fix which doesn't actually solve anything but makes congestion and air quality worse leading to a huge waste of money.	<p>5.16 Include The A27 is the only Strategic Route on the South Coast between Folkestone and Honiton. It is also Chichester residents' local distributor road. This means that the local traffic mixes with 48% through traffic of which a large proportion are HGV vehicles between the major ports of Southampton, Portsmouth and Dover. Chichester's section of the A27 is the only part of the Strategic Route without a diversionary route, so if there is an accident on it there is no alternative route for the through traffic, the local traffic and the visiting tourists.</p> <p>5.19 first sentence include after "Chichester City" and on the Manhood Peninsula. Take out the word Bypass from Chichester A27 bypass.</p> <p>5.20 "The rural" include and coastal parts of the plan area.</p> <p>5.21 Add to "Projected growth in road journey" from THE THROUGH TRAFFIC ON THE A27, the existing population, together with new housing....." "...increased queueing times around the....within Chichester City AND MANHOOD PENINSULA AND EAST WEST CORRIDOR</p> <p>5.31 Take out the junction improvements for Fishbourne Roundabout, Stockbridge Roundabout, Whyke Roundabout. The RAISED New Road connecting Birdham to A27 Fishbourne Roundabout. PBS did not consider the impact of these changes during the summer season when Selsey alone doubles in resident numbers.</p>	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
50	Transport Infrastructure	899	Please include names of some of the important cycle paths referred to at the end of section 5.16 In particular Centurion Way (National Cycle Route 88), Salterns Way, Chichester to Bognor Regis (National Cycle Route 2) and Chichester to Emsworth (National Cycle Route 2)		Comment	Mr Mark Record [6963]
50	Transport Infrastructure	910	Given the projections for an increasingly ageing population is a strategy built around the promotion of increased cycling and walking viable in the long term? Similarly, integrated transport systems are to be applauded except that the provision of real-time travel information, upon which the efficiency of such integration depends, relies upon easy internet access through the use of smartphones, thus disadvantaging anyone who either does not have one or who does not feel confident in using same.		Comment	Mr Robert Carlisle [6969]
50	Transport Infrastructure	914	Any 'improvements' to the A27 must be done sympathetically with an overarching regard to the quality of life of those residents who live near to the road itself.		Comment	Mr Robert Carlisle [6969]
50	Transport Infrastructure	932	Access roads to the Manhood peninsula are already stretched to capacity at most times of the day. During the Summer the A286 to the Witterings is frequently completely blocked as far as the Stockbridge roundabout. Until a serious plan has been implemented to cope with the existing traffic volumes it would be bordering on total incompetence by the planning authorities to allow construction of any further properties.	<p>The A126 would have to be widened in order to accommodate further housing development.</p> <p>In fact during the summer there is a strong argument that there is already a case for this</p>	Object	Mr Barrie Allsop [6972]
50	Transport Infrastructure	941	The A27 bypass issue should be resolved before any further development takes place. Preference for northern bypass.	The details of the northern route options should be made available and this option should be given more serious attention by Highways England as well as WSCC and CDC	Object	Mr Barrie Allsop [6972]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
50	Transport Infrastructure	943	<p>The concept that the effects of new development can be mitigated for in isolation from existing traffic problems is fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>The problems arising from the already seriously conflicted strategic/local A27, have become so severe (among worst 10% for accidents/ 3rd worst for congestion after 2 sections of the M25), that the PBA mitigation measures will be insignificant by comparison. The PBA concepts have been recycled and found wanting so many times. There is nothing to suggest that will now be different. Road users will look for respite and for a long term solution in vain.</p>	<p>-5.16 .delete... strategic road link between Havant and Eastbourne', and replace :the A27 is part of the Strategic Route Network connecting the south coast from Folkestone to Honiton, including the major ports of Portsmouth and Southampton.It is also a local road with five junctions within a four mile stretch where local and through traffic compete for space'.</p> <p>5.19 amend to include:... congestion in the City, ON THE MANHOOD PENINSULA, and the A27 junctions.</p> <p>5.27 add: effects of behavioural change will be limited</p> <p>5.29 add: benefits of Park and Ride will be limited</p>	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
50	Transport Infrastructure	967	<p>Use of initiatives e.g bus service will only work if car use is properly discouraged.</p> <p>Highways England's rejection of northern bypass should be challenged, it is the only one which will provide a long term solution.</p> <p>Addition of traffic lights to Stockbridge roundabout will improve for those trying to cross it. Abolition of right turns will be inconvenience.</p>	<p>Make bus use the sensible option by restricting car parking in new developments. Continue to press for a northern option for the A27</p>	Object	Mr Alan Green [6991]
50	Transport Infrastructure	980	<p>Transport model incorrect and outdated.</p> <p>Link road and AL6 cannot be included as no funding for it or the upgrade of junctions at Fishbourne roundabout.</p> <p>No evidence the correct and proper consultation with Highways England has taken place.</p>		Object	Mrs Margaret Holdstock [6013]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1041	<p>The Council should not be proposing changes to the A27 until the outcome of discussions with the Highways Agency is known.</p> <p>The changes proposed are similar to those in the Highways Agency consultation which were rejected by the residents. It is not appropriate for the Council to implement them.</p> <p>Many of these changes are of limited benefit and will force traffic onto local streets if access to the A27 is restricted on the junctions at Stockbridge and Wyke.</p> <p>The proposal to build a new link road across the floodplain through an AONB, ruining the views of the Cathedral is appalling.</p>	<p>The Council should make it clear that discussions with the Highways Agency to improve the road network are ongoing.</p> <p>The Council should be focusing on improving local transport links on existing roads to the south of the City and ensuring that traffic can move easily north-south across the A27.</p>	Object	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1059	<p>Plan fails to address traffic volume now and in future.</p> <p>No viable transport study, 2010 version is incorrect and outdated - this needs to be addressed in future iterations of the plan.</p>		Object	Mr Brian Horn [7020]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1067	<p>A259 only access for developments in E-W corridor to A27 and the city. Traffic inc lorries and agricultural machinery will increase as bus services/trains are cut.</p> <p>No further development should take place until A27 is resolved.</p>		Comment	Libby Alexander [7023]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1109	<p>I urge the authorities to implement the improvements to the A 27 junctions the local plan committing to doing, without further delay.</p>	<p>Radical re-structure of Fishbourne roundabout, with A27 continuing to run unrestricted and north/south traffic crossing via a 350 mt tunnel joining the approach roads would easily be tanked with back up pumping. Brunel made Rotherhithe tunnel below the Thames in 1855, twice as long and by hand digging.....get on with it.</p>	Object	Mr mark Jeffries [6943]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
50	Transport Infrastructure	1125	<p>CDCF are pleased to see that CDC's Local Plan sets out a commitment to improve the highway infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Sustainable transport, such as cycling, buses and trains are the only solution and for the former, a decent cycle route must be put in place to encourage the population to leave their cars at home.</p> <p>Require developers to finance cycle infrastructure improvements to encourage their 'new residents' to cycle or walk.</p>		Support	Chichester and District Cycle Forum (Mr Ian Smith) [7054]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1132	<p>Para 5.15 - very good to see "bridleways" included in this para.</p> <p>Para 5.16 - The wording "There is an extensive public rights of way network across the plan area... is misleading. The wording implies that this path network is available to all users, whereas on the Coastal Plain the path network consists almost entirely of footpaths, which are not available for use by cyclists and equestrians. Upgrading appropriate/suitable path to bridleways would contribute to the West Sussex Transport Plan (2011-2026) aim of "improving safety for all road users", mentioned in para 5.18.</p>		Comment	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1187	Support investigation into northern alignment as a preferred option (but with more analysis of costs and options for achieving a solution for through traffic). Object to 'left exit' only junctions as these are likely to worsen congestion within Chichester and its parallel roads and streets north of the A27 and cause traffic churn and potential congestion on the A27 by-pass itself (therefore self-defeating).		Comment	Mr Mark Taylor [7057]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1193	<p>Limited emphasis on an integrated public transport system which is essential to avoid congestion and pollution.</p> <p>Upgrades to the Fishbourne roundabout will not rectify the congestion currently. It will be made worse by the planned link Road to Birdham.</p> <p>The traffic from an additional 2250 homes travelling east will severely impact the traffic flow from commuters and beach traffic.</p> <p>The Impact on the A259 will be further worsened by the lack of planned slip roads between Emsworth and Fishbourne.</p> <p>Deterioration in air quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * plans to mitigate the increased pressure on the A259 to be researched and included * robust plans to construct integrated safe cycle ways particularly from Chichester to Emsworth by working with Chemroute. * Costed plan to create a truly integrated and affordable public transport system 	Object	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1594	Para. 5.26. This should not be considered as part of this plan. WSCC/CDC prefer a new bypass to the north of the city and this should be pursued vigorously with the Department for Transport and Highways England.	Remove	Object	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1680	CDC needs to work with HE for a long term strategy.	<p>Park and ride is needed now for both consideration of events (Goodwood and beach days) and for normal activities including employees in Chichester including East Pallant house. I believe that the site allocated for employment space to the SW in level 2 and 3 floodplain is perfect for a park and ride</p> <p>The council must remove a southern link road from the local plan.</p> <p>All infrastructure funding must reflect a mitigated northern route and integrate with it when it is finally delivered.</p>	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1689	CDC needs to work with HE for a long term strategy.	<p>Park and ride is needed now for both consideration of events (Goodwood and beach days) and for normal activities including employees in Chichester including East Pallant house. I believe that the site allocated for employment space to the SW in level 2 and 3 floodplain is perfect for a park and ride</p> <p>The council must remove a southern link road from the local plan.</p> <p>All infrastructure funding must reflect a mitigated northern route and integrate with it when it is finally delivered.</p>	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
50	Transport Infrastructure	1749	<p>5.15 The plan provides insufficient detail for the provision of cycle routes on all new developments. Cycle routes should be part of the agreed outline and not set down later. All new developments MUST have dedicated cycle routes that link in with existing routes on the highways.</p> <p>5.19 We believe the level of housing proposed along the a259 will cause major holdups at the Fishbourne roundabout. This will be damaging to business, tourism and the local population.</p>	more cycle routes	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1829	Section 5.16 lists specific roads but not cycle paths, it would make sense to include existing cycle paths such as Centurion Way, Salterns way, the Bognor cycle way and the south coast cycle route.		Comment	Mr Bruce Brechin [7213]
50	Transport Infrastructure	2095	<p>Recommended strategy has several risks to deliverability and acceptability associated with it, which require further work to be undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of mitigation exceeds figure supported by value of developer contributions therefore strategy will depend on external funding. - Need to ensure land outside highway boundary is available - LPR should set out how it will deal with funding uncertainty - Feasibility work necessary prior to submission - Sustainable transport measures required to mitigate planned developments - through more detailed assessment of sites including pre-app. <p>W of Chichester could act as corridor for increase volumes of non-motorised access.</p>		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
50	Transport Infrastructure	2351	<p>Para 5.15 - the inclusion of bridleways is welcomed but there should be specific inclusion of PRoW</p> <p>Para 5.16 - the wording is misleading as the provision of bridleways on the Coastal Plain is very limited, restricting access for cyclists and equestrians. Upgrading suitable PRoW to bridleways would improve access for all NMUs and contribute to the West Sussex Transport Plan (2011-2016) to improve safety for all road users.</p>		Comment	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
50	Transport Infrastructure	2470	Support para 5.27 - supports Southbournes desire of pedestrian bridge over railway.	Requirement for bridge to be included in policy.	Support	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
50	Transport Infrastructure	2904	<p>Para 5.19 Transport Infrastructure: Re: A27 - serious disruption occurs every sunny weekend in summer with people trying to get to Manhood peninsula, particularly the beaches at West Wittering, and during events at Goodwood motor circuit, and horse race track.</p> <p>Para 5.22: Current A27 inadequate. It is congested, dangerous, and polluting.</p> <p>Para 5.28: is manifestly unproven and a statement of hope largely not supported by observation on the ground, unless the improvements to the A27 include an offline route that separates through traffic from local traffic. Concern over time taken for any improvements. This must be opposed by CDC</p>		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
50	Transport Infrastructure	3143	Object on grounds that: over-reliance on private car; trains, cycle and walking networks must be included; local communities not always included; not working effectively with WSCC; new road connecting Birdham Road to A27 Fisbourne does not help climate commitments.	<p>5.16 Insert "and a number of nationally important cycle paths including the Salterns Way and Centurion Way that need to be preserved and enhanced".</p> <p>5.18 Insert "The strategy requires government input and earmarked funding to pre-plan the required integrate transport needed to enable the area's residents to travel sustainably."</p> <p>5.21 Change to "Without mitigation, and putting forward a fully financed integrate tansport plan,this would lead".</p> <p>5.23 and 5.24 Insert "Local communities firmly voted against a southern relief road and no right hand turns on the A27 during the HE consultation. The PBA report has reintroduced elements into the plan that were rejected by local communities."</p> <p>5.26 Change to "To address this position, the Council will work with Highways England, the County Council, the local community and Network Rail and major development..... A central element of the strategy is package of proposed improvements to the rail network and sustainable travel network."</p> <p>5.28 Insert at end of last paragraph "...need to be carefully monitored and funding coordinated to prevent rat running through local communities, put in more crossings and safe cycle routes to cross the road".</p> <p>5.31 Change to "Dutch-style roundabouts and allocation of more space to people who walk and cycle are needed to enable modal shift".</p> <p>Delete "New road connecting Birdham Road to A27 Fisbourne Roundabout".</p> <p>5.33 Change to "With Network Rail, train operators and local stakeholders to improve and extend services to facilitate.... The Council also works closely with bus operators to put in cleaner buses and extend their services."</p>	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
50	Transport Infrastructure	3219	<p>PBA Comments:</p> <p>1) No modelling for holiday/events</p> <p>8) Southern Link Road and no right hand turns rejected by the community.</p> <p>9) Reject assertion that air quality not impacted by increase in housing.</p> <p>12) Need anti rat-running measures to prevent spike in air pollution in city.</p> <p>13) Table 5.3- confusion about what will be allowed in these two tables.</p> <p>14) Fishbourne Junction- oppose the closing of the link to Terminus Road.</p> <p>16) Bognor Road Roundabout- object to any works which take away trees and hedges or the bridge.</p> <p>19) Northgate roundabout (Junctions 5&6)- direct people on bikes onto fast moving roundabout?</p>		Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	69	Talking about roads more zebra crossings in Selsey especially Chichester Road [brackets illegible] bus stops and in Manor Road near Ellis Square.	Housing for people who cannot afford to buy. Talking about roads more zebra crossings in Selsey especially Chichester Road [brackets illegible] bus stops and in Manor Road near Ellis Square.	Comment	Mr Frederick Rowland [6598]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	110	The A259 Emsworth to Fishbourne is getting more overloaded day by day, with people avoiding the A27.	<p>We need a detailed transport study of the A259 Emsworth to Fishbourne before large scale development is approved along this road.</p> <p>To enable the large scale development this plan envisions, transport must be considered. An exit to the A27 somewhere along this 8 mile stretch would be a boon. Alternatively improve the A27, with a northern bypass, so that the A259 can breathe again, and cope with the additional traffic this local plan will bring.</p>	Object	Mrs Alice Smith [5409]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	118	5.31 Add to Wider Plan Area row "Small-scale junction improvements on A259 between Emsworth and Chichester.		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	128	On Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility * The Chichester Society welcome this additional policy and support its purpose in the Plan. * It especially welcomes the proposed New road connecting Birdham Road to A27 Fishbourne roundabout (see Policy AL6), known as the Stockbridge Link Road when first proposed by Highways England as part of Option 2b in the 2016 Consultation.		Support	Chichester Society (Mr Christopher Mead-Briggs) [802]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	177	AQ/Public Health Concern	A statement that articulates to the Public that AQ will will not be adversely impacted by S23. This to be backed by facts and believable simulation/computer modelling.	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	187	The future relationship between the proposed Local Plan and Local Traffic Flows. This needs to be clarified in order to make sure Chichester fit for sustainable living and possible climate change by 2030, in line with the recommendations by the International Committee on Climate Change. See full text		Comment	Friends of Brandy Hole Copse (Professor Vincent Porter) [838]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	243	To add under New Integrated Traffic measures an additional bullet point concerning cycling on Route NCN2	New Strategic cycling provision between Chichester and Emsworth [NCN2] in a segregated form to ensure safe movement for all transport users.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	262	With reference to the A27 corridor in the Chichester area, I believe the Northern Bypass (in some form) remains the only viable option to make the Manhood Peninsula more accessible. I appreciate that Highways England has rejected this twice no, but it is the only logical way forwards especially as this can be primarily developed off-line with minimal impact during construction		Comment	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	264	Notwithstanding my earlier objection to the Highgrove development, any new developments should include cycle routes and for the larger developments bus routes one site. Other developments should see an increase in bus services (or in the case of villages on the A259 corridor, reinstatement of the peak hour frequency train service reduced from May 2018).		Comment	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	266	Object to link road which will increase stress on Fishbourne roundabout. Northern bypass is preferred.	I believe this link road will increase stress on the Fishbourne Roundabout. A better intervention would be consideration of the Northern Bypass.	Object	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	284	Residents of the Manhood Peninsular and Donnington would be hugely disadvantaged when trying to access the A27 to travel east. Extra congestion would be caused on the A27 between the Fishbourne and Donnington roundabout, and also ob back roads that drivers would use to circumvent the Donnington roundabout.	Continue to allow free access to the A27 at all junctions.	Object	Mr Peter Balaam [6739]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	286	The long timescale for these changes to A27 junctions would cause unacceptable hardship to local residents. Increased gridlock at busy times for three years is an horrific prospect. The supposed advantages of the Plan are for through traffic. Local traffic would be heavily disadvantaged. The Plan is very similar to Option 3a from Highways England. It is unacceptable for CDC to resurrect these proposals that were emphatically rejected by local residents across all of Chichester. At best this is disingenous. At worst it shows contempt for the people who will be affected and who have already made their views known.	Delete these changes to A27 junctions. Urge upon Highways England the need for a proper bypass, to the north of Chichester, as recommended by WSCC.	Object	Mr Peter Balaam [6739]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	294	New road joining south of FB roundabout will create huge traffic and pollution problems New road from the south will damage local views to and from Cathedral and AONB	Do not build industrial units etc on land which is flooding and requires such high building line. Do not add yet another junction to the FB roundabout. Removing the terminus road junction was suggested to improve safety but replacing that with another bigger road of equal industrial usage will not make any improvement to the roundabout and further add to pollution closer to FB and to the AONB etc at the harbour.	Object	Ms Lynda Hunter [6740]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	312	Concerns over safety of Fishbourne roundabout - access, traffic, loss of right hand turn		Object	Mr John Pearson [6757]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	324	Reject the proposed changes to the A27 junctions at Donnington and Whyke on the basis of: a) disadvantage & disruption to local residents b) poor cost v benefit outcome	Changes need to be considered as part of the wider A27 gateway consultation for which the strongest support would appear to lie with a Northern Route option. This would by definition take a significant amount of traffic away from the existing 'southern' A27, reducing congestion and potentially eliminating the business case for altering the local network/junctions.	Object	Mr Robert Upton [6760]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	328	The choice of the Northern Bypass should be a policy within the Local Plan to attract Government funding. The 'Southern Gateway' development should include a road bridge across the railway. This will allow bus access to the station at all times and reduce congestion.	A policy for the Northern Bypass. A commitment to the provision of a road bridge at the 'Southern Gateway' site.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	329	Support donnington bypass.		Support	Mrs Charlotte Brewer [6734]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	340	I agree that a new link road from Birdham road to Fishbourne would significantly help congestion and pollution in Donnington and Stockbridge. Donnington is often gridlocked in the summer and becomes impossible to leave the house in hot weather. It will unfortunately be visible from the AONB , so feel strong mitigation measures should be made to ensure it is hidden from view (e.g built into a grassed/tree lined bank) and noise barriers/ reducing surfaces should be used to minimise harm to the residents and wildlife. The turning restrictions on Stockbridge junction will also significantly reduce traffic flowing through Donnington.		Support	Mrs Deborah Hack [6717]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	341	The plan may bring marginal through-traffic improvements on the A27; but will be a step backwards for those on the Manhood. The plan to ban east bound traffic coming up the Manhood and the new link road from Fishbourne to the A286 is a rehash of a plan that got a huge rejection in the failed HE consultation. Spending large sums on A27 tinkering is seen by me and most folk on the Manhood as a way to avoid a more effective Northern route. The plan fails its own test of minimising flood risk in terms of site AL6	Run a distinct consultation on the A27 changes before submitting a plan that carries these as a consequence. Stick to your own strategic objectives on flood risk	Object	Mr Jim McAuslan [6602]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	355	The disruption likely to be caused to local residents is completely unacceptable	Find a different solution	Object	Mrs Alison Balaam [6785]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	369	Invidious to propose the off line link road/restricted turning measures again when these have been so roundly rejected more than once, shown to be short term, and of limited effectiveness against HE monetised criteria in the very comprehensive and clear Mott McDonald reports for HE in 2016. Drip feed of funding will mean protracted construction periods over years punctuated by setbacks and inactivity..It is questionable whether all measures will ever be fully introduced in which case the City, the Manhood, and the wider area will be left with an unsafe, economically and environmentally damaging number of white elephants..	-Delete one reference to the Link road -The measures shown must more clearly satisfy two further aims: to be for the long term, and not cause harm to the environment or unacceptable noise , - a much clearer report with monetised outputs must be commissioned on how PBA measures achieve sustainable improvement in the three AQMAs; -reduction in noise, accident rates, light pollution, and congestion over the long term needs to be demonstrated in monetised outputs; - CDC's June 2018 resolution to support a northern bypass must be included in Policy S 23 as an aim; -insert additional comment between 5.26 and 5.27 as follows: 'meanwhile the likely alignments of a northern route as identified in existing 2016 HE studies will be safeguarded against other development' ; include same in Policy S23 -Third bullet in Policy S23 : change 'Planning to achieve...' to 'Requirement to achieve....'	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	379	This policy is seriously flawed because the supporting paragraphs do not reflect the extent of the traffic problem on the Western Manhood Peninsula (WMP). Much emphasis is, rightly, placed on the highway network and A27 but nothing of significance is planned or allowed for in respect of the worsening traffic congestion on the WMP. Indeed worse than that the CDC advocates building many hundreds of additional houses without any mitigation and a total disregard for the consequences.	Change the house building policy on the WMP to reflect sensible limits when your transport Policy S23 might become credible.	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	448	I would like to see firm targets here for improvements in public transport/ reduction in car 'wheelfall' and reduction in CO2 emissions over the period. In addition, reductions in atmospheric pollutants other than CO2 should be planned to be monitored, with the expectation of significant falls over the period.	Add measurable targets for uptake of public transport, reduction in CO2, reduction in other pollutants.	Object	Ms Rachel Ritchie [6830]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	454	A27:J14 (Stockbridge);J15 (Whyke) The PBA Report(pp67-68) states there will be banned right turns at these junctions. This will be incredibly disruptive and inconvenient for all residents of the area. Figs.7.5/7.6 also show arrows in North/South directions that imply there are no right turns onto the A27 (see attached). This requires urgent clarification. Whilst I understand that keeping the flow of through traffic is important, it should not be done to the detriment and inconvenience of local traffic. Appendix F (Journey Times) to the PBA Report does not include a comparison of journeys impacted by the 'No Right Turn' restrictions.	Do not restrict any junctions to 'No Right Turn'; Do not use the LOCAL plan to prioritise through traffic and at the same time deteriorate the congestion / journey times for local residents. In order to facilitate meaningful consultation: 1) Clarify diagrams and text in the PBA report (Figs. 7.5 & 7.6) regarding A27 Junctions 14 & 15 (Stockbridge & Whyke). 2) Include comparisons of Journey Times (Appendix F) to include journeys affected by 'No Right Turn' restrictions at Stockbridge and Whyke.	Object	Mr Neil Hipkiss [6831]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	465	I object to the proposals for the A27 junctions. This is a major rebuild of all junctions and will implement the least popular of all the options from Highways England, imposing a large number of traffic lights on through traffic. It appears to be designed to ensure that the A27 around Chichester will rival the daily problems experienced around Worthing and Lancing. If the authorities spend £62m on this inadequate rebuild, it is very unlikely priority will be given again to developing a real solution to A27 problems for another 30 to 40 years.	Strike out the proposals for the A27 junctions. The policy should be that the council will continue to work with Highways England and the local highways authority (WSCC) to reach agreement, in consultation with local residents, on a lasting improvement to the A27 Chichester Bypass.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	466	The planning officers at the exhibition assured me that there would be no further public consultation on these proposals, despite the last sentence of S23. I object to this process, which seems designed to force through significant developments without proper consultation and regard to the views of local residents.	Strengthen the last sentence of policy S23 to ensure effective consultation on all planned transport measures takes place, separately from the Local Plan Review.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	477	It states that cycling will be promoted as a sustainable method of travel, but there are no defined proposals to encourage it. The only way to seriously promote it is to provide a dedicated cycle route from Chichester into the peninsula and east / west that is separated from road traffic. The subsequent reduction in vehicle traffic would possible mean that many road improvements would not be needed. That would be a better use of S106 / S278 funds than a new link road that will have a major adverse impact on the countryside of this area.	Remove link road which will not resolve the current traffic problems. A holistic solution is required which integrates with the A27 proposals when these are more finalised. Provide a new super cycle highway linking surrounding rural areas to Chichester	Object	Mr Richard Hutchinson [6455]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	487	Local residents have already been consulted on the junction improvements in 2016 repeated in this plan the combination of Options 2 & 3- the results 3% supported junction changes and 47% objected to the junction changes and link road, they read the benefits and compared them to the northern alignments after construction- Northern alignment savings to air quality £3.9M improvement to road safety £73.6M V proposed upgrades Air quality £2.2M Improvement to Road Safety £8.4M (HE data). Why the need for another consultation on the same concepts recycled, the public know the facts and they said NO!	Take out the link road and junction changes to Bognor, Whyke, Stockbridge and Fishbourne Roundabouts-Transport aims must produce a robust unarguable solution for- the longterm, reduction of accident rates, reduction in congestion, increase in air quality, reduction of noise and light pollution. None of Peter Bretts assumptions for a link road slipped into the plan in September 2018, 9 months after the initial brief was set by CDC will solve these problems. An independent study must be included in addition to Peter Brett's to prove any of their statements on air quality, noise reduction and light pollution impacting the AONB and the health and well-being of Chichester residents based in the East-West Corridor.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	500	1 There is no provision for Park and Ride facilities in the district 2 Proposed changes to the A 27 are likely to result in considerable long term disruption with minimal gain, especially at the Fishbourne roundabout. Salthill Road is a very busy cut-through for traffic from the A259 to avoid this roundabout. This feeds traffic onto narrow country roads ill equipped to provide routes into and north of Chichester. 3 Current housing developments in the district will generate more traffic for the A27 ,with seemingly no provision in place to deal with this before any A27 improvement are made..	1 Small Park and Ride should be established around Chichester. Land acquired through compulsory purchase orders where necessary. This would help alleviate the A 27 congestion. 2 Further attempt to achieve a northern route for the A 27.A tunnel under the National Park would cause the least disruption. 3 A freeze on new house building until significant improvements to the A27 are in place.	Object	Mr Stephen Page [6591]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	511	Traffic option seems to benefit through traffic rather than local traffic. Air Quality at the Stockbridge roundabout is already bad, this can only make it worse. We all remember the trouble caused by the work on the footbridge over the Stockbridge roundabout, having continuous and more serious work as envisaged by this plan will make travel in/through Chichester terrible for years. There are no proposals for extra schools on the Manhood peninsular, school traffic is already a major contributor to traffic jams and poor air quality, this can only make it worse.		Comment	Mr Tony Gammon [6741]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	519	Opposed to the Stockbridge Relief Road. A coordinated package of improvements to junctions within the city is missing from this policy. The roundabouts on Westhampnett Road near Sainsbury's, New Park Road near the new Coop, Eastgate, Northgate, Westgate and Southgate need redesigning to allocate more space to people on bikes and on foot. More bus lanes and a linked up, continuous network of proper, protected cycle lanes. St Paul's Road and Bognor Road need to have less private car parking to enable sustainable means to be prioritised - Transport measures to ensure that we reduce our carbon footprint		Object	Sam Pickford [6841]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	540	As mentioned previously even though the Peninsula has already met the supply commitment detailed in the adopted Local Plan nothing has been done to address the A27 issues. Regarding the A286 Link Road this is ill conceived. No thought on the damage to the AONB, it will block the view across the fields as you approach Chichester along the A286. Cause even more congestion at the Fishbourne Roundabout and the potential increase in traffic could require a dual carriageway.	As mentioned previously even though the Peninsula has already met the supply commitment detailed in the adopted Local Plan nothing has been done to address the A27 issues. Regarding the A286 Link Road this is ill conceived. No thought on the damage to the AONB, it will block the view across the fields as you approach Chichester along the A286. Cause even more congestion at the Fishbourne Roundabout and the potential increase in traffic could require a dual carriageway. On a further point a statement was made by James Brokenshire Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government on 10 December 2018 in Parliament during the Housing, Communities and Local Government Question Time. The statement, I believe, was during a discussion on housing developments in Oxfordshire. The key point raised in the Secretary of States response was to a question on infrastructure delivery. In response he stated that prior to any significant development the supporting infrastructure must be already in place.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	554	Object on following grounds: - A27 right turns have been rejected meaning increased congestion and pollution - policy needs to focus on needs of residents	Leave the Oving Crossing Alone. Keep pushing for the Northern By Pass.	Object	Vanessa Rucklidge [6845]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	555	Donnington residents, of which I am one, will be hugely disadvantaged by these A27 changes including the ban on access to the East from the Stockbridge roundabout. We will face increased traffic disruption and idling queues adding environmental damage to our health on top of limits that are already being exceeded	Do not implement these road changes	Object	Mr Jim McAuslan [6602]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	570	There is little mention of provision for pedestrians and cyclists at major roundabouts. This would be an opportunity to improve them. Transport measures need to take emissions into account. Carbon emissions from transport are rising. Air quality is already bad. More housing and more traffic will make it worse,	Provide more space for cyclists by removing street parking on Bognor and St Paul's Road, so cycle lanes could be created, and bus lanes.. Prioritize public transport and cycling and walking. Monitor air quality at many points, especially near schools, and take action. eg fine drivers for idling , as they do in Richmond Borough council area.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	588	Please include specific protection for existing routes under Integrated transport measures will be developed to mitigate the impact of planned development on the highways network, improve highway safety and air quality, promote more sustainable travel patterns and encourage increased use of sustainable modes of travel, such as public transport, cycling and walking. Real commitment to infrastructure must be made. eg Centurion Way, Westgate, links to Manhood Peninsula.		Support	Julia Smith [6865]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	589	"If the A27 is not improved within the next 5 years the area will be gridlocked. With the hundreds of new houses being built in the area and the ever growing number of cars it is folly to leave this vital work to the last minute. Councillors have a duty to the community to sort out the problem without delay. Why there was never the proposed flyover, over the Fishbourne roundabout is quite ridiculous and would have made the now vital improvements a much easier task."		Comment	Ms Judy Whitehead [6862]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	595	I object to the proposed changes to the A27 namely not being able to turn right at the Stockbridge roundabout. This will unfairly impact on local residents and I don't think will improve the traffic situation. The proposed new road would create huge disruption. Again making the local traffic even worse. The area North of the city should be used for the additional housing as this would have much less impact on residents and the A27.	Not changing access to A27. Not causing further disruption to A27. Reducing level of proposed housing near Donnington. Consider site north of the city which will have less impact.	Object	Mrs Joanna Earl [6866]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	617	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - northern bypass would significantly improve traffic flows - alternative route must be put in place before changes to existing A27 are made - no right hand turns - increase number/volume of traffic movements along stretch from Portfield-Fishbourne and vehicles would need to cover more miles than currently required and will refocus gridlock elsewhere - no thought given to residents in Donnington whose access to anywhere is via A27, would involve significant increase in mileage and time onto trips in and out - flyovers A27 are good idea - better public transport/ cycle paths/ footpaths would improve access to city 		Comment	Mr David Barty [6877]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	618	<p>Concern over A27 proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of traffic lights at Oving - no right turn junctions will cause inconvenience to westbound traffic accessing town and eastbound traffic to the Manhood - vehicles will use residential streets as rat runs to avoid no right hand turns - more mileage will be added to journey which will increase emissions and contribute to poor air quality. 		Comment	Mrs K Grimstead [6890]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	625	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact of link road from Fishbourne roundabout to Birdham Road - lack of public transport to areas surrounding proposed developments - additional houses west of Chichester will impact on A259 and exacerbate problems on Apuldram Road. 	DQSC recommends that other alternative options are considered for access to developments in Southbourne and Fishbourne, possibly a suitable junction onto the A27 in both directions between Southbourne and Fishbourne.	Comment	Dell Quay Sailing Club (Mr Donald Piers Chamberlain) [6895]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	627	Donnington residents will be hugely disadvantaged by proposed changes to A27 access arrangements under Policy S23 and the Peter Brett Associates report - effectively no access to the East from Donnington (or the Manhood Peninsula) via A27 unless residents either head West first, encountering the amended Fishbourne Roundabout which will prioritise through traffic and will include an additional junction. Alternative routes to the East are either through the City or via unsuitable "back roads", increasing traffic levels through Hunston and North Mundham. Increased traffic from Whyke (facing the same issue) will cause even more congestion between Donnington and Fishbourne.		Comment	Mr Philip Waters [6820]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	641	If another road is to come into Tesco roundabout from the south west Apuldram/Donnington, I hate to think of the chaos this will cause with even more traffic travelling along the A259.		Comment	Mrs Davina Robinson [6857]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	644	<p>Commenting on: PBA report page 60 Table 7.1 and page 67 Fig 7.3.5; PBA report Exec Summary xiii & page 60 Table 7.1.</p> <p>Propose change to mitigation measures: Allow right turns from A27 to north/south A286 and B2145. Redo analysis of traffic flows taking account of local traffic needs and analyse more accurately the conflict arising from PBA's non-separation of through and local traffic and whether their proposals will accommodate the additional traffic. Any further work by PBA or any other consultant must take account of the Systra consultation.</p>	Propose change to mitigation measures: Allow right turns from A27 to north/south A286 and B2145. Redo analysis of traffic flows taking account of local traffic needs and analyse more accurately the conflict arising from PBA's non-separation of through and local traffic and whether their proposals will accommodate the additional traffic. Any further work by PBA or any other consultant must take account of the Systra consultation.	Comment	Linda Boize [6620]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	650	Object to mitigation measures suggested in the PBA Study on basis that they will adversely affect air quality and noise in conflict with DM24 Air Quality and DM25 Noise.	Signalising the Stockbridge junction for the benefit of through traffic does not benefit residents. Separating through and local traffic would reduce traffic volume and reduce the stop/hard acceleration noise. Even though this noise is not continuous, its occurrence is sufficiently frequent and loud to ruin outdoor enjoyment.	Object	Linda Boize [6620]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	672	Objection to the Birdham Road to Fishbourne roundabout link road, on the grounds that it will not resolve congestion, but merely move it to Fishbourne.	Ditch the scheme, and make further representations to the Highways Agency.	Object	Mr Iain Harrison [6899]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	720	This additional policy is welcomed and its purpose in the Plan is supported including the proposed new road connecting Birdham Road to A27 Fishbourne roundabout (see Policy AL6), known as the Stockbridge Link Road when first proposed by Highways England as part of Option 2b in the 2016 Consultation.		Support	West Itchenor Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1036]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	733	The plans for the A27 will not solve the problem. The junction changes will not solve the lack of road capacity for through and local traffic, and restricting right-hand turning at junctions will make local journeys more difficult. The proposed link road would direct more traffic off the A27 on to the A286. It is vital that mitigation measures should be taken to reduce the effects of the additional traffic noise on Bracklesham Lane, preferably in the form of a speed limit reduction to 30mph.	I would ask CDC to abandon proposals for the AL6 link road and junction changes on the A27, which are a waste of money, and instead urge the government to invest in a long-term, sustainable solution for the A27 so that the district is more able to accommodate the increased housing numbers being imposed on it.	Comment	Miss sarah backhouse [6692]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	754	I strongly support the proposal for a new road connecting Birdham Road to A27 Fishbourne roundabout. 1: It will make it easier for traffic to join Stockbridge Road from side roads. 2: It will make Stockbridge Road safer for pedestrians. 3: Reducing the number of northbound vehicles queuing for the Stockbridge Roundabout will reduce pollution from exhausts.		Support	Mr Tim Morgan [6921]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	766	Please reinforce your plans for dedicated cycle / walking paths to connect all 4 quadrants of the City outskirts to the centre. Improve cycle links. A27: I reject the Northern bypass option. Invest in rail infrastructure, clean and cheap local buses and train links.		Comment	Dr Ian Swann [5585]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	768	Congestion will be increased along the A27 between Whyke and Fishbourne, pedestrians and cyclists accessing the city will be subjected to increased pollution. The canal path will not be a pleasant place if it is to be a highway to the town, it can only take so much traffic (cyclists/pedestrians). Considering the amount of disruption the partial replacement of one bridge caused these A27 changes would be make Chichester an unpleasant place to live or visit (a place to be avoided) for several years.	No tinkering with the A27. No new roads. Emphasis on sustainable transport. Any new housing in Donnington needs the infrastructure to support it if we are to prevent more driving eg primary school, doctors.	Object	Mrs Melanie Adams [6925]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	775	Include Traffic movements from Tourist season, holiday population increase and Goodwood events in the scope of the transport study.	Reinstate para 1.2.3 and explain to the public why CDC is not doing an assessment of the impact to AQ/public health from the exacerbated effect of online construction work and, its impact to the Highway congestion over a 4+ years of diversionary traffic through residential areas. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise this with the examiner as the aforementioned would significantly change the AQ assessment conclusion .	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	778	The new Stockbridge Link Road is stated in Policy S23 to "promote sustainable modes of travel";. There is no provision whatsoever in the PBA document for walking/cycling from Chichester centre to area AL6. The road itself is therefore largely proposed to support that development. The policy clearly states that the development of the link road is contingent upon funding from the development of site AL6. This area was previously excluded from development plans. The Sustainability Appraisal in November 2016 states: "Overall this site has the most negative impacts and the fewest positive of all the Chichester options."	Do not include the development of the Stockbridge Link road: 1) It does not promote the sustainable modes of travel that are so important in our infrastructure development. 2) It is contingent upon funding from land development AL6 - which in turn has previously been assessed as unsuitable for development by CDC.	Object	Mr Neil Hipkiss [6831]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	785	The traffic mitigation measures are not deliverable as there is no defined funding plan. The issue of air pollution on the existing A27 is severe. 4.1% of deaths in CHI District are attributed to pm2.5 particulates. The majority of this pollution relates to the A27. The proposed transport mitigation measures do not adequately deal with this issue of air pollution as the assumptions used are no robust.	The implementation of a longterm solution to the issue of the A27 Strategic East West road at Chichester is required. CDC states that they along with West Sussex County Council support a Northern Bypass. This is the only effective mitigation measure to support additional housing and employment sites in the plan area.	Object	Mr K Martin [6938]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	794	The details in paras 5.21 to 5.24 have not been addressed in Policy S23. Para 5.26 should refer to both County and District Councils preference to a Northern By-pass.	The details in paras 5.21 to 5.24 have not been addressed in Policy S23. Para 5.26 should refer to both County and District Councils preference to a Northern By-pass.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	796	Proposals rejected twice before, unlikely to help and no evidence it will reduce particulate pollution.	A concerted effort to get into the RSI programme with HE and design a sustainable low pollution improvement for the A27	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	806	People travelling across the Stockbridge Roundabout are faced with ever increasing levels of pollution. This will only deteriorate further if further housing is built on the Manhood Peninsula. Only a Northern A27 bypass will reduce the level.	People travelling across the Stockbridge Roundabout are faced with ever increasing levels of pollution. This will only deteriorate further if further housing is built on the Manhood Peninsula. Only a Northern A27 bypass will reduce the level.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	824	POLICY S23 promises a travel plan to "achieve timely delivery of transport infrastructure to support new housing". A comprehensive travel plan would be welcomed but "timely delivery" would require the provision of the infrastructure before the building was completed.	SOLUTION: Any building requiring such infrastructure should be placed in the second or third phase of the Local Plan so as to allow time for planning, funding and implementing the necessary infrastructure programmes.	Object	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mr Geoff Hand) [34]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	847	Paragraphs 5.23 - 5.25 reference the support given to a northern bypass and a reasonable alternative of a full southern upgrade by CDC and uncertainty over funding. This position and uncertainty is now out of date following statements by HE that neither scheme is feasible or affordable. These paragraphs should be updated to reflect the current situation which is that no viable scheme capable of central government funding is available	Amend paragraphs to reflect current situation following receipt of HE response	Object	Mr Ben Kirk [6563]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	856	I object to the insertion of the Stockbridge Relief Road. Any road building will only attract more traffic, congestion and pollution in future, which given climate change we cannot afford. We need to limit travel in individual cars and encourage instead public transport use. This strategy should include a package of measures to improve inner city junctions to allocate more space for people on foot or on bikes eg New Park Road junction near the University, Eastgate and the roundabout near Sainsbury's.	Cancel building Stockbridge Relief Road. Include measures to improve inner city junctions to give more safe space to pedestrians and cyclists.	Object	Ms Valerie Briginshaw [6946]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	867	Penultimate para, first sentence - A27 improvements (mitigation works) funding. Is proposed scope of contributing developments consistent with current Highways England approach that appears to seek financial contributions from all significant development proposals (e.g. including housing sites of <50 dwellings and major economic/business sites) which will impact on the A27 at Chichester? Need to number paragraphs and sub paragraphs for ease of reference throughout Local Plan document where possible.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	872	A27:J14 (Stockbridge);J15 (Whyke) The PBA Report(pp67-68) states there will be banned right turns at these junctions. This will be incredibly disruptive and inconvenient for all residents of the area. We will have to turn west before going east. Figs.7.5/7.6 also show arrows in North/South directions that imply there are no right turns onto the A27 Whilst I understand that keeping the flow of through traffic is important, it should not be done to the detriment and inconvenience of local traffic. Appendix to the PBA Report does not include a comparison of journeys impacted by the "No Right Turn" restrictions.	Do not restrict any junctions to "No Right Turn". Do not use the LOCAL plan to prioritise through traffic and at the same time deteriorate the congestion / journey times for local residents. In order to facilitate meaningful consultation: 1) Clarify diagrams and text in the PBA report (Figs. 7.5 & 7.6) regarding A27 Junctions 14 & 15 (Stockbridge & Whyke). 2) Include comparisons of Journey Times (Appendix F) to include journeys affected by "No Right Turn" restrictions at Stockbridge and Whyke.	Object	Karen Jelfs smith [6941]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	936	The road improvements suggested for A27 will inconvenience current residents. There will also be increased pollution caused by traffic being held at traffic lights. Solution appears to be most beneficial to through traffic, not to the developments it is supposed to be mitigating. It appears to be a rehash of Option 3 from the previous Chichester Bypass Improvement Scheme consultation which was REJECTED by the community	Rethink the junction improvements.	Object	Pagham Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann) [6976]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	937	The proposals for improvements to A27 will inevitably cause additional pollution as cars are held at the various traffic lights. This is particularly inappropriate given the existing issues at Stockbridge in terms of Air Quality. Planned improvements are contrary to Policy S28 Pollution.	Rethink proposed junction improvements	Object	Pagham Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann) [6976]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	939	The proposals for the A27 junction improvements will inevitably lead to increased pollution. Are these junction improvements included within the requirements of this policy?		Comment	Pagham Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann) [6976]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	945	The Fishbourne to Birdham Rd link road will be cause traffic chaos throughout the Chichester area in Summer when West Wittering beach is popular - forcing Manhood traffic down this road including Selsey traffic, will cause bottlenecks and significant increases in Air Pollution. The modelling quoted does not appear to recognise the actual reality of summer traffic to the tourist hotspots. More emphasis should be given to increasing cycling and focusing cycle improvements in Chichester City is not adequate - Selsey is still awaiting a decent cycle route to Chichester. The proposed link road will negatively impact the Salterns Way.	Remove Link road proposal Additional focus / weight on cycling and similar transport methods	Object	Mr Steve Frampton [6919]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	959	Principal emphasis here is on roads and car/lorry traffic. There needs to be much more thought given to and specific suggestions made on innovatory alternatives - some kind of light railway link from the Manhood Peninsula could be one example. Current studies increasingly indicate that road traffic will decrease, so more emphasis is essential on the alternatives people will want. The £18 million (or should it be £38 million?) link road between the Birdham Road and A27 Fishbourne roundabout will be an environmental and landscape disaster and there is no chance of a developer funding it.	Add specific, innovatory alternatives to road improvements. Remove Birdham Road and A27 Fishbourne link road from this policy.	Object	Liz Sagues [6982]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	990	There are no accepted proposals to improve traffic flow on the A27, apart from some improvements to junctions. Already condemned during the HE A27 consultation. Improvements funded by developers will take 15 years to complete In addition, the A286 is a busy road at all times,especially during the summer, it becomes completely gridlocked. There have been 2 traffic fatalities in Birdham on the A286 in the last 2 years. Considerable loss of jobs from the peninsula over the last few years, so most residents of newly built houses using the A286 to travel to work, increasing the road burden.	Site AL6 should be moved, and any plans to build a link road should be abandoned. Birdham Parish Council objects to the proposal to build 600 houses on the Western Manhood Peninsula, due to the lack of a credible plan to improve the transport network, and environmental constraints outlined in the 2014 Plan.	Object	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	997	Air Quality - well outside current Government guidelines. Children affected. Sustainable transport - cycleways - not viable on access roads to Manhood peninsula.		Comment	The Hon Susan Barnes [6999]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	998	Proximity to the Chichester Harbour AONB Pagham Harbour SPA and Medmerry designated SPA There are no accepted proposals to improve traffic flow on the A27, apart from some improvements to junctions. Proposals very similar to these were roundly condemned during the Highways England A27 consultation process. The improvements which will have to be funded by the developers will take 15 years to complete at a rate of one junction every 3 years. This means 15 years of disruption and delays.	The A27 must be improved prior to any major development taking place.	Object	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1014	A new road from Birdham to Fishbourne is unacceptable. It has already been rejected in public consultation. It would damage the AONB and lead to settlement growth in that direction. The method of funding would lead to protracted construction and related disruption.	A new road from Birdham to Fishbourne roundabout should be removed as a transport mitigation possibility. Improvement to the Stockbridge roundabout, perhaps by an underpass, would be preferable.	Object	Mr Keith Martin [4610]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1015	I object to the new road connecting Birdham Road to A27 Fishbourne roundabout The road would impact views of the cathedral from inside the AONB including the sea (Fishbourne Channel), Salterns Way and the Apuldram area. The link road would need to be raised over the flood zone and would increase noise pollution in a very sensitive area. Increase emissions pollution and light pollution. The run off from the road would risk entering the water at the river Lavant and also running into the harbour. The link road would impact on important migratory bird species.	The link road connecting Birdham Road to A27 Fishbourne roundabout should be discounted and removed from the plan.	Object	Mr Stephen Holcroft [7004]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1031	Traffic lights replacing roundabouts at Stockbridge and Whyke junctions will dangerous increase pollution. Stockbridge is already an established Air Quality Management Area.	Do not modify Stockbridge or Whyke roundabouts, a proper solution needs to be put in place.	Object	Mr Mark Hitchin [7008]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1032	Road layout changes on the A27 round Chi will cause more traffic and more pollution.	Do not tinker with Stockbridge or Whyke roundabouts, a proper solution needs to be put in place.	Object	Mr Mark Hitchin [7008]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1033	Pollution around the A27 past Chi is already unacceptable. The proposed changes to the A27 and the raised link Road at Stockbridge/Donnington/Fishbourne will make an already disastrous situation worse.	A long term solution to the A27 is required. That means building a new bypass to the North.	Object	Mrs Louise Hitchin [7012]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1049	It is not clear what junction improvements are actually proposed for the A27 but anything that restricts the movement of north-south traffic will have a significant impact on local roads with an increase in cars using them as rat runs. Introducing left turns only at Stockbridge and Wyke will force traffic to drive through the city to reach the A27 and through the very narrow road at North Mundham past the primary school. Implementing these changes would then be used as the reason for a new link road. Proposed changes to junctions have already been consulted on and rejected.	The Council should stop trying to impose Option2 on a community that have already rejected these changes	Object	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1061	Object to Apuldram link road as no evidence that consultation with Highways England has taken place. Link road would need raising and this would destroy views of cathedral.		Object	Mr Brian Horn [7020]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1072	The proposed road joining Fishbourne to the A286 is inappropriate given its proximity to the AONB and the impact on the views across the countryside to the South Downs and Chichester Cathedral. The road and development will be detrimental to the natural environment, increase traffic and pollution and cause additional congestion on the A286; this will be particularly dangerous during the summer period.	The proposed route and development need to be re-sited away from this beautiful area as once it is damaged it can never be replaced.	Object	Mrs Geraldine Firmston [6962]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1087	I object to the Stockbridge relief road on environmental grounds. This will cause increased air pollution, destroy vital wildlife habitat and is in conflict with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.	Increased and affordable public transport will ease traffic congestion, reduce air pollution and address the need to tackle climate change.	Object	Mrs Claire Wilton [6733]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1105	<p>1. 'Timely delivery of transport infrastructure' must mean that development will not be allowed to commence until construction is underway of a Government funded A27 Relief Road Scheme. Developer funded junction improvements are not the answer.</p> <p>2. The Transport Study, based on the 2014 study, is insufficiently robust for the Manhood Peninsula. Other factors have led to traffic growth and congestion is not limited to morning and evening rush hours.</p> <p>3. The link road from Birdham Road to A27 will increase congestion on A286 and A27/Fishbourne roundabout.</p> <p>4. The Strategy should aim to deliver segregated cycle routes on busy roads between settlements.</p>	<p>1. The Strategy should make clear that no development of allocated land will be permitted to take place until construction of A27 Relief Road Scheme, funded through Highways England, is under construction. (Consequential changes will be needed to policies for each allocation to reflect this constraint.)</p> <p>2. Require additional real time transport survey work to fully assess the impact of proposed development, particularly on the Manhood Peninsula.</p> <p>3. Remove the proposal for a link road between Birdham Road and A27.</p> <p>4. Include strategy to deliver segregated cycle routes on busy roads between settlements.</p>	Object	Mrs Susan Pope [6851]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1119	<p>Regarding: New road BirdhamRoad to A27 Fishbourne. Additional traffic onto a roundabout that's complex to navigate and dangerous already is unacceptable.</p> <p>Issues from the StockbridgeRoundabout will simply be transferred to the fishbourneRoundabout exacerbating delays for exiting fishbourne from the A259 or Cathedral Way, and interrupt A27 further.</p> <p>Furthermore, the impact of additional traffic on Clay Lane (a small country lane, partially national speed limit and national cycle route) should be assessed given most people in fishbourne and other east/west corridor service villages to use the road to access Chichester and locations west of Chichester to avoid A27 roundabouts.</p>	Alternative entry point for manhood peninsula traffic joining the A27 near Fishbourne roundabout instead of directly onto the roundabout - left /eastward merge only onto the A27?	Object	Mr Nathan Day [6572]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1128	Proposals for the improvements are flawed and will lead to unacceptable detours for residents in Donnington and the wider Manhood community, an increase in AQMA levels as traffic queues at junctions and the introduction of a scheme which was roundly rejected during HE's Chichester ByPass Improvement Scheme consultation exercise.	Rethink the proposals.	Object	Mrs Nicola Swann [7052]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1155	Stockbridge already exceeds the recommended Air Quality levels and the proposed improvements to the A27 do nothing to change or improve that. There are now 3 schools along the route of the A27 which suffer from the poor air quality and the increase in traffic from the housing proposed will add to this. A northern relief road is the only viable solution , not 15 years of work on the existing route building Hamburger junctions.	A more positive policy to reduce the air pollution along the A27.	Object	Mr Roger Baynham [5456]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1163	<p>The proposals for the A27 do not address the need of local traffic , only through traffic. The Hamburger junctions will cause major delays at peak times plus additional miles in order to travel eastwards from south of the A27. The similar scheme in the 2016 consultation was firmly rejected by the community. The northern relief route as proposed by SYSTRA consultants is the only viable solution to separating through and local traffic.</p> <p>Construction of new junctions could last for up to 15 years , a ridiculous prospect for all road users.</p>		Comment	Mr Roger Baynham [5456]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1200	The link road from the Fishbourne Roundabout would go straight though a flood plain Level 3 and a site of environmental significance impacting on the AONB and the views to the SDNP nad Chichester cathedral. There are no robust plans to demonstrate that cycling or walking routes will be enhanced, air quality improved or increased congestion mitigated. Car sharing clubs and electric charging points, although sound strategies, are a drop in the ocean and will do very little to ameliorate car journeys. A fully funded public transport . Plans in this policy are vague and wooly.	*A fully costed and funded integrated public transport system is essential . *Park and Ride could serve Goodwood events, beach traffic, commuters and would be ideally placed in Apuldram	Object	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1215	the impact on residents of Donnington and Apuldram resulting from these developments will be considerable, particularly the proposals for access to the A27. it is not clear what the co-ordinated series of improvements to the A27 roundabouts consists of but if it includes no right turn proposals, even with the proposed new road (ON A FLOOD PLAIN !!) it will be intolerable.	Remove any proposals for no right turn at Stockbridge and Whyke roundabouts. include aim of securing a northern alternative via negotiations with Highway Agency in longer term.	Object	Ms. Lynda Marsh [7074]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1230	Donnington residents disadvantaged by the proposed changes to the A27. There will be even more congestion. This is a version of Option 2 that residents voted out in the previous consultation. Pollution levels are ALREADY exceeded in the Stockbridge area and all the current Options for the A27 will only cause more damage to quality of life for local people in the areas surrounding the A27. After seeing the Stockbridge Footbridge debacle when ONE footbridge went over budget and took a whole YEAR. These so called "improvements" would bring years of misery for local residents.	Improve the air quality in Stockbridge as it already EXCEEDS the recommended levels. Request serious funding for a proper alternative to the proposed A27 ideas. These ideas do not offer a viable long term solution to the A27.	Object	Penny Kirk [6567]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1237	Proposed plans for the A27 and AL6 will further deteriorate Air Quality. Stockbridge already EXCEEDS the recommended air quality levels.	Remove AL6 Seek proper funding for alternative routes rather than messing about with A27 online options.	Object	Penny Kirk [6567]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1259	Although the plan contains proposals to deal with congestion at the A27 junctions, there is nothing to address the congestion caused by railway crossings. We are not convinced that the proposed junction improvements proposed as mitigation measures will fulfil the requirement. The mitigation proposed can not be achieved without a significant deleterious effect on the travel options for the population south of the A27. They merely perpetuate proposed solutions that have already been overwhelmingly rejected by the local population.	Further consideration to be given the issued caused by the railway crossings and the A27 junctions	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1267	Although a resident of Stockbridge Road my property only has vehicular access at the rear via Queen's Avenue. The PBA Report(pp67-68) which states there will be banned right turns "...from the A27 onto Stockbridge Road" and "...from the A27 onto B2145 Whyke Road" supports this Policy (S23) severely disadvantages residents such as myself and those in Queen's Gardens. For example, a driver proceeding from, say, Donnington Parish Hall to Queen's Ave would have to proceed west to Fishbourne and then east to Bognor roundabout before returning west. The alternative via the B2201 is equally inconvenient.	Do not restrict any junctions to "No Right Turn". Do not use the LOCAL plan to prioritise through traffic and at the same time deteriorate the congestion / journey times for local residents. In order to facilitate meaningful consultation: 1) Clarify diagrams and text in the PBA report (Figs. 7.5 & 7.6) regarding A27 Junctions 14 & 15 (Stockbridge & Whyke). 2) Include comparisons of Journey Times (Appendix F) to include journeys affected by "No Right Turn" restrictions at Stockbridge and Whyke. 3) Consider alternative options such as traffic lights at these two roundabouts	Object	Mr Graham Hart [7078]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1287	Elevation of Birdham/Fishbourne road across flood plain takes pollution to bedroom window level.HE accept it would be upgraded to dual carriageway. Traffic tailbacks in holiday season caused by speed of access to coastal car parks not road infra-structure. Tailbacks will still occur obstructing access to business units on AL6. First stage of new southern by-pass by deceit. Major risk of obstruction to water vole and other wildlife corridors between Fishbourne meadow, Lavant, pond and ditches on AL6. Donnington/Hunston residents disadvantaged by no right A27turn. Were trafficlights before roundabouts. Priority to through traffic over local. Prevailing wind carries pollution over Chichester.	REMOVE: proposed Birdham/Fishbourne Road Do not prevent right turns from Hunston and Donnington onto A27 Work with Highways England to find a solution that will separate through and local traffic. AMEND: Plan to show what development opportunities the option of a northern ring road would permit if that were to happen.	Object	Mr and Mrs A Martin [5053]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1310	As a resident of Donnington this policy will greatly reduce my access to the city and travel eastwards. It effectively cuts off Donnington from the city and will cause extra congestion, noise and atmospheric pollution to residents of Stockbridge Road. The levels of pollutants already being below acceptable standards due to high traffic volumes.	Do not make changes to access arrangements in this area.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1325	This proposal has already been rejected by the council.	This policy is against CDC decisions voted last year. It should be removed!	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1339	Residents of Donnington will be severely disadvantaged by the proposed changes to the A27 and the inability to access the A27 eastward without first going westward, utilising the revised Fishbourne roundabout. Alternative routes east will add traffic either through the city or through Hunston and North Mundham. Additionally increased traffic from Whyke will also add more congestion between Donnington and Fishbourne. With each of the 5 junctions proposed taking 3 years of work then Donnington residents will be condemned to 15 years of disruption. The plans benefit through traffic to the detriment of local residents.	Residents approaching the A27 from Donnington need to be able to continue to access the A27 eastward directly. Changes need to take account of the impact on existing local residents and these should not be compromised by the siting of new industrial and dwelling sites in the area.	Object	Mr David Roue [7122]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1358	Many fine words but the right incentives need to be in place to carry these out and to encourage change of habits.		Comment	Mr David Leah [6440]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1364	Donnington residents will be hugely disadvantaged by proposed changes to the A27 access arrangements- effectively no access to the East from Donnington (or Manhood Peninsula) Is A27 unless residents either head West first, encountering the amended Fishbourne roundabout (already v busy) which will prioritize through traffic and will include an additional junction. Alternative routes to the eAst are either through the City or via unsuitable back roads (creating rat runs and putting residents at increased risk), increasing traffic levels through Hunston and North Mundham. Increased traffic from Whyke (facing same issues) will cause even more congestion between Donnington and Fishbourne.	A viable site is available for Industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1375	Each of the 5 junction modifications requires 3 years of work meaning 15 years of misery for Chichester residents whilst the junction work takes place. The recent replacement of one footbridge brought chaos and gridlock to the area....times this by 5 makes it wholly unacceptable. The plans for improvement are to the advantage of thru traffic not local residents and bear a marked similarity to the Chichester A27 Bypass consultation which were emphatically rejected by the local community in Donnington and across the whole of Chichester	Move the site and negate the need for this disruption A viable alternative site is available fir industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there.	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1378	Support donnington bypass		Support	Mrs Charlotte Brewer [6734]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1413	The proposed changes to the A27 will benefit through traffic rather than local residents. As a Donnington resident I'll be incredibly disadvantaged as I'll effectively not have access to the East from Donnington via A27 unless I head West first. This would be financial burden due to added commuting costs and lower quality of life as a result of the extended travel time and poorer air quality . The modifications will cause years of misery to local residents. We must all remember the chaos and overruns caused by the replacement of one footbridge in Stockbridge, let alone five junction modifications	The South Downs National Park should take the allocations of the additional dwelling instead of Apuldram and Donnington. Development in the South Downs National Park will encourage investment which will help the local community to thrive. A viable alternative for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there. Both suggestions will minimise disruption to Chichester residents as a whole as well.	Object	N/A (Miss Vivian Lau) [7148]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1414	Penultimate para, first sentence. Is proposed scope of contributing developments consistent with Highways England's current approach of requiring contributions from not only new housing development identified in current LP but also significant new economic/business development, as well as significant "windfall" housing development not specifically identified in LP? Could therefore significant windfall/not identified in LP developments and other development avoid contributing to A27 junctions package? Comment also applicable to Para 4.84.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1429	The new proposed road from Fishbourne to Birdham will make the situation worse, especially when the West Wittering beach traffic arrives in the Summer. It will also take away a wildlife area.		Object	Mrs Barbara Colwell [6931]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1443	Donnington residents hugely disadvantaged by junction improvement proposals. Traffic will increase on unsuitable rural roads as a result. Major concerns over AQMA already, incorrect information in PBA report and plans will inevitably make the situation worse due to standing traffic at traffic lights. Measures appear to favour through traffic not local traffic and bear a marked resemblance to Option 3 from the Chichester Bypass Improvement scheme consultation which was REJECTED by the community.	Rethink the proposed changes to prioritise local traffic, and take proper account of Air Quality issues.	Object	Donnington Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann (Parish Clerk)) [888]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1449	Any plans for Birdham link road should be abandoned.		Object	Graham Campbell [6915]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1455	The roads plan to favour the through traffic along the A27 and reintroduces plans for a southern link road and road plans that have already been rejected in the A27 consultations(options 2&3) This would cause an increase of traffic on the A259, more congestion around the Tesco's roundabout which is already a very dangerous one and increased air pollution.		Object	Mr Gary Snook [7161]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1458	I feel the current infrastructure needs also to be improved. As you are already aware the A27 is already at saturation point every morning and afternoon and most of the daytime during the summer period being the main trunk route East to West to the Channel Ports and holiday destinations in the West Country. This is a good opportunity to consider sympathetically upgrading the existing route before building another road through our local countryside.		Comment	Mr Graham Dipple [7162]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1465	Relief road from Fishbourne roundabout to A286 will destroy beauty and habitat and add to danger of roundabout		Comment	Ms Helen Boarer [5749]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1474	The roads plan to favour the through traffic along the A27 and reintroduces plans for a southern link road and road plans that have already been rejected in the A27 consultations(options 2&3) This would cause an increase of traffic on the A259, more congestion around the Tesco's roundabout which is already a very dangerous one and increased air pollution.		Object	Karen Ongley-Snook [7151]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1489	The infrastructure needs to be in place before development is permitted.Small changes to A27 junctions will not work and will cause more congestion in the short term. a long term solution is needed. The Birdham Road link will add to traffic congestion. The A286 needs to be widened with dedicated cycle/horse routes or be cycle/horse free. Building houses to fund roads is not good for our countryside.		Comment	Mr Derrick pope [6778]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1493	The link road is a factor which must be reconsidered with its impact on accessibility to the already congested Fishbourne roundabout., If it is to be recommended there must be mitigation by a flyover east - west at this junction, A27, with pre-agreement with Highways England for this to go ahead.The level of the road is also a concern. Preferable to divert traffic from the south, east of the southern development area .Highways England involvement is needed here.		Comment	Mr Richard Young [7109]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1503	Proposals for the improvements are flawed and will lead to unacceptable detours for residents in Donnington Air pollution issues in and established AQMA have not been taken into account. Similar scheme already rejected by the community.	Rethink the proposals.	Object	Mr Christopher Swann [7177]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1546	How many additional peak-time traffic movements will be caused by the 33ha industrial site proposed for AL6 (a larger site than the Terminus Road industrial estate) adjacent to the Fishbourne roundabout junction and proposed linkroad? And by the 100+ houses planned on AL6? The PBA traffic plan and S23 seem to just be about shuffling the congestion between Fishbourne, Stockbridge and Whyke; will the Local Plan be looking at ways of Reducing peak-time traffic volumes at these roundabouts? Such as building fewer houses south of the A27 or having an exit-only junction on the eastbound A27 Before the Fishbourne roundabout?		Comment	Mr Andrew Thrasher [7123]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1560	Fishbourn Roundabout - Birdham link road was not included in any previous study of junctions, it serves no purpose and should be scrapped	Suppress	Object	Mr John Davies [5359]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1573	Grossly insufficient attention is being paid to adverse impact on traffic created by development. Highways in Chichester & environs are already extremely busy several hours daily. Proposed massive increase in housing in/around the City will inevitably lead to much greater congestion:indeed gridlock when traffic on the A27 has issues (these will get significantly worse until Highways England approve/build the upgrade for A27. Studies undertaken so far have been far from convincing. In particular the junction between Norwich Rd and St Pauls' Rd needs to be resolved. It's already dangerous but the developers say they're not required to improve this junction.	Realistic and independent studies of the effects of traffic arising from the planned new developments should be commissioned which should clearly identify the impact of this on the communities served by the roads effected including likely changes in air pollution. It is not reasonable for these studies to assume changes from car to public or non motorised forms of transport unless they can guarantee it will happen.	Object	Mr Chris Lindsay [4884]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1574	The addition of several 1000 new homes to the local area will bring greatly increased traffic to the local roads leading to increased queuing at all pinch points at peak times. This is already occurring at e.g. the roundabouts in central Emsworth and Southbourne, the exit point from the A259 onto the A27, and at the railway crossing in Southbourne. Consideration should be given to a more detailed transport management policy enhancing public transport options, promoting alternatives to combustion-engined vehicles within developments (e.g. by providing electric car charging points) and by making cycling journeys safer than at present.		Comment	Dr Alison Barker [7188]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1578	Any new road infrastructure should include generous cycle routes (and not just lines on the road).	There should be a specific bullet point to increasing dedicated cycle routes and highlighting the importance of encouraging pedestrians At the moment the emphasis is on four wheeled transport.	Object	Mrs Lynne Friel [4991]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1596	This should include the WSCC/CDC preferred solution of a new bypass to the north of the city. The proposed link road from Fishbourne roundabout to the Birdham Road was part of one of HE's proposals tabled in 2016 which was strongly rejected at consultation. A new bypass to the north would obviate the need for this link road.		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1602	Object to S23 on basis of impact on air quality in conflict with DM24.		Object	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1613	Donnington residents will be hugely disadvantaged by proposed changes to A27 access arrangements under policy S23 and the Peter Brett Associates report-effectively no access to the East from Donnington(or the Manhood Peninsula) unless heading to the amended Fishbourne roundabout which will prioritise through traffic. Increased traffic levels on the alternative back roads are unacceptable and will actually cause increased traffic congestion between Donnington and Fishbourne.	Stop that plan as it disadvantages too many residents that live and work in the area. The A27 needs a northern route to support through traffic. Then the existing A27 can support the local economy by providing viable uncongested routes into and out of Chichester. If these changes go ahead Chichester will crumble as tourism is seasonal. If it only relies on tourism as residents can't access the city it will not survive. I am a local resident that has to shop elsewhere as you can not exit the city after 3pm. This is not sustainable or logical.	Object	Mrs Philippa Hook [7195]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1616	Support EV charging provision. Concern over an apparent restriction of access onto the Manhood Peninsula as per A27 junction changes and AL6 link road improvement plans. Consider park and ride, bus and rail services are unlikely to integrate neatly as hoped. Also a little confusing to have the city transport strategy and the main transport strategy presented separately. This is necessarily a comment on both.		Comment	Anna Khoo [7196]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1619	The current proposals only take into account traffic growth from the development and not additional through traffic. The A27 is heavily congested with a high accident rate, The proposals are inadequate will cause greater air pollution in areas where there is existing air and light quality monitoring. Proposals for roundabouts and in particular Fishbourne. Proposed Link Road is in flood zone 2 and 3. Significant impact on Chichester Harbour (SSI and Ramsar Sites) both noise and disturbance leading to further environmental degradation of this AONB. Destruction of views of the Cathedral and to the SDNP which frames the Chichester Area	Remove link road. Review policy to separate through traffic and local traffic on the A27. Discard policy AL6.	Object	Ms Louise Goldsmith [5667]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1663	Proposals are similar to Option 3a of HE studies which were emphatically rejected by the local community and across the whole of Chichester . They will not improve traffic congestion and will significantly result in poorer air quality. There is no evidence that they could be wholly funded by CIL Increased journey times based on restricted right turns on Stockbridge should be included in consultants calculations	Remove proposed link road to support Development indicated at AL6 Reduce car movements by investing in improved public transport links	Object	David Ball [7141]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1677	The population of Chichester have asked for a new strategic route for the A27 endorsed by both CDC and West Sussex County Council (WSCC) in a democratic process. This needs to be incorporated into the plan. CDC should go back to government and state that the allocation of housing numbers within a very constrained area is not deliverable unless an acceptable solution to the A27 is provided within the life of this revised plan.	The population of Chichester have asked for a new strategic route for the A27 endorsed by both CDC and West Sussex County Council (WSCC) in a democratic process. This needs to be incorporated into the plan. CDC should go back to government and state that the allocation of housing numbers within a very constrained area is not deliverable unless an acceptable solution to the A27 is provided within the life of this revised plan.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1683	Policy S23 has no mention is made of the preferred Northern route as part of the RIS funding that CDC voted for.	Policy S23 has no mention is made of the preferred Northern route as part of the RIS funding that CDC voted for. This strategic route must be mentioned in this local plan summary. The councils transport strategy must reflect this and work with HE to develop a truly integrated transport plan which ensures that strategic sites are positioned on the expected likely route of the mitigated Northern bypass.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1688	Policy S23. I can see no evidence that the rejected option 2/3 which is proposed in this plan achieves the "These will increase road capacity, reduce traffic congestion, improve safety and air quality, and improve access to Chichester City from surrounding areas". This plan must come up with an integrated transport plan in coordination with HE which integrates with the Mitigated Northern route and not allow the introduction of flawed online options which this council and the public voted against. The selection of sites is influencing a plan to deliver options that are not supported	This plan must come up with an integrated transport plan in coordination with HE which integrates with the Mitigated Northern route and not allow the introduction of flawed online options which this council and the public voted against.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1695	Policy S23. I can see no evidence that the rejected option 2/3 which is proposed in this plan achieves the "These will increase road capacity, reduce traffic congestion, improve safety and air quality, and improve access to Chichester City from surrounding areas". This plan must come up with an integrated transport plan in coordination with HE which integrates with the Mitigated Northern route and not allow the introduction of flawed online options which this council and the public voted against. The selection of sites is influencing a plan to deliver options that are not supported	This plan must come up with an integrated transport plan in coordination with HE which integrates with the Mitigated Northern route and not allow the introduction of flawed online options which this council and the public voted against.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1780	The transport plans do not support the movement of local people. A plan that prioritises through traffic over local traffic, cannot call itself a local plan. The detrimental impact of the long construction period on the economy is not adequately considered. Chichester has an air quality problem and as a result this should be a primary consideration in any transport solution. Restricted access at junctions and the Stockbridge Link Road have been rejected previously. Remove them. Recognise the unique views of the cathedral from the south and that building on a flood plain will mean losing these.	The transport plan needs to be revised. Remove restrictions to junctions and ensure full local movements. Remove the Stockbridge Link Road. Make air pollution a primary consideration in the revised mitigations	Object	Heather McDougall [6651]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1786	Insufficient evidence of and weight given to sustainable transport in a "transport study" which is essentially a traffic study. Objection submitted on behalf both of myself and of Parklands Residents' Association and on the basis that the proposals as explained by the PBA report appear detrimental to Parklands and contradictory to the objectives of the Plan.	We wish to work with CDC to better understand and improve this section of the Plan, and attach a list of comments and questions. It is essential, if Chichester is to be somewhere that people choose to cycle and the Local Plan Review is not to fail, that traffic impacts are properly assessed in terms of people, not just traffic movements.	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1814	Transport Infrastructure is incomplete without acknowledging and providing for the role of trees and vegetation in mitigating harm and encouraging safe, active travel, including promoting design to retain established trees/hedgerows/vegetation as well as to plant more. I am submitting this Objection on behalf both of myself and of Chichester Tree Wardens.	Acknowledge the role of trees/hedgerows/vegetation as part of transport infrastructure (not just green infrastructure) and promote design to retain established trees/hedgerows/vegetation as well as to plant more.	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1828	I object to the proposed new road between Birdham Road and the Fishbourne roundabout because of the impact on the environment. This is near the AONB which is a precious but fragile part of our district and development on it should be greatly restricted	- commit to alternative sustainable transport solutions. - limit development on the Manhood peninsula where there are few jobs. - make improvements to the A286 roundabout to improve the flow of traffic.	Object	Mrs Sarah Scarfe [7214]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1843	a) This additional policy is welcomed b) I particularly welcome the proposed new road connecting Birdham Road to the A27 at Fishbourne roundabout. This was known as the Stockbridge Link Road as part of Highways England Option 2 in their 2016 ill-fated consultation. I feel other aspects of Option 2 should be allowed for future inclusion particularly the flyovers for the A27 at the Fishbourne and Bognor Road roundabouts.		Support	Mr Andrew Bain [7217]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1853	Object to link road as previously rejected for following reasons: - eyesore/affect views - would not solve congestion - air pollution		Object	Charlotte Horn [7218]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1855	Raised link road will have a detrimental effect on the area, a raised road will raise pollution, seriously affect the landscape and affect wildlife in the fields around. This is particular will seriously affect the character and beauty of the area obstructing views of the City, Cathedral and the Downs, the very things which attract visitors to our area		Object	Mrs C Shepherd [6948]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1858	Concerns over changes to roundabouts, rat run situation, pollution caused by traffic		Comment	Mrs Danielle Charboneau [7220]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1863	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Background study does not explore medium and long term transport infrastructure - All options should be included in the study - A27 is at full capacity - Increase in air and noise pollution - Lack of funding identified - Poor bus and rail links between Chidham and Hambrook, Bosham, Southbourne and Fishbourne 		Object	Jennie Horn [7223]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1867	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggest a policy for trees and green planting to mitigate against traffic fumes - Cycling should be promoted as a sustainable methods of transport - Integration of trains and buses supported - Not enough electric car charging points 		Comment	Jenny Cole [7114]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1882	<p>Concern about impact of development and A27 mitigation proposals on traffic including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Free School, Bartholomews, Kingsham Quarry - A27 affected by queuing during rush hours and Bank Holidays - Increased rat running - Delays to public transport - Increased accidents - Oving Road crossing will increase traffic in St James' Road - Cyclist and pedestrian safety at roundabouts on A27 		Comment	Michael Horne [7224]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1887	<p>Policy S23 is not acceptable on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highways England Option 2 which was comprehensively rejected by the public. - If S23 were to be implemented according to the Peter Brett consultation then SDNP should have to take more housing and trade development to relieve pressure that would be put on the Manhood Peninsula. - Manhood cannot cope with any more development without having a complete upgrade of the A27, not the Peter Brett S23 option. <p>The SDNP (Policy S3, Policy S5 and Policy S19) should share some of the development or have a northern route around Chichester.</p>		Comment	William Fleming [7227]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1896	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Degradation of air quality and major health consequences from the east/west flow of heavy goods traffic - Routes considered for mitigation not considered equally 		Comment	Mr Timothy C Kinross [4556]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1906	<p>Concerns relating to housing development and overburden of the A27 at Stockbridge and Fishbourne:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air quality - High levels of pollution 		Comment	Laura Marrinan [7231]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1937	<p>The A27 in present form and proposed northern route (2016) no supported on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present southern route unworkable - Northern route unaffordable - Proposed link road in AL6 would push traffic south, roads not capable of coping with increased traffic - Cost of mitigation measures not enough 		Comment	Mrs Sally Mountstephen [7239]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1958	Object - LPR pays lip service to promoting transport alternatives such as walking, cycle routes, public transport and EV charging points.	A commitment to make proactive measures to promote alternatives forms of transport.	Object	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1963	Roads - increasing traffic, but crumbling roads, no A27 bypass solution.		Comment	Mr David Myers [4894]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	1981	As prevailing wind is from south-west, best long-term solution would be to site A27 north of city.		Comment	Mr Anthony Tuffin [5052]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2000	Attachment contends that proposed alterations/mitigations to the A27 focus on the E-W-E through flow of traffic and will make local traffic journeys longer/use unsuitable narrow residential City centre roads.	Up to date and realistic understanding of effects of proposed alterations and mitigation to A27 on local journeys should be gained; right turns should be reinstated; Systra's identification of key issues must be used; increase in air pollution from increased congestion needs to be dealt with; cost-benefit analysis on A27 junction alterations required; development and road construction timetables to be made available; dedicated cycle paths incorporated.	Comment	Mr Martin Tomlinson MBE [6586]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2001	Broadly supportive of proposed improvements to the A27 to mitigate impacts of development. Nevertheless, urges decision takers to continue to pursue RIS2 Government funding to deliver more strategic interventions to enhance effectiveness of works given the upheaval that any construction works to the A27 is likely to have.		Comment	Mr mark Jeffries [6943]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2003	Object to proposal for traffic controlled roundabout: will limit access with no right turns; create more commercial traffic; lose existing farm and greenery.		Object	Mrs C Shepherd [6948]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2012	A27 junction improvements appear to be a 'southern route' by stealth. Apuldram link road in particular is of serious concern due to its proximity to Harbour.		Object	Mr Graham Porrett [7251]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2034	The SRA welcomes the additional policy however, we feel that the construction of the Stockbridge relief road is likely to be unnecessary because the proposals for the A27 works together with the changes in vehicle use is likely to make that redundant before it is constructed.		Comment	Summersdale Residents Association (Mr Roger Hobbs) [5435]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2046	The plan has no recent transport data and isn't robust enough to cope with current or future traffic.		Object	Ms Sarah Lambert [7257]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2108	Understandably much consideration is given to the A27 around Chichester; however, in addition to seeking new infrastructure from new development, it is recommended support in principle is given to maximising the value of existing infrastructure so as to facilitate off-road user modes accessing either side of the A27.	Support in principle should be given to maximising the value of existing infrastructure so as to facilitate off-road user modes accessing either side of the A27.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2198	The policy includes a new road connecting Birdham Road to the A27 Fishbourne roundabout. The site includes areas within flood zones 2 and 3 and will cross a number of watercourse. It is essential that the requirements of the NPPF paras 157-8 are satisfied prior to the allocation. We have made detailed comments on this in relation to policy AL6 - Land South West of Chichester.		Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2213	There needs to be a in integrated transport plan for the Area West of Chichester, and infrastructure investment to support this. It is not sufficient for CDC to pass on this to WSCC, there needs to be a joint solution found to these issues.		Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2324	AL6. This development, though superficially sensible, should only be actioned after the long-awaited improvements to the A27 have been made. Need flyovers for Fishbourne and Stockbridge roundabouts	Flyovers for Fishbourne and Stockbridge roundabouts	Object	Dr Mark Dancy [6961]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2353	Bullet point 8 - inclusion of PRoW is welcomed		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2385	Support policy S23 and add the following comments: - Park and ride to be considered		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2442	<p>Support in principle, particularly emphasis on sustainable modes. Suggest explicit support for improving links into NP.</p> <p>New package of improvements to A27 should be fully assessed for potential adverse impacts on landscape where there is relationship with NP. Impacts will need to be mitigated and opps taken to improve GI networks. May wish to consider additional wording to reflect this.</p> <p>Not clear what impact Scenario 1 from transport model will have on A286 which may impact on junction capacity - may seek further assurances.</p> <p>Strongly support policy to secure off-road connection for Salterns Way and Centurion Way.</p>		Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2469	<p>Transport studies have restricted scope - focus on immediate vicinity of Chichester and A27.</p> <p>Movements in Southbourne aggregated with other movements to assess impacts on A27 - predominantly on Fishbourne junction. Fail to examine local network impacts</p> <p>Object to link road - difficulty accessing A27/A259; impact on environment; views; setting of Fishbourne wildlife corridor</p> <p>Support creation of transport plan - inc cycle routes and protect pedestrian routes</p> <p>Southbourne pedestrian bridge over railway should be inc in policy.</p>	<p>CDC together with WSCC Highways should undertake to provide specialist advice to those Parish Councils chosen to implement proposed strategic housing allocations through Neighbourhood Plans in order to assess the impacts of the scale of such allocations on the local highway network. Such advice should be provided in order to aid site selection prior to any master planning of the subsequent development proposal and to help find solutions to traffic problems arising.</p> <p>Include Sbourne pedestrian bridge in policy</p>	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2479	<p>Object to link road and changes to Fishbourne roundabout: flood risk, reduce accessibility, increase danger</p> <p>Travel plan should consider increase in summer traffic to beaches.</p> <p>Development should be phased towards end of plan period to allow time for implementing/funding travel plan.</p> <p>Require moratorium on any applications which would result in more traffic on the local network and its junctions with the main road network until the Department for Transport has agreed a route for a new Chichester Bypass, allocated funding for it and announced a date for the completion of its implementation.</p>		Comment	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2495	<p>No provision for impact of 2250 homes between Southbourne and Fishbourne.</p> <p>Access to A27 at Fishbourne will be worsened by addition of no right turns at roundabouts. Hamburger junction will be gridlocked in summer.</p> <p>Object to link road - flood plain/impact on environment/views</p> <p>Need more robust policy focusing on sustainable transport</p> <p>Support creation of travel plan - including cycle routes</p>	Provide advice to PCs undertaking NPs for strategic allocations to assess impacts of scale of allocations on local network - should be provided to aid site selection	Object	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2516	Support creation of integrated travel plan - should inc cycle routes and protect pedestrian routes.		Comment	Bosham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [749]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2525	<p>Require strategic solution but local impact cannot be overstressed. Commuting for employment etc relies on functioning A27.</p> <p>Sidlesham experiences issues from Selsey commuters e.g. pollution/noise/traffic. Any development in Selsey should contribute to upgrading entire length of B2145</p> <p>No specific proposals for sustainable transport</p>		Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2538	Reference should be made to the road bridge proposed over the railway in the Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan in the table following paragraph 5.31 and Policy S23.	An analysis of traffic movement within the Bournes area and particularly within Southbourne should be undertaken. Policy 23 should refer to the need for new proposed crossings over the railway line at Southbourne.	Object	Mrs Sue Talbot [6219]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2567	We are concerned about the increased traffic on the Chichester-Selsey road (B2145). This road has to be crossed by those walking or cycling from Pagham Harbour to Medmerry and expect more accidents will happen unless better crossing facilities are provided.		Comment	Friends of Pagham Harbour (Mr Francis Parfremment) [6213]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2575	<p>Housing on Manhood would require mitigation for traffic.</p> <p>Paras 3.2.22 and 3.2.23 conflict with para 3.2.24 - no risk analysis as to death from pollutants.</p> <p>The Peter Brett Transport Study estimates that the cost of mitigation measures at £68m, this level is clearly way beyond the level at which it could be funded by developer contributions. Without defined future funding plans, housing development should be phased in line with actual funding.</p>		Comment	Earnley Parish Council (Mrs Louise Chater) [16]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2579	<p>Disappointed that only improvements for A27 are to mitigate new development.</p> <p>Proposal is supported is full given loss of HE2b proposal.</p> <p>Need more clarity over funding sources</p> <p>In relation to bullet points 8 and 9, we would wish to reiterate the importance of established cycle routes, especially Centurion Way and the Canal route, and the absolute necessity of their upkeep and development in accordance with NICE guidelines, and would urge further development of networked cycle routes</p>		Comment	Lavant Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1116]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2630	<p>Consider that work should be done to assess new junction onto A27 at Southbourne.</p> <p>Should make clear that list of works detailed is not exhaustive as not all development land is being allocated in plan.</p>		Comment	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2650	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Junction improvements reflect options rejected by previous consultation. - No mention of preferred Northern route for A27. - No mention of engagement with HE. - Junction on A27 at Southbourne should be supported. - Development money should not be used to improve a HE road. <p>See attached for full detail.</p>		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2657	Support policy but also recognise that cars are only form of transport in some areas so should not be too restrictive on use of car transportation		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2717	Important walking and cycling routes to be identified and not lost to new development; potential of cycling to mitigate traffic increase should be recognised; transport priorities should be reversed from roads-first approach; electric cars worthy; railway barrier timings to operate more efficiently; section 5.18 is missing reference to landscape protection; section 5.27 is unrealistic in expectations in light of recent bus timetable cuts; 5.28 failing to predict induced demand is not a measure to control travel demand; 5.31 transport assessment fails to consider mitigating climate change, minimising pollution, protecting character of area from visual intrusion.	change term "road improvements to "road re-workings". 5.16 CHANGE TO "... There is an extensive public rights of way network across the plan area, and a number of cycle paths, including the nationally important National Cycle Route Two. There are also several cycle routes that are currently incomplete but have great potential as drivers for tourism, and to offer alternatives to the car on shorter journeys. These include the Centurion Way (with a proposed extension to Midhurst), the Selsey Greenway (formerly the Selsey Cycle route), and the Chemroute (a proposed route between Chichester and Emsworth.)	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2718	Object to new road connecting Birdham Road to A27 Fishbourne roundabout on grounds that: commitments to climate change will be undermined; existing wildlife habitat; existing recreation and tourist site; mitigation potential is questionable, increased capacity will induce demand. Council should reverse priorities: instal better walking and cycling infrastructure then look to "extract" a portion of journeys onto public transport and potentially "Eways" (as detailed in the appended document).	Delete bullet point 4 of policy. 5.29 Change the last sentence to "In preparation for such a situation arising, potential park and ride sites will be identified at an early stage of this plan period, and if necessary secured. Also, a review may be required to revise the transport strategy for the city." Section 5.30 - Third Sentence: Change to "Implementation of the necessary measures".	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2729	SWT is supportive of CDC's commitment to an improved integrated transport network which we hope will conform to the Government's transport hierarchy. Raise deep concerns about new Birdham Road to A27 Fishbourne Link road proposal as we are aware of the priority habitats of chalk stream and coastal grazing marsh being present, along with the close proximity to Lavant Marsh LWS and Chichester Harbour SPA/SAC/SSSI and Ramsar. Remind CDC this area is within the Site of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zone, which affects the SAC, SPA and Ramsar designations. Question the survey data against biodiversity needs.		Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2805	- Proposed link road has been in consultation for nearly 50 years. - Should be built before any changes to the A27. - No right turn at Stockbridge doubles the travel miles - Roundabout should have a fly-over. See attached plan. - Residents voted for a northern A27 which would halve the traffic on this by-pass and lessen the pollution.		Comment	Mrs Phyllis Wilson [7321]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2841	The present ideas for developing the A27 will, if it goes ahead bring 15 years of misery for all the people using the local road system. The road works will slow traffic down meaning even more air pollution than we already have. Extra time will be required to make all journeys. Our homes will be devalued, those of us living within half a mile will be unable to sell property. Our house rates go up, but our house value will go down.	I suggest go ahead with a flyover at both Fisbourne and Bognor junctions, but at Stockbridge and Whyke juntions have under-passes. Le'havre in France have a main road along the seafront that have underpasses that is the design we need. They only take the centre lane traffic and have a heigh restriction. Lorry's use near side land and go around the roundabout with local traffic. With so many cars and smaller vans etc going under it take the bulk off the roundabout leaving them for lorry's and locals to go in any direction they require.	Object	Cynthia Skinner [7325]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2851	Two issues seriously concern us. 1. The proposed 'no right tum' from the A27 at the Whyke and Stockbridge roundabouts will add to people's journeys in an area already close to the Government's limits for safe air quality. 2. The frustration involved by the above may cause drivers to seek alternative routes through Whyke's already congested 20 MPH roads.		Object	JAF and GB Wright [7329]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2905	Policy S23 Transport and Accessibility4th bullet: Any proposal for a new 'link road' from Fishbourne roundabout to the Birdham road will be fiercely controversial. Many will see it as a foot in the door to establishing the full Stockbridge link road which was roundly rejected by voters in 2017. its aim is to provide relief for the A27 be effectively redirecting much local traffic along the congested minor roads of the Manhood peninsula. This will be inevitable if the other provisos of the Brett report are implemented, preventing easy access to the A27.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	2906	POLICY S23 - Bullet point 5 SUPPORT (Car sharing clubs)		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3051	Need to provide clarification on potential mitigation for resolving commuting pressures given that sub-region is facing unmet need and pressure to deliver growth		Comment	Arun District Council (N/A N/A N/A) [6554]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3152	Car Free Day enables the local population to experience more traffic calmed areas, must start to restrict the growth in private car use. CIL money should be allocated to pushing forward measures designed to address climate change obligations, health needs, sustainable travel.	Insert new bullet points: "Provision for a Car Free Day" and "Provision of bus lanes and cycle lanes". Change bullet point "Provision for electric charging points and hydrogen refuelling".	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3161	Objection to imposition of a version of option 3a, rejected by community. Will result in 15 years of chaos. Through traffic may benefit but local, holiday and city traffic will suffer immeasurably.		Object	Mr John Ridd [7376]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3165	I found the Peter Brett document both obscure and contradictory, and lacking in coherence. Although there are no large scale developments proposed within the Whyke area, traffic will increase as a result of population growth in the surrounding areas. Proposals for A27 are a concern because alterations to junctions at both Whyke and Stockbridge roundabouts include 'no right turn' limitations. Inconvenience to westbound traffic from the A27 accessing town, eastbound traffic accessing Donnington, Witterings, Hunston and Manhood. Cars will seek alternative 'rat runs' through narrow and speed restricted streets. More mileage will be added to each journey, worsening air quality.		Object	Mr Alan Carn [5417]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3251	Support policy.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3452	Object to the unreasonable and unacceptable proposal that local residents will effectively have no access to the East from Donnington.		Object	A + D Lygo-Baker [7425]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3485	Believe the only acceptable and correct solution for the A27 bypass should be a long term plan as recommended by Systra to cover the next 50 years. Any mitigating works as proposed in the Plan will cause the following: - more pollution - affect air quality - additional noise - traffic queues	No mitigating work should be considered, an acceptable long term plan for the bypass must be found and if necessary work delayed until funding is available.	Object	Mrs Sarah Headlam [7441]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3490	<p>Chichester Area Strategic Development Plan 2002 found that Stockbridge roundabout is not suited to signalisation. Testing by Highways Agency indicated that this layout could not operate satisfactory. No right turns have reappeared, similar to consultation about 15 years ago.</p> <p>I need to turn right off the A27 into the A286, to do this, I will have to navigate Fishbourne roundabout and drive back down to Stockbridge roundabout to turn into Stockbridge Road.</p> <p>HGV, tractors and trailers traveling from Bosham depot, on the A27 to Nature's Way at Selsey, mean Bognor roundabout will be at full capacity.</p>		Object	Mrs Jenny Hammerton [6929]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3496	<p>Despite quantity of new development being put forward, there has been no analysis of the impact locally. There are no proposals to manage the additional traffic on the A259. For example, there is scope for a co-ordinated approach to keep speeds down, provide village gateways and more pedestrian crossings. Cycle lanes are sporadic.</p> <p>An analysis should be undertaken of the effect of the increased traffic on local roads generated by the proposed development in Southbourne and appropriate road improvements and traffic management implemented accordingly.</p>	An analysis of traffic movement within the Bournes area and particularly within Southbourne should be undertaken. Policy 23 should refer to the need for new proposed crossings over the railway line at Southbourne.	Object	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3505	1. I support provision of link road to reduce traffic volume through Donnington.		Comment	Mr Geoff May [6914]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3508	Policies should seek to deliver joining up of existing network PROW to enable access to National Park.		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3509	<p>DM8 states that any development must minimize and not create or add to problems of highway safety, congestion , air pollution or other damage.</p> <p>The Conservative Government have not spent money in Sussex for decades, has been little done since the Brighton Bypass. I believe that there is a policy, or a non written agenda that money will not be spent on the south's transport infrastructure. London, Runcorn, the motorways and the north billions, the south nothing! This lack of investment brings the actual and proposed increase in housing and transport problems into sharp focus.</p>		Comment	Mr Andrew Relf [6566]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3525	The funding for the £65m to carryout the road mitigation measures for the A27 etc exceeds the figure which could reasonable be obtained by developer contributions, ability to deliver measures is therefore uncertain, and the plan should set out intentions to deal with uncertainty. Could be achieved by having clearly defined phasing with trigger points which require a change in approach, or the housing numbers reduced. Right turn ban would result in significant forecast changes to traffic flows on the Manhood Peninsula. Additional traffic at the Fishbourne roundabout should be assessed in terms of air quality and accident numbers.	<p>As WSCC, as the Highways Authority, points out it requires further feasibility work before the Local Plan is submitted to show that the transport strategy can be delivered and funded.</p> <p>Additional traffic at the Fishbourne roundabout should be assessed in terms of air quality and accident numbers.</p>	Comment	West Wittering Parish Council (Mrs Susan Hawker) [6669]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3528	The plan does exactly the opposite for all local traffic. It decreases road capacity, increases congestion increases air pollution and hinders access to Chichester City. New road from Birdham to Fishbourne was emphatically rejected as environmental and heritage vandalism and detrimental to local traffic whilst not solving the congestion issue. Should not be included as no funding. Junction upgrades would create 15 yrs of misery and pollution and not solve the issue. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.		Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3537	The proposed mitigation link road from Fishbourne to Brirdham surely flies in the face of your objectives. The proposed road is adjacent to some of the most vulnerable and important ecosystems and habitats in the district, internationally designated sites, and would harm some of our most treasured and unique views, those of the cathedral from the harbour, marina and the Salterns Way.		Comment	Mrs Janet Osborne [7124]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3541	Commenting on PBA report page 60 Table 7.1, page 67 fig 7.3.5; PBA report Exec Summary xiii and page 60 Table 7.1. Propose change to mitigation measures: Allow right turns from A27 to north/south A286 and B2145. Redo analysis of traffic flows taking account of local traffic needs and analyse more accurately the conflict arising from PBA's non-separation of through and local traffic and whether their proposals will accommodate the additional traffic. Any further work by PBA or any other consultant must take account of the Systra consultation.	Propose change to mitigation measures: Allow right turns from A27 to north/south A286 and B2145. Redo analysis of traffic flows taking account of local traffic needs and analyse more accurately the conflict arising from PBA's non-separation of through and local traffic and whether their proposals will accommodate the additional traffic. Any further work by PBA or any other consultant must take account of the Systra consultation.	Comment	Mr Martin Tomlinson MBE [6586]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3542	Object to S23 on basis that it conflicts with DM24 Air Quality and DM25 Noise.	Signalising the Stockbridge junction for the benefit of through traffic does not benefit residents. Separating through and local traffic would reduce traffic volume and reduce the stop/hard acceleration noise. Even though this noise is not continuous, its occurrence is sufficiently frequent and loud to ruin outdoor enjoyment.	Object	Mr Martin Tomlinson MBE [6586]
51	Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility	3555	In accepting that the PBA proposals are agreeable to Highways England there are a number of matters which require further consideration (see full submission for detail). Overall, Highways England are, at this point in the plan making process, satisfied that the full package of highways proposals as outlined in the PBA report 'Transport Study of Strategic Development Options and Sustainable Transport Measures' will mitigate the adverse impacts of the Local Plan review proposals on the Strategic Road Network.		Comment	Highways England (Mr David Bowie) [1082]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	190	I agree with your comments in these paragraphs but it is at odds with the related policy		Comment	Mrs Trish Mackinnon [6698]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	267	Paragraph 5.42 contradicts with the threatened developments at Highgrove (Bosham) and Bethwines Farm (Fishbourne) I support maintaining the gap whole heartedly.		Comment	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	381	The language needs to be strengthened in 5.42, line 7, change "may be" to "must/should be".		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	825	Para 5.52 Future Policy for Gaps Between Settlements. Maintaining separate village identity scored very highly in the 2018 Village Survey and was the reason the Boundary Commission agreed that the new District Ward should be named "Harbour Villages" rather than "Harbour Ward". By delaying any decision on this "until the next iteration of the Plan" will be too late for some of the villages who have their borders threatened by the allocation of new building in the consultation document..	SOLUTION: I would strongly urge CDC to delay any decisions on allocations that could be affected until the Policy for Gaps has been added to the Revised Local Plan.	Object	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mr Geoff Hand) [34]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	1133	Para 5.37 - Absolutely agree the plan area's countryside is an important and diminishing resource, and the Council's aim to protect the countryside from the urbanising impacts of development is welcomed. For existing and future residents, the opportunity to enjoy 'informal recreation' (walking, cycling, horse riding) in the countryside is important for leisure, health, and well-being. The Council needs to take a very active role in ensuring that any development provides benefits, most likely in the way of safe, off-road multi-use routes(green links), and the mention of this in para 5.40 is welcomed.		Comment	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	1260	5.36 With development expanding into current rural areas as Hunston Parish (which it is proposed should be re-designated as urban) and outward from urban areas such as Chichester, the Runcton HDA and Pagham the rural area of North Mundham will be further constricted. Consideration of development within the rural parish North Mundham should take account of the diminished resource of the countryside recognised in the Plan.		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	1340	Para 5.42. Noting Section 13 of the NPPF and the aims of this Local Plan Review para, it would appear appropriate to include a commitment to explore Green Belt land designation in the South of Plan Area. Support introduction of Countryside Gaps and associated Policy in Submission version of LPR to prevent significant further erosion of open countryside around Chichester and its immediately adjacent settlements, as well as prevent general coalescence of settlements, as an interim and backstop measure to Green Belt designations, noting the discussion on longer term growth requirements in paras 4.30 to 4.33.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	1692	No mention is made of the importance of the Chichester Harbour AONB but reference is made of the SDNP. This is particularly pertinent as the effect on the AONB and boundaries (including views) is equally as important as those of the SDNP. The same rules for exclusion of strategic sites must be applied (consistency) which is not the case in this plan. SDNP is being given an unequal consideration.	The importance of the Chichester Harbour AONB needs to be included in the plan.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	1755	5.34 to 5.43 Countryside gaps need to be defined urgently and guaranteed to be in place for at least 25 years. If not they will be valid for only till the next 5 year Review.....		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	1784	Settlement boundaries can be redrawn in the light of exceptional circumstance during Plan Review. The strategic allocations proposed demonstrate that. It is unclear how Policy S24 is being applied in respect of the AL site-based allocation proposals. The Settlement Boundary Review Background Paper provides no effective framework for the reconsideration of boundaries and what intrinsic sensitivity exists and capacity for change. Paragraph 5.42 refers to a study that would inform that analysis. That Study is necessary to inform this Preferred Approach consultation, and decisions on countryside boundaries should be delayed until this is available and can be subject of consultation.	Additional paragraph after 5.42 "Once this Study has been completed, it will be published for consultation and those conclusions will inform future progress on allocations through the Local Plan Review. This Study should consider sites proposed for allocation in the Local Plan Review and any larger sites identified to meet Longer Term Growth Requirements.	Object	Heaver Homes Ltd [7183]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	2257	Historic England suggests that paragraph 5.37 could also refer to the range of heritage assets to be found in the countryside of the Plan area.	Reword paragraph 5.37 as; "It is valued for many reasons, including agriculture and community food production, its landscape qualities including the special characteristics of Chichester Harbour and Pagham Harbour, the setting it provides for Chichester City and other towns and villages, its range of heritage assets, including historic landscapes, and the opportunities it provides for recreation and biodiversity".	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	2400	We note the intention of identifying settlement gaps and look forward to seeing the evidence base and the proposed gaps in the Regulation 19 iteration of Chichester Local Plan Review 2035, particularly as to how they will contribute to safeguarding the relationship between the SDNP and Chichester Harbour AONB. We would welcome the opportunity to work with CDC on this matter.		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	2461	<p>Language is weak and aspirational.</p> <p>Recognise value of agricultural coastal plain.</p> <p>Give more value to land e.g. in SPD for vision for Bournes area.</p> <p>Consider introduction/preservation of bees and habitats.</p> <p>Greater support to establishment of community orchard and nut plantations.</p> <p>Support the "encourage of proposals that enhance the woodlands and recreational links to and within this area".</p> <p>Greater engagement with the SDNP and recognition from the SDNP that it is at risk of becoming an island which will negatively impact the park. Need the NP to be more flexible to accepting housing.</p> <p>Support maintenance of individual settlement identities</p>		Support	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	2487	Fishbourne Parish Council urges CDC to support the introduction of gaps and to delay any decisions on allocations that would be affected by such a provision until this policy has been added to the Revised Local Plan.		Comment	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	2528	The identity of the rural areas is an important consideration in maintaining their character if they are not to become just the spaces between larger settlements. This is particularly important on the Manhood Peninsula and in the countryside associated with the transport corridors of the A286 and B2145. The open countryside along these routes with their small settlements are in danger of encroachment by development and urbanisation. A specific policy is suggested to protect such areas and enhance their character by schemes of tree planting, improvement to the roadside environment and strong traffic management.	A specific policy is suggested to protect such areas and enhance their character by schemes of tree planting, improvement to the roadside environment and strong traffic management.	Support	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	2971	<p>5.37 On the ground, there is little evidence of this having been robustly implemented during the period of the present Local Plan. Council itself needs to implement this provision more robustly. In particular by bringing it to the attention of developers at an early stage.</p> <p>5.41 On the ground, there is little evidence of this having been robustly implemented during the period of the present Local Plan. A particularly salutary lesson comes from the severe degrading of the quiet access onto Centurion Way at its southern end, due to a new access route for cars into the Whitehouse Farm development.</p>		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	3073	<p>Page 82, 5.37 Countryside and Countryside Gaps: Refers to "the special characteristics of Chichester and Pagham Harbours."</p> <p>Firstly, the two Harbours should be kept separate; and secondly, Chichester Harbour has a list of 10 special qualities that constitute the AONB designation. These are not "characteristics" and they do not apply to Pagham Harbour. The wording is inaccurate and misleading, indicating a lack of understanding by the LPA.</p>	Re-writing 5.37 so that it is factually accurate.	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	3499	Gaps under pressure from developers - whilst NPs should contain policies relating to land outside Settlement Boundaries to ensure proper protection of gaps, Local Plan Policy could embody coalescence prevention in SPG issued earlier.		Comment	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
52	Countryside and Countryside Gaps	3519	Land between the city and National Park is an area that must be governed by landscape priorities that provide a crucial open, and where deliverable, accessible green space to the city community, but equally provides (a) clear linkages to the national park, (b) protects the integrity of the National Park boundary, and (c) protects the important relationship and setting of city and Park.		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	52	Criterion 3 is over restrictive as there are more policies than just DM21 and DM22 which relate to the countryside. The last paragraph of the policy is not an actual policy and should be supporting text instead.	Amend wording of criterion 3 to words to the effect of: "It is a type of development provided for by other policies in this Plan or in the NPPF." Delete the last paragraph from the policy and insert as supporting text instead.	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	370	the accompanying text in para 5.41 refers to the National Park which is outside the Plan Area, but there is no reference to the Chichester Harbour AONB in the text anywhere. The first line of the Policy should be amended to include ' development will ONLY be permitted...etc' The Policy does not include DM 19 (Chichester Harbour AONB) as a fourth requirement to be addressed.	-5.41 second sentence should be amended to include Chichester Harbour AONB first and then the SDNP with their special qualities as recognised in their respective designations etc....and of Pagham Harbour. - Requirement to satisfy Policy DM 19 should be included as a fourth item in Policy S24	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	901	Where is the reference to Chichester Harbour AONB SSSI Ramsar SAC SPA Nor is there any mention of Policy DM19 Chichester Harbour AONB	Second sentence 5.41 to include Chichester Harbour AONB SSSI Ramsar SAC SPA, followed by Pagham and Medmerry Harbours. Policy S24 point 3. Policies DM19 then the other two policies.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1016	Policy S24 preamble refers to South Downs National Park which is not in the Local Plan area but omits Chichester Harbour AONB. This policy should make clear that the need to conserve and enhance the AONB is National Policy. As is giving its protection the greatest weight in planning decisions.	Spell out the part the AONB plays in conserving and enhancing the countryside.	Object	Mr Keith Martin [4610]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1234	Rural communities need supporting and development opportunities should be encouraged within them in a consistent manner commensurate with how rural communities have developed in the past, It would almost be discriminatory practice to deny that consistency of growth for rural communities-, sustainability comes in a social form with vibrancy of rural communities assured through sensible development. Small scale developments for rural communities is beneficial towards local builders/ tradesman, this is both economically advantageous and encourages local employment. Rural development also promotes the housing mix that is needed especially for single storey dwellings which the corporate builders seem not to build.		Comment	Miss Sandra James [7079]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1359	What is the point of having settlement boundaries if they can be extended and built on.	What is the point of having settlement boundaries if they can be extended and built on.	Object	Mr David Leah [6440]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1527	Whilst Policy S24 is required to focus new development within identified urban areas, it should not preclude sites outside of but immediately adjacent to settlement boundaries in the following circumstances: * To allow for entry-level exception sites, suitable for first time buyers as required by paragraph 71 of the National Planning Policy Framework; * Where there is a shortfall in housing supply in the District.		Comment	Lewis & Co Planning (Mr Paul Burgess MRTPI) [7175]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1597	Because you have not included Lavant in this plan, there is no mention of its settlement area and so the status of the area of Lavant outside of the SDNP is not defined.		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1702	No mention is made of the importance of the Chichester Harbour AONB but reference is made of the SDNP. This is particularly pertinent as the effect on the AONB and boundaries (including views) is equally as important as those of the SDNP. The same rules for exclusion of strategic sites must be applied (consistency) which is not the case in this plan. SDNP is being given an unequal consideration.	The importance of the Chichester Harbour AONB needs to be included in the plan.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1782	In the event that the housing land supply is insufficient to meet the Objectively Assessed Housing Need and thus the Council need to find additional sites (potentially from outside existing settlements) to meet the housing need then priority should be given to sites that are adjacent to, but outside of, the settlement boundary.	Add a clause to S24 (and or DM22) covering the eventuality that if there is insufficient land supply to meet the objectively assessed housing need then appropriate development should be permitted on sustainable sites adjacent to, but outside of, the settlement boundary.	Object	Mr Nick Way [5110]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1948	Policy overlooks biodiversity loss and needs which may allow developments to increase the catastrophic losses of recent years.	Insert reference to biodiversity and the natural environment at paragraph 5.36.	Comment	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1949	Wording of policy gives preference to development in such a way that it will continue the incremental loss of the countryside.	Insert the word "protecting" next to "biodiversity" in first sentence of paragraph 5.38. Recognise in text that there are competing or conflicting needs to Council's intentions to enhance countryside and insert reference to mitigation measures being required where conflict arises.	Object	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1950	Biodiversity is overlooked in paragraph 5.40.	Insert reference to ecosystem links in paragraph 5.40 alongside recreational links.	Comment	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	1951	Policy needs to make reference to ecosystem character as well as rural and landscape character. Unacceptable harm should not be confined to the appearance of the countryside but include ecosystems and biodiversity.	Insert reference to ecosystems and biodiversity at points 1 and 2 of policy.	Comment	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2107	A considerable network of businesses are supported by such a high equine population, and in addition to financial value within the local community there is considerable benefit in terms of health and wellbeing of individuals. It is suggested that Policy S24: Countryside, could recognise this specifically.	Recognise value of equine businesses	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2212	Strongly supports the maintenance of individual settlement identities through introduction of gap policies. Local communities should have an input into the formulation of these. Gaps would also serve to maintain the relationship between the Harbour and the Downs . The Coastal Plain has huge importance and is also prime agricultural land, the relationship with the Downs and the Harbour is very important, and no account of the proposals to site 1000's of homes on this area has taken account of the impact. Action: requires policies to fully recognise these issues, with an impact assessment being undertaken.		Comment	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2386	Lavant Gap important to Lavant and Summersdale for amenity		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2480	Support policy but building on Bethwines would be hypocritical and erode gap between settlements		Support	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2527	Policy supported but should reflect problem of conversions with more specific criteria covering what is acceptable. Policy that seeks to promote the balance between agricultural production, the environment and amenity would be welcome as a basis for whatever system of agricultural subsidy eventually is formulated. Particular emphasis should be placed on the protection of high grade agricultural land (grade 1 - 3a), biodiversity , and for instance structural tree planting for drainage and co2 reduction. A positive approach to recreational access in support of green tourism should also form part of a strengthened countryside policies.		Support	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2547	Concerned of impact on landscape character, context and setting of AONB and NP. Concerns of coalescence of settlements. Strengthen policy to protect gaps	* Include a new paragraph on Chichester Harbour AONB (as per 5.41 for the SDNP) * Include a new paragraph on intervisibility between the AONB and NP * Rename policy S24 "Countryside and Settlement Gaps" * Suggest reversing the policy wording to say that "development in the countryside outside the settlement policy area will be refused unless it can demonstrate that ...etc." * Develop additional SPD guidance for Chichester to Emsworth to guide development and prevent coalescence between settlements and loss of countryside gaps	Comment	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2609	Marina should be considered within a settlement boundary not countryside in recognition of number of dwellings/employment/leisure opportunities it provides. Policy does not recognise contribution of other sites (such as marina) to jobs and homes. Suggest policy rewording	Reword policy to: 1. It conserves and, where possible, enhances the key features of the site's context and setting within the countryside; 2. It is of an appropriate scale, siting and design that is unlikely to cause unacceptable harm to the appearance of the countryside and existing site and locational context; and 3. It contributes towards the fulfilment of the development needs of the District in an appropriate manner.	Comment	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2659	Support first 2 points, however should make provision within supporting text to promote protection of existing traditional barns/agri buildings through sensitive reuse.	Make provision within supporting text to promote protection of existing traditional barns/agri buildings through sensitive reuse.	Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2710	Revise policy to ensure plan flexibility e.g. edge of settlement boundaries	Revise policy to ensure plan flexibility e.g. edge of settlement boundaries	Comment	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2730	The Sussex Wildlife Trust supports the statement in section 5.37 that 'The plan area's countryside is an important and diminishing resource'. However, the policy wording fails to specifically reference the natural environment or biodiversity despite it being recognised in the support text and an intrinsic component.	We suggest the following amendments to make the policy clearer and more robust: 'Outside settlement boundaries as defined on the policies map, development will be permitted in the countryside provided that: 1. It conserves and, where possible, enhances the key features and qualities of the rural and landscape character of the countryside setting, including its biodiversity value; 2. It is of an appropriate scale, siting and design that is unlikely to cause unacceptable harm to the appearance of the countryside; and 3. It requires a countryside location or meets an essential local need, as provided for in Policies DM21 and DM22. Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan if supported by evidence to demonstrate that this is acceptable.'	Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2740	Little attempt to preserve good grade agricultural land raising issue of food security. Insufficient appreciation of value of city's rural hinterland leading to loss of Whitehouse Farm. Para 5.37 re; protecting the countryside from urbanising impacts of developments should be brought to developers' attention at an early stage. Para 5.41, loss of well established quiet access route on to Centurion Way.	Para 5.41: Insert new sentence at end of paragraph "It is particularly important to protect and enhance connectivity into the park through walking and cycling routes. Of particular relevance are Centurion Way, the footpath leading out of Summersdale, and the quiet route leading via Fordwater Lane." Insert item 4 into Policy as follows: "It does not degrade existing connections or identified potential connections; particularly walking and cycling connections, and connections for innovative low-carbon technology that might help relieve congestion on the A27."	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2839	Land to the rear of Sturt Avenue should be within the settlement boundary for Lynchmere	The policies maps should be updated to include the site known as 'Land to the rear of Sturt Avenue, Lynchmere/Camelsdale', within the settlement boundary.	Object	Casa Coevo [1734]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2864	Support wording - approach will ensure that the plan will be able to adapt to changing circumstances		Support	Persimmon Homes (Mr Joe Maphosa) [1216]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2891	Amend policy wording to read: "Outside settlement boundaries and allocations contained within this Local Plan as defined on the policies map"	Amend policy wording to read: "Outside settlement boundaries and allocations contained within this Local Plan as defined on the policies map"	Comment	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2920	Object to how settlement boundaries will be reviewed - prefer early review for all settlements in the plan as this would address under delivery.		Object	N/A (Mr D G Phillips) [7340]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	2943	We welcome Policy S24 in relation to development in the countryside and agree with para 5.37 that "The plan area's countryside is an important and diminishing resource." Should para 5.41 not also refer to the AONB? We note the comments in paragraph 5.42 concerning establishing and protecting green gaps between communities that retain a clear identity for those communities. We strongly support this approach in an area where these identities have already been severely eroded.	We suggest that the last para should read "Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan if supported by evidence to demonstrate that this is acceptable." Or similar wording.	Support	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3030	Wording is highly restrictive and inconsistent with national policy	Suggest merging this policy with DM22 to remove ambiguity and ensure compliance with national policy.	Comment	William Lacey Group [1623]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3074	Clarification in text: For the first line of the policy, we suggest the word "only" is inserted in between "will" and "be."	For the first line of the policy, we suggest the word "only" is inserted in between "will" and "be."	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3275	We object to the way the settlement policy boundary reviews are proposed to take place in the Plan. Therefore we propose a settlement boundary amendment for Fishbourne to include land south of Clay Lane/west of Blackboy Lane. However if boundary reviews of all settlements are not to be made in the Plan we would request policy wording to the last sentence of S24 be amended.	Policy 24 should have additional wording as suggested above unless a settlement boundary amendment is made in the Submission Plan to include land at Clay Lane/Blackboy Lane as shown on the attached plan. However if boundary reviews of all settlements are not to be made in the Plan we would request policy wording to the last sentence of S24 be amended as follows: 'Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a future development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan. In the interim, where a boundary amendment is justified against the key requirements of the settlement boundaries background paper that should be regarded as a material consideration in connection with the submission of any planning application'.	Object	Landacre Developments Ltd [7392]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3283	Support policy but would like it strengthened to reflect the wording of an inspectorate decision for an application in the Meon Valley Support principle of countryside gaps.	Westbourne PC have recently been informed of an inspectorate decision regarding an application in the Meon Valley which the appeal was dismissed in the narrative it says; Whilst strategic gaps are not specifically referred to, it endorses the creation of high-quality places, which would include respecting the pattern and spatial separation of settlements. We believe this could reinforce your Policy and some form of wording along these lines in the Policy may help at any appeal.	Support	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3322	We object to the way the settlement policy boundary reviews are proposed to take place in the Plan. We prefer an earlier boundary review for all settlements in the Plan. A boundary amendment now could increase the supply of windfall sites in an urban area and reduce the requirement for new greenfield allocations in the later DPD or Neighbourhood Plan. A boundary amendment now could also secure benefits from redevelopment opportunities of previously developed sites or other appropriately located sites especially where they abut an existing boundary and relate more to a built up area than the surrounding countryside.	Change to last sentence of policy: 'Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a future development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan. In the interim, where a boundary amendment is justified against the key requirements of the settlement boundaries background paper that should be regarded as a material consideration in connection with the submission of any planning application'.	Object	Landlinx Estates Ltd [1541]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3335	We object to the way the settlement policy boundary reviews are proposed to take place in the Plan. We prefer an earlier boundary review for all settlements in the Plan. A boundary amendment now could increase the supply of windfall sites in an urban area and reduce the requirement for new greenfield allocations in the later DPD or Neighbourhood Plan. A boundary amendment now could also secure benefits from redevelopment opportunities of previously developed sites or other appropriately located sites especially where they abut an existing boundary and relate more to a built up area than the surrounding countryside.	Policy wording to the last sentence of S24 to be amended as follows: 'Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a future development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan. In the interim, where a boundary amendment is justified against the key requirements of the settlement boundaries background paper that should be regarded as a material consideration in connection with the submission of any planning application'.	Object	Mr Samuel Langmead [7400]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3342	Object to land at Lagness Road is designated as countryside.	Propose site at Lagness Road is removed from designated countryside and encompassed within settlement boundary of Runcton to accommodate up to 25 dwellings. Proposed settlement boundary extension at North Mundham adjacent to School Lane should be reduced to deliver 25 dwellings.	Object	Mr and Mrs R Ellis [7401]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3365	We object to the way the settlement policy boundary reviews are proposed to take place in the Plan. We prefer an earlier boundary review now for all settlements in the Plan including North Mundham/Runcton. A boundary amendment could increase the supply of windfall sites in an urban area and reduce the requirement for new greenfield allocations in the later DPD or Neighbourhood Plan. However if boundary reviews of all settlements are not to be made in the Plan we would request policy wording to the last sentence of S24 be amended	If boundary reviews of all settlements are not to be made in the Plan we would request policy wording to the last sentence of S24 be amended as follows: 'Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a future development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan. In the interim, where a boundary amendment is justified against the key requirements of the settlement boundaries background paper that should be regarded as a material consideration in connection with the submission of any planning application'.	Object	Junnell Homes Ltd [7402]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3383	We object to the way the settlement policy boundary reviews are proposed to take place in the Plan. We prefer an earlier boundary review now for all settlements in the Plan including Chidham and Hambrook. A boundary amendment could increase the supply of windfall sites in an urban area and reduce the requirement for new greenfield allocations in the later DPD or Neighbourhood Plan.	Request policy wording to the last sentence of S24 be amended as follows: 'Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a future development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan. In the interim, where a boundary amendment is justified against the key requirements of the settlement boundaries background paper that should be regarded as a material consideration in connection with the submission of any planning application'.	Object	Mr and Mrs Tearall [7404]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3390	Object to settlement policy boundary reviews as proposed in Plan. Prefer earlier boundary review for all settlements - boundary amendment now could increase the supply of windfall sites in an urban area and reduce the requirement for new greenfield allocations in later DPD or NP; could also secure benefits from redevelopment opportunities of previously developed sites or other appropriately located sites especially where they abut an existing boundary and relate more to a built up area than surrounding countryside.	If boundary reviews of all settlements are not to be made, would request wording to the last sentence of S24 be amended as follows: 'Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a future development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan. In the interim, where a boundary amendment is justified against the key requirements of the settlement boundaries background paper that should be regarded as a material consideration in connection with the submission of any planning application'.	Object	Ms Rebecca Newman [7405]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3419	We propose a settlement boundary amendment for Fishbourne to include land to the rear of 98 Fishbourne Road. If boundary reviews of all settlements are not to be made in the Plan we request policy wording to the last sentence of S24 be amended.	Policy 24 should have the suggested following wording above unless a settlement boundary amendment is made in the Submission Plan to include land to the rear of 98 Fishbourne Road as shown on the attached plan: 'Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a future development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan. In the interim, where a boundary amendment is justified against the key requirements of the settlement boundaries background paper that should be regarded as a material consideration in connection with the submission of any planning application'.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3426	We object to the way the settlement policy boundary reviews are proposed to take place in the Plan. We prefer an earlier boundary review now for all settlements in the Plan. A boundary amendment now could increase the supply of windfall sites in an urban area and reduce the requirement for new greenfield allocations in the later DPD or Neighbourhood Plan. A boundary amendment now could also secure benefits from redevelopment opportunities of previously developed sites especially where they abut an existing boundary and relate more to a built up area than the surrounding countryside.	However if boundary reviews of all settlements are not to be made in the Plan we would request policy wording to the last sentence of S24 be amended as follows: 'Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a future development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan. In the interim, where a boundary amendment is justified against the key requirements of the settlement boundaries background paper that should be regarded as a material consideration in connection with the submission of any planning application'.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3430	Not all settlements are proposed for a boundary review in the LP and this includes West Wittering. We object to the way the settlement policy boundary reviews are proposed. We prefer an earlier boundary review for all settlements. A boundary amendment now could increase the supply of windfall sites in an urban area and reduce the requirement for new greenfield allocations in the later DPD or NP. It could also secure benefits from redevelopment opportunities of previously developed sites especially where they abut an existing boundary or simply relate more to a built up area than the surrounding countryside.	However if boundary reviews of all settlements are not to be made in the Plan we would request policy wording to the last sentence of S24 be amended as follows: 'Defined settlement boundaries may be altered by a future development plan document and/or a neighbourhood plan. In the interim, where a boundary amendment is justified against the key requirements of the settlement boundaries background paper that should be regarded as a material consideration in connection with the submission of any planning application'.	Object	Meadows Partnership [1879]
53	Policy S24: Countryside	3518	It is important the District retains existing open land to the north and north east of the city, permitting only new development and activity that are appropriate to a rural area, complement existing land uses and or which maintain the essential openness of the area.		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
54	The Coast	3075	Page 84, 5.46 The Coast: Firstly, there is no mention of the Special Protection Area (SPA). Secondly, the wording is unclear whether the Local Plan is referring to the Chichester District coastline, inclusive of Chichester Harbour, or whether it is referring just to the coast outside of the Harbour.	For the purposes of clarity, the coastline of Chichester Harbour is designated as a Ramsar Site, SAC, SPA and SSSI, as well as an AONB. Some of these designations do also apply to stretches of the coast to the east of Chichester Harbour, but not all of them. We suggest 5.46 is re-written so it is clear and accurate.	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	83	The area covered by the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 lies within the South Marine Plan Area therefore, it is recommended to ensure your plan is 'sound' that it includes a reference to the South Marine Plan. There are policies within the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 that have marine relevance and so it is recommended that the South Marine Plan and specific policies are referred to in these sections.	The area covered by the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 lies within the South Marine Plan Area therefore, it is recommended to ensure your plan is 'sound' that it includes a reference to the South Marine Plan. There are policies within the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 that have marine relevance and so it is recommended that the South Marine Plan and specific policies are referred to in these sections. For example, policies: S18, S25, S27, S31. See full submission	Comment	Marine Management Organisation (Stakeholder and Networks Officer) [1144]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	541	This Plan totally misses the point. The continued over-development on the Peninsula is creating an unattractive environment for tourists. Also the issue of 'adaptation to climate change' should be addressing the fall back area as defined in the NPPF.	This Plan totally misses the point. The continued over-development on the Peninsula is creating an unattractive environment for tourists. Also the issue of 'adaptation to climate change' should be addressing the fall back area as defined in the NPPF.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	713	Your comments are half hearted. yes it affords views of the SDNP...it is a flood plain so will be flat. Yes it is an area of SSI, AONB, Ramsar and Special Area of Conservation so why do you seek to vandalise it with a link road and housing when the land to the south of the SDNP does not have such protected status , is largely hidden by the topography and again is excluded !!! Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations I will raise it with examiner at the appropriate time.	All areas should be included that are suitable and areas near to the sensitive Chichester harbour should be removed.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	1261	Existing permitted and proposed development areas extending the urban areas of Selsey and Pagham erode the intention of the policy which is to safeguard the character and environment of the coast. This development does not constitute protection and enhancement of the coast identified in the policy.		Comment	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
55	Policy S25: The Coast	2200	<p>We are pleased to see the support in this policy for future habitat creation as well as the delivery of flood defences and adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>There are specific locations within Chichester District which offer opportunities to provide saltmarsh and coastal grazing marsh in the medium to longer term. These locations include areas in Fishbourne, Chidham and Hambrook and on Thorney Island.</p>		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	2424	Paragraph 5.44: We suggest adding 'serves to provide important scenic views from the water across to the SDNP which should be conserved'.	Paragraph 5.44: Add 'serves to provide important scenic views from the water across to the SDNP which should be conserved'.	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	2462	<p>Weak policy. Needs to address inadequate wastewater infrastructure capacity and discharging of untreated waste.</p> <p>Include robust strategy for mitigating pressure on harbour by providing alternative routes. Link with policies promoting wildlife corridors/gaps/green or blue space.</p> <p>Work with agricultural/horticultural business to reduce impact of chemical and nutrient run off into Harbour.</p>		Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	2530	Policy should reference Pagham Harbour Management Plan and importance of Harbour's drainage function should be reflected in specific policy.		Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	2548	<p>Welcome inc of AONB in para 5.46</p> <p>Cross-reference DM30</p> <p>Include ref to success of Bird Aware</p> <p>Change text to ref Chi Harbour AONB Management Plan</p>	<p>In the policy text, amend the reference to Chichester Harbour Conservancy's Harbour Management Plan to Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan, to which CDC is a partner signatory in its delivery.</p> <p>Include a policy commitment to continue supporting the Solent disturbance and mitigation programme "Bird Aware" to reduce the impact of increased housing development on the designated bird species of the Harbour.</p> <p>Include a commitment to developing alternative mitigation measures (such as on-site recreational provision) to prevent the additional impact of housing development on the European designated site for migrating birds.</p>	Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	2610	<p>Premier is pleased to see a recognition within the Plan for support for leisure and recreational use and waterbased activities in the coastal areas, and marine employment uses.</p> <p>It is therefore essential that a policy approach considers the wider range of uses suitable for coastal locations in order to maintain, as the policy states, such sites as 'an important recreational, economic and environmental resource.'</p>		Support	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	2907	Changes proposed since under the duty to co-operate, the Local Plan should also look at things from the Park's perspective; the area is threatened by sea-level rise from CO2 based global warming.	<p>Section 5.44 CHANGE TO "... flat topography which, on occasion, serves to provide views from the water across to the South Downs National Park, and as a key part of the view from the Park across to the Sea (particularly from the Trundle)."</p> <p>POLICY S25 - Bullet point 2 CHANGE TO low-carbon and low pollution leisure/recreational uses, including water based activities;</p>	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
55	Policy S25: The Coast	3076	<p>Firstly, it is not the "Chichester Harbour Conservancy Harbour Management Plan." It should be called the "Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan." This also applies to: 7.59, page 151; and the appendix, page 229.</p> <p>Secondly, on the topic of flood defence, Chichester District Council are advised that Chichester Harbour Conservancy and Royal Haskoning DHV have published guidance for installing, replacing or strengthening shoreline defences in Chichester Harbour AONB. Reference could be made to that document here:</p> <p>https://www.conservancy.co.uk/page/planning</p> <p>Thirdly, a reference could be made to coastal squeeze.</p>	Consistent description of the AONB Management Plan. Cross-reference the published shoreline defence guidance. Highlight the issue of coastal squeeze.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
55	Policy S25: The Coast	3162	Insert new bullet point: "A plan to become carbon neutral by 2030 to prevent major sea level rise."	Insert new bullet point: "A plan to become carbon neutral by 2030 to prevent major sea level rise."	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
56	Natural Environment	1785	<p>5.53</p> <p>Most of the land proposed for development along the A259 corridor is Grade 1, 2 or 3a land. It is required for growing food and keeping livestock.</p>		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
56	Natural Environment	2947	Loss of food growing land when the population is rising is the antithesis of any definition of "sustainable".	5.53 Delete "In planning for the sustainable growth of the plan area, it is recognised that there may be occasions when the loss of such land is necessary."	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
56	Natural Environment	3077	<p>Strongly objects to the weak policy commitment of the Local Plan to "not cause significant harm" to the natural environment, and "landscape and biodiversity is not unduly compromised."</p> <p>The policy ensures there is no adverse impact, "on the openness of views....and the setting of the South Downs National Park."</p> <p>Chichester Harbour AONB is designated as having equal landscape value and its setting should also be referenced here.</p>	<p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>5.51 In seeking to reconcile these demands on the natural environment, the Council will only support proposals where there is an environmental net gain. This includes safeguarding the richness of the landscape and biodiversity, with opportunities taken to conserve, manage and enhance their value where necessary.</p> <p>Chichester District Council should undertake a biodiversity audit to demonstrate improvements brought about by the Local Plan as continued monitoring show net gains.</p> <p>S26 second bullet point should conclude ..."and the setting of Chichester Harbour AONB, or South Downs National Park."</p>	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
56	Natural Environment	3171	We must not build on our high quality agricultural land but make plans to become carbon neutral and protect our fields.	5.53 Add to end of paragraph: ", after proper consideration has been given to using all brownfield sites, empty properties.	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	192	5.51 Church Farm Lane and surrounding area has a very high biodiversity of habitat for wildlife and there are animals and birds on the Red list including nocturnal animals. Building development in fields to the South would have a harmful effect on habitat and light pollution on the nocturnal species. There would be an adverse impact on the openness of views from the Church Farm Lane/Stubcroft Lane footpath. So your policy is directionly correct but is at odds with other areas of your plan		Support	Mrs Trish Mackinnon [6698]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	194	How can you be protecting "distinctive local landscape" by destroying it with so many houses?	Make the policy match your aspirational words	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	371	<p>Policy S 26. There is no mention of the Chichester Harbour AONB in the Policy while the SDNP, which is outside the Plan Area, is referred to</p> <p>.S26 in the second bullet at '....and the setting of the SDNP': change to '...and the setting of the Chichester Harbour AONB and of the SDNP</p>		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	542	Acres of very productive agricultural land on the Peninsula has already been taken over by high density urban housing estates and now even more damage is proposed.	Acres of very productive agricultural land on the Peninsula has already been taken over by high density urban housing estates and now even more damage is proposed.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	575	The wording is not strong enough. Too many vague terms of " is not unduly compromised" ", " significant harm", "may be occasions..."	Take out unduly and significant, to make the proposals much stronger and change the last sentence so that valuable agricultural land will not be used for development.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	902	West Sussex Grower's Association's Growing Together Strategic Plan 2017-West Sussex produces over £1billion in annual sales of fruit, vegetables, salads and plants and employs more than 9,000 people, employing 65% in the Chichester area. They proceed to state that their members require additional land for the successful growth of the local horticultural industry. The Local Plan area has the best natural light, longest daylight hours and some of the most fertile agricultural soils in the county, CDC are destroying this prized asset by building on it. This arable land needs protecting from development.	Change final bullet point to "considering the quality of the agricultural land, the best and most versatile land will be protected with development focused on poor quality agricultural land.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	1017	Policy refers to no adverse impacy on the setting of SDNP with no mention of the AONBs. Note that SDNP is outside the Local Plan area. Chichester Harbour AONB is in the front line and vulnerable. Para 5 51 is wooly. What does " not cause significant harm to the function of the natural environment"; mean?	Add reference to the need to conserve and enhance Chichester Harbour AONB. Spell out what is meant by "designated environmental areas";. Reword Para 5.51.	Object	Mr Keith Martin [4610]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	1201	The landscape is characterised by extensive arable land with some nurseries and pasture. Hedges, bushes, orchards and groups of trees contribute to the landscape, as do streams which pass through the Parish. The South Downs National Park is to the North and the AONB of Chichester Harbour to the South. The CDC Landscape Capability Study reinforces the detrimental effect development will have on the landscape and character in all areas within the Parish	The Plan needs to take account of its own Landscape Capability Study	Object	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	1262	Night time light associated with current planned and proposed development adjacent to the Pagham SPA will impact on the wildlife and diminish the current 'dark sky'	This policy should specifically consider light pollution	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	1468	Natural England recommends explicit reference to Chichester Harbour AONB in the policy. We recommend reference to the importance of the views from Kingley Vale to the AONB in the supporting text. We welcome the BMV land policy, though note the conclusions on the Sustainability Appraisal on this point.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	1815	Support.		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	1825	The Plan fails as it doesn't address the issue of climate change mitigation. It therefore needs to include a Policy to become carbon neutral by 2030 in order to protect its residents.	This Plan will work with partners including the University of Leeds and the Can Do Cities organisation to produce Carbon Accounts and the Scope for Low Carbon Development in the Plan area. This will provide the groundwork for guiding changes to the way residents heat their houses, travel and consume in order to meet internationally recognised carbon reductions.This Plan needs to be redrafted to take into account the necessary actions the Council will need to undertake to meet these obligations.	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	1870	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concrete for housebuilding or industrial units or road building is at odds with the provisions for natural environment, and in dealing with floodplains. - Any sea level rise or storm surge will make our natural environment more required as a buffer. - Where is the provision for climate change? - Unless we halt the use of fossil fuels and use more renewable energy there is no way out of this crisis. - Building of houses and industry does not give us resilience to be able to cope with the future. 		Comment	Jenny Cole [7114]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	1952	<p>Paragraph 5.50 needs to recognise that the range of demands are conflicting; modern farming practices have contributed significantly to the loss of native species, biodiversity and ecosystems and developments addressing housing needs also contribute to loss of the natural environment.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.52 needs to recognise that demands are conflicting and the natural environment is formed of networks.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.51 needs to prioritise brownfield sites.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land - kept to a minimum</p> <p>Poor quality agricultural land may have great biodiversity value</p>	Make reference to demands being conflicting, farming practices contributing to loss of native species, biodiversity and local ecosystems and developments addressing housing needs contributing to loss of natural environment.	Comment	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	1966	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The latest Plan will substantially increase the amount of development in the East - West corridor along the A259. This is likely to have an adverse impact on the wild life in the Chichester Harbour AONB, with increased public use of the shoreline footpaths. - I thought the AONB had the same status as a National Park. Surely any ideas for development likely to affect it should be treated in the same way as the NP? 		Comment	Mr David Myers [4894]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2006	We welcome Policy S26 and support its intention to protect and enhance the natural environment of the Plan Area. There is however is no specific reference to designations within the policy and or the supporting text (para 5.51).	<p>The specific conservation designations relevant to the Chichester Local Plan in respect of both international and national designations should be detailed within the Local Plan.</p> <p>The inclusion of site designations; SPAs, SACs, SSSIs etc. rather than 'biodiversity of the site'.</p> <p>We would also recommend the outcome of the net gain consultation to be referenced in Policy S26 and reflected in the regulations 19 draft.</p>	Comment	RSPB (miss Chloe Rose) [6981]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2122	<p>No definition for "significant harm at 5.51; 7.168 - open space, sport and recreation are man-made features designed for humans, not nature; 7.189 - 21 types of priority habitats are not listed in Plan; map 5.1 is not provided with a reference where this can be found; Clarification required as to whether habitats are classified as "Habitats of Principal Importance" as is detailed by Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre records.</p> <p>Landscape Capacity Study is a useful inventory of landscape types in Chichester District though language provides too many opportunities for misunderstanding or misinterpretation; location of sections is prolonged.</p>	Priority Habitats should be included in the Glossary in the Plan Review.	Comment	Mr John Auric [7266]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2201	We would recommend that the policy wording be extended to say "protect and enhance biodiversity". This is consistent with the NPPF requirements in para 170 regarding net gain and current Government proposals to mandate biodiversity net gain for all new developments.	Recommend that the policy wording be extended to say "protect and enhance biodiversity".	Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2209	Policy is oxmronic. Particularly referenceing paragraphs 5.52 and 5.53, one cannot protect and support the natural environment and bio-diversity, and at the same time build all over the countryside, and the coastal plain in particular. Proposed change: Local Plan links to the natural Environment Strategy need to be reinstated, as it has disappeared from the draft proposals		Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2397	Welcome the requirement in policies S26 (Natural Environment) and DM28 (Natural Environment) to ensure that development proposals have no adverse impact on the openness of views and setting of the SDNP.		Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2425	We suggest deleting reference to 'openness' and to include reference to views from and to the National Park.	Delete ref to openness and include ref to views from and to NP.	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2463	Weak policy. Work with agricultural/horticultural businesses to reduce impact of chemical and nutrient run off into Harbour. We note that the adopted Local Plan links its Natural Environment strategy to that which protects and promotes biodiversity, but this link seems to have been dropped in the draft proposal. We recognise that there is a section on biodiversity but question the implication of the breaking of this link.	Strengthen policy.	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2481	Support policy		Support	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2500	There are clearly significant constraints on the landscape and character if large scale development were to take place in Chidham & Hambrook. The principles in the AONB Management Plan must be rigorously applied to any new developments.		Object	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2549	Welcome policy and text but LP is contradictory with inclusion of AL6 and AL7	Update policy text to include reference to Chichester Harbour AONB in the same context as the South Downs National Park	Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2640	Support policy.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2719	Policy should identify particularly sensitive landscape views.		Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2731	<p>SWT is supportive of the inclusion in the PAP of a strategic policy for the Natural Environment. However we object to the weak policy commitment in section 5.51 to 'not cause significant harm' to the natural environment, and that 'landscape and biodiversity is not unduly compromised'. The wording is not nearly strong enough and does not reflect the aims of Defra's 25 Year Plan for the Natural Environment. CDC have responsibilities both under the NPPF to deliver net gains in biodiversity and under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 to have regard for biodiversity.</p>	<p>We recommend that section 5.51 is amended as follows:</p> <p>'In seeking to reconcile these demands on the natural environment, the Council will only support proposals where there is an environmental net gain environment. This includes safeguarding the richness of the landscape and biodiversity, with opportunities taken to conserve, manage and enhance their value where necessary.'</p> <p>Having looked at the wording of Policy S26 we seek clarity on the 3rd bullet point. It currently says: 'Protecting the biodiversity value of the site and its environment in accordance with Policy DM29; and' When the bullet point refers to 'the site and its environment' does that specifically mean other land that it might be functionally linked with? If so, we suggest that the word of the policy should be amended to make this clearer, in addition to a commitment to enhancing biodiversity in line with the NPPF:</p> <p>Protecting and enhancing the biodiversity value of the site and its environment to which it maybe functionally linked in accordance with Policy DM29; and</p> <p>The monitoring framework for the Chichester Local Plan - Key policies is extremely limited in its ability to assess the success of the environmental policies, and in particular Policy 49 - Biodiversity, due to the fact that only the condition of SSSI appear to be considered. This is not robust given that there are many external influences, outside of CDC's control, as to why a particular SSSI may or may not be in good condition. Indeed the Authority's current Monitoring Report 2016-2017 contains very little information available on the state of the District's environment or how this has been impacted by Local Plan.</p> <p>As such, we are not confident that the effectiveness of the current Local Plan policies have been evaluated in order to inform the PAP. We encourage CDC to invest in robust monitoring indicators which will actually allow them to measure the success of policy S26 in protecting and enhancing the natural environment of the plan area. We recommend that the following commitment is added to the policy:</p> <p>'Chichester District Council will undertake a biodiversity audit to demonstrate improvements brought about by the Local Plan as continued monitoring demonstrate measurable net gains'</p>	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	2944	<p>Concerned about the references in most allocation policies to mitigation measures. Our experience is that mitigation measures are often ill thought through and of limited, short-term benefit. Becomes a means of developers buying out their responsibilities towards your plan. We would want to see realistic mitigation measures which can be seen to have a very long-term effect, and used only as a last resort. Avoidance of the damage referred to in your policy documents is the top priority. We will be monitoring closely any planned mitigation in new developments.</p> <p>Should this policy not include the setting of the AoNB?</p>	<p>The plan should be worded to clarify a genuine commitment to using mitigation measures only where they are essential, and then in a way that is open, transparent and achieves genuine gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>This policy should include the setting of the AoNB</p>	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
57	Policy S26: Natural Environment	3252	Support policy.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
58	Flood Risk and Water Management	2111	Suggest some amendments to wording of supporting paras.	<p>Supporting text paragraph 5.54, requested amendments underlined - as a consequence of the rise in sea levels and storm surges, parts of the plan area will be at increased risk from coastal erosion, groundwater, fluvial and/or tidal flooding. Hard defences may not be possible to maintain in the long term, therefore development needs to be strongly restricted in areas at risk to flooding and erosion, whilst ensuring that existing towns and villages are protected by sustainable means that make space for water in suitable areas. Development must take account of the policies of the relevant shoreline management plan</p> <p>Supporting text paragraph 5.58, requested amendments underlined - Built development can lead to increased surface water run-off; therefore new development is encouraged to incorporate mitigation techniques in its design, such as permeable surfaces and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Where appropriate, SuDS should be used as part of the linked green infrastructure network to provide multiple functions and benefits to landscape quality, recreation and biodiversity. This can be achieved through habitat creation, new open spaces and good design. SuDS should be designed to help cope with intense rainfall events and to overcome any deterioration in water quality status. In determining the suitability of SuDS for individual development sites, developers should refer to guidance published by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA): West Sussex LLFA Policy for the Management of Surface Water: https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/12230/ws_llfa_policy_for_management_of_surface_water.pdf and, if necessary, seek further advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority LLFA. See attachment for where underlining occurs.</p>	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	86	The area covered by the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 lies within the South Marine Plan Area therefore, it is recommended to ensure your plan is 'sound' that it includes a reference to the South Marine Plan. There are policies within the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 that have marine relevance and so it is recommended that the South Marine Plan and specific policies are referred to in these sections.	<p>The marine planning remit is directly for coastal and marine waters up to the mean high water spring mark where Chichester district council extends to the mean low water spring mark (we can supply a GIS layer of the spatial extent for any policy maps if you wish). The area covered by the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 lies within the South Marine Plan Area therefore, it is recommended to ensure your plan is 'sound' that it includes a reference to the South Marine Plan. There are policies within the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 that have marine relevance and so it is recommended that the South Marine Plan and specific policies are referred to in these sections. For example, policies: S18, S25, S27, S31.</p> <p>See full submission</p>	Comment	Marine Management Organisation (Stakeholder and Networks Officer) [1144]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	268	I believe that the Highgrove development fails this: Development should not result in any property or highway, on or off site, being at greater risk of flooding than the 1 in 100 year storm return period, including an allowance for climate change		Comment	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	372	5.54 states '....therefore development needs to be strongly resisted in areas at risk of flooding...' The Policy does not reflect the strength of meaning of Para 5.54 Environment Agency is due to publish revised 100 year sea level rise predictions	The second sentence of Item 1 in the Policy should be modified as follows: ' In locations identified as being at risk of flooding, LAND WILL ONLY BE ALLOCATED FOR DEVELOPMENT OR planning permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that..etc'	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	727	Manhood Peninsula is already at severe risk of flooding and yet more houses are planned, reducing run off capabilities and increasing risk of widespread property flooding. Many houses in the area are already excluded from flood claims by insurance companies.AL6 is on the highest Flood plain risk 3 (govt data). It also acts as the River Lavant drainage area. Chichester will flood if you concrete over the natural drainage basin. Madness..Data is there. Do not ignore it. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise it with examiner at the appropriate time.	Flooding is a huge issue. Remember Chichester in the 90's when the whole town was underwater. You have to realise that you cannot keep concreting over countryside..leaving little green oasis...they won't be green oasis they WILL be under water !! The natural drainage basin of Chichester Harbour is there for a reason.It must not be built on.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	797	The Flood risk assessment provided with the local plan takes no account of sea level rises across the period of the plan. The climate change assessment only considers the effects on rainfall and fluvial discharge changes related to global warming. As a large part of the southern area under consideration including the Manhood, FApuldham, Fishbourne, Bosham and Southbourne are at or below the 5 meter contour, this is a key issue in deciding where new housing should go.	All the proposals for housing in areas on or below the 5 meter contour need to be re-assessed in terms of the likelihood of sea level rise caused by global climate change	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	1218	Terminology of "not impeding flood flow" is not sufficiently robust. Following the Chichester Floods a report commissioned the agencies including CDC stated a contributory factor was the interception and disruption of natural underground water courses carrying ground water from the City to the sea, in the south east, caused by mineral extraction, and development. Interception of these natural drainage routes allowed the water table to increase until it built to flood level and overflowed . Issue should not be repeated in the South West Corner where there are numerous springs/spring fed ponds and underground aquifer some close to the surface.	ADD: a presumption against development where foundations/piling or development is likely to intercept natural underground drainage routes to the sea.	Object	Mr and Mrs A Martin [5053]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	1471	SuDS are important in addressing water quality impacts of surface water run-off, as well as managing flood risk. Natural England advocates the use of the risk index method in the CIRIA SuDS Manual, to identify the risk of pollutants and the SuDS measures that would mitigate the risk. Therefore, we recommend amending the text to read: There should be no increase in either the volume or rate of surface water runoff leaving the site, and the SuDS should be designed to minimise water quality impacts.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	1816	Support.		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	1871	- Concrete for housebuilding or industrial units or road building is at odds with the provisions for natural environment, and in dealing with floodplains. - Any sea level rise or storm surge will make our natural environment more required as a buffer. - Where is the provision for climate change? - Unless we halt the use of fossil fuels and use more renewable energy there is no way out of this crisis. - Building of houses and industry does not give us resilience to be able to cope with the future.		Comment	Jenny Cole [7114]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	1904	Flooding issues to affect the following: - Trunk road improvements - Housing schemes Predicted sea level rises not mentioned in Policy S27		Comment	Mr David Rozier [6413]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2110	Suggest some amendments to wording	<p>S27 policy text requested amendments underlined for section 1 - a. through a sequential approach, taking into consideration all forms of flooding, it is located in the lowest appropriate flood risk location in accordance with the NPPF and the Chichester Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA); and</p> <p>S27 policy text requested amendments underlined for section 2. Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) will be required on major developments (10 or more dwellings or equivalent) and encouraged for smaller schemes. SUDS should be designed into the landscape of all new development and should be included as part of a District wide approach to improve water quality and provide flood mitigation. A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required for sites within or adjacent to areas at risk of surface water flooding as identified in the SFRA. There should be no increase in either the volume or rate of surface water runoff leaving the site.</p> <p>S27 policy text requested additional bullet point as number 4 - Clear management arrangements and funding for their ongoing maintenance over the lifetime of the development should be proposed. Planning conditions and / or obligations will be used to secure these arrangements.</p> <p>S27 policy text requested amendments underlined for section 2, but would be section 5 - Development should not result in any property or highway, on or off site, being at greater risk of flooding than the 1 in 100 year storm return period, including an allowance for climate change.</p> <p>See attachment for where underlining occurs.</p>	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2204	Support the intention of the policy, however, we would wish to see changes made to ensure the policy is as clear as possible. We would also recommend you consider what a strategic policy on flood risk management is seeking to achieve in addition to the development management policy. As drafted there are some duplications and/or inconsistencies between the two policies.	<p>We would recommend removing point 4. It is not clear entirely what the rationale behind this is but as drafted it suggests that development within areas with a certain level of flood risk would be approved. This should only be the case when the sequential and exception test have been satisfied in accordance with the NPPF paragraph 157- 8. I would be happy to discuss this further if the intention behind the statement is different.</p> <p>Consider amalgamating the two flood risk policies into one shorter overarching policy that seeks to ensure that flood risk will be taken into account of at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk.</p> <p>Include a requirement for development to seek to achieve a reduction in flood risk for existing communities on and off site.</p>	Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2298	Policy S27 'Flood Risk Management' refers to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and the need to control surface water run-off. It should also refer to aquifer protection and the need for caution when using infiltration systems especially deep bore systems. This applies particularly when the site is in, or close to, a source protection zone.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2387	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2471	Need stronger role for green/blue space in mitigating flood risk Reinstate Ham Brook wildlife corridor Look at wider picture and what a more ambitious strategy could achieve	The reinstatement of the Ham Brook Wildlife Corridor would provide an opportunity to introduce many of these features in a part of the District prone to the flooding of homes and to storm-related discharges of untreated wastewater into the harbour. The policy must think beyond what individual sites can do to mitigate the risk of flooding on small areas of land and look at the wider picture and what a more ambitious strategy could achieve.	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2482	No problem with aim of policy and agree with requirement to locate development outside of flood risk areas. Risk of flooding in Fishbourne is higher than assumed from table top exercises.		Comment	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2533	Does not full realise risk to Manhood. Integrated network using ditches and attenuation areas must be developed. Include policy that requires developers to be responsible for water produced from point of generation to its disposal Include policy and text to ensure Surface Water Management Plans are kept updated	Include policy that requires developers to be responsible for water produced from point of generation to its disposal Include policy and text to ensure Surface Water Management Plans are kept updated	Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2550	The policy introductory text does not tackle the issue of storm discharge and the capacity of water treatment works to cope with the excess run off in flood conditions. It seems remiss that the policy and supporting text does not discuss coast protection policy and guidance (although this is covered in DM18 and could be cross referenced). We would hope to see reference to the Chichester Harbour Conservancy guidance on shoreline defences in Chichester Harbour AONB.	Add reference to the Chichester Harbour Conservancy guidance on shoreline defences in Chichester Harbour AONB.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2641	Support policy.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	2759	Suggest policy rewording	Reword policy to: "3. Discharge rates on previously developed should be reduced as far as practicable below existing run off rates for that site."	Comment	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	3172	5.44 Insert "Actions to prevent climate change and become carbon neutral must be prioritised by this council". Policy: Insert bullet point: "In order to reduce the overall and local risk of flooding in the area: Teh Plan area must become carbon neutral by 2030."	5.44 Insert "Actions to prevent climate change and become carbon neutral must be prioritised by this council". Policy: Insert bullet point: "In order to reduce the overall and local risk of flooding in the area: Teh Plan area must become carbon neutral by 2030."	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
59	Policy S27: Flood Risk Management	3253	Support policy.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
60	Pollution	234	The B2145 already has very high traffic levels and the combination of the congestion from the new Free School and the proposed development down the B2145 will lead to a significant increase in the slow moving and stationary traffic during peak times with a corresponding increase in pollution levels during those periods.	Reduce the proposed number of new dwellings and bypass the choke points at the top pf the village.	Object	Mr Andrew Sabin [6729]
60	Pollution	3173	This section needs to be more robust in order to protect itself against legal challenges.	5.59 Insert: "The Council will investigate means to limit pollution caused by vehicles including but not limited to: clean air zones, clean buses, safe cycle routes, anti-idling zones, school streets, increased car charging points, use of bus lanes, workplace parking levies, car free days,"	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
61	Policy S28: Pollution	373	Policy 28 does is vague and does not specifically refer to air quality, soil. light and noise. Policy should include reference to Policies DM 23, 24 and 25.		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	467	This policy ignores pollution that is already outside appropriate guidelines, e.g. the Stockbridge AQMA, which has been above the maximum allowed NO2 measure for over 6 years. This is unacceptable. Regarding pollution generated by future developments, a policy committing the Council to "...require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level" is quite simply not good enough and needs to be more specific.	Revise the last sentence as follows: Where future development is likely to generate significant adverse impacts by reason of pollution, the Council will require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level that is within the appropriate Government guidelines. Add an additional sentence as follows: Where existing levels of pollution are already outside the appropriate Government guidelines, the Council will require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level that is within the appropriate Government guidelines.	Object	Mr Neil Hipkiss [6831]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	515	This policy as it is not detailed enough. I would like to see more monitoring and more measures to be included in this policy to ensure actions are taken. These should include Clean Air Zones introduced, cleaner buses, car free day, workplace parking levy, anti-idling zones, increased pedestrianised areas in our villages and towns, better joined up cycle network		Comment	Sam Pickford [6841]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	574	This policy is so weak it offers little protection to the environment or to people. There is a presumption that development of housing and roads is necessary. It should be seen the other way round. Protection form pollution is the necessary thing here, and any proposed housing , roads, industry should follow that. there is no mention of climate change and possible detrimental effects.	Ensure that all development does not add to pollution. Do not allow any development that likely to generate significant adverse impacts by reason of pollution. Do not accept mitigation, eg a few trees planted elsewhere to compensate for old orchards destroyed, if a development is detrimental to the environment, do not allow it. Make developers show how their development has a net zero impact on climate change, in line with oru governments commitment in 2008 Climate change Act.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	630	Air Quality will further deteriorate as a result of the proposed plans. Stockbridge already exceeds the recommended air quality levels and development on this scale will increase the problem. This has serious health implications for residents.		Comment	Mr Philip Waters [6820]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	710	I live in Donnington with my young family. We are encouraged to walk to school for health. Donnington is heavily congested most days and is horrendous in the summer. I question what the council are doing to decrease and ease this problem in this area full of families? I worry about the health of my young children and how the pollution is affecting them.	Why can't access to West wittering beach be restricted over the summers e.g pre booked cars only. The beach causes dangerous and chaotic traffic never mind the pollution levels. Alternatively, a park and ride to the beach that drastically reduces traffic heading to the beach. The health of local residents should come before the beach making a profit	Object	Mrs Deborah Hack [6717]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	737	No substance. How are you going to mitigate huge increases in air and light pollution from all these developments ? Each new house generally generates 2 more cars in that area. Air pollution in Chichester city is already at dangerously high levels which are not being addressed and with each new development this is only going to get worse. Less green space , less natural lungs so greater air pollution and danger to health.	Pollution is proving to be a huge risk to public health and should be taken incredibly seriously. More children than ever are suffering from respiratory diseases and there are now links to dementia and many other illnesses. It must be at the forefront of any plan and no development should be allowed to increase air, noise or light pollution	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
61	Policy S28: Pollution	773	<p>This policy ignores pollution that is already outside appropriate guidelines, e.g. the Stockbridge AQMA, which has been above the maximum allowed NO2 measure for over 6 years. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>Regarding pollution generated by future developments, a policy committing the Council to "...require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level" is quite simply not good enough and needs to be more specific.</p>	<p>Revise the last sentence as follows: Where future development is likely to generate significant adverse impacts by reason of pollution, the Council will require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level that is within the appropriate Government guidelines.</p> <p>Add an additional sentence as follows: Where existing levels of pollution are already outside the appropriate Government guidelines, the Council will require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level that is within the appropriate Government guidelines.</p>	Object	Mr Neil Hipkiss [6831]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	798	Pollution assessment of any changes to the A27 with particular regard to pollution by particulate matter must be taken into consideration	Pollution by particulate assessment needed for all development	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	857	The Council needs to do more to combat pollution. Poor air quality is one of our biggest problems in the city. I live in Orchard Street and witness daily the build up of traffic and pollution at certain times of the day. The Council needs to do much more to limit pollution caused by vehicles eg introduce clean air zones, clean buses, safe cycle routes, anti-idling zones, more electric car charging points, use of bus lanes, workplace parking levies, car sharing schemes for commuters, use of the car club rather than car ownership, car free days...etc .		Comment	Ms Valerie Briginshaw [6946]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	873	<p>This policy ignores pollution that is already outside appropriate guidelines, e.g. the Stockbridge AQMA, which has been above the maximum allowed NO2 measure for over 6 years. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>Regarding pollution generated by future developments, a policy committing the Council to "...require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level" is quite simply not good enough and needs to be more specific.</p>	<p>Revise the last sentence as follows: Where future development is likely to generate significant adverse impacts by reason of pollution, the Council will require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level that is within the appropriate Government guidelines.</p> <p>Add an additional sentence as follows: Where existing levels of pollution are already outside the appropriate Government guidelines, the Council will require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level that is within the appropriate Government guidelines.</p>	Object	Karen Jelfs smith [6941]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	1068	Level of air pollution at Fishbourne roundabout is already breaking legal limits - what will happen with additional development?		Object	Libby Alexander [7023]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	1089	Introduce cleaner electric busses, safe cycle routes, car free days, workplace parking levies, more electric car charging points.		Comment	Mrs Claire Wilton [6733]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	1328	it s necessary to improve air quality not to avoid reduction but to actually encourage measures that can improve health for residents and be more attractive to visitors and tourists.		Comment	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	1376	Air quality will further deteriorate as a result of the proposed plans. Stockbridge already exceeds the recommended air quality levels and development on this scale will increase the problem. This has serious health implications for the residents, especially the young and the old.	<p>Move the development.</p> <p>A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there.</p>	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	1694	Please can you confirm what you are putting under the umbrella Pollution. Please list the mitigation and what an acceptable level is for each of the pollutants. Does S28 include Air, Light, Noise, Soil and Water Pollution?	Please list Air, Light, Noise, Soil and Water Pollution independently and state the "acceptable levels" for each.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	1817	Support		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	1865	- air/noise/pollution associated with the building of a link road - increase in air pollution despite traffic volume increasing year on year		Comment	Jennie Horn [7223]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
61	Policy S28: Pollution	1873	- We already have three AQA zones, how about more robust measures to counter private cars running on diesel and petrol? - Where are the Park and Ride schemes out of town? I don't see any areas designated for this?		Comment	Jenny Cole [7114]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	1957	Object on grounds that policy wording fails to acknowledge that traffic is a major cause of pollution and that new transport routes are likely to add to the problem.	New paragraph on causes of air pollution and acknowledgment that traffic is a major cause.	Object	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	2004	Ill health will be caused by potential build up of fumes from A27 proposals.		Object	Mrs C Shepherd [6948]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	2388	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	2472	Weak policy - strategy need to recognise different forms of pollution and more detail on how to address		Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	2483	Next to the M25, the A27 has the worst congestion rates in the country and the air pollution from this has caused several "hot points" along the Chichester bypass. EU Regulations concerning air pollution are already being breached and air quality will worsen as a result of traffic from all the proposed developments feeding onto the A27. It is also a matter of concern that this section does not cover noise or light pollution.		Comment	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	2551	This policy, whilst welcomed, is not sufficiently comprehensive and should certainly identify and address the different forms of pollution likely to arise from housing development (and its relating infrastructure) including: - Noise pollution - Air pollution - Light pollution - Water pollution The policy should recognise there are three designated Dark Skies Discovery Zones within the District (in the AONB) and seek to introduce measures to protect these.	This policy really needs to be much more comprehensive, providing guidance and limits on at least the following measures: - Noise pollution - Air pollution - Light pollution - Water pollution	Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	2573	No significant deterioration of air quality is recognised.		Comment	Earnley Parish Council (Mrs Louise Chater) [16]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	2642	Support policy.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	3078	The Conservancy is unsure what is meant by "pollution" since it is not defined.	It is suggested in the in the accompanying text a reference point is given to pollution (e.g. noise, light, air, water, soil, etc.).	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	3254	Support policy.		Support	WSSC (Estates) [6889]
61	Policy S28: Pollution	3455	Concerned about the impact on Air quality in the Stockbridge Road locality		Object	A + D Lygo-Baker [7425]
62	Green Infrastructure	868	Para 5.61. Add reference to "Local Green Spaces". Add new para relating to how Local Green Space designations will be enabled and supported (e.g. via Neighbourhood Plans and Site Allocations DPD). Ref: NPPF paras 99 - 101.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
62	Green Infrastructure	2748	Agree with inclusion of private gardens, allotments and other features as functional parts of GI. The plan should continue to recognise that development can come forward with a positive impact on biodiversity and can maintain important connections for wildlife through incorporation of suitable GI within new devt.		Support	Gleeson Strategic Land (Mr Peter Rawlinson) [855]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
62	Green Infrastructure	2948	Lack of inserted change would result in Policy ostensibly allowing new developments at "Strategic Development Locations" to be planned without regard to green-route connections.	5.61 Re: the phrase "blue spaces", define this lesser known phrase. Change paragraph to: "As a network it includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, walking and cycling routes and "greenways", woodlands, but also street trees, allotments and private gardens. It can also include streams, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and walls."	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
62	Green Infrastructure	3174	5.63 Change to "The benefit of these spaces for climate change, the economy,...."	5.63 Change to "The benefit of these spaces for climate change, the economy,...."	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	244	Need to provide where suitable access for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.		Comment	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	740	Commendable. But why are many new houses still not being forced to instigate green policies such as solar panels/renewable energy as standard. Planners should insist on this along with sustainable sized green spaces on land that is suitable for wildlife...not just areas of land that are not viable for developers to build on.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	1819	Support both this and Policy DM32. Thank you for recognising street trees and water bodies.		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	1872	- The policies map showed no new green infrastructure, which is an opportunity missed.		Comment	Jenny Cole [7114]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	2112	The Green Infrastructure policy is welcomed, including provision of new Green Infrastructure as an integral part of the development at Strategic Development Locations. It is recommended that measures are put in place to secure the long term management of such Green Infrastructure.		Support	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	2205	We support the policy and are pleased to see specific reference to "blue" infrastructure.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	2389	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	2464	Need to: recognise conflict of interest between GI for human use and that intended to protect habitats which may require restrictions for human use give thought to coordinating creation/protection/links of GI		Support	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	2552	We welcome the inclusion of this section, and feel that it could be more comprehensively expanded, particularly relating to the creation of green infrastructure links between the AONB and South Downs National Park.		Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	2643	Support policy.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	2732	SWT supports the statement made in section 5.61 which recognises the blue aspects of green infrastructure, however we feel that this is inconsistently represented throughout the rest of the PAP. we are concerned that section 5.62 highlights that: New green infrastructure is to be provided as part of the development at selected Strategic Development Locations.... We question why CDC have proposed only selected strategic development sites when there is a clear need to enhance the District's GI network.	We suggest that CDC ensure the definition of Green Infrastructure (GI) within the glossary recognises the inclusion of the blue aspects of GI. although we support a strategic policy focused on GI, we are concerned that as proposed by CDC it is unambitious in its approach. We therefore recommend the following amendments: 'The Council will ensure development reinforce, enhances and embeds the delivery of green infrastructure. In accordance with Policy DM32 the Council will secure the long term sustainable growth of the plan area and beyond through partnership working.'	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	3079	There is no reference to recreational disturbance. If the intention is to create new green spaces, this should be central to the policy.	Reference to recreational disturbance so as to get the benefits to wildlife.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
63	Policy S29: Green Infrastructure	3255	Support policy.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	36	Support the concept of wildlife corridors but the wording of the policy is weak and may 'lack teeth' in practice.		Support	Karen Fielder [6569]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	201	There is a growing requirement for a Western Manhood Southern Coastal Wildlife corridor in addition to the Western and Northern corridors to the South Downs National Park that are under consideration at the moment. It has been suggested that a Wildlife corridor could run from East Head to Medmerry so that areas which are identified to be rich in wildlife and especially animals and birds that are endangered species should not be isolated. These should include green fields, hedgerows, ditches ponds and woodland which offers habitat and natural animal hunting grounds.		Support	Mrs Trish Mackinnon [6698]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	236	There is a rich and varied number of wildlife in Hunston and the surrounding areas but the proposed development in Hunston would have a serious negative impact on the current wildlife corridors. The canal already acts as a hard North/South border to wildlife movement and the proposed development would only further impede wildlife movement.	Reduce the proposed number of houses and find a way to avoid developing prime farmland.	Object	Mr Andrew Sabin [6729]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	347	Comments made on Background Paper - Appendices not available - Concerns about crossing A27, A259, railway - Data needs to be kept up to date - Not all parts of plan area are equally covered by surveys		Comment	Mr Nick Gray [5743]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	579	-Largely arbitrary lines on maps not likely to serve the intention of corridors. -need to evaluate need and locations of corridors	-consult with Chichester Harbour AONB and SDNP professionals and evaluate need and location for corridors ; -investigate E/W corridor possibilities	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	865	Para 5.66, penultimate sentence. Replace "(see Maps 5.1 and 5.2)." with "and another connecting the SDNP with Pagham Harbour (see Policies Maps S30a and S30b)." Para 5.67. After "AONB" insert "and Pagham Harbour SPA". See also my comments on Policies Map S30b (Representation 861) which seek to enhance the East of City corridor.		Support	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	992	The provision of robust Wildlife Corridors is critical so species can travel between habitats and maintain genetic diversity. Our wildlife cannot survive in isolation. As in-fill and urbanisation reaches a critical level in the Chichester area, I urge the planners to ensure the proposed Wildlife Corridors are given the due protection, and importance they deserve.		Support	MS Sarah Cunliffe [6596]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1263	5.66 The wildlife corridor identified on Map 5.2 does not recognise Pagham Rife which is a key wildlife area of flood plain and reed beds penetrating northwards into North Mundham Parish. Ignoring this major migratory zone poses a threat to the integrity of the Pagham SPA.	Amend map 5.2	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1361	Support the principle but once they have been established they should be held. Any developer can circumvent this policy.	Support the principle but once they have been established they should be held. Any developer can circumvent this policy.	Object	Mr David Leah [6440]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1422	I believe that a wildlife corridor must be maintained in order to prevent some species south of the A27 from being denied access to their natural habitat.		Support	Mr Len Gough [6763]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1788	5.64 We support strategic wildlife corridors. However the one in Fishbourne has already been desecrated by Whitehouse Farm and development on Clay Lane. We propose a new one running from Chichester Harbour through Beth wins Farm to the South Downs. This will require planting and developing.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1823	I do not believe the wildlife corridors for west of Chichester as shown on map S30a is complete	Centurion Way should be added as a wildlife corridor on Map s30a, West of City Corridors. While the Whitehouse Farm developments mean this will become a very narrow corridor it is important as wildlife will be able to use areas alongside the railway line to move towards Fishbourne to connect with that wildlife corridor.	Object	Mr Bruce Brechin [7213]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2435	Part of the CDC Plan area within key impact zones of draft Sussex Bat Special Area of Conservation Planning and Landscape Scale Enhancement Protocol - SDNPA would welcome opportunity to discuss work with CDC and Natural England.		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2950	The whole section on Strategic Wildlife Corridors is missing acknowledgement that some of these corridors could be substantially improved.	5.65 CHANGE TO "They also function as green infrastructure (GI)." Insert new paragraph after 5.68 "All the identified wildlife corridors are to some extent severed for non-flying animals by the railway and the A27. It is desirable to introduce remedial measures (such as animal tunnels) to mitigate this."	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
64	Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3175	These corridors link the AONB with SDNPA. If they were not maintained wildlife would have no ability to travel between areas which would limit the gene pool and species would become weaker and die out.		Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	53	The wording is unclear and contradictory. The final paragraph seems specific to 'minor' development' and if this is the case [which i consider it should be] then the word 'Major' needs to be inserted at the beginning of the first paragraph.	Insert the word 'Major' at the beginning of the first paragraph.	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	97	Insufficient work on strategic corridors has been done for a district with so many important habitat sites. Most work to date had focussed on one corridor (to the west of the city) while inadequate resources have been given to provide corridors linking the district's international habitat sites (Chichester and Pagham Harbours and Medmerry). More work also needs to be done to ensure that the corridor to the west of Chichester would be the most appropriate corridor to link the harbour with the SDNP	Include wildlife corridors linking Chichester Harbour to Medmerry and Pagham Harbour	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	105	I support the inclusion of wildlife corridors in the local plan as they are vital to a viable ecological network within the whole district and will ensure there are both permanent green links between the AONB and SDNP. This network will not only support wildlife but provide spaces to be close to nature - so important for our own health and well-being. I notice from the maps that the corridors do not extend east-west in Chichester Harbour but appear to just end at the sea - it is important that they join together at the southern end for maximum benefit.		Support	Maria Court [6613]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	188	I consider that the two fields which lie to the south of Brandy Hole Copse should be integrated along with Brandy Hole Copse into the proposed wildlife corridor. See full submission		Comment	Friends of Brandy Hole Copse (Professor Vincent Porter) [838]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	442	My believe is that the natural wildlife corridor should be on Bethwines not Clay Lane. Please save this Farm Land. I would be interested to know how this corridor has been agreed !		Comment	Mrs Helen Kirk [6625]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	445	I wish to see enforcement of penalties against those who adversely affect a wildlife corridor. The presumption should always be in favour of maintaining the full benefit of a wildlife corridor, not setting out circumstances in which damage to it is permitted.	Introduce enforceable penalties for damage. Remove references to acceptability of destruction.	Object	Ms Rachel Ritchie [6830]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	449	Minor development is ONLY acceptable when it does not cause damage, and enforcement/ full restoration notices will be used where damage is caused.	Add section on restoration enforcement	Object	Ms Rachel Ritchie [6830]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	463	Ensure strategic road improvements are not blocked by wildlife corridors, with some mitigation of road developments to allow movement of wildlife to continue. This will allow for an A27 northern route to be safeguarded, and ensure the route of a western relief road (as identified some years ago by WSCC) is safeguarded.	Add a sentence to allow strategic road improvements, with mitigation measures to allow movement of wildlife to continue.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	464	Recognize the strategic value of Centurion Way as an existing wildlife corridor, as it is one of the few routes that already connects the South Downs with Chichester Harbour. It would be a helpful development to identify and protect a link westwards from its southern end towards Fishbourne, running north of Clay Lane.		Comment	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	524	Wildlife Corridors need support but the wording needs to be made stronger so that development within this corridor is not permitted. The plan needs a stronger commitment to the preservation of wildlife within the area, in its current form it is lacking. All proposals should demonstrate that they will have a net zero impact on climate change in line with the government's commitment in 2008 Climate Change Act as a signatory to COP21 Paris Agreement and the IPCC's report published in the autumn of 2018.		Comment	Sam Pickford [6841]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	534	1. The proposed wildlife corridor for Clay Lane Fishbourne to be reconsidered, freeing the site for house building if necessary. 2.Reject any building on Bethwines Farm Fishbourne.House building here would reduce the countryside gap with Bosham and generate urban sprawl.It would also reduce valuable agricultural (A2) capacity and have a determinant affect on views across country to the west and to the south downs national park..	1. Bethwines Farm Fishbourne provides the good quality agriculture land which could also fulfil the dual role as a wildlife corridor/environment. This it does in part now, providing a diverse habitat for birds, deer, bats and other species. 2. Make Clay Lane the preferred building site for house building if necessary.	Object	Mr Stephen Page [6591]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	566	Admirable including Wildlife Corridors but the positioning of these in the West of the City and their size is questionable in the actual benefits to the whole Plan area's biodiversity It is short sighted to think that using these corridors to prevent development without actually exploring in acute detail with further input from nationally recognised, local plan area conservation bodies, in identifying other areas better suited for the protection and enhancement of our fragile biodiversity. There is no point having empty Wildlife corridors ineffective at stopping the loss of Chichester's fragile and nationally protected biodiversity.	Remove the current positioning and rethink their location with tangible evidence, proving that all areas within the local plan, South, North, East and West have been fully explored in equal detail. Include SDNP and Harbour AONB in the development of the Wildlife Corridors.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	572	The aim is good, but needs backing up with much more robust legislation. These corridors should be protected from development in perpetuity. There should be a statutory duty to protect these corridors from development, and to increase their number and scope as more and more infrastructure is built in the area. The pressure on wildlife is increasing all the time. Any area designated as a wildlife corridor should never be considered for development for housing, roads etc.		Support	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	640	<p>I understand that a 'wildlife corridor' is proposed to the west of Chichester. Due to the current building work in Clay Lane and the Whitehouse Farm development, it would be eminently more sensible to provide this wildlife corridor to the west of Fishbourne. The link could easily be made from the top of Chichester Harbour to the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The area round Bethwines Farm has enormous diversity. Buzzards, starlings, sparrows, owls, bats, woodpeckers, deer, hedgehogs, harvest mice, slow worms, partridges are regularly seen. In contrast, I don't recall seeing any wildlife along Clay Lane.</p>		Comment	Mrs Davina Robinson [6857]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	750	Essential that meaningful wildlife corridors are installed. Agencies with expertise must be employed at the earliest planning stage and their recommendations must be instigated. Places such the AONB of Chichester must be afforded the greatest protection as the biodiversity is unique and should not be compromised. Chichester is unique in biodiversity and it is a jewel that should be nurtured completely at every stage and not dismissed. As your plan says, people choose Chichester because of the unique environments... please don't shoot yourselves in the foot by destroying it !!		Support	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	782	The wildlife corridors should not be positioned where they conflict with 5.24 which addresses the possibility of an A27 northern relief road. They should also be wider at the coastal ends: the two to the east of the city could even be joined to form one. As the plan recognises the international importance of the two harbours and the Medmerry Realignment for wetland habitat (2.25), it would be a positive step to designate a protected area to link Chichester and Pagham Harbours in the same way.	The location of the wildlife corridors should be relocated and widened. The new location of the corridors currently conflict with policy 5.24	Object	Mr K Martin [6938]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	799	The Wild Life Corridors do not appear to give a robust rural link between the areas of special protection. Clear links should interlink the AONB, SDNP. Pagham Harbour and Medmerry.	The Wild Life Corridors do not appear to give a robust rural link between the areas of special protection. Clear links should interlink the AONB, SDNP. Pagham Harbour and Medmerry.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	948	There needs to be very careful definition of control of what constitutes minor development in wildlife corridors; AL6 for instance will squeeze the corridor and probably have a significant detrimental impact.		Comment	Mr Steve Frampton [6919]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1069	Fishbourne corridor should be positioned to the west where open green field sites will enable wildlife to access Harbour and National Park. Corridor to east will not provide safe haven for wildlife.		Comment	Libby Alexander [7023]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1090	I support the proposed wildlife corridor policy and the NPFF which states that wildlife rich habitats should be safeguarded, including wildlife corridors and the stepping stones that connect them.		Support	Mrs Claire Wilton [6733]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1199	The so-called 'wildlife corridor' is a nonsense. Are we to teach wildlife to read so that they know where they will be 'allowed' to roam? The deer & rabbits are already losing Whitehouse & now they're supposed to know that they must keep to Clay Lane! Bethwines has deer, rabbits, pheasants, hedgehogs, birds and bats galore. After 50 years in Godwin Way the only animals I have ever seen in the Chi end of Clay Lane are the sheep and cows on the small-holding.		Object	Mrs Bridget Choutov [6970]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1323	Development within Strategic Wildlife Corridors should not be permitted.	Development within Strategic Wildlife Corridors should not be permitted.	Object	Mrs Lynne Friel [4991]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1333	<p>For the last four years the Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group has been working to improve green connectivity between the important wildlife sites on the Peninsula. It's vital that this connectivity should continue beyond this relatively small area to provide opportunities for species to reach new populations and thereby strengthen their gene pool.</p> <p>We strongly request that Chichester District Council ensure green links exist between the coastal plain and the South Downs and are protected from encroaching development.</p> <p>The wildlife corridors planned form an essential way of protecting species in a rapidly changing environment, and are the minimum requirement.</p>		Support	Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group (mr JOE SAVILL) [6924]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1392	<p>It is vital to indentify and protect the wildlife corridors between areas of biodiversity, so that these do not not become squeezed into ever smaller islands of life, eventually dying out when condtions change adversely or become overcrowded. This is not something that can be done 'after the event', if it's done wrongly or without due consideration and planning, then these lifelines are lost forever to the detriment of the area and all who inhabit it.</p>		Support	Ms Charlotte Foster [7136]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1497	<p>Strategic Wildlife Corridors are important in complying with the NPPF. However, we would like the policy strengthened by widening the corridors (particularly in the east); linking to the SDNP bat protocol; linking to the net gain concept of off site compensation of biodiversity loss; linking to the GI policy; and making it clear that development within or close to the corridor will be avoided.</p>		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1566	<p>For Strategic Wildlife Corridors - please add the following Policy.</p> <p>Reference to existing linear features - especially where these features are predominantly naturalised (or can be) must predispose them for Formal Recognition as Strategic Wildlife Corridors.</p> <p>High on this list should be Footpaths, Bridleways and Cycleways, Railway lines and Canal Courses - especially those where their route is largely away from Roads, and where a significant linkage for both Wildlife and Human travel is, or could be easily demonstrated. Thereby recognising a synergy in the needs of Wildlife and Humans in their need for safe transport routes and connectivity.</p>		Comment	Mr Philip Maber [7107]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1571	<p>I support the Wildlife Corridors Policy but strongly urge that the fifth corridor along the Ham Brook be reinstated as this provides much-needed high quality wildlife habitat is appreciated and valued by local residents.</p>		Comment	Dr Alison Barker [7188]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1576	<p>Add Following Policy:</p> <p>All new Building Developments to include an Assessment of existing and potentially enhanced Wildlife Corridors to preserve and enhance connectivity. This is vital to facilitate populations access to, and the ability to colonise suitable habitats that meet each species' varied and often individual needs.</p> <p>Ideally, these Wildlife Corridors should follow the routes of human, non-road traffic Pathways. Therefore, sufficiently wide to accommodate naturalised margins, typically including trees and scrub.</p> <p>Heritage, established linear links must be granted special Conservation Status, especially as oases through major new Developments. So retaining natural links between SDNP and Chichester Harbour.</p>		Comment	Mr Philip Maber [7107]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1579	<p>Please lower the criteria required for Formal Strategic Wildlife Corridor Recognition.</p> <p>Evidence of Rare or Listed Plants and Animals should NOT be a criterion for Wildlife Corridor Recognition: Existing Records are sparse and patchy.</p> <p>Obvious inclusions for SWCs include a link along the narrow gap between Chichester and Lavant, and similarly between Chichester and Fishbourne - including multi-directional options.</p> <p>Recognised Strategic Wildlife Corridor Recognition should include, wherever possible, the inclusion of small areas specifically Recognised as Wildlife Refuges - ideally, these will be managed and nurtured by local volunteers.</p>		Support	Mr Philip Maber [7107]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1700	With the planned development at Whitehouse Farm, land currently inhabited by a lot of wildlife will be destroyed. It is therefore imperative that Centurion Way be accepted as a wildlife corridor linking the Downs and Chichester Harbour.		Support	Mrs Anne Pointer [7205]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1820	<p>Strongly support.</p> <p>If this Policy is altered, I may wish to make further representations, including at Examination in Public.</p>		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1822	The Wildlife Corridor East of Chichester connecting SD National Park to Pagham Harbour, has the potential to be extended to link to the series of lakes around the East side of Chichester, which are havens for wildlife. More emphasis could be given to this to protect wildlife and provide a local amenity for quiet leisure activities - eg bird watching, walking.		Comment	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1832	<p>Ref: S30a West of City Corridors Map</p> <p>Centurion Way provides a VITAL Wildlife Corridor Linking SDNP with Chichester Harbour and the Manhood Peninsular - taking in Brandy Hole Copse Nature Reserve. The 20m wide heritage railway route links 2 SARs (Singleton and Cocking Tunnels) within SDNP. There is Evidence of at least 12 species of Bat in the Whitehouse Farm 1600 House Development Area (14 Species nearby). It is proven that Bats require many miles of suitable habitat to forage and complete their Life Cycle. Bats particularly require linear routes with continuous tree cover for dusk and dawn travel.</p>		Support	Mr Philip Maber [7107]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1835	<p>Policy S30</p> <p>During the last century our natural habitats have been lost on a frightening scale. With the present spread of developments it is more important than ever to have a policy to protect our wildlife .</p> <p>I support the wildlife corridor policy . It is important to ensure , that corridors are of sufficient size so that where they pass near developments the wildlife are not disturbed by non-native species or by pollution,noise or artificial light. Consideration would need to be given to how the A27, A259 and the railway line would be crossed</p>		Support	Miss Patricia Jones [6904]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1868	- Wildlife corridors need to be wider and bolder to allow crossings of the roads that block access		Comment	Jenny Cole [7114]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1960	<p>Wildlife corridor north/south across the derelict land adjacent to the A27 not suitable due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - birds would have to overfly the trunk road at turbulent and elevated level before it starts to fall away into a cutting towards Salthill Road. - Local ornithological knowledge indicated this is an illogical place to 'nominate' as a wildlife corridor 	The farmland at Bethwines Farm is on gently rising ground and woodland beyond that naturally overflies the deep cutting of the A27. This provides a natural wildlife flightpath between the upper reaches of the harbour and the South Downs	Comment	Mr C N Robinson [7242]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	1992	Objects to location of strategic wildlife corridor at Fishbourne and asks that consideration is given to a wildlife corridor on western side as an alternative.		Object	Mr Geoff Smith [7245]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2041	<p>Welcome the approach of designating wildlife corridors however have concerns with criterion 1 - we have no idea what a "sequentially available site" is. And secondly we do not see how any circumstances can be permitted that allows any development to occur within a Strategic Wildlife Corridor (other than those that satisfy condition 3 of this policy) that would not result in the destruction of the corridor.</p> <p>The Y-shaped eastern corridor (Map S30b) shows that this corridor is extraordinarily narrow in places, so much so that its effectiveness looks questionable.</p>		Comment	Sussex Ornithological Society (Mr Richard Cowser) [7256]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2113	Support the concept of Wildlife Corridors in the Plan	Wildlife Corridors are not defined in the Glossary in the Background Paper and should be included	Support	Mr John Auric [7266]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2114	Object to the removal from the Plan Review of the Chidham/East of Nutbourne Wildlife Corridor.	If the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Review [SNPR] wishes to give more priority to natural habitats then it can devise policies which avoid "the close proximity of...proposed development" cited in paragraph 5.5.	Object	Mr John Auric [7266]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2115	<p>Policy welcomed. CDC should work with Chichester Harbour Conservancy and SDNPA to ensure corridors provide effective connectivity across wider landscape. Section 5.66 refers to four corridors west of city, but not east. Maps 5.1 and 5.2 missing. Mitigated northern route could impact on SWCs - as drafted Policy 30 would seem to prevent a mitigated northern route coming forward - the Council should consider whether policy is overly restrictive and how it would be applied. Area in Westbourne BOA is housing and should be considered if land has potential for biodiversity enhancement.</p>	<p>Amend title of West of city corridors map to "West of City Strategic Wildlife Corridors".</p> <p>Change colour of corridors on maps as two different colours make it confusing.</p>	Support	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2189	These are draft corridors as the biodiversity study is incomplete at the time of this consultation and will need to be re-consulted on.		Object	Debbie Leonard [7215]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2206	<p>We are supportive of this policy and believe it provides a strong framework for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity within the Plan Area. In particular we support the corridors along watercourses and the links with Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.</p> <p>We would be interested to discuss whether the Strategic Wildlife Corridors Background Paper could be expanded upon to consider more natural flood management measures to complement traditional defences - see attached note.</p>		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2236	Objects to the term Wildlife Corridor implying as it does a narrow strip of land. The Hambrook Wildlife strip needs to be reinstated in the plan.		Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2261	<p>Support policy S30 on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Corridors important between SDNP and Harbour AONB - Maintains healthy and vibrant wildlife - Supports bat movement 		Support	Mr Stephen Johnson [26]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2390	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2434	<p>Support policy.</p> <p>No corresponding policy within SDNP LP - concern that it is unlikely to be sufficient for corridors to reach SDNP boundary.</p> <p>Some of corridors also v narrow - question whether they are sufficient</p>		Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2465	Support policy, but wish to see Hambrook corridor reinstated. Background Paper prejudices NP as the NP determines where devt should go ahead. Ham Brook corridor: provide POS, enhance setting of SDNP, contribute to GI, mitigation for SPA/SAC/ramsar		Support	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2475	WCs do little good/too narrow/do not go far enough - a single wider corridor would be better so should be repositioned to W of F'bourne.	Relocate Fbourne wildlife corridor to W of village	Object	Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan Group (Mr Geoff Hand) [7282]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2484	Support policy but object to location of Fishbourne corridor - move to west	Relocate Fbourne corridor to west of village	Comment	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2498	Support corridor policy - corridor along Ham Brook as abundance of wildlife - development in this area should be constrained by proximity to wildlife corridor		Support	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2526	We fully support Policy 30, but object to the omission of a Wildlife Corridor directly along the route of the Ham Brook in Southbourne Parish. This would be in addition to the corridor identified east of Hambrook village.	The inclusion of an additional wildlife corridor along the Ham Brook in Southbourne Parish.	Object	Mrs Sue Talbot [6219]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2531	Propose corridor joining Chichester and Pagham Harbours	Include new corridor	Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2553	We strongly support the inclusion of this policy and would welcome its further development to ensure its effectiveness. We support the policy responses from Chichester Harbour Conservancy and from Southbourne Parish Council in this regard. We feel that with further development, the inclusion of this policy may go some way towards mitigating some of the potential impacts of the local plan housing allocations on the AONB.	We wish to see further strengthening and widening of the Wildlife Corridor proposals, with thorough evidence based exercise to identify and locate the corridors most effectively. We defer to the expertise of the Conservancy and SDNP authority to support this exercise and strongly urge further consultation with these bodies on this subject.	Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2565	We support proposal for wildlife corridors. We have been strong proponents of the Pagham Rife wildlife corridor which stretches from Pagham Harbour to Chichester.		Support	Friends of Pagham Harbour (Mr Francis Parfremment) [6213]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2569	The Chichester Wildfowlers' Association supports the proposal for a policy on Strategic Wildlife Corridors.		Support	Chichester Wildfowlers' Association (Mr Francis Parfremment) [7287]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2576	It is encouraging to see the proposed introduction of "wildlife corridors" to the east and west of Chichester linking the Downs with Pagham and Chichester Harbours respectively. However they should not be positioned where they conflict with 5.24 which addresses the possibility of an A27 northern relief road. They should also be wider at the coastal end: the two to the east of the city could even be joined to form one. Designate a protected area to link Chichester and Pagham Harbours in the same way.	Designate a protected area to link Chichester and Pagham Harbours	Support	Earnley Parish Council (Mrs Louise Chater) [16]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2581	We endorse the overall thrust of the policy but the absolute necessity of applying the guidelines at 5.67 cannot be stated too often and too strongly.		Comment	Lavant Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1116]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2733	We support CDC in its progressive move to include a strategic wildlife corridor policy within its strategic policies. With regards to the policy word we seek clarity on what bullet point one means when it refers to 'sequentially preferable site'. We see that the Glossary for the plan does include a definition for sequential test but not sequentially preferable site.	We encourage CDC to make a commitment within the Local Plan to keeping the evidence base that informs the location of strategic wildlife corridors up to date.	Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2749	<p>See attached ecology report.</p> <p>Fishbourne corridor - ecology report supports opp to bring forward development with sensitively designed/ecologically driven site layout .</p> <p>Suggest Fbourne corridor extended east of the A27 to acknowledge presence of key connective underpasses and role of habitats east of the A27.</p> <p>Suggest reword policy.</p>	<p>Reword policy to: "Development proposals, within, or in close proximity to, strategic wildlife corridors will be granted where it can be demonstrated that the development will not have an adverse impact on the integrity and function of the wildlife corridor and that for large scale strategic development there are no sequentially preferable sites available outside the wildlife corridor. Development within the strategic wildlife corridor will be acceptable where it does not undermine the connectivity and ecological value of the corridor. Development located in close proximity to a strategic wildlife corridor should protect and enhances its features and habitats."</p>	Comment	Gleeson Strategic Land (Mr Peter Rawlinson) [855]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	2945	<p>Generally, welcome the inclusion of strategic wildlife corridors within the plan in what is an important area for wildlife biodiversity, including both native and migrating species. We believe there may be other important wildlife corridors that need to be considered, particularly east west across the Manhood Peninsular. We would request further research into this aspect, or at least an acknowledgement that further corridors may need to be incorporated in due course. We support the views expressed by the Chichester Harbour Conservancy that the suggested corridors need to be extended further south and strengthened and with an east-west corridor.</p>	<p>We would like a commitment to review Wildlife Corridors and for the results of this review to be built into the plan.</p>	Object	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3080	<p>The principles of the wildlife corridors are sound. In short, joined-up habitats are better at preserving species diversity and allow species to disperse across the landscape.</p> <p>The network of corridors presented are primarily on a North-South axis, and don't link to one another in the East West direction. There is also a lack of corridor penetration to the southern parts of the Bosham and Chidham peninsulas.</p>	<p>Recommendations</p> <p>Developing these corridors/routes so that they are broader and go further would make them much more powerful as the basis for ecological networks and be of greater benefit to a wider range of species. Parishes could use the corridors as a basis for their own more local network. This may lead to links being created to habitats via and the protection of an East- West network.</p> <p>Specifically, the Conservancy recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Extending the proposed west of Chichester to Fishbourne wildlife corridor to the Chichester Marina and Birdham Pool Local Wildlife Sites on the East of the Fishbourne Channel, and to Old Park Wood SSSI; * Extending the proposed Chidham/East of Nutbourne wildlife corridor South to Cobnor; <p>A further benefit to the integrity or function of the corridors would be provided if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Tree Preservation Orders were placed on hedges/rows of trees or significant individual trees within the designated corridors; * The LPA developed a mechanism for monitoring of wildlife corridor habitats and to engage with local Parishes so that wildlife corridors are better linked between Parishes at a local level, thus landowners could be approached to directly enhance specific sections of the corridor. <p>The Conservancy welcomes the concept of Wildlife Corridors. However, for them to be successful the LPA must be far more visionary, creating a genuine Wildlife Network embedded across East-West corridor. The Conservancy would positively welcome further discussions about this with the LPA and SDNPA.</p>	Support	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3128	<p>Strongly support identification of strategic wildlife corridors. In particular to the west of the city, linking the harbour to SDNP. However land north of B2178 and south of Brandy Hole Copse, as well as Centurion Way to its east should be added.</p>		Support	Mr John Templeton [7371]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3134	Wording implies that in principle it will be acceptable to develop land within a corridor.	Propose the following rephrasing: 'There is presumption against development proposals within or in close proximity to strategic wildlife corridors unless it can be demonstrated that: 1, 2, 3.'	Comment	Mr John Templeton [7371]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3169	This policy should be made statutory so that wildlife from the Harbour area can reach that in the National Park, despite all the building along the A27. The corridors designated are most important, but others should be established around all new building developments to ensure that wildlife does not exist only in isolated pockets.		Comment	Mr Alan Carn [5417]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3224	Object to nature and application of broad area designation - don't appear to be based on specific characteristics or up to date evidence. Location of Fbourne corridor limits opportunity for FPC to undertake an appropriate assessment of sites	The Fbourne wildlife corridor should be removed and allocated through the NP process or subsequent DPD - to allow flexibility for Fishbourne PC to undertake an unconstrained review of their NP	Object	The Feltham Family [6885]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3229	Object to nature and application of broad area designation - don't appear to be based on specific characteristics or up to date evidence. Fbourne corridor limits the FPC to undertake an assessment of suitable sites	Remove Fbourne corridor and allocate it either through NP process or subsequent DPD to allow flexibility for PC	Object	The Smith Family [6886]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3261	Object to nature and application of broad area designation which does not appear to be based on specific characteristics or up to date evidence. Fbourne corridor limits opportunity for FPC to undertake an assessment of all sites available.	Fbourne corridor should be removed and reallocated through NP process or DPD to allow FPC flexibility to choose sites	Object	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3284	Support policy.		Support	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3502	Object to the omission of a Wildlife Corridor directly along the route of the Ham Brook in Southbourne Parish. None of reasons for rejection in the Background Paper are sufficient to justify the omission. It is one of the more significant watercourses in the area between Lumley and Fishbourne. All the other major watercourses in this area flowing from the Downs to the Harbour form the basis of a proposed wildlife corridor and it is inconsistent to exclude the Ham Brook.	The inclusion of an additional wildlife corridor along the Ham Brook in Southbourne Parish.	Object	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3507	The general concept of Wildlife Corridors is supported, this policy could be significantly stronger.		Support	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
65	Policy S30: Strategic Wildlife Corridors	3527	Both CDC and WSCC promoted a Mitigated Northern Route for the A27 at Chichester as the preferred option. Policy S30 which introduces 'wildlife corridors' conflicts with the ability to deliver a Northern Route. Policy S30 requires amending so that it does not exclude the possibility of a Northern Route. There cannot be any policy which excludes the possibility of a Northern route.	Policy S30 requires amending so that it does not exclude the possibility of a Northern Route. There cannot be any policy which excludes the possibility of a Northern route.	Comment	West Wittering Parish Council (Mrs Susan Hawker) [6669]
66	Wastewater	1789	5.72 We support this. We do not support on site systems. We are opposed to any new connections to the Apuldram Waterworks.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
66	Wastewater	2451	Object to content of Water Quality Assessment, need to update Surface Water and Foul Drainage SPD to cover LPR period.		Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
66	Wastewater	2951	Define "SPD" for the non-expert reader of the plan.		Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
66	Wastewater	3497	There has been concern for a number of years about whether there is adequate capacity both at the Thornham Works and in the pipe network. There have been occasions when sewers have surcharged. Storm water discharges of sewage, which has only had primary treatment, into Chichester Harbour have been increasing. This issue needs to be addressed for the Bournes area as a whole.		Object	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	87	The area covered by the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 lies within the South Marine Plan Area therefore, it is recommended to ensure your plan is 'sound' that it includes a reference to the South Marine Plan. There are policies within the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 that have marine relevance and so it is recommended that the South Marine Plan and specific policies are referred to in these sections. See full submission	The marine planning remit is directly for coastal and marine waters up to the mean high water spring mark where Chichester district council extends to the mean low water spring mark (we can supply a GIS layer of the spatial extent for any policy maps if you wish). The area covered by the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 lies within the South Marine Plan Area therefore, it is recommended to ensure your plan is 'sound' that it includes a reference to the South Marine Plan. There are policies within the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 that have marine relevance and so it is recommended that the South Marine Plan and specific policies are referred to in these sections. For example, policies: S18, S25, S27, S31. See full submission.	Comment	Marine Management Organisation (Stakeholder and Networks Officer) [1144]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	320	The existing sewage disposal solution is unsustainable under the WFD. The additional housing allocation to Tangmere SDL is unsustainable because brown field sites are available at the same location. Additional facilities at Tangmere are unsustainable.	A new 'Regional' sewage disposable solution needs to be developed by Southern Water. This will include the developments at Southbourne, Hambrook, Bosham and Fishbourne. All Chichester developments to drain to Apuldram for treatment with a long sea outfall at Bracklesham as originally proposed. Tangmere SDL to remain at 1000 houses with additional growth included at the 'Apron' site. Remove references to unsustainable community facilities at Tangmere.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	330	A regional wastewater treatment policy needs to be developed that respect the harbours and all the other water bodies covered by the WFD. Groundwater infiltration is an issue for Southern Water not individual developers. There should be a statutory obligation to resolve this issue and no attempt made to transfer responsibility elsewhere.	A Regional Wastewater policy is required. Groundwater infiltration is not an issue for developers to resolve.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	374	The Policy does not place a sufficiently strong requirement on the water companies to provide timely upgrades to their networks and treatment works. This has bedevilled the area for years as they manage to have conditions discharged without actually carrying out the work required. Guidance under an SPD is nowhere near strong enough.	Policy S31, first line ...'should be able to demonstrate.'. change to... 'will be required to demonstrate.' Para 3 should be modified to read: 'Where appropriate. development WILL BE REQUIRED TO contribute..etc' This requirement should be further strengthened with: THE STAGE OF THE DEVELOPMENT AT WHICH THE REQUIRED MEASURE SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED WILL BE DETERMINED IN THE GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION' Last line change to: 'Permission will ONLY be granted...'	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	907	The present sewage works are totally inadequate for the present number of houses in the area, especially when there is much rain. This has resulted at times in raw sewage being emptied into Chichester harbour. This also contains residue from drugs passed out in urine which i am told in harming wild life.	A new sewage works will be required with improved treatment facilities to ensure better filtering. This should be provided by the housing builders.	Object	mrs Patricia Carroll [6964]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	1002	Para 17 of the Adopted Local Plan 2014-2029 stated that because the Tangmere Water Works upgrade would only be operational from 2019, proposed strategic allocations in the Chichester/Tangmere area were not expected to be deliverable until after 2019. To compensate the Plan strategy sought the early release of housing land in areas where wastewater capacity was available, i.e. the Manhood Peninsula.	Building on the Peninsula was front loaded for this reason. In the event that it is decided to retain the proposed numbers in the Plan Review, the requirement to build should be deferred until the improvements to the A27 have been implemented.	Object	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	1264	Policy should include the large industrial scale horticultural developments which are located within the Chichester and Pagham Harbour Treatment Catchment areas. This includes the Runcton HDA and Selsey where high levels of nitrates and other pollutants may leach into watercourses.	This policy should specifically include large industrial scale horticultural developments.	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	1354	AL6 / S31. It is clear from the Southern Gateway plan that Apuldram WwTW is under severe pressure, further evidenced by the Whitehouse Farm development pumping its wastewater to Tangmere. How much wastewater will the 33ha industrial estate and 100+ houses discharge into ApuldramWwTW? How much does the existing 25ha Terminus Road industrial estate already discharge there? Will the proposed Fishbourne and other developments also discharge into ApuldramWwTW?		Comment	Mr Andrew Thrasher [7123]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	1459	I understand that although improvements are on going to the foul sewer system this is designed only to cope with the new housing already approved. No further capacity has been allowed for the additional housing proposed in this Local Plan Review		Comment	Mr Graham Dipple [7162]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	1507	Natural England's view is that the policy needs redrafting in order to ensure an adverse effect on Chichester Harbour SPA/SAC/Ramsar is avoided. Our view is that the current evidence base indicates that the overarching policy is sufficient to address potential impacts on Pagham Harbour.	* The scope of the policy needs clarifying - it applies to all the catchments and this should be made explicit. * The detail of the policy is imprecise with regards to the circumstances and explicit impacts from development that affect sites, in particular Chichester Harbour. * Natural England therefore recommend there is a policy that is below this overarching policy that applies to development that goes to WwTW that are in the Chichester Harbour catchment or any such development that is non-mains. This policy should seek to achieve nutrient neutrality of all development either by contributions to a nutrient management plan or by their own means. This policy should lead to no net increase and where possible a net reduction in nutrients to the Harbour.	Object	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	1965	- Foul Drainage - denials by Southern Water that there are problems. Proposal to run a sewer from Whitehouse Farm around north of Chichester to Tangmere instead of upgrading Apuldram WW treatment works. Sewer pipe problems at Bosham and elsewhere. Untreated sewage discharged into the harbour. Increasing danger to public health.		Comment	Mr David Myers [4894]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2117	Suggest amendments to wording Remove: Where appropriate, development should contribute to the delivery of identified actions to deliver infiltration reduction across the catchment. Amend wording to: Where appropriate development should contribute to the delivery of identified actions to deliver a reduction in the level of infiltration of groundwater into the sewer system.	Remove: Where appropriate, development should contribute to the delivery of identified actions to deliver infiltration reduction across the catchment. Amend wording to: Where appropriate development should contribute to the delivery of identified actions to deliver a reduction in the level of infiltration of groundwater into the sewer system.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2119	The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is concerned about the approach being taken with regard to ensuring potential wastewater treatment for proposed new sustainable development. In the LLFAs view, the Local Plan Review is not setting out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development in relation to arrangements for wastewater management. The LLFA considers that CDC needs to go further in incorporating within the Local Plan Review how this provision is being made.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2207	Support policy intention but recommend amending to ensure issues associated with Apuldrum WWTW are addressed and that wider opps for protection/enhancement of water quality are taken forward. Recommend expanding policy to discuss wider water quality and water resources within the Plan area - inc ref to Water Framework Directive and South East River Basin Management Plan. We would wish to see the Plan include a policy that will ensure that the design and location of development will both protect and enhance water bodies, both surface and groundwater e.g. Arun/Cambridge Support BR standard of 110l but is necessary in this policy?		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2299	Policy S31 'Wastewater Management and Water Quality' refers to higher standards in the Building Regulations for water consumption to reduce pollution in the harbours. Portsmouth Waters 'Water Resources Management Plan' is based on lower per capita consumption and we have an aspiration for all customer to reach 100 litres/head/day by 2050. This is no substitute for reducing overall flows to sewage treatment works by the control of groundwater infiltration and surface water drainage.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2325	Adopting higher water efficiency measures and ensuring that surface water from new development is prevented from discharging to the foul network - will be effective in helping to mitigate the impact of new development. This approach is supported, in conjunction with a requirement to phase development to align with the delivery of new or improved infrastructure. The combination of these measures, together with those submitted for inclusion within individual site allocations which seek to prevent occupation of new development ahead of necessary sewer improvements, will contribute to reducing the risk of sewer flooding that may otherwise have been exacerbated		Support	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2391	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2452	Amend policy wording to be more appropriate to local circumstances.	Amend wording of policy to "Proposals for development within the Plan area must be able to demonstrate no adverse impact upon the quality of receiving waters including with regard to the capacity and condition of existing wastewater and sewage systems, local storm discharge risk and the capacity of the Wastewater Treatment Works. The Council as planning authority will look to satisfy itself on these matters including to ensure sufficient capacity within the relevant Wastewater Treatment Works before the delivery of development as required."	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2485	In the Parish Council's view, no planning application should be considered without previous guarantee that the updates at the relevant WWTW have been completed and that the waste water from the new building can be safely dealt with without any risk of polluting the AONB.		Comment	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2512	S31 should be amended to include an additional criterion which makes it clear that planning permission will only be granted where enhancements to necessary foul water infrastructure occur prior to the commencement of development. On site schemes which discharge into nearby water courses should not be deemed acceptable, particularly those within proximity of the Chichester Harbour AONB.	S31 should be amended to include an additional criterion which makes it clear that planning permission will only be granted where enhancements to necessary foul water infrastructure occur prior to the commencement of development. On site schemes which discharge into nearby water courses should not be deemed acceptable, particularly those within proximity of the Chichester Harbour AONB.	Object	Bosham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [749]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2534	The Parish requests that a clear reappraisal of the wastewater capacity of SWWTW and of the network is made and the infrastructure costs of a system that has the required headroom and a network that will support existing and any new development is made and factored into the plan.		Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2554	<p>Concerned about the potential adverse impact of additional housing requirement on the water quality of Chichester Harbour.</p> <p>Chichester Harbour SSSI at risk of being downgraded to Unfavourable - no change - failing of authorities to adequately manage the nutrient input into the harbour by the three Waste Water Treatment Works.</p> <p>There needs to be critical analysis of the capacity of the WWTW to cope with additional inputs from the numbers of new houses proposes with a robust strategy to manage this input, given the current unacceptable levels of storm discharges into the Harbour (data available from the Environment Agency).</p>	We support the proposal by Chichester Harbour Conservancy to adopt a nutrient neutral policy for any new inputs into Chichester Harbour. We support the Conservancy's proposal to develop a Nutrient Management Plan, in partnership with Natural England, the Environment Agency, Chichester Harbour Conservancy and Southern Water.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2566	We are concerned about the impacts additional housing will have on existing infrastructure, particularly the sewage system. During the winter months Pagham Harbour suffers several sewage spills per week into the Pagham Rife due to storm surges and this will only increase should further housing be built. Furthermore, other seage treatment plants that discharge into rifes which flow into Pagham Harbour will be similarly affected.		Comment	Friends of Pagham Harbour (Mr Francis Parfremment) [6213]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2644	Support policy.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	2734	Having viewed this policy we note that it captures standards for water consumption in new development. This seems to be focused on households and suggests standard of a maximum of 110 litres per person per day. Whilst we support this requirement, given the plan's commitment to delivering significant growth in the horticultural sector, we ask how water consumptions standards in this policy would apply to these developments, as we do not feel it is clear from the policy or supporting text.		Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	3082	<p>Too often, matters of foul and surface water drainage are left reserved by a planning condition. For all major development the Policy should set this out as a requirement and be a local requirement for validating such planning applications.</p> <p>Policy S31: Chichester Harbour is largely in unfavourable condition because of excess nitrates, and monitoring by Natural England show no trends of improvement. This policy should have a commitment to a nutrient neutral policy.</p> <p>Also refer to Article 6(4) tests of Habitats Regulations for sites not recovering</p>	<p>It would be helpful if the process by which wastewater management and water quality are considered is better explained in 5.71, perhaps with a flowchart. The lack of public understanding results in general dissatisfaction on water quality matters.</p> <p>There is also an opportunity for Chichester District Council to cross reference compliance with the Policy 28 on Pollution, whether this be impacts to water quality, artificial light impact during hours of darkness and noise, which all ought to be assessed by the developer when proposing to develop in such areas. Chichester District Council is invited to review its published local requirements checklist and to make this a requirement of validating any planning application in such areas.</p> <p>Chichester District Council should adopt a nutrient neutral policy for any new inputs into Chichester Harbour. Furthermore, the Conservancy would welcome a commitment from the LPA to prepare and publish a Nutrient Management Plan, to be developed in partnership with Natural England, the Environment Agency, Chichester Harbour Conservancy and others.</p> <p>Add point 4. Wastewater from proposed developments that will discharge into Chichester Harbour must demonstrate no net increase in nutrients to the receiving waters.</p>	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
67	Policy S31: Wastewater Management and Water Quality	3256	Support policy.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
f. Strategic Site Allocations						
68	Strategic Site Allocations	331	The identification of strategic locations should have looked back at the 'Unconstrained List' of sites considered in previous plans. Housing requirements and sustainability issues have changed over time and these sites were studied and housing capacities estimated in the past. For example Site CC175 to the South of Chichester was identified in the 2009 Plan and is now sited next to the new secondary school. This location is sustainable and encourages walking rather than driving to school which affect the A27 at peak times.	Policy S32 should consider all previously identified sites and net ecological gain.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
69	Strategic Development					
70	Design Strategies					
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	504	Paragraph 5.18 No mention of use of gray water, design,. Overall appearance should not be red brick boxes with small windows. Lets get modern, architectural that is designed to resist flooding, not just raise houses by 1m which can then cause problems to existing lower houses.		Comment	Mrs Glenda Baum [5809]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	548	Archaeological Assessments should be presumed to be required for all strategic sites, unless there is a clear reason to suppose that archaeological remains have already been destroyed (e.g. at former landfill or gravel extraction sites). The area in Chichester District has been one of human occupation for many thousands of years, so everywhere will most likely have significant archaeological remains, unless known to have been already destroyed. Currently only some sites require archaeological assessments.		Comment	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	558	Agree with Point 6.		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	590	Point 4 of Policy 32. Proper planning to encourage walking, cycling and non-car transport. Not lip service. Excellent guidance in WSCC Walking and Cycling Strategy and Dept of Transport guidelines.		Comment	Julia Smith [6865]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	592	The emphasis on sustainable transport is not borne out in practice. The Local Plan will have more teeth and must specifically support cycle routes within the city and build more, they must protect national cycle route 2 and Centurion Way, and enhance these routes to make them safe for people to use.		Comment	Julia Smith [6865]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	651	Chichester Gate with its unused piazza and tawdry, empty premises is the template of how not to do it. The planned Southern Gateway development will be very visible to all, residents and visitors. Chichester Gate is a reminder of CDC's failure to deliver its aspirations. The Southern Gateway development may follow a similar trajectory, not meeting CDC's flagship project aspirations as developers/builders sacrifice quality to higher/denser buildings, poor and low cost design and build.	Strengthen the quality and rigour of CDC's planning scrutiny and enforcement processes at all stages. Disallow piecemeal development of different standards occurring as a result of the main developer selling parcels of land to 'sub-developers'. Appoint/co-opt a Design Champion - perhaps an architect who represents good practice, design etc, to work with and advise CDC and developers. Use the Design Codes system to define more accurately design requirements.	Comment	Linda Boize [6620]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	800	Great in theory. But this never happens at the prelim stage. Local communities are dictated to not allowed to be involved until initial plans have already been instigated. This plan lacks any concrete data, even housing numbers are fluid ie AL6 maybe 100 houses maybe 200 houses. how can you justify a masterplan with no detail or data on transport infrastructure, schools, doctors etc? Just a glorified wish list ! Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations I will be raising it with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Proper detail must be included in the plan along with proven data before the plan can be accepted.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	1134	Points b, e and g are welcomed. It is important that leisure and recreational routes, and new paths connect to the wider countryside for public benefit, and are not just contained within a development. There are many examples in the county where new routes have been created across or on the fringe of a development, which link to a wider network of recreational routes.		Comment	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	1265	Existing settlements area at risk of losing their existing identity and meaning with villages turning into sizeable towns.	This policy should be strengthened to ensure protection of existing communities through appropriate design strategies.	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	1305	The masterplan states in section e) provide community facilities and other amenities to meet the needs of all the community including access to education and training facilities, health care, community leisure and recreation facilities as appropriate. If it is to be an inclusive facility and meet the S12, S21 and S32 policy. Location will yet to be defined through working with the District Council and Parish Council. Options to be considered. This will then meet the required short fall of identified facilities for the Open Space Pitch Study, DM32.		Support	Bosham Football Club (Mr Neil Redman) [748]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	1520	Given the potential impacts of the strategic allocations on the setting of the National Park and AONB, Natural England recommends including a requirement for the Masterplan to be informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	1725	We note and endorse the approach wherein proposals for strategic development should be developed through consultation and iterative dialogue. There is no reference to a requirement that a given Masterplan should be adopted or incapable of review once agreed. This pragmatic approach provides the best opportunity of responding to market signals to secure deliverable schemes and early contribution to the OAN. A comprehensive site-wide design strategy can be prepared and/or taken forward by developers. There should be no requirement for the LPA to manage delivery unless it is clearly evidenced that this is necessary to realise policy objectives.		Comment	Heaver Homes Ltd [7183]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2020	Development that would either involve the loss of playing field or prejudice the use of the playing field (for example, housing immediately adjacent to an existing playing field) would be strongly resisted by Sport England.		Comment	Sport England (Ms Laura Hutson) [1308]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2208	We support this policy and specifically requirements for issues such as green infrastructure and SuDS to be fully considered through a Masterplan. Without this overarching vision for larger sites it is often difficult to provide a comprehensive scheme to address key environmental constraints and opportunities.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2258	Historic England welcomes and supports clause d of Policy S32; "integrate with the surrounding built, historic and natural environments" as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2354	Bullet points b, e & g - the aims of these are welcomed but any new routes are linked from new developments to the wider PRoW and access networks		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2392	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2412	<p>We would strongly encourage masterplans and development briefs for each allocation to come ahead of applications and demonstrate positive design interventions which respond directly to landscape/SDNP sensitivities. We would be happy to be involved in shaping these as consultees in order to achieve the best quality scheme. These interventions could be written in to the policy wording.</p> <p>Suggest that the policy requires such design strategies to be informed by landscape character and the sites landscape context. We also suggest that criteria h. includes a requirement to state maximum building heights.</p>	<p>Criteria h - include requirement to state max building heights</p> <p>Policy to require design strategies to be informed by landscape character/context</p>	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2555	We welcome the inclusion of the masterplanning requirement for strategic development sites to ensure they meet the needs of the local community and avoid ad-hoc piecemeal development of green-field land without a coherent structure.		Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2645	Support policy.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2736	SWT supports the inclusion of this policy, particularly given the large number of dwellings planned within strategic allocations. However, whilst it includes a requirement for proposals to consider green infrastructure, there is a lack of detail regarding biodiversity. In particular, we think section 1d currently confounds several planning issues, which means neither are given appropriate weight in the policy. As stated previously, CDC need to be more proactive and ambitious when it comes to delivering green infrastructure enhancements for the District.	<p>We therefore recommend the following amendments:</p> <p>'Proposals for housing allocations and major development sites must be accompanied by a site-wide design strategy that includes the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Masterplan which should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. identify the vision for the development, setting out a clear description of the type of place that should be created whilst building on the overall aims for the plan area b. demonstrate a coherent and robust framework for development that clearly sets out: land uses proposed including amount, scale and density, movement and access arrangements and Green Infrastructure provision c. show how the design requirements of the scheme work within the vision and demonstrate how the vision will be achieved d. integrate with the surrounding built, historic and natural environments, in particular ensuring a measurable net gain to biodiversity is achieved e. maximise existing and potential movement connections and accessibility to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport f. provide community facilities and other amenities to meet the needs of all the community, including access to education and training facilities, health care, community leisure and recreation facilities as appropriate g. define a hierarchy of routes and the integration of suitable infrastructure, including, for example, SuDS within the public realm h. contain a Green Infrastructure framework to ensure that public and private open space standards are met, relate well to each other and to existing areas and that the new spaces are safe, convenient, accessible and multi-functional, and i. contain an indicative layout which illustrates a legible urban structure based on strategic urban design principles and identifies key elements of townscape such as main frontages, edges, landmark buildings and key building groups and character areas. 2. An accompanying Design and Access Statement, which should explain: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the steps taken to appraise the context of the proposed development, and how the design of the development takes that context into account to create or reinforce local distinctiveness to achieve a positive sense of place and identity b. the design principles and concepts that have been applied to the proposed development and how these principles will be used to inform subsequent phases or development parcels and the mechanism for delivering the Vision at more detailed stages, for example through design coding c. how sustainability and environmental matters will be addressed through positive design including the efficient use of resources both during construction and when the development is complete...' 	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2893	<p>Support policy.</p> <p>Expand policy to reference that masterplans/DAS should incorporate phasing strategy to demonstrate how major sites can be delivered on phased basis.</p>	Expand policy to reference that masterplans/DAS should incorporate phasing strategy to demonstrate how major sites can be delivered on phased basis.	Support	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2946	We welcome this Policy but would like it to better reflect the NPPF (2018) requirement that "Design policies should be developed with local communities so they reflect local aspirations, and are grounded in an understanding and evaluation of each area's defining characteristics" (para 125) and "Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot" (para 128)	Point 2 could read "how early, proactive and effective consultation with the existing community has been incorporated"	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	2952	6.5 Shopwhyke Lakes site is not "well integrated" because it is severed by the A27 (and the planned bridges are hardly an inducement to walk or cycle, unless you cannot afford to drive). Elsewhere Whitehouse Farm comes crashing into existing green infrastructure. POLICY CHANGES: "maximising existing and potential movement connections and accessibility to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport including walking and cycling provision both across the site, and between the site and the wider area". Final paragraph INSERT reference to "self build" and "custom build" and the District Council's commitment to identify suitable sites for such activity	POLICY CHANGES: "maximising existing and potential movement connections and accessibility to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport including walking and cycling provision both across the site, and between the site and the wider area". Final paragraph INSERT reference to "self build" and "custom build" and the District Council's commitment to identify suitable sites for such activity: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/boost-for-aspiring-self-builders)	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	3085	Add an extra point in part 1. Page 92, 6.4, 6.5: A few minor amendments to strengthen the wording. Page 92, 6.3 Strategic Development: A few minor amendments to strengthen the wording.	1i. for any sites within 1 kilometre of Chichester Harbour AONB, to show how the design requirements protect, conserve and enhance the landscape. 6.3, refer to the Chichester Harbour AONB Landscape Character Assessment. 6.4, change to: "A design and landscape strategy" 6.5, change to: "informed by available evidence of the landscape, natural and historic environment."	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	3182	1 d. 'integrate with the surrounding built, historic and natural environments, in particular maximising existing and potential movement connections and accessibility to encourage walking, cycling an use of public transport' Keen to see priority of alternative sustainable transport options.		Support	Martyn Chuter [7380]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	3257	Support policy.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
71	Policy S32: Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites	3543	Concerns regarding standard of development at Southern Gateway. Suggestions made to ensure high standard and sustainable development is achieved.	Strengthen the quality and rigour of CDC's planning scrutiny and enforcement processes at all stages. Disallow piecemeal development of different standards occurring as a result of the main developer selling parcels of land to 'sub-developers'. Appoint/co-opt a Design Champion - perhaps an architect who represents good practice, design etc, to work with and advise CDC and developers. Use the Design Codes system to define more accurately design requirements.	Comment	Mr Martin Tomlinson MBE [6586]
72	Chichester City					
73	West of Chichester	701	Para 6.10 refers to 6 hectares of employment space west of Chichester =60,000 sq.m. Para 4.112 also refers to 6 hectares at that location but then in parentheses refers to 36,000 sq, m=3.6 ha Confusion needs to be cleared up		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
73	West of Chichester	1704	Para 6.13 acknowledges the issue for building west of Chichester and advocates using the Tangmere waste water processing plant. The para acknowledges that Apuldram plant can't cope and therefore this will be impacted by the land SW of Chichester with the same reason.	The strategic site West of Chichester may need to grow to replace the area proposed at Apuldram which is not and should not be a strategic site in the plan. The proposed development at AL/AP6 will directly impact the Apuldram site which the council itself acknowledges is at capacity hence the proposal for waste treatment from the West going to the East at Tangmere. CDC are aware of the limit on the site imposed by their own policy and have ignored its own cap.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
73	West of Chichester	1707	Para 6.14 bullet 5 there are no proposals for access to the A27 with this development. The only route to the A27 would be via Chichester city centre, Fishbourne roundabout or via Emsworth.	This site would fit well with a mitigated Northern route junction and this should be the preferred strategic development site which would enable the adoption of a preferred route with junctions to support the local increased traffic needs. By doing this there would not be a requirement for a link road and this junction would integrate with a strategic network upgrade.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
73	West of Chichester	1711	Para 6.14 bullet 5 there are no proposals for access to the A27 with this development. The only route to the A27 would be via Chichester city centre, Fishbourne roundabout or via Emsworth.	This site would fit well with a mitigated Northern route junction and this should be the preferred strategic development site which would enable the adoption of a preferred route with junctions to support the local increased traffic needs. By doing this there would not be a requirement for a link road and this junction would integrate with a strategic network upgrade.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
73	West of Chichester	1830	Para 6.8 includes "It therefore offers good accessibility to the city by sustainable modes of travel" whereas para. 12.29 of the adopted Local Plan refers to good "potential" accessibility, which is accurate. Para. 6.12 includes "The site does not present any major issues of flood risk." This is disputed. The Plan fails to recognise in its own right and to protect a recorded chalk stream running mostly north-south towards the east of the site which comprises a specialist river habitat under the UK BAP rivers and streams habitat action plan and is also notable under the Water Framework Directive.	Refer to good "potential" accessibility in pasra. 6.8 consistent with Adopted Local Plan para. 12.29. Add chalk stream habitats to Policy SA1, as part of the "Promote increased biodiversity, and protect and enhance the setting of" bullet point list.	Comment	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
73	West of Chichester	3176	6.12 Change to "The site does present major issues of flood risk and it contains rare chalk streams".	6.12 Change to "The site does present major issues of flood risk and it contains rare chalk streams".	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	32	Need to consider the environment and the future.	Re assessment on future needs.	Object	Mr Roland Gay [6561]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	120	As part of improving sustainable transport links with the city (bullet 4) The Centurion Way has a major role to play and should be maintained unaltered on its present route		Support	Mr Ian Bartle [4921]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	122	The Centurion Way has an important role to play in protecting and enhancing biodiversity. It's 8 km length, with an average width of 22 metres, represents an area of 40 acres (16 ha). It links Brandy Hole Copse to the South Downs National Park and provides a wildlife corridor between the South Downs and Chichester Harbour.		Comment	Mr Ian Bartle [4921]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	147	Improved cycle routes between Fishbourne and North of City, through land associated with this development		Comment	Mr K B [6656]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	246	Should specifically retain existing Centurion Way as a strategic cycle and walking route.	Add a sub section to Protect Centurion Way on its current route.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	269	This development mus have cycle lanes and bus routes from the outset to ensure sustainable travel choices are available.		Comment	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	332	Why was a road bridge not considered at Fishbourne Road with access to the SDL? Why is Aldingbourne Rife being allowed to deteriorate?		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	472	For point 12, the access to the site from the south should be from Cathedral Way, not Westgate. The small Westgate/Sherborne Road roundabout does not have the capacity to support access to a further 1600 dwellings.	Add to point 12: "and access to the southern edge of the site directly from Cathedral Way"	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	593	The developer's provision for Whitehouse Farm is inadequate and does not comply with the current local plan. No provision for safe cycling or walking No protection for centurion way poor transport planning that will lead to gridlock.	Enhance National Cycle Route 2 through proper safe segregated cycling. Designate Centurion Way as a key access to and from the city, and provide links from teh west of Chichester Ensure the SAR has safe segregated walking and cycling. Ensure the Sherborne ROad roundabout is safe for 1200+ school children, pedestrians, and cyclists	Object	Julia Smith [6865]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	803	No mention of detail traffic infrastructure for southern end of development with 2nd phase. There is no from in Westgate with constraints of school, train line and existing traffic flow. There is no spare capacity to put in a satisfactory road layout for the southern end which means all traffic from the development will have to use St Pauls Rd/ Sherborne road..Unsuitable.Again potentially no school built until 2029 not acceptable. School must go in first. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Detailed transport infrasture must be made public before development begins. School should be built at the beginning of the development.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	917	This land is very very wet - springs constantly appear. There is a much greater risk of flooding than has been accepted as the Council is so desperate to go for the plan	Insist that all houses are sold subject to covenant that no back gardens can be turned into patios and that front gardens must abide by what I have been told will be suggested which is no turning front gardens into car parking unless using the approved national trust style parking - I doubt that this is true but one of Linden Homes told me so	Object	Mrs Teresa Carlisle [6968]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	918	Why will there be access to the sports facilities from Clay Lane which is not suitable for the extra traffic? Why was this access point changed from the original plans whereby it was for the sewage vans?		Comment	Mrs Teresa Carlisle [6968]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	1135	Point 4 - this development provides an excellent opportunity to improve links to the wider countryside, in particular to BW 270 and Park Lane. Point 10 - An "appropriate landscaping buffer", is also an excellent opportunity to provide a multi-use prow (bridleway). We would also request that when looking at 'key landscaping' of the Centurian Way (CW), the issue of upgrading this to a multi-user path where possible, to include equestrians is considered, so that they can also benefit from a safe and secure off-road environment.		Comment	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	1362	Safe Pedestrian crossing (e.g. traffic lights) needed at the difficult junction of Sherborne Rd., St. Paul's Rd., and Norwich Rd.		Comment	Rev. John-Henry Bowden [7126]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	1518	Update policy to minimum 1600 homes to allow flexibility. Changes in density may allow up to 1750 dwellings without increasing development area. Update to policy regarding WWTW. Firstly connection and pipeline is being delivered separately by Southern Water. Secondly, the outline permission actually allows not only for a connection to the Tangmere facility, but also allows for an onsite foul drainage facility.		Comment	Linden Homes & Miller Homes [6783]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	1521	Natural England supports the biodiversity and landscape clauses in Policy AL1. However, we recommend amending clause 14 to read: Be planned with special regard to the need to mitigate potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar including contributing to strategic access management, and providing on-site recreational space; and avoiding/mitigating water quality impacts.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	1710	6.13 acknowledges the issue for building west of Chichester and advocates using the Tangmere waste water processing plant. The para acknowledges that Apuldram plant can't cope and therefore this will be impacted by the land SW of Chichester with the same reason.	The strategic site West of Chichester may need to grow to replace the area proposed at Apuldram which is not and should not be a strategic site in the plan. The proposed development at AL/AP6 will directly impact the Apuldram site which the council itself acknowledges is at capacity hence the proposal for waste treatment from the West going to the East at Tangmere. CDC are aware of the limit on the site imposed by their own policy and have ignored its own cap.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2029	Disappointed that such a large development is to be built immediately to the west of our community at White House Farm but are heartened by the statements assuring the no development occurs to the north of the B2178. Would also welcome a provision for a health centre. Would also like to see in the document a sentence on CDC desire to limit the impact of that development on the country lanes to the north of the B2178. There was an intention in the planning agreement to partially close Brandy Hole Lane which does not get mentioned.		Comment	Summersdale Residents Association (Mr Roger Hobbs) [5435]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2120	Education: It should be noted that phase one of this development will provide the primary school with the core of the building being built to the specification for a 2 form entry (FE) school and 1FE teaching accommodation. Phase 2 as per 6.10 on page 93 should include expansion of the primary school for the further 1FE of teaching accommodation.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2136	Flooding: Suggest amendment to wording. AL1 policy text requested additional bullet point as number 8 - Increase capacity to attenuate surface water on site, thereby reducing the discharge flows off the site below current rates and reducing the risk of flooding to residential areas downstream.	AL1 policy text requested additional bullet point as number 8 - Increase capacity to attenuate surface water on site, thereby reducing the discharge flows off the site below current rates and reducing the risk of flooding to residential areas downstream. AL1 policy text requested additional bullet point under 15 as 15 b- Provide mitigation for any loss of watercourse habitat resulting from culverting for highway provision in the development; AL1 policy text in supporting 'improved cycle and pedestrian routes linking the site with the city, Fishbourne and the South Downs National Park', a new key link for cycling will be to Salthill Road, thereby enabling cyclists to benefit from the existing bridge crossing of the A27 for journeys to and from the west.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2190	Al 1 is incomplete as presented. The settlement boundary should extend to include sites to the North to accommodate the unmet housing need as an exemption site for affordable homes 100% within 5 miles of the need as required in statute (unless the unmet housing need is returned to SDNP as it should be).		Object	Debbie Leonard [7215]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2259	We are therefore pleased to see that the Strategic Site Allocation still excludes the scheduled monument. We also welcome and support the requirements of Policy AL1, which we consider provide, in principle, adequate protection for the Scheduled Monument in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. However, this comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any planning application that may be submitted for the development of this site.		Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2300	Policy does not mention water supply so we assume that the site has reverted to a conventional system with sewerage pumped to Tangmere WWTW and water supplied by us. Portsmouth Water has provided provisional designs for this system and there are no existing large diameter water mains on the site. Costs for reinforcement of the water mains will be recovered by the new Infrastructure Charge and on site mains are likely to be provided by a third party.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2329	The existing provision within Policy AL1 relating to wastewater conveyance and treatment is noted, and was supported by Southern Water during historic consultations on the current Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029. However, since OFWAT's new approach to water and wastewater connections charging was implemented from 1 April 2018, we have adjusted our approach accordingly. Southern Water will need to work with site promoters to understand the development program and to review whether the delivery of new infrastructure aligns with the occupation of the development, and this is reflected in the proposed amendments below.	Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following amendment to Policy AL1: Occupation of development is phased to align with the delivery of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards.	Comment	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2355	Para 4 - this development provides an opportunity to improve access links to the wider access network Para 10 - there is an opportunity here to provide a multi-user PRow for all NMUs		Comment	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2394	- Cycling links poor - Increase in traffic - No reference to Centurion way for recreation disturbance		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2414	We welcome the consideration of the Centurion Way in criteria 10. However, we would ask for stronger policy wording to explicitly state that development must not adversely affect, and preferably enhance usability of, Centurion Way connecting Chichester with the SDNP.		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2737	<p>SWT is concerned there is no recognition of net gains to biodiversity within the policy, in particular the presence of a chalk stream, which is priority habitat, within the allocation site and parkland priority habitat adjacent to site. Should be noted section 6.14 with Brandy Hole Copse LNR and ancient woodland.</p> <p>The term 'mitigation' used in relation to protecting nearby SPA from adverse impacts. Habitat Regulations clear that adverse impacts must be avoided. This is the purpose of strategic mitigation strategy. If this strategy is not resulting in avoidance of impacts then it is not effective and not legally compliant.</p>	<p>'Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester needs to amended as follows:</p> <p>Land at West of Chichester, as defined on the policies map, is allocated for mixed use development, comprising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1,600 dwellings; 2. 6 hectares of employment land (suitable for B1 Business uses); 3. A neighbourhood centre / community hub, incorporating local shops, a community centre, small offices and a primary school; and 4. Open space and green infrastructure, including a Country Park Taking into account the site-specific requirements, development should: 5. Be planned as a sustainable urban extension of Chichester City, that is well integrated with neighbouring areas of the city, and provides good sustainable access to the city centre and key facilities in the city; 6. Landscaped to protect priority views of Chichester Cathedral spire; 7. Keep land north of the B2178 in open use, free from built development, to protect the natural history interest of both Brandy Hole Copse, and the setting of the Chichester Entrenchments Scheduled Monument; 8. Conserve, enhance and better reveal the significance of the Chichester Entrenchments Scheduled Monument and other non-designated heritage assets and their settings and to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be harmed or lost; 9. Deliver a measurable net gain to biodiversity, and protect and enhance the setting of Brand Hole Copse Local Nature Reserve and areas of Ancient Woodland and other priority habitat, including chalk streams; 10. Provide an appropriate landscaping buffer on the western boundary of the site, which could form a continuation of the existing planting already present, having regard to the adjacent priority habitat. Appropriate provision should also be made for key landscaping of Centurion Way, where necessary to contribute to green infrastructure; 11. Subject to detailed transport assessment, provide road access to the north from Old Broyle Road and to the south from Westgate; 12. Provide or fund mitigation for potential off-site traffic impacts through a package of measures in conformity with the Chichester City Transport Strategy (see Policy S14), including improved access to the A27 and road improvements to the St Paul's Road / Sherborne Road junction; 13. Make provision for regular bus services linking the site with Chichester City centre, and new and improved cycle and pedestrian routes linking the site with the city, Fishbourne and the South Downs National Park; 14. Be planned with special regard to the need to avoid potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar including contributing to any strategic access management issues; 15. Protect and enhance the existing biodiversity and important ecological corridor linking Chichester Harbour and the South Downs National Park. Any development will need to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide multi-functional green infrastructure both across the site and linking development to the surrounding countryside and Chichester City; b. Provide buffer zones to sensitive habitats such as ancient woodland. <p>Development is dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards. Development of the site should be phased so that the neighbourhood centre / community hub and Country Park and linking green infrastructure are delivered at an early stage of development, before any dwellings are occupied. Proposals for the development should have regard to the West Sussex County Council Minerals Safeguarding Area and associated guidance.'</p>	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2922	We understand that this is a key aspect of the plan, but we are concerned at the loss of green fields and agricultural land involved. If there is such a development, we welcome the protection of named sites and the suggestion of possible enhancements (net gain). We also welcome the recognition of the need for mitigation in relation to special protection areas.	We believe that Chichester DC should challenge the unreasonable housing targets on the grounds of its special position in which major developments will inevitably have a disproportionate impact on greenfield sites. Such appeals have been successful in many authorities such as Wealden, Brighton and Hove and Adur. On this basis, development on this scale may be unnecessary	Object	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2953	Object on grounds that there is failure to acknowledge the disruption that southern access route will cause for greener modes of travel; needs to make reference to green infrastructure making a contribution to the extension of Centurion Way to Midhurst.	Insert new final sentence in section: "It is recognised that under present proposals the southern access causes disruption to pre-existing walking and cycling routes (notably Centurion Way, and currently quiet roads such as Westgate). Should the developer be so minded, the council would welcome a low-car development on this site, with consequent lesser burden on the developer for road based CIL money contributions." Change Policy AL1 15a to: "Provide multi-functional green infrastructure both across the site and linking development to the surrounding countryside and to Chichester City and potentially making a contribution to the extension of Centurion Way to Midhurst;"	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	2972	Policy AL1 - Point 7 SUPPORT Strong support for policy the "Keep land north of the B2178 in open use, free from built development".		Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	3086	The context could be clearer - Map AL1, the Proposed Settlement Boundary, is just 200 metres from the AONB boundary. This should be stated in the accompanying text.	Map AL1, the Proposed Settlement Boundary, is just 200 metres from the AONB boundary. This should be stated in the accompanying text.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	3129	Objection to land north of B2178 being included in allocation. Potential car parking, visitor centre, playing pitches etc would damage rural setting and open view of cathedral spire.		Object	Mr John Templeton [7371]
74	Policy AL1: Land West of Chichester	3177	Walking and cycling safely in and out of the development should be as important as access for cars. It is imperative that a new, direct and safe route direct into the centre (not round the houses) should be provided.	At 10. Insert: "Provide an appropriate wildlife and landscaping buffer". At 15. Insert: "Development of the site should be phased so that the sustainable cycle and walking paths, the neighbourhood centre/community hub...are delivered at an early stage".	Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
75	Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	353	The proposals for cycle tracks and bridges at Portfield and Shopwyke seem to be at the expense of the existing cycle route from Tangmere to Chichester. This is very well used route but no attempt has been made to enhance the pavement at Westhampnett. No off road cycle route was included in the Rolls Royce or recent housing developments. If a bridge is provided at the Portfield roundabout, as proposed, where does the cycle route go on the western side? How does it get to the secondary schools and to the city centre?		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
75	Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	971	I am only supporting the development of the rest of this site for housing if it is really unavoidable to have more housing developments on the edge of Chichester (and in Oving Parish). Of all available sites this seems to me to be the most suitable. Wildlife corridors linking the South Downs and Pagham Harbour are important as well as footpaths/cycle routes that can be safely used to access all areas, not just for recreation but for routes into Chichester and out to the surrounding villages and countryside.		Comment	Miss Diana Pitts [6535]
75	Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	2954	A bridge will always be offputting to a section of walkers and cyclists, and to a section of the disabled. And some of the proposed bridges are only designed to the standard of a footbridge (rather than shared foot and cycle bridge) and/or with bends so tight that they do not accommodate non-standard cycles.	6.19 Add the words "Cycle provision will be expected to be fully compliant with all relevant aspects of current Local Transport Notes and, where doubt exists about compliance, developers may be asked to submit an independent cycle audit". 6.20 Bullet point 7 CHANGE TO "and a new bridge, built to shared foot and cycle bridge standards, across the A27 via Coach Road to Westhampnett village"	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	247	Support point 9. Make provision for foot/cycle bridge across the A27 south of Portfield Roundabout, and foot/cycle bridge across A27 to Coach Road.		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	270	"Make provision for regular bus services linking the site with Chichester City centre, and new and improved cycle and pedestrian routes linking the site with the city, Westhampnett, Oving, Tangmere, and the South Downs National Park;" Amend "make provision for" to "provide..."		Comment	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	333	Why was the housing allowed to be completed before the new footbridge is provided? I thought this was a condition of development along with closing the Oving lights junction and improvements to the A27. In the latest plans the footbridge appears to have moved to Coach Road and the Portfield crossing is at road level. These do not provide safe routes to the new secondary school or the existing primary schools.		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	805	Makes no provision for transport infrastructure. Just mentions noise screening. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations, i will raise with examiner at the appropriate time.	There has to be transport infrastructure included in the plan. Approx 585 new homes are going to have a huge impact on local roads.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	1136	Point 9 - policy wording excludes horse riders. In order to gain maximum benefit from bridge infrastructure, it should be made available for as many users as possible.		Comment	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	1645	Lake provides opportunity for linking with habitats (eg other lakes), east of Chichester. This to be in addition to the proposed narrow wildlife corridor shown on your map and focussed on the River Lavant Flood Alleviation Channel. Additional development proposed in Plan 2016-2035 puts more pressure on habitats. Community facilities/amenities should be planned to complement proposed community provision in the development "East of Chichester (Oving Parish)", to avoid duplication and/or competition if community provision is developed piecemeal across two sites. Sustainable travel links should support WSCC Walking and Cycling Strategy 2016 - 2026 Scheme i.d. 192 Barnham to Chichester via Oving.		Comment	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	2137	The policy acknowledges need 'for foot/cycle bridge across A27 to Coach Road'. There is also need for equestrian users to cross the A27 and WSCC PROW has received several enquiries seeking support for such infrastructure. Consideration could be given to the proposed bridge providing for all three modes.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	2260	Historic England makes no comment on the principle of the Shopwyke Strategic Site Allocation, which we note is an existing allocation. However, we consider that reference should also be made to the Grade II listed Shopwyke Grange. This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any planning application that may be submitted for the development of this site.	Reword criterion 7;"Protect existing views of Chichester Cathedral spire and conserve and enhance the historic significance of the listed barn at Greenway Farm, the listed Shopwyke Grange and the cluster of buildings associated with the grade II* listed Shopwhyke Hall which should be analysed at an early stage of the masterplan".	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	2302	Policy AL2 'Shopwyke' is already under construction and has a conventional water supply system with all elements provided by us. Costs are being recovered via the Infrastructure Charge and on-site charges.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	2330	The existing provision within Policy AL2 relating to wastewater conveyance and treatment is noted, and was supported by Southern Water during historic consultations on the current Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029. However, since OFWAT's new approach to water and wastewater connections charging was implemented from 1 April 2018, we have adjusted our approach accordingly. Southern Water will need to work with site promoters to understand the development program and to review whether the delivery of new infrastructure aligns with the occupation of the development, and this is reflected in the proposed amendments below.	Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following amendment to Policy AL2: Occupation of development will be dependent on the provision phased to align with the delivery of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards.	Comment	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	2356	Para 9 - any bridge should be for all NMUs, including equestrians, to reinstate the route severed when the A27 was re-aligned.		Comment	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	2396	Issues to consider: - Transport access at Bognor roundabout and Oving traffic lights		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	2739	SWT does not believe this policy is ambitious enough in terms of the enhancements to biodiversity and green infrastructure that need to be delivered in order to ensure that the development is truly sustainable. All the other requirements in the policy, for example in relation to views and road access are written as 'absolute musts' whereas criteria for green infrastructure reads as a much softer 'nice to have'. This is not acceptable in terms of the NPPF, in particular the requirement to safeguard components of ecological networks (174) and conserve and enhance the natural environment, including green infrastructure (20).	<p>SWT is also concerned that the term 'mitigation' is used in relation to protecting the nearby SPA from adverse impacts. The Habitat Regulations are clear that adverse impacts must be avoided. This is the purpose of the strategic mitigation strategy. If this strategy is not resulting in avoidance of impacts then it is not effective and is not legally compliant. This needs to be amended as follows:</p> <p>'Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish) Land at Shopwyke, as defined on the policies map, is allocated for mixed use development, comprising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approximately 585 dwellings; 2. At least 4 hectares of employment land (suitable for B1 and/or B2 Business uses); 3. A neighbourhood centre / community hub, incorporating local shops to provide for small scale retail uses to meet primarily day to day convenience retail needs and a community centre; and 4. Open space and green infrastructure, with the enhancement of the existing lakes to deliver biodiversity net gains and safer access. <p>Taking into account the site-specific requirements, proposals for the site should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Be planned as a sustainable urban extension of Chichester City, that is well integrated with neighbourhoods on the east side of the city, providing good sustainable access to the city centre and key facilities; 6. Provide integrated green infrastructure in conjunction with the other strategic sites to the north east of the city and Tangmere; 7. Protect existing views of Chichester Cathedral spire and conserve and enhance the historic significance of the listed barn at Greenway Farm and the cluster of buildings associated with the grade II* listed Shopwhyke Hall, which should be analysed at an early stage of the masterplan; 8. Provide new and improved road access to the site from the A27. <p>Development will be required to provide or fund mitigation for potential off-site traffic impacts through a package of measures in conformity with the Chichester City Transport Strategy (Policy 13), including improved access to the A27 and changes to the A27 Oving Road and Portfield junctions;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Make provision for foot/cycle bridge across the A27 south of Portfield Roundabout, and foot/cycle bridge across A27 to Coach Road. 10. Make provision for regular bus services linking the site with Chichester City centre, and new and improved cycle and pedestrian routes linking the site with the city, Westhampnett, Oving, Tangmere, and the South Downs National Park; 11. Be planned to integrate with other proposed development within the site; and 12. Be planned with special regard to the need to avoid potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar including contributing to any strategic access management issues. <p>Development of the site should be phased so that bridges providing access out of the site, the neighbourhood centre / community hub, open space and green infrastructure are delivered at an early stage of development, before any dwellings are occupied.</p> <p>Development will be dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards.'</p>	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	2908	Policy AL2: Another 585 dwellings as proposed, on top of the large Shopwhyke Lakes already recently completed will together change the nature of Oving completely		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	3049	100 additional dwellings could be accommodated on the site (in addition to the 585 already allocated). Other employment uses should be allowed on the site.	Amend policy to reflect updated position (how SDL could accommodate 100 extra dwellings and alternative employment uses) and to provide flexibility.	Object	Hanbury Properties [1697]
76	Policy AL2: Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)	3178	It is unacceptable to make people who walk and cycle wait until a certain number of houses have been built as this would preclude people who don't drive from buying a property.	Change penultimate paragraph to "Development of the site will be dependent on provision of bridges providing access out of the site"	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
77	East of Chichester (Oving Parish)	438	The current allocated site is of reasonable size but the extension all the way to the Drayton road is a massive and significant extension of Chichester that is not acceptable. It is essential that an adequate green gap is kept between Chichester and Oving village and this would not safeguard this. It is also worth pointing out that not all wildlife refuges are in parks and gardens and the long disused gravel pit/landfill site is an important wildlife habitat that should remain undisturbed and protected.	Reject the proposed new allocation	Object	The Woodhorn Group (Mr John Pitts) [1010]
77	East of Chichester (Oving Parish)	610	6.24. Add after first sentence: "Development on this site will need to take account of and be integrated with the existing permitted site." This would be consistent with the approach taken for Bosham in para 6.54. 6.27. Note comments on para 4.85 regarding Primary education facilities.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
77	East of Chichester (Oving Parish)	966	I am only supporting the development of this site for housing if it is really unavoidable to have more housing developments on the edge of Chichester (and in Oving Parish). Of all available sites this seems to me to be the most suitable. Wildlife corridors linking the South Downs and Pagham Harbour are important as well as footpaths/cycle routes that can be safely used to access all areas, not just for recreation but for routes into Chichester and out to the surrounding villages and countryside.		Comment	Miss Diana Pitts [6535]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
77	East of Chichester (Oving Parish)	1307	<p>Insufficient evidence provided describing the means for improving local air quality which must mitigate pollution sources introduced through an increasing local population, principally from increasing vehicle numbers introduced to the site, and increased incidences of standing traffic due to local vehicle network restrictions. Insufficient detail of further local amenity improvements presented, which should include: dental practice with NHS provision, GP surgery with NHS provision, multiple safe pedestrian access routes to the City and Portfield areas, safe cycle routes to the City and Oving village, convenience store, childrens' play areas, sports activities area, pet exercise areas, public transport infrastructure, and allotments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consideration of access to the railway network via a purpose-built railway stop on the southern boundary of the site to relieve access pressure on the City centre's station. - Access to and from the south and south-west of site is currently not safe for pedestrians or cyclists and deserves routes that are independent of the existing vehicular routes (A27). Desirable destinations will include the variety of DIY stores in the Bognor roundabout area (Portfield Trade Centre, Chichester Trade Centre, and Quarry Lane Industrial Estate) and, in the future, the proposed retail site directly to the south of the site on the opposite side of the railway line. - Open recreational green space is very desirable considering the lack of existing areas suitable for safe access by children and pet owners for play and exercise. Dedicated locations should be provided for dog walkers so that maximum separation and distinction is maintained between childrens' play areas and pet exercise areas. - Views of the cathedral spire from much of the site's existing ground level is obscured by the A27 highway as it rises and descends the railway crossing bridge along the west side of the site. After installation of infrastructure mitigating against road noise and air pollution it will not be possible to view the cathedral spire from a greater proportion of the site from existing ground level, and so the desire to retain views of the cathedral spire is an obstructive design goal. - There exists the opportunity to afforest as much of the green space within the site as possible, which should be considered of greater value to the local community than attempting to retain cathedral spire views. - Existing dense hedgerows running continuously along the majority of the northern, western, and southern perimeter of the proposed site should be preserved in their present and continuous state during site development in order to safeguard established wildlife corridors and shelters. - Publicised site plans should highlight public transport connections and sustainable transport infrastructure at the earliest possible opportunity in order to persuade new residents that alternatives to private vehicle ownership are being encouraged within the City's sustainable development strategy. - Forward planning of the changes in use of the section of the B2144 between the proposed northern access points to the site and the current A27 junction should be proposed and discussed with existing Shopwyke residents as soon as possible. Existing residents already experience conflict between parked vehicles and cyclists using the only pedestrian route along this section of road. Change of use plans should clearly demonstrate the considerate accommodation of residential parking needs, cycle paths, and access for pedestrians having various degrees of mobility. - Safe and sustainable pedestrian and cycle access routes to and from the site from the direction of Oving village should be considered so that villagers can also enjoy access to new local amenities. 	Object	Dr Jeremy Matcham [7111]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	334	<p>Has the allocation of an additional 1000 houses been allowed for in the design of the sewage pumping main to Tangmere and the design of the uprated WWTW? Did the Sustainability Appraisal consider the impact of sewage discharges on the ephemeral Aldingbourne Rife and on flooding in the lower reaches?</p>		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	611	Proposed additions and amendments.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	622	I strongly request that this strip of land along eastern boundary is removed from site AL3, which would retain the ability to provide housing of an only slightly reduced scale, whilst providing very high environmental benefits, both to the existing local residents and to future residents of site AL3.	A strip of land 20 to 25 metres wide along the eastern edge of the site should be removed from designation AL3 in order to give the substantial environmental benefits described above.	Comment	Mr Derek Jenkins [5078]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	809	Mentions sustainable transport but what about cars. Are you going to build the development , banning cars. Where is the detail on road infrastructure ? Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will be raising it with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Road access plans must be included in the local plan . Cannot submit a plan with no transport infrastructure.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	929	I know that Oving Parish Council have a number of reservations many of which are identified also in your review particularly regarding infrastructure, traffic generation and local services such as schooling and medical. However if Oving Parish has to accept further development on top of Shopwhyke Lakes and the site behind the Jehovahs Witnesses premises then it would appear to be the least worst site. I am surprised you have excluded the adjacent long closed and derelict Sherwood Nursery which would allow for some more units and shouldn't have the subsoil issues of former gravel pit locations.		Comment	Mr Clive Sayer [6517]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	1139	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	1523	Natural England notes that the Sustainability Appraisal identifies the importance of the pit in the SE of the site for wildlife, and the risk that this allocation will cause harm to the wildlife, and through water quality impacts. Therefore, Natural England recommends adding a clause to the policy to ensure that the existing biodiversity interest of the site is protected and enhanced, and that a buffer should be left around the pit to minimise disturbance. A Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme should also be produced to minimise the potential for surface water quality impacts from run-off.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	1654	Integrate community facilities to complement those provided at "land at Shopwyke" to avoid duplication/competition. Maintain eastern fringe as wildlife habitat encompassing lake in SE corner as part of ribbon of lakes East of Chichester. Also copse. This site is one of the least sensitive proposed due to prior gravel extraction and proximity to A27. Maximise this opportunity to reduce proposed numbers at sensitive locations proposed at Selsey, Wittering and South of A27 which increase impacts at Chichester and Pagham harbours. Sustainable travel to include cycle path as per WSCC strategy route id192 to Barnham via Oving.		Support	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2036	Drayton Pit in SE corner is good site for birds but is under-recorded due to access issues. We believe that wildlife and house building could both be accommodated if a buffer zone (ideally of 50 metres) could be established around the shores of Drayton Pit in which no development or landscaping took place.	Put a 50m buffer zone around the Drayton Gravel Pit	Comment	Sussex Ornithological Society (Mr Richard Cowser) [7256]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2083	Minerals and waste: The site is to the north of the Fuel Depot site allocation in the Waste Local Plan (Policy W10) for a built waste facility as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site (including complimentary non-waste uses). The East of Chichester allocation is the land to the north, bisected by the railway line, of the Fuel Depot. Reference should be made to giving consideration to the allocation, and therefore its safeguarding.	Reference should be made to giving consideration to the allocation, and therefore its safeguarding.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2121	Education: - Insufficient space within primary schools - further capacity required to accommodate development. Land for a 1FE-2FE and pro rata share of build costs required - if numbers increase, education provision will need to be reviewed - expansion capacity to accommodate secondary aged pupils. Contributions would be required for expansion of secondary schools. - expansion capacity to accommodate sixth form pupils. Contributions would be required for expansion of secondary schools.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2138	Flooding: Suggested amendment to wording. Include: "and capacity of the site to provide flood risk attenuation for the increased housing density."	Include: "and capacity of the site to provide flood risk attenuation for the increased housing density." para 6.22 after "The site is identified for 600 dwellings, however, there may be potential to deliver a large strategic development of 1000 dwellings, subject to further evidence, including the testing of additional growth on the local highway network ..."	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2218	There is a small area within the site located in Flood Zone 2, along with an additional surface water body (lake). We would recommend that the masterplan for this site fully considers these constraints in designing the site including the adopting the sequential approach. We would wish to see built development located solely within Flood Zone 1.		Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2262	According to our records there are no designated heritage assets on this site, although the Grade II listed Shopwyke Grange and Grade II* listed Shopwyke Hall lie to the north-east of the allocated area. Include reference to listed Shopwyke Grange. Support criterion 8. However, this comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any planning application that may be submitted for the development of this site.	Reword criterion 8 as; "Protect existing views of Chichester Cathedral spire and conserve and enhance the historic significance of the listed Shopwyke Grange and the cluster of buildings associated with the grade II* listed Shopwhyke Hall which should be analysed at an early stage of the masterplan".	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2303	Policy AL3 'East of Chichester' is a new strategic site and there are no large diameter mains crossing it. This is an old landfill and may contain material that can damage plastic pipes. On site mains may need to be protected or be more expensive to ensure water quality is maintained.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2332	We note the existing provision within Policy AL3 relating to the need to demonstrate capacity within the sewer network and wastewater treatment works. Southern Water supports this provision, however since OFWAT's new approach to water and wastewater connections charging was implemented from 1 April 2018, we also will need to work with site promoters to understand the development program and to review whether the delivery of new infrastructure aligns with the occupation of the development. This is reflected in the proposed additional policy - see wording in main text.	Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following additional criterion to Policy AL3: Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.	Comment	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2357	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Plan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2584	<p>Half of parishioners support AL3 but Oving Parish Plan states that the PC will "Oppose large market housing developments if they lack supporting infrastructure and where they put pressure on roads and traffic"</p> <p>Also concerns over biodiversity/habitat fragmentation; air pollution; water pollution</p>	<p>If Chichester District is mindful to continue to progress with this site despite the concerns raised above, we propose the following amendments to the Policy wording</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening of this site is provided for the existing residents of Shopwhyke Road as well as protecting the existing landscape aspect from Drayton Lane • There is provision for a GP surgery or space for a visiting GP within the neighbourhood centre • This site contributes to an upgrading of the frequency of a Bus route so that the residents are connected by a usable public transport system to Chichester as the main destination but also to Barnham with its better railway connections and Arundel for access to the South Downs. This will also benefit the existing residents of Oving as well as those of the Arun DC 3,000 dwellings allocated site at Barnham/Eastergate/Westergate (SD5) and the Shopwyke Lakes and student housing already granted permission. • The site creates a separated pedestrian and cycle path connecting Oving Village to Chichester. This would be along the north side of Oving Road and then east side of Drayton Lane before creating a crossing to connect through the site and into its own cycle and footpath connections to Chichester. • That care home provision is allocated to the site. 	Comment	Oving Parish Council (Miss Ruth Palmer) [1205]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2683	Development of the site is supported. It is well located and can assist in the delivery of the Council's housing requirement in a sustainable manner. Being a former landfill the site can be regarded as 'brownfield' according to para 117 of the NPPF. In conjunction with the adjacent land owner the site can be developed comprehensively to deliver up to 1,000 homes including the provision of community facilities, on the whole site.	Amend policy to refer to 'up to 1,000 dwellings' - Policy S4 should be amended accordingly	Support	Suez (Sita UK) (Emma Smyth) [11]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2722	Development of the site is supported. It is well located and can assist in the delivery of the Council's housing requirement in a sustainable manner. Being a former landfill the site can be regarded as 'brownfield' according to para 117 of the NPPF. In conjunction with the adjacent land owner the site can be developed comprehensively to deliver up to 1,000 homes including the provision of community facilities, on the whole site.	Amend policy to refer to 'up to 1,000 dwellings' - Policy S4 should be amended accordingly	Support	Obsidian Strategic AC Limited, DC Heaver and Eurequity IC Ltd [7312]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2747	<p>-Concerned about the very broad housing number associated with this allocation. States a minimum of 600 dwellings, the supporting text refers to the possibility of 1000.</p> <p>-Unclear how such a difference can be planned for in terms of impacts on natural and deliver the required green infrastructure and natural environment enhancements.</p> <p>-Must be a robust assessment of the true capacity of this allocation taking into consideration impacts on natural capital assets, e.g. gravel pits have high biodiversity value in terms of breeding birds.</p> <p>-Reference to Chichester Harbour and SPA unclear.</p> <p>-Requirement for green infrastructure is unambitious.</p>	<p>We therefore recommend the following amendments:</p> <p>'Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester Approximately 35 hectares of land at East of Chichester is allocated for a phased residential led development of a minimum of 600 dwellings, a neighbourhood centre / community hub (incorporating early years, primary school, local shops, a community centre and flexible space for employment/small-scale leisure use) along with open space and green infrastructure. Development in this location will be expected to address the following site-specific requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of a high quality form of development to be masterplanned as a sustainable urban extension of Chichester City, that is well integrated with neighbouring areas on the east side of the city and to the north of the site, providing good sustainable access to the city centre and key facilities and to sustainable forms of transport; 2. A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation to include specific provision to meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older people; 3. Existing ground conditions on the southern part of the site should be investigated; 4. Provision of suitable access points from Shopwhyke Road and contributions to off-site highway improvements, which will include promoting sustainable transport options; 5. Provision of on-site public open space and play areas in accordance with Policy DM34; 6. Provision of appropriate landscaping and screening to minimise the impact of development and achieve measurable net gains to biodiversity; 7. Provision of integrated green infrastructure with the other strategic sites to the north east of the city, Tangmere and the wider countryside; 8. Existing views of Chichester Cathedral spire are to be protected; 9. Provision of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the most up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan; 10. Be planned with special regard to the need to avoid potential impacts on the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar including contributing to any strategic access management issues, and potential for loss of functionally linked supporting habitat <p>Proposals will need to demonstrate that sufficient capacity will be available within the sewer network, including waste water treatment works, to accommodate the proposed development in accordance with Policy S31. Development proposals should address the provisions of the West Sussex Minerals Plan, and associated guidance, in relation to the site being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area'</p>	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	2955	<p>Section 6.22 not clear how site can be severed from city by A27 and at same time be an "extension to the city". Section also optimistic in expectations of quality and impact of walking-and-cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>Plan should be encouraging home working.</p> <p>Two proposed changes should also be implemented in all other Policies where the same wording occurs.</p>	<p>POLICY AL3 - Point 2 CHANGE TO "A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation to include specific provision to meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older people and home working;"</p> <p>POLICY AL3 - Point 4 CHANGE TO "off-site traffic improvements"</p>	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
78	Policy AL3: Land East of Chichester	3223	Promote land at Sherwood Nursery and Lansdowne Nursery for inclusion within wider strategic allocation.	Amend the boundary of the proposed strategic site allocation to include land at Sherwood Nursery and Lansdowne Nursery	Comment	Elberry Properties Ltd [7384]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
79	Westhampnett/North East Chichester	401	The advantages of choosing the site identified in AL4 as compared to AL6 are as follows: - Proximity to other businesses in the area, notably Rolls Royce. - Additional employment opportunities for the rural communities within SDNP who would not have to cross the busy A27 and Chichester to access such opportunities. - Compared with AL6 no flood plain issues - Good access to the A27 - This site has already identified in 5 possible access points - No issues regarding views of the cathedral or the South Downs unlike development at AL6 - Buffered from SDNP by an aerodrome		Object	Mr Mike Harper [6564]
79	Westhampnett/North East Chichester	811	Not an overall flood risk compared to sites in the south. Still no proper mention of transport infrastructure. No mention of increased school places. One primary school in the area that is already over subscribed.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
79	Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2956	6.35 - Bullet point 4 (River Lavant floodplain - opportunity to plan for green infrastructure) SUPPORT Though it may be advisable to add that infrastructure detailing should be rural in nature (e.g. soft detailing such as hedges, not metal rails or bland fencing).	6.35 - Bullet point 2 CHANGE TO "The site lies within 1km of the National Park boundary and is open to views from The Trundle to the north and also from Goodwood and from the northern end of Fordwater Lane, which currently constitutes an important section of green infrastructure linking the city to footpaths and bridleways into the downs;"	Support	MR William Sharp [7072]
79	Westhampnett/North East Chichester	3179	6.34 Change to: "The development must provide improved access and transport links".	6.34 Change to: "The development must provide improved access and transport links".	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
79	Westhampnett/North East Chichester	3340	Para 6.33 - the proposal to remove areas no longer required for development is inconsistent with AL4.		Object	CEG [7397]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	226	I am supportive of the removal of the large field to the West of Madgwick Lane and East of the River Lavant from the Existing Strategic Site Allocation. The preservation of this strategic gap between Chichester and Westhampnett and Goodwood Airfield/Motor Circuit is important for a number of reasons: 1. It maintains the individual identity of each of the three areas 2. It maintains the view of the cathedral spire 3. It provides natural flood resilience for the River Lavant, given the housing proposed to the West of the Strategic Site 4. It avoids building houses too close to noise		Support	Iain Burgess [6720]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	248	Agree with Point 13.		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	314	As I live just outside of the 400 metre Goodwood Circuit Buffer, I am pleased that you agree with the MAS study that no development should be allowed within this boundary. I appreciate the Circuit from a personal point of view and also the fact that it benefits the local area and businesses and would not wish that any development should place restrictions on the Circuit. The removal of land from the existing allocation in Policy AL4 hopefully ensures the future of the Circuit.		Comment	Mr Ken Burgess [6759]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	335	Part of this allocation has become directly linked to the Greylingwell Development. Has the provision of services and road access been carefully considered?		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	848	The site whilst suitable for some development as outlined has potential for significant landscape impact as it is open to views from the higher ground to the north within the National Park contrary to national policy and DEFRA guidance. This is a key constraint of the site and commercial development here, whilst not sensitive to the noise buffer, has potential for significant visual and landscape impact and should not be considered in any amendments to the plan		Comment	Mr Ben Kirk [6563]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	890	I support removal of the large field to the West of Madgwick Lane and East of the River Lavant from the Existing Strategic Site Allocation. Many of the reasons have been referred to in the particulars: - Maintaining the integrity of the Lavant floodplain - Avoids building houses too near the Goodwood Motor Circuit/Aerodrome In addition it is important that the semi-rural environment should be retained to some extent -there is a need for some new development but it Westhampnett, and Lavant must maintain their identity and not become part of a Chichester suburban sprawl		Support	Mr David Young [6960]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	1045	This area has not been considered for employment space. It is close to other businesses including Rolls Royce and being close to the SDNP will open up employment opportunities for the rural community. Using it for employment overcomes the noise issues and it has good access to the A27. It has limited environmental impact and would not affect views of the Cathedral or the SNDP.	This area should be identified as suitable for employment space	Object	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	1140	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	1279	Land removed from further development pressure a positive use of the land should be defined through this plan. It has a distinct open space use, to protect views of the cathedral and setting of the city and also to provide a suitable landscape transition between the city and National Park. The role of the land removed should be confirmed as performing the role of open space and green infrastructure, including a linear greenspace with public access along the Lavant Valley.		Support	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	1342	The land around the motor racing circuit was previously allocated as a strategic site for employment. Why has this been changed and replaced with a 'Buffer Zone'? What does this buffer zone mean? I think this land would be very suitable for additional employment use.		Comment	Mr Seamus Meyer [7049]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	1598	I consider this area suitable for employment space.		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	1714	<p>Errors in statements identified</p> <p>6.35 bullet 2. There can not be any effect on views from within the SDNP to the North.</p> <p>"The site lies within 1km of the National Park boundary" This is irrelevant as the same distance factor is not being considered with proximity to the AONB.</p> <p>"and is open to views from Goodwood" views from aerodrome or motor circuit irrelevant in planning terms</p> <p>"and The Trundle to the north" The justification here is therefore flawed</p> <p>6.35 bullet 4. "and protects important views of Chichester Cathedral spire". Views from the proposed site are very limited of the cathedral.</p>	please correct the errors	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	1718	<p>Errors in statements identified</p> <p>6.35 bullet 2. There can not be any effect on views from within the SDNP to the North.</p> <p>"The site lies within 1km of the National Park boundary" This is irrelevant as the same distance factor is not being considered with proximity to the AONB.</p> <p>"and is open to views from Goodwood" views from aerodrome or motor circuit irrelevant in planning terms</p> <p>"and The Trundle to the north" The justification here is therefore flawed</p> <p>6.35 bullet 4. "and protects important views of Chichester Cathedral spire". Views from the proposed site are very limited of the cathedral.</p>	please correct the errors	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	1721	This site has not been considered for employment space. This should be the preferred site for employment space	This should be the preferred site for employment space	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	1722	This site has not been considered for employment space. It should be the preferred site for employment space removing that proposed in the plan for the SW of Chichester.	<p>benefits of doing so are as follows:</p> <p>a. Proximity to other business in the area and particularly Rolls Royce. Co location of business in specialised areas is a key benefit for supply chain and mentoring delivering the support mechanism for this high tech business.</p> <p>b. Benefit of opening up employment opportunities for the rural community within the SDNP without having to cross Chichester itself to reach employment opportunities.</p> <p>c. Limited flood plain impact as the majority of this site is outwith level 3 floodplain.</p> <p>d. Overcomes the noise sensitive impact of the race circuit and aerodrome.</p> <p>e. Outside the safe air corridor f. Good access to the A27 with no requirement for major new junctions or relief roads that are expensive and unaffordable.</p>	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2084	<p>Minerals and waste:</p> <p>Reference should be made to minerals safeguarding, for consistency with other allocations, as within the sharp sand and gravel safeguarding area.</p>	Reference should be made to minerals safeguarding, for consistency with other allocations, as within the sharp sand and gravel safeguarding area.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2123	<p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The remaining 200 dwellings will impact on the education provision - financial contributions towards expansion of existing or pro rata costs towards the expansion of the school within AL3. - expansion capacity to accommodate the child product from this proposed development for secondary aged pupils. Contributions would be required for expansion of secondary schools if feasible and required. - expansion capacity to accommodate the child product from this proposed development for sixth form pupils. Contributions would be required for expansion of the provision if feasible and required. 		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2139	<p>Amend wording to Taking into account the site-specific requirements, proposals for the site should satisfy the following requirements:</p> <p>Policy AL4 policy, it is welcomed that 'provision should be made for green links to the South Downs National Park and Chichester City.' Safe and convenient walking and cycling to Lavant, from where people will access the South Downs, will provide for sustainable transport use.</p>	<p>Amend wording to Taking into account the site-specific requirements, proposals for the site should satisfy the following requirements:</p> <p>Policy AL4 policy, it is welcomed that 'provision should be made for green links to the South Downs National Park and Chichester City.' Safe and convenient walking and cycling to Lavant, from where people will access the South Downs, will provide for sustainable transport use.</p>	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2191	<p>AL4 the land proposed for removal should not be removed as a strategic employment site and should be included in the plan as any development will not be affected by the noise buffer and will not contribute to further light and other pollution not currently present at this commercial site. The settlement to the north should be extended to accommodate the unmet housing need as an exemption site for affordable homes 100% within 5 miles of the need as required in statute (unless the unmet housing need is returned to SDNP as it should be).</p>		Object	Debbie Leonard [7215]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2264	<p>Historic England makes no comment on the principle of the two sites.</p> <p>The site abuts the Graylingwell Hospital Conservation Area, the buildings of the former 'pauper lunatic asylum' (including the Grade II listed chapel), the Grade II listed Summersdale Farmhouse and a Grade II registered park and garden.</p> <p>Criterion 9 provides adequate protection for designated assets.</p> <p>This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any planning application that may be submitted for the development of this site.</p>		Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2304	<p>Policy AL4 'Westhampnett' Phase 1 is already under construction and account has been taken of the large diameter main that crosses the site. Phase 2 is an extension of the existing Greylingwell site but it is not clear if this has been allowed for in the design of this 'Inset Appointment'. Portsmouth Water do not own the mains and there may be a single point of supply.</p>		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2333	<p>The existing provision within Policy AL4 relating to wastewater conveyance and treatment is noted, and was supported by Southern Water during historic consultations on the current Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029. However, since OFWAT's new approach to water and wastewater connections charging was implemented from 1 April 2018, we have adjusted our approach accordingly. Southern Water will need to work with site promoters to understand the development program and to review whether the delivery of new infrastructure aligns with the occupation of the development, and this is reflected in the proposed amendments below.</p>	<p>Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following amendment to Policy AL4: Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards.</p>	Comment	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2358	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Plan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2415	We note that Policy AL4 (Land at Westhampnett/NE Chichester) still refers to Lavant Valley greenspace but we query if this is likely to be secured now based on planning applications submitted. We would suggest that criteria 12, last sentence, could also refer to securing offsite improvements/upgrades for cycleway links		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2660	Site should be considered for employment space: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proximity to other businesses in the area - Employment opportunities for SDNP - Limited floodplain impact - Overcomes noise sensitive impact - Outside safe air corridor - Good access to A27 See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	2750	<p>SWT are concerned about the suggestion of a 'new linear greenspace with public access' along the River Lavant floodplain. Any progression of this would need to consider the potential impacts of recreational disturbance on riverine habitats. We also recommend that there is assessment of the potential for any greenspace to contribute to natural flood management of the river.</p> <p>As stated for the previous allocations, SWT recommend that the policy is amended in terms of its ambitions for green infrastructure provision and biodiversity net gains:</p>	<p>As stated for the previous allocations, SWT recommend that the policy is amended in terms of its ambitions for green infrastructure provision and biodiversity net gains:</p> <p>'Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester Land to the west of Westhampnett and north-east of Chichester city is allocated for mixed development, comprising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 500 homes; 2. Community facilities; 3. Open space and green infrastructure, including a sensitively planned linear greenspace with public access along the Lavant Valley. <p>Taking into account the site-specific requirements, proposals for the site should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Development will be directed towards the settlement of Westhampnett, to the south of Madgwick Lane, and to the eastern edge of Chichester, but away from the floodplain of the River Lavant; 5. Development should be well integrated with the village of Westhampnett and neighbouring residential areas in Chichester City and should be planned to provide good sustainable access to existing facilities; 6. Development should provide or contribute to improved local community facilities; 7. Provision should be made for green links to the South Downs National Park and Chichester City and measurable net gains to biodiversity. Provision of integrated green infrastructure in conjunction with the other strategic sites to the east of the city, including Tangmere; 8. Development should be designed with special regard to the landscape sensitivity of the site (especially to views towards and from within the South Downs National Park), and to reduce the impact of noise associated with the Goodwood Motor Circuit/Aerodrome. Major new structural planting will be required to soften the impact of development on views from the north and around the Motor Circuit; 9. Development should be designed with special regard to the Graylingwell Hospital Conservation Area, the buildings of the former 'pauper lunatic asylum' and the Grade II registered park and garden in which they sit, and to other listed buildings in the vicinity of the site and their settings. Important views of Chichester Cathedral spire from the area should be protected; 10. Adoption of a comprehensive approach to flood risk management on the site, including consideration of surface water drainage and natural flood management as part of the masterplanning process...' 	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	3359	<p>Object to CDC's failure to consider/allocate additional land within SDL for residential development.</p> <p>There is additional land within the existing SDL boundary, to the east of the River Lavant, that is available and suitable for development as detailed in Appendix 1. This amounts to 7.1ha of land outside the 400m indicative buffer which could accommodate approx. 250 dwellings (35dph density).</p>	The site should be allocated in preference to some of the other less sustainable/deliverable sites.	Object	CEG [7397]
80	Policy AL4: Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester	3521	A sound planning approach to the use of land south of Lavant Straight, between the A285 and A286, will ensure policy objectives within that area are complementary, and do not detract from the setting of either the historic city or national park. The land should be kept open primarily with the exception of appropriate development around the settlements of Westhampnett, Westerton, Strettington, and at Goodwood Aerodrome and Motor Circuit (as more specifically controlled through other policies of the plan). The land should be used for agriculture, countryside, forestry, public access and other landscape purposes.		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
81	Southern Gateway	1790	6.37 to 6.43 and AL5 We support this but feel it needs to be extended to include the railway and other buildings. It requires an extension to the station with an additional platform and line for a Metro service. There needs to be a multi use building for concerts, conferences, exhibitions and community activity. All waste water must be pumped to TANGMERE. We need to include suitable housing for young people. Employment sites for entrepreneurs. A link to the gigabyte project.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	129	We propose the following changes are made: "3. Respect for the historic context, have regard to that part of Southern Gateway that lies within the Conservation Area and to the Listed Buildings and Heritage Assets, and make a positive contribution towards protecting and enhancing the local character and special heritage of the area and important historic views, especially those from the Canal Basin towards Chichester Cathedral; "provision of a bridge or underpass to allow the removal of the level crossings on Stockbridge Road and Basin Road"	On Policy AL5: Southern Gateway * The Chichester Society propose the following changes are made: * In site specific requirement number 3 we propose "3. Respect for the historic context, have regard to that part of Southern Gateway that lies within the Conservation Area and to the Listed Buildings and Heritage Assets, and make a positive contribution towards protecting and enhancing the local character and special heritage of the area and important historic views, especially those from the Canal Basin towards Chichester Cathedral; * We propose to add as site specific requirement number 4 "provision of a bridge or underpass to allow the removal of the level crossings on Stockbridge Road and Basin Road" * We propose the removal of paragraph 7	Object	Chichester Society (Mr Christopher Mead-Briggs) [802]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	209	Sensible builder knows its full cost but unknown cost for junctions. No dedicated cyclepaths shown or section of cyclepath near Appledram Centre. Use of narrow residential streets in city centre unwise No right turn from Terminus Road to Stockbridge Road is unhelpful for local residents. Detailed plans to be shown to residents for housing and construction traffic. All the proposed alterations at junctions are detrimental - pollution, noise - not just the Stockbridge one and ruining so much farmland forever. Chichester Gate remains an eyesore		Object	Miss M Pratt [6704]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	249	Currently National cycle routes NCN 2 [and 88] cross this site, albeit not very safely. New proposals should make better provision.	Require Policy to include specific Provision for NCN 2 [and 88] in safe and segregated manner.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	271	It is not clear at this stage what the proposals will be to ensure no negative impact to users of the bus station.		Comment	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	336	This policy must include a requirement to provide a road bridge across the railway from the sorting office to the old bus station. The Master Plan can still include a sustainable road layout suitable for pedestrians, cars and buses.	Policy AL3 must include the provision of a road bridge.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	473	The plans for the Southern Gateway are fundamentally flawed in terms of proposed land uses, transport issues, sustainability and density of development. As alternative schemes such as Freeflow and Gateway + have shown, a more imaginative approach is possible that will truly regenerate this area and boost Chichester as a thriving City. The current plans are unimaginative and narrow minded and waste a once in a century opportunity.	A complete rethink of the proposals for the southern gateway to respond to the changing high street environment, the need for conference, exhibition centre, traffic issues and the requirement for more housing. 350 new homes in 12 hectares is 29 homes per hectare, less than the minimum standard for rural areas according to the policies. Even allowing for other uses (most of which will be at ground level) the proposed density should be over 100 units per hectare, easily possible with 3 -4 storey apartment buildings. This would give nearly 1200 homes in a far more sustainable way than building on more countryside	Object	Mr Richard Hutchinson [6455]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	517	The current CDC Masterplan does not meet the objectives set out in AL5 and wastes a huge opportunity to enhance the public realm in Chichester, in particular it does not currently include specific proposals for a high quality distinctive design response. The road layout with the level crossings being maintained does nothing to improve safety, communication, and environmental issues such as exhaust fumes. Item 7 completely misses the requirement		Comment	Commander Brian Raincock [6301]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	522	This policy needs to deliver better plans for people walking and cycling. The green space should be preserved and an additional pocket park added to the area. The city needs a welcoming bus and train station, a proper public transport hub with toilets, tourist information, waiting area in the dry, warm and shade and proper information with RTPI screens (not just bus stops). The current bus and stations are hideous and unwelcoming and are not in keeping with the rest of the city.		Comment	Sam Pickford [6841]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	656	LPC rejects the proposal as outlined simply because it lacks any substance. The issue is outlined in section 4.95 and 5.19. We find the proposed solution as detailed in section 7 of policy AL5 "....., restrict vehicular traffic using the Stockbridge Road level crossing" as insufficient, lacking in any detail to give it any credence. This is a wish, not a policy. The proposal as outlined is a 20th century concept; we live in the 21st Century. Southern Gateway is undeliverable.		Object	Lavant Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1116]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	669	Southern Gateway is flawed as it stands. It will disadvantage local residents hugely . lead to even more gridlock around the Station and lead to a hideous gentrification of the a wonderful asset, the canal. Stop ruining Chichester's heritage and assets for the sake of the greed from developers. The whole scheme needs to go back to the drawing board and be led by local Chichester residents who do not have developers manipulating the outcome.	See above	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	721	It is proposed that there is provision of a bridge or underpass to allow the removal of the level crossings on Stockbridge Road and Basin Road It is proposed that paragraph 7 is removed.	It is proposed that there is provision of a bridge or underpass to allow the removal of the level crossings on Stockbridge Road and Basin Road It is proposed that paragraph 7 is removed.	Object	West Itchenor Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1036]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	816	Southern Gateway should be removed from the plan until the A27 issue has been addressed. There is NO non essential traffic using this route. It is traffic that is local/national that would otherwise clog the A27. Define non essential traffic !! Housing would no doubt be overpriced and not affordable for locals .Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Southern Gateway cannot be included until at the point that decisions have been made about the A27 configuration as it has a huge bearing on traffic coming into the city from the south.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	975	Policy fails to acknowledge that part of the site is within the Conservation Area and includes heritage assets. Statements about buildings in area not making positive contribution are misleading e.g. bus garage is an example of early use of thin-shell pre-stressed concrete to give a clear span. Need for high quality design is included but will the policy be enforced? Traffic management and diverting all but buses along Basin Rd are dubious ideas.	Correct the policy by stating that the SG area is in the Conservation Area and include from the above about the heritage assets, listed buildings etc. Also commit to enforcing the design policy.	Object	Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (Mr Alan Green) [788]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1141	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1205	Whilst supporting the general principles of the Southern Gateway Development, it would be detrimental to the residents of the area south of the A27 if vehicular access to the City from the south was to be restricted prior to the implementation of a Highways England scheme to relieve congestion on A27. The planning strategy recognises that Chichester is the centre upon which residents to the south of Chichester rely for many of their needs. Access for them needs to be maintained until an alternative improved access across the A27 to the City had been provided.	The Policy should indicate that restriction of vehicular access from the south can only be implemented once a Highways England scheme for traffic relief of A27 has been carried out, so as to maintain adequate access for residents south of A27.	Object	Mrs Susan Pope [6851]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1222	CDC's £5million grant from central government's Coast to Capital regeneration fund specifically for the Southern Gateway provides financial resources for CDC to mitigate traffic congestion and noise light and traffic pollution that will doubtless result from current regeneration plans 350 dwellings and further commercial buildings will result in heavier traffic All this traffic is intended to use Basin Road only which will become two way according to current plans Resulting air, noise and light pollution will have a massive detrimental impact on those living in this area	CDC must use the £5million grant from central government's 'Coast to Capital' regeneration fund specifically intended for the Southern Gateway development to mitigate the impact of current plans This must include : - No building of private houses or commercial buildings unless vehicular access and parking is included in planning - Re- assessing the decision that Basin Road only should carry private traffic and the road becoming two way - Specific research into further traffic pollution along Basin Road and the resulting noise and light pollution from current plans The purposes to which the £5million central government grant is used should also be accessible and open to people of Chichester as it is their future that will be impacted CDC must grasp this opportunity to plan a city fit for the future with an infrastructure that encourages investment rather than deters it and to reconfigure the omnishambles that exists now	Object	Ms Jacqueline Jones [6399]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1343	The reliance on commercial and housing development in this critical area for the city appears to be misplaced. The success or otherwise will depend on a community led development scheme that incorporates significant public open space and high quality buildings. The city will not be well served by Chichester Gate style developments with low grade design and building. This is a great opportunity to enhance the experience for visitors to the city approaching from the rail and bus stations.	Remove this policy and its concentration on housing and commercial development.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1365	Generally agree but needs a fully integrated bus/train interchange and the closing of both level crossings with maybe a tunnel for local buses and deliveries. There is no point what so ever in attracting cars to use the city centre as a n-s or e-w route. These should be forced on to routes around.		Comment	Mr David Leah [6440]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1373	Southern Gateway redevelopment is to be welcomed, but must include a modern, safe vehicle crossing of the railway line.		Comment	Rev. John-Henry Bowden [7126]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1463	The Southern Gateway idea is completely ludicrous and a waste of tax payers money!		Comment	Ms Helen Boarer [5749]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1492	Whilst supporting the general principles of the Southern Gateway Development, it would be detrimental to the residents of the area south of the A27 if vehicular access to the City from the south was to be restricted prior to the implementation of a Highways England scheme to relieve congestion on A27. The planning strategy recognises that Chichester is the centre upon which residents to the south of Chichester rely for many of their needs. Access for them needs to be maintained until an alternative improved access across the A27 to the City had been provided.	The Policy should indicate that restriction of vehicular access from the south can only be implemented once a Highways England scheme for traffic relief of A27 has been carried out, so as to maintain adequate access for residents south of A27.	Object	Mr Derrick pope [6778]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1551	Revisit Southern Gateway taking idea from Gateway + to improve transport and interchange	Level crossing - new underpass	Object	Mr John Davies [5359]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1599	I would like to see a support for a road bridge over the railway as part of this development.		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1792	Supported but should be extended to include railway and other buildings. An extension to the station is required with additional platform and line for a Metro service. Multi use building for concerts, conferences, exhibitions and community activity also necessary. All waste water must be pumped to TANGMERE. Include suitable housing for young people, employment sites for entrepreneurs and a link to the gigabyte project.		Support	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1833	Please reference trees and links to the Lavant course and to the trees/greenspace in the vicinity of The City Walls, both north-east and north-west of the site, and in the vicinity of Kingsham Road and the Canal - there is significant opportunity to introduce green infrastructure to enhance this location and the connectivity of other sites. N.B. as a volunteer Chichester Tree Warden, Chichester Tree Wardens may wish to pursue the subject of the inclusion of trees in the context of Policy SAL5: Southern Gateway.	Please reference trees and links to the Lavant course and to the trees/greenspace in the vicinity of The City Walls, both north-east and north-west of the site, and in the vicinity of Kingsham Road and the Canal - there is significant opportunity to introduce green infrastructure to enhance this location and the connectivity of other sites.	Object	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1844	Propose amendments to the policy regarding: respecting historic context to include part of Southern Gateway lying within Conservation Area as well as Listed Buildings and other heritage aspects; provision of height limited underpass on Basin Road; deleting reference to accommodating buses/coaches, restricting vehicular traffic using Stockbridge Rd level crossing and provision of appropriate car parking.	a) In site specific requirement number 3 I propose " Respect for the historic context, have regard to that part of Southern Gateway that lies within the Conservation Area and to the Listed Buildings and Heritage Aspects and make a positive contribution towards protecting and enhancing the local character and special heritage of the area and important historic views especially those from the Canal and its Basin towards the Cathedral," b) I propose you site specific requirement number 4 "provision of a height limited underpass on Basin Road to allow removal of the level crossings on Stockbridge Road and Basin Road. c) I propose the removal of paragraph 7	Comment	Mr Andrew Bain [7217]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	1994	Attachment raises concerns regarding lack of indication of new employment possibilities; housing mix reflecting current population range; possible low quality build materials and potential repeat of failings at Chichester Gate.	The CDC should appoint/co-opt a Design Champion for this project - perhaps an architect who is able to represent good practice, design etc, not someone motivated by profit.	Comment	Mr Martin Tomlinson MBE [6586]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2051	Homes England is concerned that the wording within Policy AL5 doesn't give planning certainty to the delivery of the site. Policy AL5 in its current format doesn't give the clarity to Homes England that the principle of residential development on the Police playing fields is acceptable. When the proposal is progressed to pre-application and formal application stage local stakeholders, statutory undertakers and decision makers (including elected Members and development management officers) may take the view that loss of open space on the Police playing pitches would be contrary to Council's local evidence base and Policy AL5 (in its current format).	Homes England requests that Policy AL5 be amended to give greater clarity that re-provision is only applicable to the allweather pitch. Accordingly, point 5 should be re-worded to the following; - Provision of open space in accordance with Policy DM34, including retention of the existing all weather playing pitch at Chichester High-School unless suitable re-provision is provided. Homes England believes that the Council should also consider revisions to paragraph 6.41 to include commentary on the reasons why the retention or re-provision of the lost open space on the Police site is not necessary. This would further support the re-development of the site and the delivery of up to 144 residential units.	Comment	Homes England (Mr Jonathan Alldis) [7264]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2085	Minerals and waste: Reference should be made to the mineral infrastructure safeguarding policy M10 as within 200m of the Chichester Railhead.	Reference should be made to the mineral infrastructure safeguarding policy M10 as within 200m of the Chichester Railhead.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2124	<p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sufficient space/expansion capacity to accommodate the child product from 350 dwellings - consideration to the cumulative impact of housing in AL6 to allocate land within the area for a 1FE-2FE primary. Pro rata financial contributions towards the build costs would be sought from developers to mitigate their impact. - expansion capacity to accommodate secondary aged pupils. Contributions would be required for expansion of secondary schools if feasible and required. - expansion capacity to accommodate the child product from this proposed development for sixth form pupils. Contributions would be required for expansion of the provision if feasible and required. 	<p>Consideration should be given to the cumulative impact of housing in the area Land South West of Chichester (AL6) to allocate land within the area for a 1FE expandable to 2FE primary school. Pro rata financial contributions towards the build costs would be sought from developers to mitigate their impact.</p>	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2140	<p>Amendments suggested relate to including reference to incorporating blue/green infrastructure in policy text and at point 5 of policy relating to the provision of open space. Point 5 to also refer to S29 Green Infrastruce and make reference to fully exploiting opportunities for sustainable drainage. Point 8 should refer to a surface water management plan as well as a waste water management plan.</p>	<p>paragraph 6.38 - The area has been identified as suitable for comprehensive regeneration with the aim being to make it a more attractive and welcoming gateway for the city, providing new housing, business and retail space and leisure and tourism facilities. Opportunities will be identified to improve transport links with a focus on cycling, walking and public transport and the removal of non-essential traffic from the area. There is also scope for significant public space enhancements and new landscaping incorporating blue / green infrastructure delivering multi-functional benefits.</p> <p>AL5 policy text requested amendments underlined for section 5 - Provision of open space that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Is in accordance with Policy DM34, including retention of the existing playing pitch unless suitable re-provision is provided; * Reinforces / enhances green and blue infrastructure consistent with Policy S29 and fully exploits the opportunities for sustainable drainage. <p>AL5 policy text requested amendments underlined for section 8 - Provision of both a surface and waste water management plan which demonstrates no net increase in flow to Apuldram Waste Water Treatment Works would result from this development, unless suitable alternative provision is agreed;</p>	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2211	<p>We have previously made comments on the proposals for the Southern Gateway through the adopted masterplan for the site. As highlighted there are a number of constraints to development in this area, however, we are pleased to see specific criteria in the policy to ensure that these key constraints to the site within our remit are fully considered.</p>		Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2266	<p>No comment on the principle of the allocation.</p> <p>Site includes listed buildings/non des heritage assets, buildings of interest, is within CA and near to listed buildings.</p> <p>Criterion 3 and 9 are supported but should be strengthened.</p> <p>Policy should more strongly promote opportunity to use heritage of the area to define its character and the desirability of new development.</p> <p>These comments are without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any planning application that may be submitted for the development of this site.</p>	<p>Reword clause 2 as follows;</p> <p>Proposals should include a high quality distinctive design response appropriate to this gateway location and based on the character and heritage of the area, which establishes a clear hierarchy of streets and spaces, active frontages of buildings which front streets and spaces with clearly defined building lines;</p> <p>Reword clause 3 as follows;</p> <p>3. Respect for the historic context and make a positive contribution towards protecting and enhancing the local character and special heritage of the area, including the Conservation Area, listed buildings (both on and adjacent to the site), non-designated buildings of historic interest and important historic views, especially those from the Canal Basin towards Chichester Cathedral;</p> <p>Reword clause 9 as follows;</p> <p>9. Include an archaeological assessment to define the extent and significance of any archaeological remains and reflect these in the proposals;</p>	Object	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2305	<p>Site has good water supply system. Reference to the 'efficient use of water' is confusing because many of the other strategic development sites also drain to Apuldram. All sites need to be water efficient but not follow the example of the 'Code for Sustainable Homes'. An alternative provision might be to reduce infiltration but it is not clear how this would be funded or who would carry out the work.</p>		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2359	<p>Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Pan 2018-2028.</p>		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2399	<p>Welcome references to access for cyclists and pedestrians; references to bus depot not clear as to whether that includes bus station; present bus station is close to the railway station which is important for integrated travel; present crossing gates should be taken away as are a serious impediment to traffic on Stockbridge and Basin Road.</p>		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	2754	<p>As the only brownfield site allocated as a strategic allocation, CDC should aim to be more progressive in realising opportunities site could deliver in terms of green infrastructure and biodiversity net gains. NPPF states green infrastructure used in new development to avoid increased vulnerability to impacts arising from climate change. Southern Gateway is a fantastic opportunity to incorporate innovative design, particularly increased green infrastructure e.g. green walls.</p> <p>SWT objects to the term 'mitigation' in relation to protecting nearby SPA from adverse impacts. If this strategy is not resulting in avoidance of impacts then is not effective and not legally compliant.</p>	<p>This needs to amended as follows:</p> <p>'Policy AL5: Southern Gateway Approximately 12 hectares of land in the area known as Southern Gateway, as shown on the policies map, is allocated for a comprehensive mixed-use development of a minimum of 350 dwellings, approximately 21,600 sq.m of mixed commercial space (including 9,300 sq.m of employment floorspace in Use Class B1(a and b)) as well as retail and leisure uses. Development proposals will need to demonstrate a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to the regeneration of this area, addressing the following site-specific requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of an appropriate mix of uses that reinforce and complement this edge of city centre location, including a significant proportion of retail, residential, employment, community/civic uses, and other main town centre uses; 2. Proposals should include a high quality distinctive design response appropriate to this gateway location which establishes a clear hierarchy of streets and spaces, active frontages of buildings which front streets and spaces with clearly defined building lines and innovative use of green infrastructure enhancements; 3. Respect for the historic context and make a positive contribution towards protecting and enhancing the local character and special heritage of the area and important historic views, especially those from the Canal Basin towards Chichester Cathedral; 4. Enhance the public realm, particularly connectivity to the railway station, Canal Basin and city centre via South Street, Market Avenue and Chichester Gate for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users; 5. Provision of open space in accordance with Policy DM34, including retention of the existing playing pitch unless suitable re-provision is provided; 6. Improve pedestrian and cycle access; 7. Include proposals which accommodate buses and coaches, restrict vehicular traffic using the Stockbridge Road level crossing. Appropriate car parking should be provided and proposals should include any on or off-site mitigation measures identified through the Transport Assessment; 8. Provision of a waste water management plan which demonstrates no net increase in flow to Apuldram Waste Water Treatment Works would result from this development, unless suitable alternative provision is agreed; 9. Include an archaeological assessment to define the extent and significance of any archaeological remains and reflect these in the proposals, as appropriate; 10. Include a Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate how the development responds to the flood risk on the site; suitable mitigation measures identified and committed to; 11. Be planned with special regard to the need to mitigateavoid potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar including contributing to any strategic access management issues; <p>Proposals for the development should have regard to the West Sussex Minerals Plan, and associated guidance, in relation to the site being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area.'</p>	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	3135	Listed and locally listed buildings of architectural or historic interest should be protected from demolition.	<p>After AL5 (3) add:</p> <p>'Protection of those building or architectural or historic interest which are identified on the statutory or local lists, as well as recognition of unidentified heritage assets.'</p>	Comment	Mr John Templeton [7371]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	3180	<p>6.37 sentence starting "The majority of the buildings...." - this is a value judgment, buildings such as the Bus Garage/Station might not be "liked" but they are examples of their time and should be preserved.</p> <p>Object to 6.41- Playing pitches are valuable assets, once built on they cannot be put back.</p> <p>Policy: Chichester's plans to take the bus station away and replace it with bus stops on the road are less conducive to supporting the modal shift onto public transport.</p>	Add "12. Proposals should include a bus station for passenger to find out information about buses and wait in the warm and to be able to use public facilities."	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	3341	<p>Reservations with respect to deliverability due to proximity to SINC, Floodzones 2 and 3 on site and heritage assets.</p> <p>Not sufficient information to conclude that the site is suitable for development.</p>		Object	CEG [7397]
82	Policy AL5: Southern Gateway	3489	<p>Take the Systra BABA27 report into account to separate A27 through traffic from local traffic. No evidence has been provided that the junction improvements will be adequate beyond 2035, except that further work will be required to support the likely increased capacity after that date.</p> <p>Success of the Southern Gateway development depends on the long term access to the A27. Also removal of the level crossings. Believe that third platform be included.</p>		Comment	Mrs Sarah Headlam [7441]
83	Apuldram and Donnington Parishes	376	<p>Paras 6.44 to 6.49 deficient in several respects.:Contrast with AL4 where extensive mention is made of flood risk and Lavant flood plain, 'comprehensive approach to flood risk management, ...including surface water management' etc. This barely rates in AL6.</p> <p>6.45 omits Ramsar site</p> <p>No mention of Flood zones 2 and 3</p> <p>No mention of 100 year sea level rise: review due from EA.</p> <p>.6.48 mentions 33 ha of employment land: three times requirement of 11 ha which can be spread over other sites with better connections (see comments under 'Meeting Business and Employment Needs, Paras 4.56 and 4.57, and under AL6</p>	<p>add: Flood zones 2 and 3</p> <p>add: 'comprehensive approach to flood management ...including surface water, at an early stage of the master planning process' ;</p> <p>include Ramsar site in 6.45</p> <p>add: 'development will be dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate waste water conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards'. (See last point in AL4).</p> <p>In 6.48 and 6.49: 100 homes, 33 ha employment land, and the link road should be removed (see comments under AL6)</p>	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
83	Apuldram and Donnington Parishes	821	<p>The proposed link road is very similar to the one soundly rejected in one of the Highways England options. Its location would provide an extra flow of traffic before traffic from Fishbourne could enter the Roundabout, That causes long delays now - and that's without the 4,500 extra cars that would be crammed into the A259 from all the building along the Corridor.</p>	<p>SOLUTION: (1) Scrap the idea of the Link Road on the grounds that it would create more problems than it would solve and was clearly in breach of Policy DM8.</p> <p>(2) Work with WSCC, Highways England and local groups on an integrated road system for the area, rather than coming up with piecemeal projects.</p> <p>(3) Introduce a moratorium on medium or large developments until an integrated solution is agreed, resourced and time-tabled. WE HAVE REACHED THE STAGE WHERE DEVELOPMENT CAN NO LONGER PRECEDE INFRASTRUCTURE.</p>	Object	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mr Geoff Hand) [34]
83	Apuldram and Donnington Parishes	1043	<p>Even though much of this area is an AONB, SPA, SAC and a SSSI the importance of protecting this area is given less emphasis than in paragraph 6.35 above where a number of specific issues are listed. Why are these given more importance for Westhampnett/North Chichester?</p> <p>The views of the Cathedral are better from the south and the importance of the Canal is not stressed.</p>	More emphasis should be given to protecting the areas to the south and southwest of Chichester	Object	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
83	Apuldram and Donnington Parishes	1729	<p>6.47 states that "the impacts of development (including landscape, flooding and transport) in this location, along with the commercial attractiveness of the site, will need to be tested further".</p> <p>The evidence of the currently conducted tests have not been provided for comment in the local plan.</p>	This failure to consult on the testing means that currently this site should not be a strategic development site. Further if the unmet need for the SDNP is rejected and CDC go back to government to get the strategic route built or the housing allocation reduced then this site will not be required.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	34	CDC should consider carefully how the minor improvements proposed to the A27 might be used as part of a phased larger scale improvement to the A27 by early engagement with Highways England.		Comment	Mr Ben Kirk [6563]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	46	Object to Link Road on basis that obstruction will continue to A259 eastbound gaining access to roundabout; additional junction will make roundabout more clogged and dangerous especially with increased traffic along corridor; any signalisation will not cure congestion.		Object	Mr Andrew Relf [6566]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	96	The AL6 link road and commercial development site flies in the face of climate change resilient planning. It is adjacent to internationally designated habitat sites, crosses Flood Zones 2& 3 and degrades significant views of cathedral and Downs from harbour, marina, Salterns Way and A286.As such is contrary to CDC's own ICZM policy. The environmental, social and economic harm to the tourist industry completely outweighs any (unproven and short term) benefit.Directing more Manhood traffic off the A27 and onto the A286, the most congestion prone road in the district, is an unsound strategy.	Remove AL6 link road and commercial development site	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	98	This development site is not climate change resilient and is contrary to NPPF and ICZM.It is adjacent to internationally designated habitat sites,crosses Flood Zones 2& 3,harms significant views of cathedral and Downs from harbour, marina, Salterns Way and A286.The site is physically removed from residential and other business areas and environmental, social harm and economic harm to tourist industry outweighs any benefit.The link road directing more local traffic off the A27 and onto the A286, the most congestion prone road in the district, is an unsound strategy.There are better sites for commercial development eg motor circuit noise buffer zone.	Remove Policy AL6	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	130	On Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes) * The Chichester Society supports this new policy, and its land allocation.		Support	Chichester Society (Mr Christopher Mead-Briggs) [802]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	131	I approve fully the use of this parcel of land for light industry and housing as it will offer employment for the Manhood Peninsula without a long and difficult commute.		Support	mr Michael Thomson [6639]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	146	The Link Road is essential		Support	James Rank [6661]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	250	Agree with Point 5 if site is to be developed.		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	275	I think it would be a good thing to have a new link road to bypass Donnington .I am in favour of this plan.		Support	Mrs Charlotte Brewer [6734]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	279	The views of the Cathedral from the South West of the city should also be protected		Comment	David Dean [6735]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	280	I am not supportive of the proposed link road. I also believe that the development is in flood plain. There is room for some development in this area, especially immediately south of the A27, however scale of the proposed developments do not seem to be compatible with the stated aims.	I believe that his element of the plan needs to be significantly rethought.	Object	David Dean [6735]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	285	Because of the flood plain, the road would have to be elevated, destroying the iconic view of the cathedral that the Plan elsewhere says it will protect.	Delete polict AL6. An alternative site for the industrial development is the buffer zone at Goodwood.	Object	Mr Peter Balaam [6739]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	308	You do realise the River Lavant runs through the area as two rivers joining as one. A drainage ditch runs under the Fishbourne Roundabout. There is no easy way to get across the A27 by foot to reach the train station. That a link road would deliver more traffic from the peninsular directly to Fishbourne Roundabout and block the Fishbourne, Portsmouth and Chichester exits.		Comment	Mr Robert Styles-Forsyth [6752]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	311	I must express my OBJECTION to the proposed plans on following grounds: - plan addresses none of previous objections - no improvements of services - more traffic and no right turn will make it worse		Object	Janet Toseland [6742]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	318	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site AL6 includes a flood plain. The road will have to be elevated by at least 2.5 metres and more. This would destroy the iconic views of the cathedral framed by the South Downs. Impact on ecology - the Chichester Harbour and surrounding area are designated as an AONB and have the status of being a SPA, SAC, SSSI and is a Ramsar site. A viable alternative site is available at Goodwood. <p>The traffic generated under AL6 proposals will add considerably to existing severe congestion and delays on the existing the A27.</p>		Object	Mr Mike Harper [6564]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	337	The site now called AL5 'South West Chichester' has been proposed in previous CDC Local Plans including the need for a Stockbridge Link Road. The previous site details identified sufficient capacity for 750 houses under the reference SL164. It is not clear why such a large allocation has been made for business use and why only 100 houses are included in this draft reveiw. The allocation should be for 750 houses at 'West of Chichester' and the allocation of an additional 300 houses at Tangmere should be removed.	increase the housing allocation at 'West of Chichester' to 750 and remove the additional 300 hoses from the allocation at Tangmere.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	338	This area is already close to a highly populated area of Donnington which is extremely congested, it also next to an area of AONB. More houses and business can only lead to more gridlock, more pollution and more unhappy and unhealthy residents and the impact on wildlife. Even with a well built and environmentally mitigated link road, I feel this land should be used promote clean energy e.g solar panels or left as it is as environmental corridor. Land in the buffer zone around Goodwood or Westhampnett is less congested and has better transport links and are less environmentally challenging.	I agree with environmentally well built Stockbridge link road to ease pollution and congestion in Donnington/Stockbridge but do not agree with building in AL6 zone. Plant more trees and use new green technologies in this area to mitigate climate change and pollution.	Object	Mrs Deborah Hack [6717]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	354	Elevating the road would destroy the iconic views of the cathedral	REMOVE Policy AL6	Object	Mrs Alison Balaam [6785]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	385	AL 6 gives rise to serious questions around need for link road, river bridge, and housing in this location: situated in coastal and fluvial risk Flood Zones 2 and 3; road height, views of Cathedral and Downs, low public acceptance for Option 2; major development adjacent to AONB; employment land allocation three times what is required in HEDNA identified need; no Sustainability Assessment.	Policy AL6 must specify requirement to satisfy ALL provisions in NPPF, including Flood Risk Assessment, and in Policy S27 (Flood risk management), and in DM18, BEFORE AL 6 is adopted and planning permissions are granted. Requirement for proper assessment of disturbance of wild life and AONB buffer zone; Change penultimate sentence of Policy to: ' Development will be dependent on adequate provision for waste water conveyance and treatment being provided.' Justify requirement for a strategic open space and a managed country park. Demonstrate conservation of and net gains in biodiversity. Proper sustainability assessment required. Consult with Harbour Conservancy before adoption of Local Plan Place 11 ha of employment land in space previously in AL4 or distribute over the other three areas with better existing or planned connections Distribute housing over other strategic sites with better existing or planned connections Remove link road from local plan	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	462	This area was previously excluded from development plans: The likelihood of flooding in an area with risk Zones 2/3a/3b The proximity to and detriment of the AONB, wildlife. The negative impact on views of Chichester Cathedral In November 2016 CDC concluded: "Overall this site has the most negative impacts and the fewest positive of all the Chichester options." CDC needs to be clear about the reasons it has changed its view since previous iterations of the Local Plan. There are viable alternative sites for these developments as cited in Policies S15 & S16 of the Local Plan.	Remove Policy AL6.	Object	Mr Neil Hipkiss [6831]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	478	This area is very attractive rural land, and contributes to the adjacent AONB and harbour. Whilst a strip of land adjacent to the A27 could be suitable for employment uses, the area to the south should not be developed for environmental reasons and harm to the AONB. 33 hectares of employment plus housing and new road would radically change the area. Provision of a country park sounds potentially good, but doesn't seem compatible with the amount of proposed development.	Remove the area from being "achievable" apart from a strip along the A27.	Object	Mr Richard Hutchinson [6455]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	513	Can I also ask will you be building on a flood plain? I understand that there is an alternative site within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there.		Comment	Mr Tony Gammon [6741]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	518	I am opposed to the Stockbridge Relief Road and the allocation of houses to Apuldram and Donnington as it is too close to the AONB, on a floodplain and destroys prime agricultural land.		Object	Sam Pickford [6841]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	543	An ill thought through plan. This development will do untold damage to the AONB and it will clearly remove view of the cathedral when driving into Chichester and when walking along footpaths and lanes within the AONB. It should also be noted that this area is on the Manhood Peninsula and should be treated as part of the Peninsula.	An ill thought through plan. This development will do untold damage to the AONB and it will clearly remove view of the cathedral when driving into Chichester and when walking along footpaths and lanes within the AONB. It should also be noted that this area is on the Manhood Peninsula and should be treated as part of the Peninsula.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	556	This area includes a flood plain. CDC's own data indicates that any road will need to be elevated by nearly 4 metres to avoid flooding by the Lavant destroying the heritage views of the Cathedral which attracts some to the area and gives such pleasure to residents. Object to link road	The protection proposed is pie in the sky. Remove this policy AL6	Object	Mr Jim McAuslan [6602]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	608	Building on a flood plain very sensible idea! Why build in this area? Fishbourne and Donnington would become one BIG settlement they would merge together. The capacity at Apuldram Waste Waster is already high. There are so many houses being built at the moment that it will not cope with more. All these new houses, Industrial Units etc. will all will be using the A27 at some stage. It is damaging and detrimental to our quality of life having all this pollution coming from the A27.	Remove Policy AL6. Viable alternative site for industrial development is within the Goodwood buffer zone. Industrial development should be put there. Consider the population near the A27 that are being tightly squeezed into the smallest area. Compare it to the vast plains in the North of the City and then question who is benefiting from Health and Wellbeing, certainly not the local population living by the A27.	Object	Penny Kirk [6567]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	624	Concerns over: - infrastructure - waste treatment/run off - flooding - traffic management - effects on SSSI/AONB/other habitats - quality of water in Chichester Harbour	There should be no development in the area designated AP/AL6.	Object	Dell Quay Sailing Club (Mr Donald Piers Chamberlain) [6895]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	628	* Site AL6 Land South West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington parishes) includes a flood plain. Using data from CDC's flood plain assessment, the average height of flood water on the River Lavant is 2.05 metres (6.07 feet) above datum (sea level). This means that the road will have to be elevated by at least 2.5 metres and more with the supporting structures and road thickness itself. Therefore nearer 4 metres (13 feet). This would destroy the iconic views of the cathedral framed by the South Downs. The protection proposed by para 3 of Policy AL6 is unachievable.	REMOVE POLICY AL6	Comment	Mr Philip Waters [6820]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	636	A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there.		Comment	Mr Philip Waters [6820]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	685	Object to AL6 due to conflict with S13 Chichester City Development Principles.	See above. Proper upto date transport study needs to be done before the infrastructure for the A27 can be assessed and given proper consideration. The Peter Brett Assoc report was out of date when it was produced in 2010 and discredited as being incorrect so to use it for the basis of this Local Plan is absurd and disgraceful. It is essential that traffic volume and movement is accurately assessed before any plan is adopted as it is probably the most important individual aspect of the viability of any plan and its success.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	700	Objection on grounds of detriment to local residents due to traffic congestion and poorer access to A27E, loss of views of Cathedral and Downs due to elevated road in flood plain, years of severe disruption due to changes to A27 junctions under plan similar to one already rejected, poorer air quality, increased pressure on existing schools and resulting increase in traffic, adverse ecological impact, adverse effect on rural economy due to negative impact of excessive development on tourism. Use viable alternative site for industrial development in the Goodwood buffer zone, allocating the employment land there.	Remove Policy AL6. Allocate employment land in Goodwood buffer zone. Plan A27 route north of Chichester for through traffic, leaving current southern bypass unchanged for local traffic. Safeguard the ecology and rural character of the Manhood Peninsula, thereby encouraging green tourism and protecting the rural economy.	Object	Mr David E.R. Moore [4761]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	722	We support this new policy and its land allocation.		Support	West Itchenor Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1036]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	743	1. I support provision of link road to reduce traffic volume through Donnington. 2. Realistically I accept need for new housing but would strongly support provision of a new primary school south of A27. 3. Air quality around Stocbridge roundabout must be addressed. 4. Existing SSI and AONB area must be respected. 5. Protect all existing footpaths/cycle ways and in particular improve existing right of way from A286 to join with the Salterns Way.		Comment	Mr Geoff May [6914]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	752	So as a sensitive area of AONB how are you going to ensure that any development on this land is not going contaminate the extremely sensitive harbour environment? Apuldram is at capacity which would necessitate pumping waste/foul/runoff elsewhere...more concreting and disturbing of the fragile environment.Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise it withe examiner at the appropriate time.	More detail is required in the plan as to mitigation.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	756	I object to the notion that there is potential for development in this area. It's too close to the AONB and will cause disturbance to wildlife there. The initial assessment was inadequate and the area should betaken out of potential development for industry and housing, and no link road should be built.	This area , with its flooding potential, and proximity to Chichester Harbour, should not be developed further. 100 new dwellings is not sustainable, a new link road will generate more traffic near a sensitive area, . The area is now fairly inaccessible; d should be left as a wildlife corridor, rather than opened to dog walkers etc. Keep the inaccessible area as it is.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	757	This area is so near the AONB it should be left alone and not made part of the urban area. A manged country park will be no substitute for an area that is now fairly inaccessible, crossed by one public footpath, and no preserved from pressures from dog walkers etc. No link road should be built. New roads generate new traffic and are not sustainable. The country's climate change commitments should prevent new road building, rather than promote it. Mitigation proposals are not specified and can't compensate for damage to the AONB, the SSI and Ramsar sites nearby.	Take this area out of any development . Do not build any link road. Leave the inaccessible area as it is and allow the land to be a refuge for wildlife. Write in much more definite protection for the AONB, the RAMsAR sites, the SSI and protect them from any development nearby.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	769	Exactly how can you protect views if buildings are going up? The sewerage works are not able to take any more. Why are we building on floodplains, this will bring misery for residents in new houses and existing.	Put industry where you can't put houses because of Goodwood motor circuit noise.	Object	Mrs Melanie Adams [6925]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	770	<p>1. With the available infrastructure there are too many houses being proposed for this land.</p> <p>2. The pollution is already high at Stockbridge and the proposed building work will increase the pollution and noise and do environmental damage, as well as being built on an existing flood plain.</p> <p>3.The proposed link road will cut across a wildlife corridor and damage the tranquility of the harbour and subsequently the tourist trade on the whole peninsula.</p> <p>4. There will be huge disruption for years while the building work is done, without there being any viable detours for the high volume of traffic.</p>	<p>1. The business park should be sited at Goodwood where there is space and transport links.</p> <p>2. The proposed solution is a short term one and does not address the issues of traffic usage on the A27. We need a more long term solution that is more acceptable to the community of Chichester.</p>	Object	Mr. Donald Hagell [6928]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	781	AL6 should be removed due to the severe adverse impact to the landscape, the harm to wildlife, and the risk of major flooding from the river Lavant and particularly the very real risk of rising sea levels due to its proximity to Chichester Harbour	AL6 should be removed and in considering alternative industrial / housing sites to AL6, AL4, which is included in the current CDC Local Plan, is ideal. It is recognised that this has been withdrawn from the HELLA; consideration should however be given to using compulsory purchase powers to acquire this site for industrial use. Most airports / airfields in the UK have industrial area on their boundaries.	Object	Mr K Martin [6938]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	801	This land is unsuitable for this development for several reasons. 1. Much of it is on or below the 5 meter contour and is vulnerable to sea level rise. 2. It abuts onto the Chichester harbour AONB and will have adverse effects in terms of 'Dark Skies' and habitat for wildlife. The raised link road will destroy the views of the Cathedral from the AONB. The land is already damp and would require extensive mitigation in terms of the policy for houses vulnerable to flooding which is likely to make development uneconomic	This land should be included in the Chichester Harbour AONB	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	818	REMOVE AL6. It says there has been no testing done therefore it should not be included.The link road has no funding and has not complied with HE consultation so should be removed.No mention of flooding risk Flood plain 3..govt states it should never be built on.No mention of unique view or light/noise/air/pollution. No mention of junction upgrade required at Fishbourne roundabout again HE funding.Looked at before and rejected by examiner as most unsuitable place in the area. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will be raising it with the examiner at the appropriate time.	The only change is to REMOVE AL6 from the plan. It has not been fairly assessed in anyway and there is no funding in place for link road or junction upgrades which are the responsibility of HE and there is no evidence that the due process of consultation with them has occurred with regard to AL6. Therefore the inclusion of AL6 is invalid.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	850	Policy AL6 is proposed to have 33 hectares for employment space.The numbers don't add up when those listed in para 4.5.7 total 12.4 hectares which leaves 10.8 hectares remaining. at the school I went to that leaves 10.8 hectares to be identified. How do our officers propose 33 hectares for AL6. The government inspector needs to probe deeply into this. Something is not jivingwhy ?	Relook at AL6 and come up with an allocation that avoids damage done unnecessarily to the Apuldram/Stockbridge area. I would suggest the inspector should challenge why the land SW of Goodwood Motor Circuit was removed in this latest plan review.	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	853	The open spaces / play areas need to be sufficient in size to offset the new employment buildings and housing impact such as designating a country park, rather than some small spaces between the buildings. The proposed link road from the Fishbourne roundabout to the A286 Birdham road will have a detrimental impact on the countryside and the views that are a special feature from the AONB across to the city and South Downs.	Ensure a large enough country park /open space is provided. Identify another access road route to this south-west quadrant development area.	Object	Mr Timothy Firmston [6945]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	854	The strategic site amounts to 85 Ha. Whilst there is a significant central belt of the site that is within a flood zone this amounts to some 28 Ha leaving 57 Ha of land without flood constraints. Allocating 33Ha for employment and just 100 houses at 35 dwellings/HA uses only 36Ha leaving 21Ha of usable land undeveloped in addition to the 28Ha within the flood zone. Acknowledging proximity to designated sites & potential for impact on views to the cathedral, dwelling allocation seems too low for this site & should be increased to make more efficient use for the land.	Dwelling allocation should be increased to make the site more viable and increase S106 funding for the link road which is key to the plans success. Poor land use and site viability to fund infrastructure will be raised with the inspector if not suitably addressed in subsequent revisions of the plan	Object	Mr Ben Kirk [6563]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	874	<p>This area was previously excluded from development plans: The likelihood of flooding in an area with risk Zones 2/3a/3b The proximity to and detriment of the AONB, wildlife. The negative impact on views of Chichester Cathedral</p> <p>In November 2016 CDC concluded: &quot;Overall this site has the most negative impacts and the fewest positive of all the Chichester options.&quot;</p> <p>CDC needs to be clear about the reasons it has changed its view since previous iterations of the Local Plan.</p> <p>There are viable alternative sites for these developments as cited in Policies S15 & S16 of the Local Plan.</p>	Remove Policy AL6.	Object	Karen Jelfs smith [6941]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	876	Does AL6 Land South West of Chichester fall under the Manhood Peninsula policy S18 as that seems to contrary to the policy in light of the flood risk and impact on the attractiveness of the area with the views of the Cathedral and Downs when returning towards the city to encourage visitors to return to the area because of its natural beauty, this will have a negative economic impact on the area. We should be enhancing the areas attraction protecting its views and the countryside around it and the AL6 suggestions seem contrary to that aim		Comment	Mrs C Shepherd [6948]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	878	The damage to both land and the people of Donnington is obvious the plans are contradictory only this week there is an articulate in the local paper that the Stockbridge area has gone over the air pollution levels laid out by government so this will be added to by a min of 450 houses in the south of the county including the Witterings development,	This site is not suitable for development for either housing or a link road.	Object	Mrs C Shepherd [6948]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	892	This development, though superficially sensible, should only be actioned after the long-awaited improvements to the A27 have been made.	Flyovers for Fishbone and Stockbridge roundabouts	Object	Dr Mark Dancy [6961]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	908	I believe the inclusion of the proposed AL6 site and adjacent link road contravenes Policy S24 Countryside. The proposed area seriously harms the habitat of the location, including the wildlife and adversely affecting the natural lay of the land especially a raised road totally changing the landscape irreparably		Comment	Mr Mark Shepherd [6967]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	921	Object to AL6 on basis of conflict with DM19.		Object	Mr Mark Shepherd [6967]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	922	Object to AL6 on basis of conflict with DM23.		Comment	Mr Mark Shepherd [6967]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	946	Object: Affects the AONB on its border: Light pollution Noise Pollution Waste water issues Habitat risk Green buffer between Chichester and AONB Only view of cathedral from the sea lost Unsuitable for residential property due to flood plain Green buffer between Chichester and Manhood Proposed link road: Ruined views of cathedral framed by South Downs Traffic congestion onto Fishbourne roundabout moves pollution Loss of Salterns way Requirement for infrastructure (schools) which can be met with development in North with 100% exception site to meet unmet housing need of SDNP. Employment space in floodplain object linkroad	Utilise area around Goodwood as Strategic site for light industrial use (not impacted by noise restrictions from motor racing circuit) and return SNDP housing need - better for housing to be provided within SDNP to ensure greater social cohesion and viability	Object	Mr Steve Frampton [6919]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	951	Development will not be possible within necessary protective constraints set by CDC and other authorities and will lbe a landscape disaster; Stockbridge link road will blight the area and is undeliverable on cost grounds.	The AL6 Strategic Site Allocation and the accompanying Stockbridge link road should be withdrawn from the Local Plan Review.	Object	Liz Sagues [6982]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	965	Looking at AL6, policy point 2 and at the pba Transport study which states this link would be strategic, other policies for land use totally contradict this. I would therefore ask the Government inspector to examine very carefully this "strategic" claim to the depth that it would be able to withstand a Judicial Review. (I would add that this is not a NIMBY statement I live well north of the A27.)	Remove the need for this link road and, solution other options to deliver the 100 + houses and more importantly the industrial land which I agree is needed but not in this location.	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	985	I'd like to register my objection to the proposed development at AL6; an area prone to flooding that is too close to an AONB. It would also have an impact on views of Chichester and the Downs. I also object to CDC accepting to take the SDNP's allocation of 41 dwellings. Of what benefit is this to Chichester District residents? I also object to any proposed Stockbridge to Fishbourne by-pass. It would be a short term fudge redolent of the abhorred and discarded options 2 and 3 of the A27 by-pass consultation	Put the proposed AL6 housing and industry close to Rolls Royce and Goodwood racetrack. Scrap the intended disruptive modifications to the A27 and concentrate on getting a northern A27 by-pass	Object	MR STEPHEN MANN [6868]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1008	Priority views to the Chichester Cathedral framed by the SDNP from inside the AONB, Salterns Way and Dell Quay would be impacted or lost. The site is located on top of and split in half by flood zones 2/3 Deterioration in water quality from run off on the link road and development sites detrimental impact on the landscape character in relation to the AONB Waste water issues The development takes away a green corridor between Chichester and the Harbour increase in noise, emissions and light pollution	Remove any plans for development on the site including the link road.	Object	Mr Stephen Holcroft [7004]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The road will need to be elevated by an absolute minimum of 2 metres which is completely unacceptable. - The development would destroy the unique view of the cathedral framed by the South Downs. -Noise generated by the road would not be acceptable in terms of Policy DM25. -Waste Water Treatment provision is inadequate. -There is no pedestrian access from the North. - The link road is A27 Option 2 by the back door - this has already been utterly rejected by the community. - &quot;this site has the most negative impacts and fewest positive of all Chichester options.&quot; 	REMOVE POLICY AL6. A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood. Employment land should be allocated there.	Object	Mr Mark Hitchin [7008]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1037	<p>The floodplain in AL6 is unsuitable for development. Indeed CDC themselves concluded: "Overall this site has the most negative impacts and the fewest positive of all the Chichester options." (December 2016 Site Allocation: Proposed Submission Development Plan Document 20142029 P40)</p> <p>No pedestrian access to town or station, without a footbridge (not planned). The views of the Cathedral framed by Downs from the sea are at their best from here. The link road would need to be raised several metres. Apuldram Wastewater Treatment Works is inadequate, it already periodically discharges raw sewerage in the harbour where my children kayak and sail.</p>	Do not develop this area in any way.	Object	Mrs Louise Hitchin [7012]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1046	<p>It is premature to suggest that this area is suitable for development if there has been no assessment of the issues. It is clear that there are significant issues in terms of flooding and impact on the environment as well as obscuring views of the Cathedral.</p> <p>There are other sites which could be put forward which would be more suitable.</p>	This site should not be put forward as it is untested.	Object	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1047	Landscape buffers are used a justification for not putting forward suitable development sites to the north and east of Chichester. Why is there no suggestion of landscape buffers to the sites to the south and southwest? The untested AL6 is not given the same protection so there would be no buffer between Chichester and the AONB. It would be further damaged by a raised road.		Support	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1048	The Council needs to remove from the Local Plan any development on areas such as AL6 which are identified by the Environment Agency as a floodplain and are untested for their suitability for development.		Support	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1060	<p>Object to allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inclusion of site = vandalism - no detailed work/discussion with Highways England to justify link road - site is Flood Zone 3 - raising link road would impact on views of cathedral - no mention of increased traffic or pollution 		Object	Mr Brian Horn [7020]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1086	Trustees are very concerned at the effect that these proposals will have on the amenities at the Centre, and would ask CDC to ensure that these are kept to a minimum and to liaise with the Centre to ensure that this is achieved. They are particularly anxious that the proposed link road is kept well away from the Centre, rather than on its boundary, as was at one time proposed, and that it is not elevated, as they have heard may be necessary on account of the propensity of the land to flooding to which they would be totally opposed.		Comment	The Apuldram Centre (Mrs Rachel Aslet-Clark) [7042]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1129	Object to AL6 due to conflict with Policy S26 Natural Environment. Proposals for AL6 are at odds with this policy. Distinctive local landscape character cannot be preserved if the link road is built.		Object	Mrs Nicola Swann [7052]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1142	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1152	Site AL6 land south west of Chichester includes a flood plain. This means it is not suitable for housing or industrial development. The relief road would only be built with money from the housing development. How will the houses be accessed until the road is built? Similarly the industrial area. The road would have to be elevated by some 2.5 metres above the flood level meaning it would be some 4 metres high thus destroying the views of the cathedral and south downs.	Remove Policy AL6	Object	Mr Roger Baynham [5456]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1166	Wholly inappropriate use of flood plain with an established rural character. Views of Chichester Cathedral would be seriously compromised by a road of the dimensions necessary to overcome flooding issues. Inappropriate development in a rural area.	REMOVE POLICY AL6 ALTERNATIVES TO AL6 A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there. (Policy AL6, S15, S16)	Object	Mrs Nicola Swann [7052]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1190	Flood Plains- should not be built on. They are to absorb flooding as a natural defence. Air Pollution -already above recommended levels and further pollution has serious health issues Noise Pollution will seriously impact AONB & SSSI plus affect local ecology Traffic considerations Fishbourne roundabout already very dangerous so no addition junctions with it should be built	Reject the changes proposed by CDC in their local plan review and use alternative sites in South downs National Park and within the buffer zone at Goodwood.	Object	Mr Graham Pound [5069]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1192	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM29 Biodiversity	Remove AL6 and actually look properly at biodiversity and its destruction within the plan.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1195	I object to the proposed link road between Birdham Road and Fishbourne Roundabout. It will add to congestion at A27/Fishbourne roundabout, make it more difficult to exit from Fishbourne Road, move traffic congestion further along A286 Birdham Road and become a rat run for those trying to avoid A27 around the south of Chichester.	Remove the proposal for a link road between A286 Birdham Road and Fishbourne Roundabout with A27. A consequential reduction in the land allocation in Apuldram/Donnington, as funding for the link road is not required.	Object	Mrs Susan Pope [6851]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1216	The proposal to build the Stockbridge link road across the river Lavant flood plain is totally unacceptable. It is my understanding that in order to avoid the road being flooded it would need to be elevated. this will destroy the views across the plain to the Cathedral and the Downs, and will increase pollution to adjacent properties (including the proposed new builds) given the prevailing south westerly wind.	REMOVE POLICY AL6	Object	Ms. Lynda Marsh [7074]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1224	Light industrial development is not appropriate because 1) the proximity to the Chichester Harbour AONB 2) the impact on traffic management at The Fishbourne roundabout, already a complex junction with a poor safety record in terms of accidents 3) there is currently no access to railway station, or other public transport or cycle or pedestrian friendly links to the rest of Chichester between the Stockbridge and Fishbourne roundabouts on the A27,	A viable alternative site for industrial development already exists within the buffer Zone at Goodwood and should be included in the plan as having potential for employment land.	Object	Ms. Lynda Marsh [7074]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1227	Such extensive development in this area can only be bad for the environment and the people already living in the area. Fewer dwellings and much reduce 'industrial' building might be acceptable if proper mitigation was carried out to protect the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and cope with the flood plain without spoiling the views. Small developments in all the areas in and around Chichester should be considered.	Radically limit any development.	Object	Anne Anderson [7007]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1238	"The Council will seek to ensure that development protects, and where possible, improves upon the amenities of existing and future residents, occupiers of buildings and the environment in general. Where development is likely to generate significant adverse impacts by reason of pollution, the Council will require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level." - Policy S28 Pollution I cannot see any of these features improving when AL6 / S23 is considered.	Remove AL6. Seek proper funding for a viable alternative to current A27 options.	Object	Penny Kirk [6567]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1283	Is this raised link road being slipped in to allow for a business development and housing estate with a minimum of 100 homes and a country park? Or is the employment development 3 times the size HEDNA has identified and minimum of 100 homes an excuse to get the raised link road put in? Option 2/3 by stealth after 47% of responders in 2016 said No. AL6- Floodplains 2 and 3; DESTRUCTION of unique historic views of the Cathedral and South Downs, protected wildlife sites, buffer zone of the AONB with no supporting evidence to the contrary. Remove AL6	Remove AL6.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1322	Potential housing development in this flood plain will present a risk for householders and a significant visual intrusion on the 'views across farmland' protected under other council properties. Industrial buildings in this area and the inclusion of more relief road development will impact the adjacent AONB, affecting wildlife, tourism and the access to the countryside of local residents. It is unclear how the access to the city for users of this area could be improved by this policy.	I would propose that you remove policy AL6.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1344	I object to the land being allocated for development of housing, employment and a link road. The land borders the Chichester Harbour AONB and should be preserved as a strategic green space, without development, stretching from the coast at Fishbourne Channel right up to the edge of the City. Development of housing, employment and especially a link road will destroy this. The employment land could be provided adjacent to the Goodwood Motor Circuit and the housing within the South Downs allocation . Donnington residents will be severely disadvantaged by the proposed changes to the A27 especially if travelling east.	Reallocate the land as strategic open space. Accommodate the employment need adjacent to Goodwood Motor Circuit, and the housing within the South Downs allocation. Resolve the A27 traffic problems with a northern bypass.	Object	Mr Seamus Meyer [7049]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1346	According to CDC's flood plain assessment the land proposed includes a flood plain with the average height of of flood water at 2.05 metres above sea level. As a result the road will presumably need to be elevated by around 4 metres, once supporting structures and the road itself are taken into account. As this would severely impact the iconic views of the cathedral in the South Downs setting it would have an unacceptable impact and the protection proposed by para 3 of Policy AL6 would not be accomplished.	Remove policy AL6. A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there.	Object	Mr David Roue [7122]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1351	I object to the building of a 33ha industrial estate, 100 houses and Linkroad between Fishbourne Roundabout and the A286 Birdham Road on an Active Floodplain which includes the River Lavant and important wildlife areas, and extensive productive farming land. The main reason for the proposed development appears to be for the funding of the Linkroad and not because AL6 is the correct place to put the industrial site. It would be better to build some of the industrial site at the Whitehouse Farm development where 1600 houses are planned and within the buffer zone at Goodwood. Remove Policy AL6	The plan should be changed by some of the industrial site being built at the Whitehouse Farm development (phase 2 not yet finalised) and some within the buffer zone at Goodwood.	Object	Mr Andrew Thrasher [7123]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1366	Site AL6 Land South West Of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes) includes a flood plain. Using data from CDCs flood plain assessment, the average height of flood water on the River Lavant is 2.05 meters (6.07ft) above datum (sea level).This means the road will have to be elevated by at least 2.5m and more with the supporting structures and road thickness itself. Therefore nearer 4m (13ft). This would destroy the iconic views of the cathedral framed by the South Downs.	The projection proposed by para 3 of Policy AL6 is unachievable. REMOVE POLICY AL6	Object	Miss Anna Gaymer [7127]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1398	I strongly object to the allocation of this site for the following reasons - it will cause demonstrable harm to the environment - proposed industrial is far to wide and will not comply with policies DM28;DM23: DM24 and DM25 - density of proposed development and new access road is contradictory in addressing site specific criteria set out in the policy - area within the flood plain and the proposed road and development would require land raising - Air quality will deteriorate further - a viable alternative site for industrial use is available within the buffer zone at Goodwood	Remove the policy as existing A27 road should form natural boundary to large scale industrial development	Object	David Ball [7141]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1410	AL6 should be withdrawn as inappropriate and detrimental, destroying natural beauty and views from the South, contrary to CDC's own policies. Its close proximity to the Chichester Harbour AONB will cause harm to the environment and ecology of the area, displace wildlife, increase pollution and destroy Dark Skies ambitions, consequently affecting the income this area generates. SLR was firmly rejected under the A27 consultation Option 2. The inclusion is against Community wishes already unequivocally expressed against the idea.. CDC should focus on supporting BABA27 rather than undermining it. The area is on a Flood Plain and is inappropriate for development.	AL6 should be withdrawn as inappropriate and detrimental to the area.and destroy its natural beauty and views of the Cathedral and Downs from the Southern aspect. Its close proximity to the Chichester Harbour AONB will cause harm to the environment and ecology of the area. We have open fields already any suggested reduced substitute is unacceptable, The impact will displace wildlife, interfere with the ecology, increase pollution, and destroy the Dark Skies ambitions for the area, consequently affecting the economy this area generates. Extend the Chichester Harbour boundary to include this area of land to protect it from encroachment and prevent detriment to the Community. A raised SLR linking the A286 and Fishbourne Roundabout was firmly rejected under the A27 consultation Option 2. The inclusion is against Community wishes which have already been unequivocally expressed against the idea.. The Changes to the Fishbourne and Stockbridge Roundabouts are going to create more congestion and hinder local residents traffic at the expense of through traffic. Alternative Community led solutions for the A27 have already been proposed, CDC should focus on giving those its support rather than undermining them. The area is on a Flood Plain, any development will cause greater water displacement to surrounding areas, especially with a raised road (SLR) which makes this site impractical and unsustainable,	Object	Mr Mark Shepherd [6967]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1421	Urbanisation of a rural area at the Gateway to the Manhood peninsular. Removal of strategic gap and merging two rural parishes with "expansion" of Chichester City will result in loss of identity for 2 communities. Loss of valuable agricultural land which contributes to the agricultural economy and employment. Agriculture is a business! There is a rich diversity of wildlife including water voles on the land which will be at risk. There is a pond/lake about to be restored with Lottery funding to support wildlife/ecology. risk of flooding could be increased.Loss of green tourism.	Remove policy AL6 Site the industrial development in the Goodwood buffer zone possibly using the Section 106 funding to support road improvements that will help traffic attending Goodwood events. Correct the statemnt in para 6.44 Do not take the National Park's allocation of 41 house per annum. It is vital that it provides some limited housing development including low cost housing for local people or the park will wither and die, communities will not thrive.	Object	Mr and Mrs A Martin [5053]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1447	The proposed Stockbridge Link Road will likely need to be 4m high and will destroy the iconic views of the cathedral framed by the South Downs. These views are protected elsewhere in the LP. Issues with Waste Water Treatment Works at Apuldram and water quality in Chichester Harbour. Site previously discounted from development plans due to impact on AONB/wildlife/pollution/protected views. Nothing has changed. Alternative site available within the buffer zone at Goodwood. Employment land should be relocated here.	Remove site AL6	Object	Donnington Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann (Parish Clerk)) [888]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1448	Too much building has been proposed that damages the Chichester Harbour AONB. Especially Policy AL6 which proposes a new link road which cuts the harbour off from the city, and a major commercial development within a few hundred metres of the AONB. Any plans for a link road should be abandoned, and the commercial site should be moved to the East of the city. Airfields usually provide a good hub for commercial sites, so close to Goodwood airfield would be a suitable place. The houses proposed for this site are not needed.		Object	Graham Campbell [6915]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1452	1. We believe the text of the policy should be amended to have an additional sentence added at the end of the first paragraph to say: The final quantum of employment space and number of dwellings will be determined by an up-to-date market assessment to determine the viability of the proposals, the need for additional commercial floorspace and the demand for more housing at the time of submission. 2. The plan in the policy map for AL6 should be altered to include all of the land outlined in red in the allocation. Promoting site at Lawrence Farm.		Support	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd. [7061]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1464	I strongly object to AL6 which concerns the construction of a relief road from Fishbourne roundabout to the A286 - what benefits will this bring to the area ? It will destroy an area of natural beauty and habitat. It will add to the danger of this roundabout which already has significant accidents.		Comment	Ms Helen Boarer [5749]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1484	Is this raised link road being slipped in to allow for a business development and housing estate with a minimum of 100 homes and a country park? Or is the employment development 3 times the size HEDNA has identified and minimum of 100 homes an excuse to get the raised link road put in? Option 2/3 by stealth after 47% of responders in 2016 said No. AL6- Floodplains 2 and 3; DESTRUCTION of unique historic views of the Cathedral and South Downs, protected wildlife sites, buffer zone of the AONB with no supporting evidence to the contrary. Remove AL6	Remove AL6.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1491	Building height restrictions would be needed to mitigate the impact views. Pay regard to possible improvements to the A27. The link road is a factor which must be reconsidered with its impact on accessibility to the already congested Fishbourne roundabout., If it is to be recommended there must be mitigation by a flyover east - west at this junction, A27, with pre-agreement with Highways England for this to go ahead.The level of the road is also a concern. Preferable to divert traffic from the south, east of the southern development area .Highways England involvement is needed here.		Comment	Mr Richard Young [7109]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1495	I object to the proposed link road between Birdham Road and Fishbourne Roundabout. It will add to congestion at A27/Fishbourne roundabout, make it more difficult to exit from Fishbourne Road, move traffic congestion further along A286 Birdham Road and become a rat run for those trying to avoid A27 around the south of Chichester.	Remove the proposal for a link road between A286 Birdham Road and Fishbourne Roundabout with A27. A consequential reduction in the land allocation in Apuldram/Donnington, as funding for the link road is not required.	Object	Mr Derrick pope [6778]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1500	Wholly inappropriate use of flood plain with an established rural character. Views of Chichester Cathedral would be seriously compromised by a road of the dimensions necessary to overcome flooding issues. Inappropriate development in a rural area.	REMOVE POLICY AL6 ALTERNATIVES TO AL6 A viable alternative site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there. (Policy AL6, S15, S16)	Object	Mr Christopher Swann [7177]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1526	Natural England notes that this is a large allocation site adjacent to the AONB and close the SPA/SAC/Ramsar/SSSI. We welcome clause 6, which requires mitigation for potential impacts on nature conservation sites - our view is that the key issues will be recreational disturbance and water quality (both surface water and sewerage). Given the status of Apuldram WwTW, Natural England's recommendations for policy S31 are particularly important for this site allocation. Clause 3 is also vital - a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be necessary to identify whether development is possible without harming the setting of the AONB.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1621	The protection proposed by para 3 of the policy AL6 is unachievable.	Remove policy AL6. A viable site is available for industrial development within the buffer zone at Goodwood and the employment land should be allocated there.	Object	Mrs Philippa Hook [7195]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1659	Too close to internationally protected habitats. Other sites are more appropriate for housing and commercial development. Noise from link road likely to cause disturbance.	Delete this site from the Plan	Object	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1737	AL6 is an uncertain proposal as it currently stands in this plan and as a result should be immediately removed from the plan. In particular: a. Testing has not been conducted for this site this is acknowledged at 6.47. b. 6.48 is unable to provide any idea what the proposed usage of the site will be c. 6.49 makes no concrete proposal just suggesting a link road may be needed. This begs the question why as the proposed link road has NO impact on relieving traffic flows.	This site is wholly unsuitable and is not ready for consideration in this plan and should be removed as we are unable to comment on untested proposals. The element of at least 100 homes is not a proposal on which we can comment as it articulates in other documents that 200 homes could be built.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1742	<p>Site is wholly unsuitable and is not ready for consideration in this plan.</p> <p>Move employment to AL4. benefits of doing so are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Proximity to other business in the area and particularly Rolls Royce. b. Benefit of opening up employment opportunities for the rural community within the SDNP. c. Limited flood plain impact as the majority of this site is outwith level 3 floodplain. d. Overcomes the noise sensitive impact of the race circuit and aerodrome. e. Outside the safe air corridor f. Good access to the A27 with no requirement for major new junctions or relief road. 	This site is wholly unsuitable and is not ready for consideration in this plan and should be removed as we are unable to comment on untested proposals. The element of at least 100 homes is not a proposal on which we can comment as it articulates in other documents that 200 homes could be built.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1745	<p>AL6 is an uncertain proposal as it currently stands in this plan and as a result should be immediately removed from the plan.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Testing has not been conducted for this site this is acknowledged at 6.47. b. 6.48 is unable to provide any idea what the proposed usage of the site will be c. 6.49 makes no concrete proposal just suggesting a link road may be needed. This begs the question why as the proposed link road has NO impact on relieving traffic flows. 	This site is wholly unsuitable and is not ready for consideration in this plan and should be removed as we are unable to comment on untested proposals. The element of at least 100 homes is not a proposal on which we can comment as it articulates in other documents that 200 homes could be built.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1773	<p>Object to link road in AL6 due to conflict with DM23 Lighting.</p> <p>The building of any link road will impact on the dark skies value of the AONB. Any link road will require associated street lighting but also the light pollution from cars on an elevated section would impact the dark sky across this flat harbour area.</p>	this needs to be adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1787	Any development South of A27 at Donnington/Apuldram/Fishbourne is at risk of flooding. It is on the Lavant flood plain	no building here	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1793	Oppose any development here due to proximity to harbour	remove all development	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1794	<p>6.44 to 6.49 Policy AL6</p> <p>We oppose this. No development should be undertaken in this area. It is in the Lavant flood plain.</p> <p>No additional housing</p> <p>No Commercial sites</p> <p>We object to the relief road.</p> <p>All employment land MUST be relocated to the Goodwood Aerodrome site.</p> <p>This site is too close to the AONB on a flood plain and the relief road would affect the landscape and views.</p> <p>An additional road onto the Fishbourne Roundabout will add to the traffic being projected onto the roundabout with development in Southbourne, Chidham/Hambrook, Bosham and Fishbourne.</p>	Remove all development	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1805	AL6 would cause an irretrievable detrimental impact on the landscape, character, context and setting of the AONB and National Park and obliterate views of the cathedral and SDNP from the coast and AONB. It would have a devastating impact on wildlife and cause noise and light pollution. AL1, AL2 and AL15 provide 12.4 hectares of the 23.2 hectares identified in 4.56. leaving 10.8 hectares additional requirement. AL6 is 3 times this requirement and therefore completely unjustified. the 10.8 hectares can be found elsewhere. AL6 is a cynical ploy to implement Option 2 of the rejected public consultation from 2016.	Completely remove AL6 (and link road) from the plan as a Proposed Strategic Site Allocation in favour of non flood areas including that element to the south of Goodwood (AL4) which should be the preferred site for employment space to replace AL6.	Object	Mr Graham Causley [7203]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1810	AL6 should be removed due to: - it is inaccessible without a link road, which would be raised due to the flood plain resulting in unacceptable light, noise, air pollution -the likelihood of flooding in the area -there is no access for pedestrians / cyclists coming from the city / train station -the impact on water pollution of runoff - it's proximity to AONB, and in particular the impact of the link road - the impact on protected and unique views into the city and framed by the South Downs	Remove AL6, utilise land within the buffer zone at Goodwood	Object	Heather McDougall [6651]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1845	I support this new policy and its land allocation. There should be allocation on this Land for relocating the Bus Garage and Royal Mail Postal Distribution Depot to allow the early freeing up of the existing sites within the Southern Gateway Masterplan.		Support	Mr Andrew Bain [7217]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1852	AL6 should be removed from the plan: - loss of wildlife - flooding - damage caused by link road - damage to Chichester Harbour		Object	Charlotte Horn [7218]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1854	Object on following grounds: - flood plain - add to congestion/pollution - link road will add to issues - loss of wildlife - loss of views - impact on services	do not build on a flood plain (I believe this is self-explanatory) Increase the protection of the areas naturistic elements Focus on reducing the levels of pollution introduced to the area due to the motorway	Object	Mrs C Shepherd [6948]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1860	Object to allocation on following grounds: - adjacent to the Chichester Harbour - Dark Skies - Landscape - Wildlife habitats - Wildlife stepping stones - Noise pollution - Air quality - Tourism	Remove AL6 from the plan	Object	Gary Neal [7222]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1866	Object to the Land South-West of Chichester allocation on following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Destroys biodiversity of the area - Destroys historic views - Destroys the natural environment - Destroys the openness of views in and around coast - Will increase flooding and contamination of Chichester Harbour - Destroys dark skies - Increase in light, air and noise pollution - Link road unsuitable - Lack of capacity for waste water - Other housing and employment sites should be considered - Unequal distribution of housing 	Policy AL6 should be removed	Object	Jennie Horn [7223]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1869	- Objection to the building of a new road between the A27 and the Birdham Road A286. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This particular part of Fishbourne being listed as floodplain 2 will need piling to support a road, which will destroy the character of the Fishbourne meadows and paths to the harbour/sea. - This area should instead be a wildlife corridor rather than the site of industrial units. 		Object	Jenny Cole [7114]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1880	I object to the proposed new road between Birdham Road and the Fishbourne roundabout because of the impact on the environment. This is near the AONB which is a precious but fragile part of our district and development on it should be greatly restricted		Object	Mrs Sarah Scarfe [7214]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1883	The AL6 link road and commercial development site flies in the face of climate change resilient planning. It is adjacent to internationally designated habitat sites, crosses Flood Zones 2& 3 and degrades significant views of cathedral and Downs from harbour, marina, Salterns Way and A286.	Remove AL6 link road and commercial development site	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1891	- Site AL6 Land South West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes) is within a flood plain with the River Lavant running directly through the middle of the area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This area should remain a strategic gap between the two parishes and efforts concentrated on the area being more gainfully used as a green wildlife corridor. - This area should be removed and use the alternative land near Goodwood; Policy AL6, S15, S16. 	This area should be removed and use the alternative land near Goodwood	Comment	William Fleming [7227]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1897	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM27 Historic Environment. 7.163 states the requirement to protect views in the area. It then mentions 4 views of which only AP6 covers 2 of them and will blight the view with employment space, residential properties and an elevated link road namely "Towards Chichester Cathedral; Towards the South Downs from the Coastal Plain".	This strategic site should be removed and replaced with suggested alternatives in the North of Chichester which currently has no development sites proposed and where the views are unaffected.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1898	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM28 Natural Environment. Due to the coastal nature of the district the protection of the coast and views are of importance." This is clearly not the case with the proposal in SA6, Fishbourne and Bosham which will all impact this statement.	Due to the coastal nature of the district the protection of the coast and views are of importance." This is clearly not the case with the proposal in SA6, Fishbourne and Bosham which will all impact this statement.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1899	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM25 Noise. The proposal to move employment space within AP6 exacerbates noise pollution in the AONB. The movement of this and the proposed link road will bring the noise pollution to the border of the AONB and impact the status of the AONB.	Placing this at the suggested Goodwood site will have no adverse noise impact that is not already present. Mitigation therefore will be immediate as this is within the AS15 buffer	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1900	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM27 Historic Environment. 7.163 states the requirement to protect views in the area. It then mentions 4 views of which only AP6 covers 2 of them and will blight the view with employment space, residential properties and an elevated link road namely "Towards Chichester Cathedral; Towards the South Downs from the Coastal Plain".	This strategic site should be removed and replaced with suggested alternatives in the North of Chichester which currently has no development sites proposed and where the views are unaffected.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1907	AL6 inappropriate for development on following grounds: a. Affects the AONB on its border: i) Light pollution. ii) Noise Pollution. iii) Waste water issues. iv) Habitat risk. v) Green buffer between Chichester and AONB vi) Only view of cathedral from the sea lost vii) Unsuitable for residential property due to flood plain viii) Green buffer between Chichester and Manhood b. Proposed link road: i) Ruined views of cathedral framed by South Downs ii) Traffic congestion onto Fishbourne roundabout moves pollution iii) Loss of Salterns way c. Employment space in floodplain: i) Noise pollution ii) Light pollution into AONB Sustainability Statement		Comment	Laura Marrinan [7231]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1938	The proposed spur road would push traffic south and cause further congestion. Roads are narrow and not capable of coping with increased traffic Roads already at capacity		Comment	Mrs Sally Mountstephen [7239]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1942	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM18 Flood Risk and Water Management. 7.118 States "The flatness of the landscape makes the AONB particularly vulnerable to visual intrusion from inappropriate development, both within or adjacent to the boundary, which can often be seen from significant distances across inlets, the main harbour channels, or open countryside. The District Council will have particular regard to these characteristics in determining development proposals affecting the AONB".	This is one of the key arguments against the development proposed at AL6. This elevated link road, employment space and residential proposals which are not tested contravenes this requirement and statement. This area is one of the only views of the cathedral spire framed by the North Downs which will be ruined with any development on AL6. In particular this development will remove the ability to see a cathedral from the sea (the only one in the country). It is also stressed that views and proximity to SDNP are used in other parts of the plan for removal of suitable land even though the views are non-existent of unaffected and the proximity is 1 Km versus 100 Metres. This is why the rural community needs to be supported if housing can not be built in the SDNP. The northern area south of the SDNP is the right location to provide the affordable 205 homes with employment space if they are not to be handed back to the SDNP to meet the need.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1943	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM18 Flood Risk and Water Management. 7.108 forwards articulates the councils approach to flood zone areas. AL6 in particular makes no specific reference to the flood zone which is listed as depicted in the environment agency map	As no flood impact assessment has been or appears to have been completed this area should be excluded from the plan. To accommodate its removal we would suggest that the housing if still required should be accommodated at West Broyle and Lavant to meet the unmet housing need of SDNP communities with associated employment site within the 400m noise buffer around Goodwood.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1945	7.25 mentions landscape buffers (DM3 Housing Mix). From the untested AL6 there are no landscape buffers between Chichester and the AONB boundary.	A buffer around the ANOB needs to be considered in the local plan	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1946	Objection to link road as part of AL6 proposal.		Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1978	Proposal at Apuldram would remove the only view of a cathedral from the sea in the country and long-distance views of the downs.		Object	Mr Anthony Tuffin [5052]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	1999	Object to proposed country park, do not want existing green fields, wildlife etc taken away by strategic housing allocation. Location inappropriate due to flood plain. Adjacency to Chichester Harbour AONB will have destructive effect due to pollution caused by suggested link road. Use of agricultural land will impact economy. Object to employment allocation on grounds that infrastructure/ affordable housing inadequate to facilitate needs of people moving into the area for employment and potential noise impact from new commercial development.	Safeguard areas of natural beauty to protect aesthetic beauty of surroundings and encourage visitors to area providing an economic boost to our area.	Object	Mrs C Shepherd [6948]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2008	The policy for this housing allocation appropriately highlights the need to provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the adjacent SPA, SAC, SSSI and Ramsar at Chichester Harbour. However, the land in this policy is across the road from site 'C23' in the Solent Brent Goose and Wader Strategy (SWBGS) and has been designated as a 'Candidate area'.	As per the SWBG strategy, development proposals which are likely to affect these sites will need to undertake survey work to confirm the site's classification prior to assessing off-setting and mitigation requirements. We urge that reference to this is made within the policy.	Comment	RSPB (miss Chloe Rose) [6981]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2038	We believe it would not be acceptable if the SPA/ SAC/ SSSI/ RAMSAR site, or indeed the AONB or LWS, were in any way affected by the development of AL6 and that the only mitigation measures that should be required are recreational mitigation measures. To make this clearer we would like to see condition 6 reading as: "Ensure the protection of the adjacent SPA, SAC, SSSI and RAMSAR site at Chichester Harbour, the AONB and the River Lavant Marsh LWS. This should include mitigation measures to avoid recreational disturbance"	Change wording of criterion 6.	Comment	Sussex Ornithological Society (Mr Richard Cowser) [7256]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2044	The proposed AL6 link road is on a category 3 Flood Plain that according the Governments recommendations should not be built on due to environmental damage and the risk of flooding.		Object	Ms Sarah Lambert [7257]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2066	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM19 Chichester Harbour AONB. The flatness of the landscape makes the AONB particularly vulnerable to visual intrusion from inappropriate development, both within or adjacent to the boundary, which can often be seen from significant distances across inlets, the main harbour channels, or open countryside.	This is one of the key arguments against the development proposed at AL6. This elevated link road, employment space and residential proposals which are not tested contravenes this requirement and statement. This area is one of the only views of the cathedral spire framed by the North Downs which will be ruined with any development on AL6. In particular this development will remove the ability to see a cathedral from the sea (the only one in the country). Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture. It is also stressed that views and proximity to SDNP are used in other parts of the plan for removal of suitable land even though the views are non existent of unaffected and the proximity is 1 Km versus 100 Metres.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2067	<p>Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM18 Flood Risk and Management and DM19 Chichester Harbour AONB.</p> <p>AL6 in particular makes no specific reference to the flood zone which is listed as depicted in the environment agency map:</p> <p>The flatness of the landscape makes the AONB particularly vulnerable to visual intrusion from inappropriate development, both within or adjacent to the boundary, which can often be seen from significant distances across inlets, the main harbour channels, or open countryside.</p>	As no flood impact assessment has been or appears to have been completed this area should be excluded from the plan. To accommodate its removal we would suggest that the housing if still required should be accommodated at West Broyle and Lavant to meet the unmet housing need of SDNP communities with associated employment site within the 400m noise buffer around Goodwood.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2068	<p>Object to AL6 due to conflict with S27 Flood Risk Management.</p> <p>Section 5.54 The council statement says that areas at risk of flooding should not be considered.</p>	The proposal for a link road and employment and residential use in SW Chichester (Apuldram) encompasses flood plain level 3 and the development site should be excluded in favour of non flood areas including that element to the south of Goodwood (for employment use) and around West Broyle and Lavant to support residential development outside of the SDNP but to accommodate any unmet need from the SDNP (which should not be included but if it is this is where the development should occur.) This would ensure that if the unmet need is forced on CDC outside the SDNP area then at least the communities are still in reach and not detached by the city itself without multiple public transport links to their rural community or employment. Areas have been suggested and are supplied here for rough reference: Currently in the adopted plan for residential housing of 500 (planning for only 300 in progress). The adopted plan states that transport intersections can be at all areas of the area yet the revised plan removes the site entirely and introduces a noise buffer and a rolls Royce buffer. This site should be adopted for employment use as it provides the required space and is largely out of flood plain. Contrary to advice to councillors from Officers this site does not affect views or the SDNP boundary. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture. Whilst it is understood that some development is taking place and wildlife corridors are a factor these should be considered as strategic sites in the plan as they offer suitable sites unlike the Apuldram, Fishbourne proposed site for both employment and residential and in particular affordable homes for the Northern rural community where appropriate.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2070	<p>Object to AL6 due to conflict with S27 Flood Risk Management.</p> <p>Section 5.54 The council statement says that areas at risk of flooding should not be considered.</p>	The proposal for a link road and employment and residential use in SW Chichester (Apuldram) encompasses flood plain level 3 and the development site should be excluded in favour of non flood areas including that element to the south of Goodwood (for employment use) and around West Broyle and Lavant to support residential development outside of the SDNP but to accommodate any unmet need from the SDNP (which should not be included but if it is this is where the development should occur.) This would ensure that if the unmet need is forced on CDC outside the SDNP area then at least the communities are still in reach and not detached by the city itself without multiple public transport links to their rural community or employment. Areas have been suggested and are supplied here for rough reference: Currently in the adopted plan for residential housing of 500 (planning for only 300 in progress). The adopted plan states that transport intersections can be at all areas of the area yet the revised plan removes the site entirely and introduces a noise buffer and a rolls Royce buffer. This site should be adopted for employment use as it provides the required space and is largely out of flood plain. Contrary to advice to councillors from Officers this site does not affect views or the SDNP boundary. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture. Whilst it is understood that some development is taking place and wildlife corridors are a factor these should be considered as strategic sites in the plan as they offer suitable sites unlike the Apuldram, Fishbourne proposed site for both employment and residential and in particular affordable homes for the Northern rural community where appropriate.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2072	<p>Object to AL6 due to conflict with S25 The Coast.</p> <p>The proposal to build SW of Chichester will not only spoil this view but will also spoil perhaps the only view framed by the South Downs of the cathedral in the whole area with employment sites and housing and with a proposed raised link relief road through countryside bordering the Chichester Harbour AONB</p>	The proposal needs to consider in full its own statement that "The landscape of the coastline is characterised by its relatively flat topography which, on occasion, serves to provide views from the water across to the South Downs National Park."	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2073	<p>Object to AL6 due to conflict with S25 The Coast.</p> <p>Section 5.44 is probably the most important statement in the plan "The landscape of the coastline is characterised by its relatively flat topography which, on occasion, serves to provide views from the water across to the South Downs National Park." SW of Chichester will not only spoil this view but will also spoil perhaps the only view framed by the South Downs of the cathedral in the whole area with employment sites and housing and with a proposed raised link relief road through countryside bordering the Chichester Harbour AONB.</p>	The proposal needs to consider in full its own statement that "The landscape of the coastline is characterised by its relatively flat topography which, on occasion, serves to provide views from the water across to the South Downs National Park."	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2075	5.36 to 5.40 (S24 Countryside) needs to apply to the area proposed as a strategic site SW of Chichester. The settlement boundary is breached and it goes directly upto the border of the AONB removing the buffer currently in existing and is likely to affect the wildlife corridor formed along the river Lavant that goes through the site . It will also directly affect the salterns way footpath/cyclepath.	S24. 5.36 to 5.40 needs to apply to the area proposed as a strategic site SW of Chichester.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2077	5.36 to 5.40 (S24 Countryside) needs to apply to the area proposed as a strategic site SW of Chichester. The settlement boundary is breached and it goes directly upto the border of the AONB removing the buffer currently in existing and is likely to affect the wildlife corridor formed along the river Lavant that goes through the site . It will also directly affect the salterns way footpath/cyclepath.	S24. 5.36 to 5.40 needs to apply to the area proposed as a strategic site SW of Chichester.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2086	Minerals and waste: Reference should be made to the mineral infrastructure safeguarding policy M10 as within 300m of the Chichester Railhead.	Reference should be made to the mineral infrastructure safeguarding policy M10 as within 300m of the Chichester Railhead.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2125	Education: - Primary education either in city centre so would have to cross A27 or on Manhood - Consideration to cumulative impact of further housing to allocate land within SA for 1FE-2FE primary. Pro rata contributions towards build costs would be sought to mitigate impact. - Expansion capacity to accommodate secondary aged pupils. Contributions would be required. - Expansion capacity to accommodate sixth form pupils. Contributions would be required.	Consideration to cumulative impact of further housing to allocate land within SA for 1FE-2FE primary	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2153	Flooding: Concerns regarding the lack of reference to flood risk constraints of the site. The above limits the options for how the site can be effectively drained without a step change from typically employed methods to embrace more innovative and currently expensive options. The LLFA recommends that the policy sets out both the above constraints and the type of innovative drainage that will be required to achieve the development objectives for the site. Recommended that CDC gives consideration to the climate change maps to understand how the flood zones are predicted to change over the lifetime of the development.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2154	WSCC PROW considers 'necessary highway improvements to adequately mitigate the likely impacts on the highway network' to include a bridge crossing of the A27 for convenient walking and cycling access to the Terminus Road industrial estate and the city. There is an existing public footpath but, as this crosses the A27 this will not provide the safest facility and not encourage people to minimise use of vehicles for local access. Provision of a bridge and access through the site could establish a valuable link to Salterns Way. An additional link to Salterns Way should be provided off the A286.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2161	Object to AL6 allocation on the following grounds: - Building on flood plain - Loss of wildlife habitat - Increase in road traffic - Air and noise pollution - Road safety - Schools - Doctors surgeries	* Not building on a flood plain. * Not building so central to Chichester. * Development within the buffer zone at Goodwood. * Creating a sustainable development that won't affect generations to come. * Reconsider the A27 plans as these are just not practical in anyway.	Object	Olivia Shepherd [7267]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2163	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM30 Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas.	Remove AL6 from the plan.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2165	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM28 Natural Environment.	Remove AL6 and acknowledge the equal importance of Chichester Harbour AONB.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2166	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM27 Historic Environment.	Actually implement what the plan says and preserve historic views etc instead of wilfully destroying them.Remove AL6.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2168	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM25 Noise.	Reinstate Goodwood. Remove AL6.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2169	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM24 Air Quality.	Remove AL6 until such time as a proper assessment has been conducted.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2170	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM23 Lighting.	Remove AL6 as it contravenes dark skies policy.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2172	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM19 Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Remove AL6 and link road and reexamine the huge impact building near the AONB will have.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2173	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM18 Flood Risk and Water Management.	Re instate all suitable sites and remove those that are not suitable under Government guidelines..Goodwood/North land is suitable under Government guidelines.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2174	Object to AL6 due to conflict with DM13 Built Tourist and Leisure Development.	Rethink and promote our jewels instead of wilfully destroying them	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2177	Object to AL6 due to conflict with S26 Natural Environment.	Complete removal of development along areas that border Chichester harbour.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2178	Object to AL6 due to conflict with S24 Countryside.	Remove AL6 from the local plan and instate suitable land near Goodwood that has suspiciously been removed.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2179	Object to AL6 due to conflict with S23 Transport and Accessibility.	Remove AL6 and idea of ineffectual junction upgrades. Work for the good of local traffic who should have priority in any scheme.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2180	Object to AL6 due to conflict with S22 Historic Environment.	AL6 needs to be removed.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2181	Object to AL6 due to conflict with S8 Meeting Employment Land Needs.	REMOVE AL6 no data and incredibly damaging to the environment. Unless AL6 is adequately addressed in future iterations of this plan I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2184	Comments on AL6 link road relate to: - Increased traffic a barrier for tourism - No easy access to the rail networks, employment, secondary schools and higher education. - No secondary school in this area - Local schools at capacity - Medical centre at capacity - Lack of employment		Comment	Erica Bryant [7270]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2193	AL 6 is wholly inappropriate for development for the following reasons: -unacceptable harm to the AONB and loss of view from harbour to cathedral -increased light pollution and noise pollution, waste water issues and habitat risk. -is a flood plain and is therefore totally unsuitable for residential property. -loss of green buffer between Chichester and Manhood Peninsular - un-necessary link road which simply moves pollution - harm to Salterns Way as a leisure route for cyclists/pedestrians		Object	Debbie Leonard [7215]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2214	At this stage we do not support the inclusion of this site within the Plan: - need further evidence to support allocation e.g. SFRA Part 2 - understanding of risk of link road flooding - policy does not ref flood risk - need to be amended - consider how proposals could be delivered & identify mitigation measures - all housing devt within Flood Zone 1 - issues of watercourses & impacts on biodiversity/water quality - concerns over wastewater		Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2238	Object to AL6 due to conflict with Policy S27 Flood Risk Management. The land is part of an Active floodplain of the Lavant and in wet winters there is flooding. Rising sea levels are likely to mean a higher water table and increased risk of flooding in Apuldram Lane South which already floods in winter. Concreting over 35ha of land will seriously reduce the ability of the floodplain to sponge up excess water and a raised linkroad will act like a dam, increasing the risk of flooding in neighbouring estates, the proposed 33ha industrial estate, 100+ houses or the A27!	Remove Policy AL6. Instead of concreting over 35ha of floodplain land the Local Plan should be looking at ways of improving the flood management (a system of ponds and ditches?) on AL6 land (by working with CHC, EA etc) to mitigate the increased flood risk to Apuldram from rising sea levels/ rising water table.	Object	Mr Andrew Thrasher [7123]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2241	<p>Object to AL6 due to conflict with Policy S26 Natural Environment.</p> <p>This is a rich biodiverse area for wildlife, I've seen many species here that I've not seen elsewhere in Apuldram. It is good habitat for water voles, the Lavant flows all year and there is little human disturbance. The wildlife areas and ditch systems provide supporting habitat for Chichester Harbour AONB and should not be built on. Most of the rest of AL6 is intensively farmed productive farmland which should be kept in production and not built on and lost forever</p>	Remove Policy AL6. CDC should create a 100m wildlife corridor around the Lavant and help support and protect all the wildlife areas. It is unclear how much of AL6 was visited by the Habitat Regulation Assessment and so an Independent Habitat and Wildlife Survey is needed to inform future plans.	Object	Mr Andrew Thrasher [7123]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2267	<p>Elevation of Birdham/Fishbourne road across flood plain takes pollution to bedroom window level. HE accept it would be upgraded to dual carriageway. Traffic tailbacks in holiday season caused by speed of access to coastal car parks not road infrastructure. Tailbacks will still occur obstructing access to business units on AL6. First stage of new southern by-pass by deceit. Major risk of obstruction to water vole and other wildlife corridors between Fishbourne meadow, Lavant, pond and ditches on AL6.</p>	<p>REMOVE: proposed Birdham/Fishbourne Road</p> <p>Do not prevent right turns from Hunston and Donnington onto A27</p> <p>Work with Highways England to find a solution that will separate through and local traffic.</p> <p>AMEND: Plan to show what development opportunities the option of a northern ring road would permit if that were to happen.</p>	Object	Mr and Mrs A Martin [5053]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2268	<p>According to our records, the site Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes) contains no designated heritage assets. We therefore have no comment on the principle of the allocation, although we would expect its potential for non-designated archaeology to have been assessed, with reference to the Council's Historic Environment Record, in accordance with paragraph 187.</p> <p>Historic England welcomes and supports clause 3.</p> <p>This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any planning application that may be submitted for the development of this site.</p>		Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2288	<p>S28. "The Council will seek to ensure that development protects, and where possible, improves upon the amenities of existing and future residents, occupiers of buildings and the environment in general. Where development is likely to generate significant adverse impacts by reason of pollution, the Council will require that the impacts are minimised and/or mitigated to an acceptable level."</p> <p>I cannot see any of these features improving when AL6 / S23 is considered.</p>	<p>Remove AL6.</p> <p>Seek proper funding for a viable alternative to current A27 options.</p>	Object	Penny Kirk [6567]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2293	<p>Object to Apuldram and Donnington allocation on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DEFRA have classified this area as one of the best food production soil. - The area is subject to flooding on a regular basis. - Will upset the natural ecosystem and wildlife including rare species of plants within and surrounding the Chichester AONB. - Overpressurised road usage on and off the Witterings Peninsula, and, especially at the A27 Fishbourne roundabout. - Inadequate public transport - Unsafe to walk to and from Chichester especially with lack of walkways under or over the A27 		Object	Mr Gordon Read [7272]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2306	<p>Policy AL6 'South West Chichester' is crossed by a large diameter main that will have to be reflected in the road layout or diverted. The proposed link road may offer an alternative route for the main.</p>		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2321	<p>Object to AL6 due to conflict with Policy S27 Flood Risk Management.</p> <p>The proposed plan to build a link road in Apuldram/Stockbridge to service employment and residential use is contrary to the council statement related to risk of flooding especially as this area is on flood plain level 3.</p> <p>Housing and Employment would be better placed around Lavant and West Broyle land outside of the SDNP as (a) CDC are absorbing housing from the SDNP (b) siting affordable housing in this area, close to where it is needed, would be more sensible and would be in line with strategic objectives.</p>	Allocate land on the Southern fringes of the SDNP for affordable housing to support the village communities resident in the SDNP. Makes no sense to build as far from the SDNP as possible. The same comment applies to the nonsense of not building employment/housing in the area SW of Goodwood. Both of these areas enjoy less risk of flooding. I and a number of others would wish to raise this with the Government Inspector if not adopted.	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2331	S24. The proposed new link road from the Fishbourne roundabout tA27 to the A286 Birdham Road will have a very detrimental effect on the countryside of Apuldram, the surrounding river meadows, the medium distant view to Chichester and the long distant view to the South Downs. The planned road would have to be elevated to cross the area to mitigate the flood risk making it even more visible with traffic.	For the proposed employment area in the south-west quadrant provide another access route.	Object	Mr Timothy Firmston [6945]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2334	<p>Local sewerage infrastructure in closest proximity to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development.</p> <p>Proposals for 100 dwellings at this site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network. Southern Water will need to work with site promoters.</p> <p>Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>Concerned over proximity to WWTW - essential operations may impact upon on the amenity of the site's future occupants - ensure layout is informed by odour assessment.</p> <p>Require easement of 6m+ on site around existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following additions to Policy AL6:</p> <p>Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.</p> <p>The development layout must provide sufficient distance between Apuldram Wastewater Treatment Works and sensitive land uses, such as residential units, to allow adequate odour dispersion, on the basis of an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with Southern Water.</p> <p>Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</p>	Object	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2360	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Pan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2374	<p>AL6 is situated immediately adjacent to the Chichester Harbour AONB.</p> <p>This site should be moved to the east of the city, where there are already substantial commercial developments.</p> <p>This disregard for the Chichester Harbour AONB is further evidenced by the proposal to build a link road between the Fishbourne Roundabout and the A286. This road will be within 300 metres of the AONB and will be elevated because of the low lying ground which it crosses.</p>	The A27 must be improved prior to any major development taking place.	Object	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2375	DM18. The Council needs to remove from the Local Plan any development on areas such as AL6 which are identified by the Environment Agency as a floodplain and are untested for their suitability for development.		Object	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2376	DM3. Landscape buffers are used a justification for not putting forward suitable development sites to the north and east of Chichester. Why is there no suggestion of landscape buffers to the sites to the south and southwest? The untested AL6 is not given the same protection so there would be no buffer between Chichester and the AONB. It would be further damaged by a raised road.		Object	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2377	S27. Proposed development in SW Chichester should be avoided as it is in a flood plain.		Object	Mrs Clare Gordon-Pullar [7010]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2416	Policy AL6 (Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)) should address the important opportunity to secure a safe off-road connection between the Centurion Way and Salterns Way as the two flagship and largely safe off-road multi-user trails linking Chichester with (respectively) SDNP and Chichester Harbour AONB. We would welcome the opportunity for further dialogue and joint working on this matter with CDC.		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2478	Object to proposals for AL6 on grounds of: - link road - views/landscape impact - impact on environment		Object	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2556	Object: impact on buffer between AONB and Fishbourne Channel impact on landscape views impact of proposed link road - pollution and visual, landscape character, pollution Do not believe Southern Water have demonstrated sufficient capacity at Apuldram WWTW to accommodate devt.	We urge that this allocation site is removed from the Local Plan.	Object	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2570	Object to AL6: - conflicts with DM19 - impact on traffic - impact on AONB - impact of link road - views of cathedral - flood risk	Relocate site to east of city or Goodwood	Object	Birdham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [969]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2574	Concerns over: - link road and traffic congestion - flood risk - agricultural land - contradicts DM28 - impact on AONB and SDNP - bird grazing area	Consider AL4 for commercial development - particularly use of CPO to acquire site	Comment	Earnley Parish Council (Mrs Louise Chater) [16]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2635	- Site not suitable for employment. This should be located at site south of Goodwood. - Site better suited to a park and ride. - Link road rejected by previous consultation. - Wastewater impact on Apuldram WWTW. - Testing has not been conducted - Unable to provide proposed usage - No concrete proposal, just suggestion of need for link road - No mention of view of cathedral and SDNP - No mention of level 3 floodplain - No mention of impact to river Lavant and biodiversity See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2770	<p>SWT objects to this allocation as no evidence is provided to demonstrate the development, in particular the new road, can be achieved without significant harm to the environment e.g. Lavant Marsh LWS and chalk stream that runs through the site. site falls within Impact Risk Zone for the Chichester Harbour SSSI.</p> <p>In the absence of adequate survey data to assess the impact of this proposal on biodiversity and demonstrate that measurable net gains to biodiversity are achievable the site should not be allocated. Unacceptable for the provision of this crucial environmental information to be left until planning application stage.</p>	<p>Whilst maintaining our objection. If the allocation were to go further, we recommend the following amendments as a minimum:</p> <p>'Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes) Approximately 85 hectares of land is allocated at land south-west of Chichester, as defined on the policies map, for an employment-led development to include approximately 33 hectares of employment land (suitable for B1b/B1c/B2 and B8 uses) and a minimum of 100 dwellings along with a new link road connecting the A27/A259 Fishbourne roundabout and A286 Birdham Road.</p> <p>Provision will also be made for sustainable transport facilities (if required) and a neighbourhood centre / community hub (incorporating local shops and flexible space for employment/small-scale leisure use). Publicly accessible local and strategic open space and green infrastructure, to include a managed country park and measurable net gains to biodiversity, will also be provided.</p> <p>Development proposals will need to address the following site-specific requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be provided as a high quality form of development planned as a sustainable urban extension of Chichester City, that is well integrated with neighbourhoods on the southern side of the city, providing good access to the city centre and key facilities; 2. Development of the site should be phased so that the green infrastructure, link road and a significant element of the employment provision are delivered at an early stage of development; 3. Protect existing views of Chichester Cathedral spire and the setting of the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which should be analysed at an early stage of the masterplan; 4. Necessary highway improvements to adequately mitigate the likely impacts on the highway network; 5. Make provision for regular bus services linking the site with Chichester City centre, and new and improved cycle and pedestrian routes linking the site with the city, Stockbridge, Fishbourne and settlements to the south; 6. Provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the adjacent SPA, SAC, SSSI and Ramsar at Chichester Harbour, the River Lavant Marsh LWS and on-site priority habitats by avoiding recreational disturbance and other adverse effects; and 7. Provision of on-site public open space and play areas; <p>Proposals will need to demonstrate that sufficient capacity will be available within the sewer network, including waste water treatment works, to accommodate the proposed development.</p> <p>Development proposals should address the provisions of the West Sussex Minerals Plan, and associated guidance, in relation to the site being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area.'</p>	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2776	Objection on grounds that: extensive areas of Greenfield have been sacrificed for development; no acknowledgment of potential severe adverse impact on Salterns Way or wildlife corridor west of Chichester; development on the other side of roads cannot be characterised as an extension to the city; cavalier attitude to rural setting - rural areas should be preserved; Link road may not prove necessary; bus services at discretion of developer are not a long-term traffic mitigation measure.	6.44 Change "only one public right of way" to "only one continuous and safe right of way". After "alongside the Chichester canal" insert "There are also a number of historic footpaths which were severed by the construction of the A27 bypass. These footpaths have potential to once again act as important green infrastructure routes, if the short severed sections are reconnected. Such reconnection could potentially take place, with least disruption, if undertaken during other proposed roadworks on A27." Policy para 1: Insert at end of first paragraph: "It is recognised that this road would be damaging to wildlife habitats and quiet recreation, and the council will keep a watching brief for the emergence of proposals that make it unnecessary (with particular reference to the recently launched search for alternative proposals by WSCC)." Paragraph 2 - Delete "if required". Requirement 1: Delete "good access to the city centre". Requirement 5: Replace "highway improvements" with "necessary mitigation measures".	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2909	Policy AL6; 4th bullet: a minimum of 100 houses on a disputed link road, followed by a glib statement about improving the highway. The latter should be the pre-condition for the former.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	2923	This major development is directly adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and it is inevitable that it will have both a direct and indirect negative impact on this protected landscape. Add considerably to the negative impact through air, soil and light pollution. Falls within the SSSI impact zone. Construction planned on a flood plain. Proper consultation has not taken place with the Harbour Conservancy on this proposal. No evidence is presented of an environmental audit of this area adjacent to the AONB. we fully endorse all the objections and comments submitted by the Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Remove this allocation from the Plan	Object	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3087	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Major development on the fringe of the AONB. * Loss of the buffer zone outside the AONB. * Breach of current and emerging AONB Management Plan * SSSI Interest Impact Risk Zone, which affects the SAC, SPA and Ramsar designations. * Wildlife * Flooding * Chichester views * Highest quality agricultural land * Urbanisation * Light, air, noise, and soil pollution. * Wastewater * Mitigation by public open space not necessary since AONB is a nationally important landscape already designated for the nation to enjoy. * Increased RTAs * Lack of support for link road <p>Object to link road</p>	<p>The Conservancy objects the inclusion of this site and it should be removed from the Local Plan.</p> <p>Please note that the Conservancy may support moving the allocation of dwellings to a 'settlement hub', which would potentially not be as sensitive to development as Apuldram and Donnington Parishes.</p>	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3131	Support the development provided no built development takes places to the west of the proposed link road.	The map should identify the actual development location and line of the link road.	Comment	Mr John Templeton [7371]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3145	Whilst further work to be done on site, the deliverability has yet to be established. Ste does not fulfil RR's requirement for expansion		Comment	Rolls-Royce Motor Cars Limited [1784]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3160	- Development will destroy the traditional agricultural nature of SW approach to city - Employment land should be located within Goodwood buffer zone - Object to link road due to elevation needed and air light and noise pollution - Destruction of priority views - Damage to AONB - Lack of infrastructure - schools	Remove Policy AL6	Object	Mr John Ridd [7376]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3168	This area, with its flooding potential, and proximity to Chichester Harbour, should not be developed further. 100 new dwellings are not sustainable, a new link road will generate more traffic close to a sensitive area and make it harder to refuse future development plans when the area is served by the 'new road'. The area is now fairly inaccessible and should be left as an important link in the North-South wildlife corridor, rather than opened up to dog walkers etc. Keep the inaccessible area as it is.		Object	Mr Alan Carn [5417]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3183	Objections on grounds that link road not wanted by residents; road and housing will take away valuable agricultural land and lead to further congestion; direct links between new development and the city centre/bus and rail transport hub need to be provided. Walkers and cyclists need to travel most direct route; bridges should have slopes as well as stairs; it is not possible to mitigate the destruction of wildlife.	Change second paragraph of policy to: "Provision will also be made for sustainable transport facilities. A crossing of the A27 will be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to reinstate the footpath severed by A27." Policy Point 2. change to "Development of the site should be phased so that cycling and walking provision and the link road..."	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3247	Support principle however there is opportunity for infrastructure requirements to be delivered without reliance on other sites/infrastructure funds if greater proportion of housing is delivered on site. Site is suitable to accommodate a strategic employment site.	Increase housing figure on site. Incorporate policy objective to release city centre sites from uses that could be accommodated on this edge of the city to deliver wider place-making objective.	Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3343	Not enough evidence to demonstrate the suitability/deliverability of the site. The site also scored poorly in the SA		Object	CEG [7397]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3460	Use buffer zone at Goodwood for industrial development	Use buffer zone at Goodwood for industrial development	Object	A + D Lygo-Baker [7425]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3526	Concerns about AL6. The link road site is at risk of both tidal and fluvial flooding on ground which already has a high-water table and no consideration is given to rising sea level associated with climate change. This site should be rejected and replaced by AL4, which is in the current Local Plan, even if this requires compulsory purchase powers to acquire it.	This site should be rejected and replaced by AL4, which is in the current Local Plan, even if this requires compulsory purchase powers to acquire it.	Object	West Wittering Parish Council (Mrs Susan Hawker) [6669]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3536	Proposed plans for the A27 and AL6 will further deteriorate Air Quality. Stockbridge already EXCEEDS the recommended air quality levels.		Object	Penny Kirk [6567]
84	Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)	3545	Object to the provision of a commercial development site and raised link road near Apuldram/Donnington as this area contains some of the most important cathedral views in the district from the harbour, marina, Salterns Way, and A286- views enjoyed by many visitors and residents. Also site is on flood plain and adjacent to internationally important habitat areas. This development would be better sited in the noise buffer zone to the south/west of the motor racing circuit		Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
85	Bosham	251	This site adjoins NCN 2 which is currently along the A259. The policy should require the site funding 'safe and segregated' cycle provision along the A259 both bordering the site and adjoining the site boundaries.	Add policy requirement of Safe and Segregated Cycle Provision for implementing NCN2 and funding of.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
85	Bosham	272	As per earlier comments, the Highgrove development was the least favoured option by the Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan	Remove reference to Highgove in favour of 60 dwellings on brownsites (previously identified in the Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan).	Object	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
85	Bosham	402	Keep the strategic gap between Fishbourne and Bosham . Respect nature , the South Downs and the views of residents . Build where the residents want . Do not build mass development which cannot be supported by the proposed infrastructure and threatens the identity of the village . A planning permission for 50 houses is being diverted into a scheme to build more than 300 . This is disingenuous and shows blatant disregard for the views of residents .	Build on plots that have been identified by the Village in their submission to the Local Plan . Consult with village residents , do not simply dictate to them	Object	Mr James Roundell [6803]
85	Bosham	417	Develop the land between Walton and Delling Lanes instead of extending the Highgrove Farm site: 1. devoid of scenic value, and invisible to any significant part of the Harbour 2. valuable in the development of Bosham village as one coherent community 3. avoid further coalescence along the A259 4. approval of hospice development already opened the area to development 5. some small pockets of "brown field" land in the area 6. school and playing facilities would be in the centre of the village 7. Shopping, transport and medical facilities are marginally better 8. proposal would offer opportunities for sheltered housing	Remove the extension of the Highgrove Farm site, and authorise the development between Walton and Delling Lanes on particular grounds	Object	Mr Jeremy Grindle [6812]
85	Bosham	706	1-The loss to the eco-systems and wild life corridors. 2-The loss of agricultural land. 3-The loss of farmland means loss of flood plain. Additional drainage /sewerage that would be generated. 4- Severe danger that if developments continue the north side of the A259 will be a continuous urban 'sprawl' from Emsworth to Chichester. 5-Substantial increases in housing results in additional traffic congestion a further degradation to air quality	For the reasons set out above my strong view is that the Highgrove housing development should be limited to 50 houses.	Object	Mr David Macfarlane [5817]
85	Bosham	820	No mention of how the extra traffic burden from 250 dwellings onto A259/A27 is to be mitigated. School is already over subscribed. Mention of railway station..not good link only 1 train an hour into Chichester and back and service is constantly under threat having already been cut in the last timetable reorganisation. Why specifically highlight older people's housing in an outlying areas. Not a great idea when services are limited. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, i will raise it with the examiner at the appropriate time	A259/A27 issue needs to be successfully addressed in future iterations.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
85	Bosham	1650	We agree that Bosham is capable of accommodating further sustainable growth to enhance its role. However, we feel that the extent of growth which is necessary to secure a step-change improvement in Bosham's performance as a Service Village is unlikely to be achieved through the draft AL7 allocation. Significant infrastructure is necessary both by consequence of the proposal and to remedy existing deficiencies. The Council should give detailed consideration to opportunities for more substantial growth to meet Longer Term Growth Requirements and the critical mass of infrastructure which is needed. Land north of the railway line provides an ideal opportunity.	In the event that draft allocation AL7 is unable to deliver the full extent of infrastructure sought, the Council should give strong consideration to a larger and more strategic parcel north of the railway line that can meet all infrastructural requirements.	Object	Heaver Homes Ltd [7183]
85	Bosham	1658	Bosham is in the AONB a historic village with its own identity. Between Chichester and Emsworth there is a sense of place reflected in separate villages which provides the context to this area..Taking into consideration policies A6, A7,9,10 and 13, there is encroaching development along the A259 causing coalescence. between the villages. other points for consideration flooding and the adequate provision for sewerage. There is no provision for green lungs to offset the coalescence and replace wild life habit which will be eroded.	Reduce housing allocation to 50 homes. Introduce clearly identified green space/lungs.	Object	Ms Louise Goldsmith [5667]
85	Bosham	1795	6.50 to 6.56 Policy AL7 This is a sensitive site close to the harbour and exposed. Any development must be supported by planting and screening. If this site is developed we support the relocating of the school with sufficient parking. Any development must include cycle routes and recreational space. We also recommend a new cricket pitch. Out of choice we would not develop this site.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
85	Bosham	2510	No preamble text about maintaining separate identity of Bosham	It is recommended that a new bullet point be added to paragraph 5.56 which states: " Protecting the separate distinct identity of Bosham in relationship to surrounding settlements, including Fishbourne;"	Object	Bosham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [749]
85	Bosham	3185	In order to facilitate safe cycling and walking a continuous, direct, safe and comfortable path must be provided, protected from the traffic; traffic speeds should be reduced to 30mph; route must not be delivered in bits as people need a safe route all the way to their destination; there should be links off the route linking the communities.		Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	29	The imposition in the CLP of the Highgrove development on Bosham shows a total disregard for local democracy and the Neighbourhood Plan has been ignored. Consultation with the village showed that Highgrove was the least favoured of 12 options. This shows a disregard for the recently defined Strategic Countryside Gap policy. The site is known to be liable to rainwater flooding. The large increase in the foul water burden on a system that already regularly discharges untreated sewage into Bosham Creek would be a totally unacceptable health risk without a major increase in capacity before any building takes place.	Fundamental reappraisal of the justification and details of the Highgrove proposal	Object	Mr Douglas McGregor [6549]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	37	Forget Highgrove Farm; Look again at using land adjacent to the new Hospice to create a new centre for the village.	A policy rethink.	Object	Mrs Rosemary Grindle [6577]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	47	The development at Highgrove Farm, Bosham where 250 homes are planned will also reduce the strategic gap between Bosham and Fishbourne and impact upon the A259.		Object	Mr Andrew Relf [6566]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	71	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal fundamentally flawed; 2. 250 dwellings an arbitrary number; 3. Does Bosham need 250 more houses; 4. Site incapable of holding 250 houses/school/open spaces/play/community areas/adequate on-site parking; 5. No 30% affordable housing condition; 6. Does the school want to move? 7. Traffic movements on A259 will become dangerous; 8. S106 funding insufficient; 9. Site floods: high risk of Bosham flooding increases; 10. Sewage system at capacity; 11. CDC under-resourced 12. CDC did not support Bosham before 13. Why not this time work with the village; 14. Build on sites the village wants 	Please read my above comments	Object	Mr Barry Colgate [5380]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	77	The plan states the intention to build a MINIMUM of 250 dwellings. We object to the term 'minimum'. The use of the word 'minimum' implies the actual number of dwellings built could be much higher than 250, and we are not given any information regarding what the maximum number of dwellings might be. This is unacceptable.	The plan should be revised to state 'a MAXIMUM of 250 dwellings'.	Object	Mr Robin Axford [6574]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	89	The allocation of an additional 250 homes plus space for a two-form entry primary school is not justified on the basis of up-to-date evidence in terms of landscape, drainage, sewerage, loss of eco-systems (wild-life corridors), views, setting of NP and AONB, car-dependency of school and loss of distinctiveness of settlements of Fishbourne and Bosham.	Reduce the allocation to 50 additional homes only.	Object	Mr Dick Pratt [6576]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	213	<p>Object, having following general concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no road improvement strategy and additional development will increase traffic - no funding for health concerns re Highgrove: - flooding - no funding from council for school and where is evidence school is needed? - if school relocated, site would go to housing - housing overpriced 		Object	karen phillips [6604]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	261	<p>The five-fold increase in homes allocated to the Highgrove site (from 50 to 250) does not take any account of the view of the local community as expressed in the Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Of 11 options considered in the plan, the last three (Highgrove 50 dwellings, 100 dwellings and 250 dwellings) we the least favoured.</p> <p>This is is far too large a development to be accomodated here.</p>	Delete reference to Highgrove, and revert to use of brownfield sites (which can provide 60 dwellings) as identified in the original Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan.	Object	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	289	If more housing is needed I fully support the proposals for Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham. The most important thing is to avoid any new development on green field sites within the AONB in order to preserve the iconic nature of the village of Bosham, as far as possible. It is essential that provision is made for a two-form entry primary school.		Support	Mr Brian Walton [5763]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	397	Even considering the building of 250 homes within this AONB would be an unmitigated disaster, totally ruining the landscape and overwhelming the infrastructure of this already vulnerable village. My home has already flooded twice and sewage has emerged from a manhole immediately outside my home. The services in this area simply cannot cope with this scale of urbanisation. Any development on Highgrove Farm should be limited to a maximum of 50 dwellings. Bosham is a village of character and historic importance to be protected and nurtured. Far more appropriate sites are available and the over-development of Highgrove Farm is unacceptable.	Limit development to 50 homes and guarantee adequate sewage provision under all conditions.	Object	Mr Mark Jarrad [6799]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	398	The land is grade one/two agricultural. There is no waste water management plan (drainage, sewerage) There are real fears that building will significantly increase flooding (on and offsite) due to the high water table. There would be considerable loss to eco-systems and wild life corridors, resulting in habitat fragmentation. There is no thought as to how to satisfactorily relieve present traffic issues, never mind future congestion and resultant diminution of air quality.	Keep to 50 house , which is already too many.	Object	Mr richard barnes [6801]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	399	The land is grade one/two agricultural. There is no waste water management plan (drainage, sewerage) There are real fears that building will significantly increase flooding (on and offsite) due to the high water table. There would be considerable loss to eco-systems and wild life corridors, resulting in habitat fragmentation. There is no evidence (in the Document) to justify the proposed two form entry (420 number) primary school There is no thought as to how to satisfactorily relieve present traffic issues, never mind future congestion and resultant diminution of air quality.	All the above need to be addressed in consultation with village representatives.	Object	Ms Judy Roberts [6802]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	403	Do not build 300 houses on agricultural land that preserves the gap between Fishbourne and Bosham . The proposed infrastructure cannot support this development and the services are inadequate	Rethink this development to sVavour unique countryside	Object	Mr James Roundell [6803]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	404	I believe that this land needs to stay as agricultural because: The land is grade one/two agricultural. There is no waste water management plan (drainage, sewerage) There are real fears that building will significantly increase flooding (on and offsite) due to the high water table. There would be considerable loss to eco-systems and wild life corridors. It would lose the distinctiveness of the settlements of Fishbourne and Bosham There is no thought as to how to satisfactorily relieve present traffic issues, never mind future congestion and resultant diminution of air quality.	The change of use of land should not be permitted.	Object	Mrs Mags Duncan-Duggal [6806]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	405	The land is grade one/two agricultural. No waste water management plan Fears that building will significantly increase flooding (on and offsite) given high water table. Clear loss to eco-systems and wild life corridors, resulting in habitat fragmentation. Dammage the setting of the National Park, & AONB generally Wreck the distinctiveness of Fishbourne and Bosham Zero evidence (in the Document) to justify the proposed two form entry primary school Zero thought how to relieve present traffic, never mind future congestion and worse air quality. Development uses the beauty of the area and destroys it by same token.	Think of something more creative than more houses more development. How about a museum, a public facility for young & old to learn about the AONB or enrich people's lives.	Object	Mr Franck R. M. Petitgas [6805]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	412	The land is Grade One agricultural land and should be used for food growing. The field is totally waterlogged most winters and will be difficult to drain as it is so flat. There is no reason to suppose that Southern Water will be able to deal with the sewage from the 50 houses which were given planning permission in December let alone the additional 200 now suggested. There is a serious danger of Bosham joining up with Fishbourne (large number of houses suggested there) to form 'Emschester East'. The A259 cannot possibly cope with the additional traffic.	The development should be limited to the 50 houses already planned and the access should be carefully considered. At present the access road opens on to a bend opposite a busy bus stop.	Object	Mrs Rosalind Bowen [5844]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	414	Highgrove is a totally inappropriate site for an additional 250 dwellings on top of the 50 already approved. There are many reasons for this: - there is no waste water management plan and not enough capacity - the high water table could lead to additional flooding - it would severely damage the setting of the National Park, the AONB generally and there would be considerable loss to eco-systems and wild life corridors, resulting in habitat fragmentation. - the distinctiveness of the settlements of Fishbourne and Bosham would be lost	Take Highgrove off as a potential site. Consider multiple smaller sites. This is preferred by residents but of course not by developers.	Object	Mr Mark Stanton [6813]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	439	I object to the further loss of agricultural use for this land, for the following reasons: 1. Waste Water Management still hasn't been addressed. 2. Future flooding once the field has been 'paved over', and the loss of valuable existing eco-systems have not been adequately addressed. 3. 300 houses on this site will put huge extra strain on local facilities - namely roads, health services, shops, schools etc... 4. A further 300 houses on this site is too many. It is vital that full consideration is given to all the issues in paragraph 6.56 before a decision is made.		Object	Mrs Fiona MacFarlane [5860]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	532	Object to allocation on following grounds: - poor infrastructure - pressure on sewage system - flooding - pollution - destruction of areas of beauty and wildlife habitat - concerns about relocating school - crossing A259 and possibility of original school site going to housing		Object	Donna Thomas [6843]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	599	I don't agree with change of use from Agricultural land; there is no waste water management plan and the local capacity is already stretched; increased danger of flooding due to already high water table (climate change too); loss to eco-systems & wildlife corridors; threat to setting of AONB and National Park; unwanted merging of adjacent villages & loss of open spaces inbetween; no justification for new primary school; no plan to cope with increased traffic on already congested road especially at junctions with A27 in Chichester & Emsworth.	Retract this proposal.	Object	Mrs Joanna Long [6871]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	601	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of grade one/two agricultural land. BREXIT? 2. No drainage/sewerage management plan. 3. It is inevitable that building on a flood plain will significantly increase flooding (on and offsite). 4. There would be considerable loss to eco-systems and wild life corridors, resulting in habitat fragmentation. 5. It would lose the strategic gap between the settlements of Fishbourne and Bosham. 6. Where is the evidence (in the Document) to justify the proposed two form entry primary school. 7. There would be significant increase in traffic and air pollution and no sustainability plan on an already overloaded system. 	Refuse the application to maintain agricultural land, the strategic gap between Bosham and Fishbourne, and prevent further increase in traffic and air pollution.	Object	Mr Richard Brodie [6872]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	746	<p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how to maintain inclusive feel - lack of provision of cycle/walking links to village - reliance on traffic - no cohesive approach to development - why not a site closer to the village - no development until Chichester bypass is resolved - something should be done to ensure the development gives back to community e.g. wildlife, village pond, play park, hedgehog friendly gardens - sewage issues - flooding issues 		Comment	Mr Jon Till [5843]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	780	<p>The proposition offers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The disappearance of defined communities and bland ribbon development. 2. Sewerage overload. 3. Flooding threat. 4. Traffic congestion 5. Environmental damage. 	<p>Fewer houses</p> <p>Provision to address these problems, which if acceptable should be legally enforced.</p>	Object	MR Nicholas Downey [6937]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	822	No mitigation addressed for the increased transport issues on the A27/A259 that a minimum of 250 dwellings would bring. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan , I will raise this with the inspector at the appropriate time.	A27/A259 increased traffic issue must be specifically addressed in the plan.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	833	This land is at or below the 5 meter contour and therefore at risk from effects of sea level rises as a consequence of global climate change. It is therefore unsuitable for development as housing and schools	Alternative development sites should be found on higher land	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	891	<p>Object to any increased housing over and above the current approval of 50 houses on the Highgrove site.</p> <p>The approved allocation of 50 houses was taken in spite of the full knowledge of the objections from the residents of Bosham. These objections still stand - The A259 cannot cope at the moment let alone the A27 which has no sensible solution to the horrendous traffic jams around Chichester. The increase of an additional 250 houses at Highgrove will without doubt produce an urban extension of suburban Chichester leading westward to Havant and Portsmouth.</p>	No more building between the existing villages I.e. Fishbourne, Bosham and Emsworth. Find alternative sites where existing rural character is not destroyed.	Object	Mrs Pamela Sweet [6959]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	895	Objecting to the use of this land for housing because: 1. loss of agricultural land that could be used to supply locally grown food 2. Coalescence of Bosham into Fishbourne and loss of distinction between the two 2. Danger of increased flooding due to existing high water table and drainage issues in the surrounding area 3. Environmental impacts, on wildlife, and the large increase of traffic on A259 and local roads 4. Impact on the AONB and the setting of the National Park, both the views towards and from it. 5. Lack of suitable local infrastructure	Study and review of brownfield sites throughout the CDC area to prioritise those. Provision of flats for all generations. Concentrate building in hubs with good local support and public transport.	Object	Mrs Emma Rayner [6846]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	931	Object on the following grounds: - Against the wishes of Bosham - Brownfield sites should be considered before greenfields, other sites should be considered. - Loss of strategic gap. - Number of houses unsuitable for a rural village, - Unsuitable site for new homes.		Object	Mr Christopher Blighton-Sande [6974]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	968	Concerns regarding the acknowledged high water table. 2 studies are required as a matter of urgency: 1. Surface Run Off resulting from over-saturated high water table with a view to provision of static pumps. 2. Hydraulics Calculations for carrying the effluent / grey water from 300 houses with recommendation for a potential solution with headline costs taking into account the current capability centered around Hart's Farm Sewage Farm.	2 studies are required as a matter of urgency: 1. Surface Run Off resulting from over-saturated high water table with a view to provision of static pumps. 2. Hydraulics Calculations for carrying the effluent / grey water from 300 houses with recommendation for a potential solution with headline costs taking into account the current capability centered around the Hart's Farm Sewage Farm.	Object	Mr Mike Brooke [6985]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	984	Object to allocation on grounds of: - state of roads - traffic and congestion		Object	Mrs Diana Chute [6998]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1052	Bosham Football Club would welcome being relocated to this area and once the facilities are phased in and provided by 106 and other agencies to include with other public bodies to provide first class recreational facilities and buildings to the benefit of the community and the club. Not a single use facility but can reach out to many uses of all ages. It will also welcome being part of a working group to identify a key site along with the Parish Council, District Council and agencies.	Approxc 13 hectares is allocated from this policy for dwellings. 3.40 hectares of amenity and recreational space should be allocated, 0.15 hectares for youth facilities and up to two form entry primary school. Provision of open space, recreational play areas and community facilities to meet the parish deficit as well as that resulting from the new development itself. Funding through CIL and section 106 agreements should be established in the masterplan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Object	Bosham Football Club (Mr Neil Redman) [748]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1143	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1207	Highgrove does not pass the Sustainability Appraisal test. Loss of grade 1/2 agricultural land. Surface water flooding - Site has very high water table and there is a danger of flooding downstream. Foul Water - Danger of foul water flooding due to poor maintenance of infrastructure. With so many more houses with small gardens more Open Space is required, not less.		Object	Mrs Gail Powell [6365]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1269	We would go along with the proposals for Highgrove if and only if there were legally binding and strongly enforceable conditions for a school on the site, for a community hall (to replace St Nicholas Hall), a good sized recreation area including a children's playground, a doctor's surgery, allotments, and parking spaces for each unit of accommodation. We would also suggest having an architectural competition to produce an interesting mix of property. No work should start until Southern Water have built a system capable of handling the sewerage from the development.		Comment	Mr Stephen Robson [7093]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1291	Object on the basis of: - loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land - SDNP and AONB setting - drainage and sewerage - surface water concerns - ecological buffer zone - coalescence of communities on A259.	There are other areas in the region that could be investigated for development. Try to the north of the railway line.	Object	Mr Peter Newman [7038]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1297	This site is one of the very few remaining between Chichester and Havant on the A259 with unobstructed view of the Downs to the north. Development of this area will accelerate the loss of identity between the Portsmouth and Chichester areas as well as Hampshire and West Sussex. Concerns over sewage disposal and flooding remain for this site as well as exacerbation of traffic access to Chichester	Alternative sites have been identified locally which would have less impact on the character of the village. These options should be re-addressed.	Object	Mr Michael Edwards [7105]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1315	There should be NO development until the drainage/sewerage issues sorted. It is not enough to declare that it is Southern Water's statutory duty There should be NO development until the greater area transport systems are sorted This is the wrong place to put a mass development. The Council's own consultants have pointed out the damage to the historic views of Downs. Harbour and Cathedral.. This document lumps the area From emsworth to Chichester into one suburban sprawl. There is no provision for realistic wild life corridors. There is no evidence base for inclusion of a two form BOSHAM primary school	Look at different and smaller developments within the Parish Ensure actual provision of adequate transport and sewerage infrastructure	Object	Rosellen Mates [6396]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1329	The provision of a suitable entrance from the A259 into the site is of paramount importance, especially in light of the DOG'S BREAKFAST that is currently being constructed at the junction with Walton Lane and the A259, and the fact that it will be on a very dangerous bend in the road!!		Comment	Mr Adrian Harrison [5819]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1334	It is of utmost importance that the sewerage system will be able to cope with the extra demand, as it will be under even more pressure when the new Hospice gets on line!! Also I have still not seen any explanation as to the so called Treatment Plant (which featured in the original proposal) supposedly to be sited adjacent to the drainage ditch and the A259 I am also concerned as to the effect there will be on DRAINAGE of the site, it already becomes waterlogged with any significant rainfall!!		Comment	Mr Adrian Harrison [5819]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1336	This proposal seems to fly in the face of the Council's own policy of maintaining strategic gaps between outlying villages. There is a danger of not only getting to SOLENT CITY, but SOUTHCOAST CITY! if it carries on with the CREEP. Has any consideration been given to the need for road network improvement, which will be sorely needed? Lastly but by no means least, I am concerned at the possibility of LIGHT POLLUTION from the site, as I am a keen amateur astronomer, and that could spoil my observing.		Object	Mr Adrian Harrison [5819]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1397	Issues regarding separation of Fishbourne and Bosham, traffic and congestion, village identity, flooding, drainage, damage to views of South Downs and landscaping design all fail to be adequately addressed. The 'minimum of 250 houses' is a clear representation of the lack of complete thought regarding the true scope of this development.	All above points must be addressed. Site development must have a clear cap on number of houses which is aligned to the associated work and development that will be required to roads, transports, natural spaces, amenities and infrastructure. Flooding and drainage must be addressed. Parity with policy across neighbouring sites must be clear.	Object	Mr Chris Adams [6345]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1425	Object to a number of points in policy AL7 including criterion 3 and 5 para 6.56, drainage, views, ecology, numbers proposed, landscape setting, number of houses proposed, open space.	Rewording of the policy	Object	Mr Nicholas Pyke [5044]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1434	Object to allocation: - traffic - sewage capacity - flooding - loss of wildlife corridor - destruction of historic landscape/views - no evidence for need for school in Broadbridge - traffic congestion - light/noise pollution - loss of protected species		Object	Mr David Broughton [7158]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1439	Only token statements in terms of environmental impact and sustainability. Not safe to get around by bike/foot. I am calling for a serious commitment to sustainable travel around all of these houses being built. If there is a new school north of the A259, families MUST be able to walk and cycle there safely. This requires a cycle path linking Bosham with Broadbridge separate from any road. It also requires a subway under the A259. Must be protected corridors between the harbour and the South Downs. This plan does not go far enough to protect these species for future generations.		Comment	Mr Michael Neville [6617]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1453	Object/concerns on: - loss of strategic gap - sewage capacity - flooding - loss of wildlife corridor - no need for school in Broadbridge - no consideration of other sites		Object	Mr Gary Snook [7161]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1472	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased traffic on local roads which are inadequate for the increase in traffic. 2. Sewage overload 3. Increase risk of local flooding. 4. Closing of the wildlife corridor 5. Destruction of historic landscape and views 6. No evidence of need for a two form entry school on the north edge 7. No consideration of the impact of the A27 plans leading to increased congestion. 8. light pollution 9. Destruction of protected species 10. noise and pollution. 		Object	Mr Joe Broughton [7169]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1473	<p>Object to allocation:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of strategic gap - sewage capacity - floodrisk - loss of wildlife corridor - loss of historic landscape/views - no need for school in Broadbridge - no consideration of other sites 		Object	Karen Ongley-Snook [7151]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1476	<p>Object to allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic - sewage - flooding - loss of wildlife corridor - destruction of landscape/views - no need for school in Broadbridge - pollution - loss of protected species - impact on A27 		Object	Mrs Lynne Broughton [7170]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1485	<p>Object to allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - flooding - traffic - loss of school would be terrible - loss of wildlife - loss of views of Bosham historic village 		Object	Mr & Mrs James and Sandra Fearn [7125]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1528	<p>Natural England is concerned that this allocation scored poorly in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), particularly in relation to waste water treatment, landscape and BMV land.</p> <p>The SA states that Bosham WwTW does not have the capacity to take effluent from the site. Please see Natural England's comments under S31 and regarding the HRA. Clause 9 should be amended to include water quality as well as recreational impacts.</p> <p>A LVIA should inform the site allocation as to whether views from the NP or AONB will be affected, and whether mitigation is possible without harming the open character of the site.</p>		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1647	<p>We agree that there is a requirement for development in Bosham to allow the settlement to perform strongly as a Service Village. The scale of development to secure that step-change in performance and infrastructure (i.e. highway improvements, school and other facilities) to mitigate harm and deliver tangible improvements.</p> <p>Our view is that the Highgrove Farm allocation land will be unable to deliver that critical mass. We suggest that the Council should reconsider and look at land north of the train line for a genuinely strategic opportunity to meet longer term growth requirements and contribution to OAN over the Plan period.</p>	In the event that the proposed allocation at Highgrove Farm cannot deliver necessary infrastructure then alternative and more deliverable sites should be considered.	Object	Heaver Homes Ltd [7183]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1690	Bosham allocation should be split between French Gardens and High Grove and/or Bosham could take up to an additional 150 houses directly adjacent to the Railway station giving more sustainable access to local key employment zones. Two files are included one for 25 houses and one outlining the entire 6ha French Gardens Site.	Allocate part of existing allocation to French Gardens or increase Bosham's entire allocation to take advantage of one of the most sustainable sites in the District.	Object	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1728	<p>I object to AL7 in line with the comments from</p> <p>Chichester Harbour AONB Chichester Harbour Trust CPRE Bosham Parish Council Bosham Residents Association</p>	<p>Changes as suggested by</p> <p>Chichester Harbour AONB Chichester Harbour Trust CPRE Bosham Parish Council Bosham Residents Association</p>	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1750	Makes provision or mention of the A259 access but no mention of where this extra traffic will enter the A27 which will either be Fishbourne roundabout or Havant. This impact the Fishbourne roundabout. My proposal for a separate junction must be considered along the A27. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture.	A proposal for a separate junction must be considered along the A27.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	1796	<p>6.50 to 6.56 Policy AL7</p> <p>This is a sensitive site close to the harbour and exposed. Any development must be supported by planting and screening.</p> <p>If this site is developed we support the relocating of the school with sufficient parking.</p> <p>Any development must include cycle routes and recreational space. We also recommend a new cricket pitch.</p> <p>Out of choice we would not develop this site.</p>		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2087	<p>Minerals and waste:</p> <p>Remove reference to minerals safeguarding as the site is not within the safeguarding or consultation area.</p>	Remove reference to minerals safeguarding as the site is not within the safeguarding or consultation area.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2130	<p>Education:</p> <p>Primary provision is at capacity, expansion of the school on its existing site is not possible. It is proposed that land for a 2FE primary school be provided. Certainty over the land allocation and sufficient funding will be key drivers in realising this proposal. AL7, AL10 and AL13 are within the same school planning area, cumulative total brings forward requirement for c3 forms of entry additional places.</p> <p>As currently drafted, LP indicates oversupply of school places which could affect viability of all schools in the planning area.</p> <p>Expansion of the secondary school may be possible. Contributions would be required.</p>		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2141	<p>Flooding: The LLFA notes that the above site has the potential for a moderate risk of groundwater flooding. It is likely that this is perched groundwater draining from higher ground / springs to the north that lies in the superficial mixed sediments underlain by Lambeth Clay.</p>		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2269	<p>According to our records, the site at Highgrove Farm, Bosham, contains no designated heritage assets. We therefore have no comment on the principle of the allocation, although we would expect its potential for non-designated archaeology to have been assessed, with reference to the Council's Historic Environment Record, in accordance with paragraph 187.</p> <p>This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any planning application that may be submitted for the development of this site.</p>		Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2307	Policy AL7 'Bosham' is situated on the old A27 and there are no large diameter mains in the area.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2335	<p>Sewerage infrastructure closest has limited capacity to accommodate proposed development.</p> <p>Proposals for 250 dwellings at this site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network. Southern Water will need to work with site promoters. Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation.</p>	<p>Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following addition to Policy AL7: Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.</p>	Comment	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2361	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Plan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2405	<p>We consider that the policy wording for the A259 corridor Strategic Site Allocations could be more robust and proactive with regard to conserving and enhancing the National Park. In particular, it could provide more active direction to applicants in order to ensure adverse impacts are minimised locally, and in relation to the National Park. For example, with regard to green infrastructure, each of the A259 Strategic Site Allocation policies (AL7, AL9, AL10 and AL13) include a criteria requiring the provision of green infrastructure.</p> <p>Criterion 5 welcomed but could be reworded to ensure developers consider impact before creating scheme.</p>	<p>Reword GI criteria to 'Identify opportunities are taken for and secure the expansion and provision of multifunctional green infrastructure into the wider countryside and protected landscapes of the South Downs National Park, and Chichester Harbour AONB, including between settlements and facilities.'</p> <p>Criterion 5 welcomed but could be reworded to ensure developers consider impact before creating scheme.</p>	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2509	<p>Object to criterion 5, 3 and need to include new criteria re nature conservation, water quality, provision of off site infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Landscape capacity suggests 250 should be max cap</p> <p>Object to density and number - no evidence to suggest higher figure can be accommodated - minimum should be removed from wording.</p>	<p>Amend criterion 5 to "Detailed consideration of the impact of development on the surrounding landscape, including the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour AONB and their settings. Development should be designed to protect long-distance views to the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour. Provision of landscaping and screening to minimise the impact of development on Bosham, and the setting of the Chichester Harbour AONB and South Downs National Park, including views to and from the wider and surrounding area shall form an integral part of any application;"</p> <p>Amend criterion 3 to: "Provision of primary access from the A259, consideration of an emergency access and pedestrian access to the western side of the site and securing necessary off-site improvements (including highways) to promote sustainable transport options. This would include an appropriately located pedestrian crossing and a footpath link;"</p> <p>Include following criterion: ""Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats;"</p> <p>Include following criterion: "Provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Chichester Harbour as a result of water quality issues relating to runoff into a designated site, and loss of functionally linked supporting habitat;"</p> <p>Include criterion on WWTW - requiring offsite infrastructure improvements to address foul sewage</p> <p>Reword policy to say "up to 250"</p>	Object	Bosham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [749]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2557	<p>We object to the allocation site at Highgrove Farm.</p> <p>This development in the countryside directly conflicts with policy S24 Countryside and Policy S26 the Natural Environment; which clearly states there should be no adverse impact on the openness of views in and around the coast, designated environmental areas (i.e. the AONB) and the setting of the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>We strongly believe that this development would cause irretrievable harm to the landscape character, setting and context of Chichester Harbour AONB and the intervisibility with the South Downs National Park.</p>	<p>We wish to see this proposed allocation site removed from the Local Plan document.</p>	Object	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2606	<p>Object to location of allocation and suggest alternative site at Broadbridge Farm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not organic growth - wrong location to benefit from facilities - intrusion into landscape - interrupt views - new school in poor location for - contrary to findings of Bosham NP - reduce gap between Bosham & Fishbourne 	<p>Consideration to Broadbridge Farm (see attached map) instead of Highgrove Farm</p>	Object	CALA Group Ltd (Mr Paul McCann) [6694]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2661	<p>Makes provision or mention of A259 access but no mention of where this extra traffic will enter the A27.</p> <p>See attached for full detail.</p>		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2706	<p>It is a huge urban extension which distorts the whole layout of the village. It cuts into the strategic gap between Bosham and Fishbourne and severely degrades the open farmland landscape.</p> <p>While we acknowledge that land south of the A259 lies within the AONB, there is land there that is within the existing village which would be much more suitable for housing.</p>		Object	Mr and Mrs C Woodburn [5835]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2714	The proposal to build 250 houses or more would change Bosham from a quiet historic village to a small town it would remove agricultural land, a habitat for wildlife, destroy views of the Downs and cause huge increase in traffic and noise. The Gp surgery would be overwhelmed as would the local sewage works causing further pollution in Chichester harbour.		Object	Anita Geser [7308]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2767	<p>Highgrove Farm Development. 17/03148/FUL</p> <p>I am totally against the building of either 50 or 250 houses not only for the various problems with drainage, numbers of people etc. but the main one is the fact that this area is in the Strategic Gap.</p>		Object	Mr John Hinton [7317]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2772	As in other comments, the requirement for green infrastructure in policy AL7 is unambitious and does not align with the requirements of paragraphs 20 and 174 of the NPPF. Additionally there needs to be some recognition of the presence of a chalk stream which is a priority habitat.	<p>As in previous comments, the requirement for green infrastructure in policy AL7 is unambitious and does not align with the requirements of paragraphs 20 and 174 of the NPPF. Additionally there needs to be some recognition of the presence of a chalk stream which is a priority habitat. We therefore recommend the following amendments:</p> <p>'Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham</p> <p>6. Provision of buffer landscaping to the north, south and east of the new development;</p> <p>7. Retention, protection and enhancement of existing priority habitat chalk stream on the site, which should be incorporated into a landscape management plan for the site;</p> <p>8. Expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities;</p> <p>9. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar site by reason of recreational disturbance and that measurable net gains to biodiversity can be achieved;...'</p>	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2859	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local significant dismay of the original approval of 50 houses. 2. Another step towards joining the existing villages of Bosham with Fishbourne and Chichester District. 3. Change the character of the area adjacent to the A259. 4. Additional urban facilities will then be required such as medical and social facilities. 5. The area in question has poor drainage and is prone to flooding. 		Object	Mr Peter Sweet [7330]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2924	<p>We are similarly (re AL6) concerned about this proposal and its proximity to, and negative impact on, the AONB.</p> <p>Comments re AL6 and AONB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - direct and indirect negative impact on protected landscape. - No evidence is presented of an environmental audit of this area adjacent to the AONB, which is essential before any such proposal can be considered properly. 	A proper assessment is needed of the impact of this proposal on the AONB.	Object	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	2957	<p>Nothing in policy ties in with 6.56 - Bullet point 8. Item 1 only talks about links integrating with "the existing Settlement". Ribbon development along the A259 is making it less safe to cycle (and walk). Some form of entirely segregated off road path is becoming necessary. This is the place to mention CIL contributions to a new ChemRoute.</p> <p>6.53 fails to mention views across the site into the downs and no mention of very high grade of farmland.</p>	Insert extra item, reading "Making a contribution to sustainable travel links with Chichester City and settlements along the East-West corridor"	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	3053	<p>Present infrastructure is already at saturation point; the most obvious problems being traffic and sewage disposal. Due to the geography of the area (i) the current roads can neither be added to or widened, and (ii) the existing sewerage is mostly inadequate.</p> <p>We are realists, and accept the inevitable development to come (a total of 300 dwellings) BUT this must be the limit, not just in the short term but for the foreseeable future since, as pointed out above, Bosham's infrastructure is already at saturation as things currently stand.</p>		Comment	Mr and Mrs L.G. Cooper [5027]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	3088	<p>Object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Major development on the fringe of the AONB. * Loss of the buffer zone outside the AONB. * Breach of current and emerging AONB Management Plan * SSSI Interest Impact Risk Zone, which affects the SAC, SPA and Ramsar designations. * Wildlife * Views * Highest quality agricultural land * Urbanisation * Light, air, noise, and soil pollution. * Wastewater * Inadequate mitigation * Contrary to the Spatial Vision * Merging of settlements 	<p>The Conservancy objects the inclusion of this site and it should be removed from the Local Plan.</p> <p>Please note that the Conservancy may support moving the allocation of dwellings to a 'settlement hub', which would potentially not be as sensitive to development Highgrove Farm, Bosham.</p>	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	3127	<p>Object to the proposal on the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flooding - Sewage - Traffic - Reduction in strategic gap - Impact on wildlife corridors - Look for alternatives to Highgrove 		Object	Ms C L Younger [7367]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	3153	<p>Primary school - provision of playgrounds and playing fields. Moves school to village fringe, encourages car use.</p> <p>Available land to the north of the railway line rejected for being 'severed' from the main settlement. Development here would take pressure off of the east west corridor.</p> <p>Paragraph 7 of Policy AL7 seems odd in that the water course referred to rises on the Highgrove sight and seems to terminate there also.</p> <p>Paragraph 9 of Policy AL7 is superfluous for both Highgrove sites and the sites north of the railway line.</p> <p>The LPA will need to provide evidence of sewer capacity.</p>		Object	Mr Alan Chapman [7083]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	3156	<p>- Loss of strategic gap between Bosham and Fishbourne.</p> <p>a. flat, first rate agriculture land suitable for arable farming. Implications for climate change and food production.</p> <p>b. scale of development will increase the size of the village substantially. location of development will increase local traffic and pollution.</p> <p>c. site absorbs rainwater, A259 already has surface water issues. Area prone to drainage/sewerage problems.</p> <p>d. loss of view to SDNP.</p>		Object	N.D Rutherford [5885]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	3207	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development will attract people from outside the area. Not affordable to local young. 2. Gross overdevelopment along the coastal strip is destroying identity of villages. 3. Dark sky should be protected. 4. Flooding from surface water. Inadequacy/lack of maintenance of water courses. 5. Overstretched sewerage system. 6. Developers must maintain water/sewage systems. 7. Location of school not acceptable. Located outside of village. 8. Existing areas of AONB which need sympathetic development. Require developers to develop brownfield sites. 9. Should be no intrusion into Brooks lane by traffic of new development. 10. Protect the dark sky environment. 		Object	Mrs M Devitt [5833]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	3291	<p>Support allocation but BDWH do not propose to deliver a new 2FE primary school as part of the 250, but to provide circa 2 ha to accommodate a new/relocated primary school.</p> <p>Object to inclusion of sports pitch provision - open space proposed is to be multifunctional naturalistic green space to buffer views and provide defensible edge.</p>	<p>Amend policy wording to:</p> <p>Approximately 13 hectares of land at Highgrove Farm, Bosham, as defined on the policies map, is allocated for a residential-led development of a minimum of 250 dwellings and the provision of land to enable the future provision of a two-form entry primary school, should the need arise. Development in this location will be expected to address the following site-specific requirements.....'</p> <p>* The provision of land to enable the relocation of the existing primary school in Bosham onto the site to facilitate expansion of pupil capacity. If there is insufficient need for a school to be located within the site, other community uses (such as leisure or recreational uses) or additional residential development would be provided on the surplus land to meet local need;'</p> <p>* Provision of community facilities and open space;'</p>	Object	Barratt Homes [1804]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	3344	Reservations with respect to deliverability of the site e.g. impact on AONB/Landscape; wastewater issues; reliance on cars		Object	CEG [7397]
86	Policy AL7: Highgrove Farm, Bosham	3362	The number of dwellings at Bosham/Broadbridge and Hambrook/Nutbourne should more appropriate to the size of the settlement, their services, facilities, employment opportunities, as well as availability of sites and deliverability. As such, the allocation at Bosham/Broadbridge should increase to a minimum of 625 dwellings and the allocation at Hambrook/Nutbourne should be a more appropriate 125 dwellings. The AL7 allocation should be extended to include land immediately to the east, either side of Ham Farm allocated employment site, as previously promoted by Landlink in its document Broadbridge Vision Statement, submitted to CDC in March 2018.	AL7 should be extended to included land either side of Ham Farm and the allocation changed to a minimum of 625 dwellings.	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
87	East Wittering	74	No amount of tweaking the road layout in the immediate area of the new development can change the fact that there is only one road to the peninsula. This road is already congested at peak times and stationary for hours at a time when tourists flock to the area. Unless you truly believe that people will not need to travel off the peninsula for vital services and employment this proposal for a potential 1213 new homes simply does not make sense. The peninsula would not function for residents or tourists with so much extra demand on an already inadequate infrastructure.		Comment	Ms Lynne Healy [6607]
87	East Wittering	935	The Health Centre in East Wittering is already stretched beyond reasonable capacity levels. Adding the number of proposed houses can only exacerbate these problems and can only have serious repercussions for residents.	The Health Centre needs to be expanded before any further housing development takes place	Object	Mr Barrie Allsop [6972]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	38	Object to large developments. Re-classify the area to reflect its true nature as "RURAL" or at the very least Rural/Semi Rural".	No change to settlement boundary. Any new development limited to brown field sites	Object	Mr Carey Mackinnon [6434]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	67	The peninsula cannot sustain any more housing. The only road in and out cannot cope as it is during busy periods and grinds to a total halt in summer. There are empty shops, closed banks and post office. You have to wait 3 weeks for a doctors appointment as it is. Crime has increased, police declined.	More roads, more doctors, more buses, better shops, more schools, better sewers, more parking.	Object	Mrs Kirstie Martin [6594]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	99	East Wittering/Bracklesham is a relatively inaccessible small coastal settlement with no secondary or higher education provision, few employment opportunities and no access to the railway network. Most importantly it has only one unreliable road connecting it to any settlement offering these important facilities. The A286 linking East Wittering to Chichester is frequently gridlocked throughout the year to the extent that St Richards hospital recommends its consultants not live in the village due to the unreliability of residents reaching the hospital within 30 minutes. Its small-scale low-key seaside village character is an inherent and important aspect of its attraction to tourists.	Replace 'a minimum of 350 dwellings' with a 'maximum of 350 dwellings' and ensure that any development is in keeping with a seaside village character on which the areas economy depends	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	252	Needs explicitly mention cycle provision both linking Medmerry with East Wittering and links to Salterns Way. In this way a suitable extension can be made to NCN 88 which can then cover the whole of the Manhood Peninsular.	To include Safe and Segregated cycle provision to link site to Medmerry and Salterns Way.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	506	We object to the proposal to allocate an additional 350 houses to East Wittering and Bracklesham, on the basis that the village is no longer a settlement hub and that such an increase in housing numbers will adversely and significantly affect the character and community of the parish.	We would like to see development spread more evenly across settlements in the western Manhood, and we would particularly like to see obvious brownfield sites such as the Earnley Concourse brought forward for development before greenfields in Bracklesham and Wittering are allocated.	Object	East Wittering & Bracklesham Parish Council (Mrs Sam Tate) [20]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	544	<p>Infrastructure, sewage, A27, schools/sixth form education are all totally inadequate and even though mitigation was needed to meet the adopted Local Plan there are no apparent plans to address these issues.</p> <p>Again there is the issue relating to the decline in retail facilities and the NPPF requirement for a 'fall back' area in the event of coastal erosion due to rising sea levels.</p> <p>And yet again where are the new residents going to work!</p>	<p>Infrastructure, sewage, A27, schools/sixth form education are all totally inadequate and even though mitigation was needed to meet the adopted Local Plan there are no apparent plans to address these issues.</p> <p>Again there is the issue relating to the decline in retail facilities and the NPPF requirement for a 'fall back' area in the event of coastal erosion due to rising sea levels.</p> <p>And yet again where are the new residents going to work!</p> <p>Also, a statement that was made by James Brokenshire Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government on 10 December 2018 in Parliament during the Housing, Communities and Local Government Question Time. The statement, I believe, was during a discussion on housing developments in Oxfordshire. The key point raised in the Secretary of State's response was to a question on infrastructure delivery. In response he stated that prior to any significant development the supporting infrastructure must be already in place.</p>	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	723	350 dwellings are too many for this location because of poor road access into Chichester.	350 dwellings are too many for this location because of poor road access into Chichester.	Object	West Itchenor Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1036]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	735	The 350 minimum homes proposed for these two villages would have severe implications on all aspects of the local infrastructure, particularly the roads.		Comment	Miss sarah backhouse [6692]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	823	There is mention of pressures on traffic in the summer months and at peak time but no mention of how the plan is going to mitigate this. Only going to be made worse by the increase in housing by at least 350 dwellings. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, i will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Information of traffic increase is to be mitigated must be detailed in the plan.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	834	There are several reasons why this area should not be developed. 1. The land is at or below the 5 meter contour and therefore at risk of flooding as a result of sea level rise as a consequence of global climate change. 2. The area has already had larger areas of new housing which require time to be integrated into the community. 3. The roads on the Manhood peninsular are already over loaded and access to the rest of the world via the A27 is poor.	Alternative sites of higher ground should be sought	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	912	Common sense should dictate that building more homes on a cul-de-sac, on flood land which is close to sea level and knowing the fact from the Environment Agency that climate change is causing sea levels to rise; with one escape route via the congested A286, this is a humanitarian disaster just waiting to happen.	<p>Delete "minimum" 350 dwellings change to "maximum"</p> <p>Include the "protection of the seaside village character" as a priority to protect the tourism economy.</p> <p>point 12- Delete and state that residential development is solely for the local community in the Witterings and not for promotion/purchase for second homes. Then include "specialised housing needs including accommodation for LOCAL older residents.</p>	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	958	Policy AL8 in Para 7 should include the Chichester Harbour AONB and its designations, with Pagham and Medmerry (It is mentioned twice in the preceding Para 6.58)		Comment	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	964	I object to 350 additional dwellings in East Wittering due to the serious traffic congestion on the peninsula and the decline of local infrastructure and services, which are not adequate to support the current population; and the lack of employment opportunities. Mass housing should be located closer to transport hubs and employment opportunities.	<p>1. There needs to be a Manhood peninsula wide comprehensive traffic management scheme.</p> <p>Additional housing on a large scale should not be permitted in East Wittering and Bracklesham until a comprehensive traffic management scheme is in place and has been shown to alleviate the traffic congestion on the peninsula, particularly in the summer months. Consideration should be given to improving the public transport offering particularly in the evenings and at weekends, making use of park and ride, public minibuses instead of large buses, one way traffic flow systems, advance payment for entrance to West Wittering beach car park, congestion payments levied on visiting vehicles at peak flow times (to help fund improvements), real time signs to direct visitors to alternative beaches when the roads and beach car park are reaching full capacity; improve the cycle path network (so that cyclists are separated from the road traffic entirely - currently there are stretches where they have to use the roads) and encourage cycling; support development of more hotels and visitor accommodation to encourage staycations instead of one day trips etc.</p> <p>2. Additional housing on a large scale should, for environmental reasons, be sited closer to public transport hubs e.g. Chichester train and bus stations rather than in East Wittering and Bracklesham where this will inevitably increase vehicle journeys. The lack of employment opportunities in the villages should also be taken into consideration as it will also add to vehicle journeys on the peninsula if more housing development takes place.</p> <p>3. Practical steps need to be taken to improve local facilities particularly in Bracklesham e.g. more cashpoints (also in East Wittering), a post office, GP surgery and pharmacy in Bracklesham to support the housing that is already in place and before more is added.</p>	Object	Mrs Sue Milnes [6842]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1019	Item 7 refers to adverse effect on Pagham Harbour SPA and Ramsar. There is no mention of Chichester Harbour AONB with SPA. SAC, SSSI and Ramsar protection	Add the need to avoid adverse effect on Chichester Harbour AONB with SPA. SAC, SSSI and Ramsar designations,	Object	Mr Keith Martin [4610]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1144	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1296	Development in East Wittering/ Bracklesham should not be permitted to commence until a Highways England scheme for the relief of A27 has been implemented. The parameters of the Traffic Study are such that traffic congestion on A286 West Manhood has not been surveyed and growth factors not related to the approved and draft local plans are not considered. Tourism and traffic accidents cause complete logjam on local roads, isolating coastal communities. Long term improvements for access to Chichester and A27 is vital infrastructure for further development on West Manhood. Junction improvements are not the answer.	There needs to be a constraint on development being brought forward until a Highways England scheme for the relief of A27 has been implemented, improving access to Chichester for local residents.	Object	Mrs Susan Pope [6851]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1428	Object to allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - homes will be second homes/holiday lets - sewage capacity - traffic on A27 and down onto Manhood - impact on services - school capacity - loss of agricultural land - loss of tourism 		Object	Mrs Barbara Colwell [6931]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1469	The infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the proposed number of minimum 350 dwellings.	Considerably reduce the number of dwellings proposed, especially until improvements are made to transport links - which means getting the A27 sorted out too, so we can get off the Manhood more quickly.	Object	Mr Clive Barrington [5751]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1496	Development in East Wittering/ Bracklesham should not be permitted to commence until a Highways England scheme for the relief of A27 has been implemented. The parameters of the Traffic Study are such that traffic congestion on A286 West Manhood has not been surveyed and growth factors not related to the approved and draft local plans are not considered. Tourism and traffic accidents cause complete logjam on local roads, isolating coastal communities. Long term improvements for access to Chichester and A27 is vital infrastructure for further development on West Manhood. Junction improvements are not the answer.	There needs to be a constraint on development being brought forward until a Highways England scheme for the relief of A27 has been implemented, improving access to Chichester for local residents.	Object	Mr Derrick pope [6778]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1532	I agree that East Wittering has potential to accommodate at least 350 houses. To retain the village character of the settlement I consider that two separate sites should be allocated and that their layout should be informed by the needs of the settlement as identified by residents through the Neighbourhood Plan.		Support	Elizabeth Lawrence Ltd (Mrs Elizabeth Lawrence) [906]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1672	Negative impact on internationally protected habitats at Chichester and Pagham Harbours, and Medmerry. Road infrastructure insufficient and a major challenge to mitigate for peak times. Tourism economy may be undermined if there is too much development on the Manhood peninsula with gridlock for visitors.	Reduce proposed allocation to a MAXIMUM of 150 rather than a MINIMUM of 350	Object	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1686	Why build so many homes when there is little employment, the surgery is too busy, public transport to the city of Chichester is hindered by the traffic on the A27? Building family homes will increase the traffic to Chichester as it will create more cars commuting for work. I agree with the need for housing for the elderly, so developers should be encouraged to build a few decent new and modern bungalows.	Less family homes	Object	MRS MIREILLE ANNICK [7156]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1743	AL8 overall mentions that the road infrastructure is not currently able to manage demand (especially on beach days!) yet no mitigation proposals are included in this element of the plan. The proposed extra housing will increase this burden and measures need to be put in place.	Provide mitigation proposals	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	1753	AL8 overall mentions that the road infrastructure is not currently able to manage demand (especially on beach days!) yet no mitigation proposals are included in this element of the plan. The proposed extra housing will increase this burden and measures need to be put in place. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture.	The proposed extra housing will increase this burden and measures need to be put in place.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2002	Severely concerned about the overall impact of increase development in the wittering area, impact on countryside, traffic, roads, infrastructure and environment.		Object	Mrs C Shepherd [6948]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2010	Lack of detail as to location of sites raises concerns given sensitivity of area and potential of conflict with legislation protecting designated sites. No indication of timescales of NP review - raises questions of deliverability and could impact upon ability to undertake HRA. Attention must be drawn to details of SWBGS and SRMP to ensure sites that are identified do not conflict with designated site interests.	The RSPB would like clarification as to whether the sites identification process is expected to be completed in time for the submission of the Local Plan, and if not what measures are being taken to ensure that this approach will not affect the overall deliverability of the plan?	Comment	RSPB (miss Chloe Rose) [6981]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2039	We would therefore like to see two paragraphs replacing point 7 in Policy AL8, so that it reads: 7a) Demonstration that suitable mitigation measures will be put in place to ensure that development will not create recreational disturbance that will have an adverse impact on the Pagham Hbr SPA/Ramsar and Medmerry realignment sites. 7b) Demonstration that development will not occur on any land that can be shown to be functionally linked supporting habitat for the birds on these two RSPB reserves.	We would therefore like to see two paragraphs replacing point 7 in Policy AL8, so that it reads: 7a) Demonstration that suitable mitigation measures will be put in place to ensure that development will not create recreational disturbance that will have an adverse impact on the Pagham Hbr SPA/Ramsar and Medmerry realignment sites. 7b) Demonstration that development will not occur on any land that can be shown to be functionally linked supporting habitat for the birds on these two RSPB reserves.	Comment	Sussex Ornithological Society (Mr Richard Cowser) [7256]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2089	Minerals and waste: It is considered that the Joint Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan are referenced, particularly with regards to safeguarding policies (M9, M10 and W2) and these documents and policies are given detailed consideration when allocating sites. Development at, adjacent or proximal to existing waste or mineral sites / infrastructure should be the subject to consultation with WSCC.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2126	Education: At the current time pupil place planning indicates that there would be sufficient space or expansion capacity to accommodate the child product from this proposed development. Contributions would be required for expansion of primary and secondary schools if feasible and required.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2142	Flooding: Due to no information on where housing is going to be located so the LLFA is not in a position to comment on proposed housing allocation sites at this stage. The policy requires 'Opportunities ... for the expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities'. Existing and future residents and the local visitor economy would benefit by delivery of an off-road route for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to and from the Medmerry development and towards Selsey. It is considered that Policy AL8 should aim to deliver this enhancement specifically.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2183	Comments on AL8 allocation for Bracklesham//East Wittering area relate to: - Increased traffic a barrier for tourism - No easy access to the rail networks, employment, secondary schools and higher education. - No secondary school in this area - Local schools at capacity - Medical centre at capacity - Lack of employment		Object	Erica Bryant [7270]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2308	Policy AL8 'East Wittering' is at the extremity of the distribution system and may be expensive to supply.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2362	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Pan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2663	Overall mentions that the road infrastructure is not currently able to manage demand yet no mitigation proposals are included in this element of the plan. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2695	<p>Strategic allocations should be made in the LPR as they are strategic policies.</p> <p>E Wittering can deliver more than 350 dwellings, particularly Land at Church Road.</p> <p>Policy fails to recognise that E Wittering settlement straddles two parishes, therefore policy should consider settlements not parishes.</p> <p>Promoting site Land West of Church Road.</p>	<p>Policy should be amended to allocate sites - Land at Church Road (see attachment)</p> <p>Should the Council continue to seek allocation through NP, policy should be amended to cover East Wittering as a settlement, not a parish.</p>	Object	Welbeck Strategic Land (IV) LLP [7303]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2773	<p>SWT is concerned that the impacts on Pagham Harbour SPA and in particular the importance of functionally linked supporting habitat for Dark-bellied Brent Geese, have not been sufficiently considered by CDC. As mentioned previously we do not think it is sufficient to simply use policy wording to require mitigation. For the allocation to be deliverable there must be sufficient confidence that avoidance of adverse impacts can be achieved. In the case of policy AL8, there needs to be recognition that both recreational disturbance and the loss of functionally linked supporting habitat needs to be avoided.</p>	<p>'Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish Land will be allocated for development in the East Wittering Neighbourhood Plan for a minimum 350 dwellings including any amendments to the settlement boundary. Development will be expected to address the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of a high quality form of development to be masterplanned as a sustainable extension(s) of East Wittering and be well integrated with the existing settlement providing good sustainable access to facilities and sustainable forms of transport; 2. A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation to include specific provision to meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older people; 3. Provision of suitable means of access to the site(s) and securing necessary off-site improvements (including highways) to promote sustainable transport options; 4. Provision of on-site public open space and play areas; 5. Detailed consideration of the impact of development on the surrounding landscape and the setting of the settlements of East Wittering and Bracklesham along with a detailed landscape management plan and delivery of measurable net gains to biodiversity; 6. Expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; 7. Demonstration that development would not, with mitigation if required, have an adverse impact on the Pagham Harbour SPA/Ramsar and the Medmerry realignment through avoidance of both recreational disturbance and/or loss of functionally linked supporting habitat; 8. Provision of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the most up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan. <p>Demonstration that sufficient capacity will be available within the sewer network, including waste water treatment works, to accommodate the proposed development.'</p>	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2925	<p>Major development around East Wittering seen as having negative impact on area. There are reassuring words in policy about impact of developments and mitigation, but unclear how these worthy aims can be achieved here. Plan refers to "promoting sustainable transport options". Additional housing in area can only exacerbate transport problems. Short of everyone using the cycleway, it is hard to envisage how this area can cope with yet further residents. Aware many new houses in the area purchased as second homes. Any development here should be strongly slanted towards affordable homes for local people. Policy does not promote that approach.</p>	Remove this from the plan	Object	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	2958	<p>This policy is not complete without consideration of global warming and sea level rise (Bracklesham Bay will be underwater at 1.5 metre rise).</p> <p>So-called "improvements" to highways do not "promote sustainable transport options".</p>	<p>Introduce an extra, separate point referring to the need to consider sea level rise.</p> <p>Policy AL8 - Item 3 delete the phrase "including highways". Phrase recurs in AL9, AL10, AL11, AL12, and AL13 where it should also be sorted out.</p>	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	3307	<p>Support for strategic allocation at E Wittering but no justification as to why growth is restricted to 350 dwellings when other Settlement Hubs have significantly higher numbers.</p> <p>Suggest 875 dwellings can be supported.</p> <p>Suggest amend policy wording.</p> <p>Promoting site at Stubcroft Farm.</p>	<p>Amend policy wording to:</p> <p>'Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish Land will be allocated for development in the East Wittering Neighbourhood Plan for a minimum 875 dwellings including any amendments to the settlement boundary. Development will be expected to address the following requirements:'</p>	Object	Barratt Homes [1804]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	3345	<p>Policies AL8-AL11, and AL13 allocate a housing number to each parish to be allocated by the relevant NPs.</p> <p>Any housing that is expected to be provided through NPs cannot reasonably be relied upon during at least the first five years of the Plan.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the Parish Council has agreed to accommodate such a significant level of growth as part of a NP.</p> <p>For these reasons we question the deliverability of 350 homes at East Wittering through a NP process, particularly given the scale of other NP allocations relied upon elsewhere to meet the Council's minimum housing requirement.</p>		Object	CEG [7397]
88	Policy AL8: East Wittering Parish	3366	<p>For the reasons set out in representations to draft Policies S2&S3, the allocation at East Wittering should be more appropriate to its size, services and facilities. As such the allocation should be reduced to 210, with the remainder of 140 allocated to Selsey, along with 25 dwellings from Birdham.</p> <p>If the suggested changes to draft Policy S3 were applied to the Manhood Peninsula in Policy S4, to help achieve the required 30% affordable housing, a total of 1400 homes would be allocated, with an appropriate proportion of 400 dwellings at East Wittering.</p>	<p>If the current allocation for the Manhood Peninsula was found sound, then AL8 should be amended to reduce the allocation to a more appropriate 210 dwellings with the remainder allocated to Selsey.</p> <p>If a larger, more equitable housing allocation of 1400 dwellings was made to the Manhood Peninsula in Policy S4, Policy AL8 should be amended to 400 dwellings.</p>	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
89	Fishbourne	35	<p>6.63 Fishbourne has limited, not reasonable facilities and services, and the suggestion that further housing is required to sustain these existing facilities is disingenuous. Building a further 250 dwelling does not constitute sustainable development in this context. Furthermore the figure of min. 250 new dwellings must be challenged, and the National Park should be compelled to take an increased share of the housing burden for the District.</p> <p>6.65 pt2 must refer to the relationship with Bosham as well as Chichester City.</p>		Comment	Karen Fielder [6569]
89	Fishbourne	48	<p>2.13 No major employers in Fishbourne making travel to work a necessity.</p> <p>2.29 What employment needs? speculation and entirely subjective.</p> <p>3.2 Speculative. Where is evidence of local need, demography and transport.</p> <p>3.6 Impact of huge traffic increases on the A259 cannot be over-emphasized.</p> <p>3.7 Fishbourne has no facilities. The railway is a halt, not a station and out of reach of Bethwines.</p> <p>Previous application for Bethwines development suggested car sharing and extensive use of cycling/walking which would never work.</p> <p>Public transport is not viable unless a new bus route created.</p> <p>Traffic will have to access development via unsuitable Blackboys Lane.</p>		Object	Mr Andrew Relf [6566]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
89	Fishbourne	274	I do not believe Fishbourne can support a further 250 dwellings.	Remove this proposal , or at the very least ensure bus services are enhanced to mitigate for the increase in traffic.	Object	Steve Blighton-Sande [6732]
89	Fishbourne	386	6.62 Chichester Harbour is not located to the south of the village, Part of Fishbourne is within the AONB	Part of Fishbourne Parish is located WITHIN the Chichester Harbour AONB with its associated designations etc.	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
89	Fishbourne	528	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School oversubscribed - No doctor's surgery - NHS dental practice oversubscribed - No shop - Public transport overcrowded in summer - Fight to fund rural bus - Development will encourage car use along the A259 - Traffic queues will increase with hamburger roundabout - Noise and air pollution from standing traffic at unacceptable levels - High water table being barely 6" below the surface. - Habitat Review appears out of date - Substantial wildlife across Bethwines Farm needs protection - Bethwines Farm is agricultural land, should not be used for building - Impact on Chichester Harbour SPA/SAC/Ramsar site 	The number of houses allocated to Fishbourne should be reduced due to the proposed placement of the wildlife corridor in Clay Lane. That corridor takes away the only viable opportunity for small development within the village.	Object	Petrina Miliam [6793]
89	Fishbourne	817	Para 6.63 contains untrue assertions about Fishbourne's need for growth (as detailed in the representation).	I submit the argument for growth in Para 6.63 is spurious and fails to make any case for a need for growth. Accordingly, I would argue that the allocation of 250 should be reduced to reflect the failure to make out the case for growth. It is pertinent here to recall the words of Secretary of State James Brokenshire: "The number of new houses we build won't be based on what a developer thinks they can sell but on the real needs of the community."	Object	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mr Geoff Hand) [34]
89	Fishbourne	819	2 examples of sharp contrasts between policies and practice would seem to make the whole document unsafe. Which is the examiner to accept as the truth? The two examples are detailed in the Representation section above.	Come to a clear decision about what the document is trying to say. You might aim to minimize as far as possible the extra pollution created by 4,000+ extra cars in the already over-heavily used A.259, but you can't at the same time assert that any development must not create problems of cgestionor pollution.	Object	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mr Geoff Hand) [34]
89	Fishbourne	887	The level of housing proposed for Fishbourne should be reduced to recognise there is limited availability in the village, that a wildlife corridor has since been introduced, further limiting land availability, leaving a viable farm as the only main alternative. This appears to go against your countryside policy. We should also be increasing and growing our tourism industry and taking greater advantage of the Manhood Peninsula. The current proposals does not give this enough consideration		Object	Mrs paula smith [6958]
89	Fishbourne	1104	<p>Fishbourne is NOT suitable for as many as 250 new homes. I would like someone to tell me how that figure was decided upon. And where does CDC expect these homes to be built?</p> <p>The area Fishbourne has chosen to be developed has now been allocated as an Environmental Corridor. However I would like to see Bethwines Farm declared an environmental corridor and the Clay Lane sites be permitted for housing. I believe Fishbourne can sustainably find land for about 140 homes if the Clay Lane sites are released.</p>		Object	Mrs Ruth Keeley [5401]
89	Fishbourne	1380	<p>Loss of farmland</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure: school capacity/medical/ dentist/ unsuitable roads</p> <p>Concern for wildlife- keeping the corridor</p> <p>Loss of village identity- negative impact on residents</p> <p>Flooding</p>	Do not build on Bethwines farm- identify smaller sites such as along Clay lane Listen to the residents concerns and protect defined villages so they keep their identities	Object	Mrs Joanne Osmond [7133]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
89	Fishbourne	1538	Fishbourne Parish Council have been receptive to development during the previous plan and during this draft plan. They have offered up space to accommodate the development of 160 homes on land in the Eastern part of the village Clay Lane. The sudden inclusion of Wildlife Corridors in Policy S30 puts this into question. These corridors have not been fully thought through and should be moved further West. Take the 250 homes quota from AL9, keep to the Parish's proposed maximum 160 and return the 90 homes to SDNP's refused allocation. Re-draft AL9 in line with Fishbourne Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan	<p>In addition the Policy 6.62 AONB Chichester is not "to the south of the village" AONB encompasses Fishbourne up to the A259. This needs amending.</p> <p>Alter Fishbourne's designation as a Service Village and place in Rest of the Plan area.</p> <p>Remove a minimum of 250 and replace with a maximum of 160 dwellings. Allocate the 90 additional homes to the SDNP quota.</p> <p>6.65 include Bosham Village to the statement after Chichester City: "Protecting the separate distinct identity of Fishbourne in relationship to surrounding settlements, including Chichester City."</p> <p>Include in point 3 " A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation... "in line with the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan" to include special provision....</p> <p>Remove Point 5 and insert Protect and maintain the arable countryside between settlements.</p> <p>Remove Clay Lane from Policy S30.</p>	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
89	Fishbourne	1668	Fishbourne Village was once a small compact historic harbour village. Over the last 15 years there has been considerable additional housing built in the Village allowing Fishbourne to develop almost within the existing curtilage of the village. 250 homes will alter the village considerably. There is the potential for coalescence between the harbour/coastal villages. A significant impact on Chichester Harbour effecting, wildlife, and general environment. There are flooding issues in the area too. This is over development of a village that has had significant development. .	Reduce housing allocation to 50 in numberu	Object	Ms Louise Goldsmith [5667]
89	Fishbourne	1762	Apuldram sewage treatment works is overloaded on occasion already. Concerned about potential detrimental affects on water quality in Chichester Harbour from more development in this vicinity.		Comment	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
89	Fishbourne	1799	Too many houses, no sustainable sites	reduce number of houses to manageable level	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
89	Fishbourne	2476	Case for increase in population to increase vitality is not made. FPC wishes to draw up revised NP but needs cooperation from CDC		Comment	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]
89	Fishbourne	2486	I query "easy access to Chichester City and the Manhood Peninsula". This may refer to roads but not to the difficulties of using them at particular times of day, days of the week and times of the year. Fishbourne "facilities" do NOT require a greater population to sustain them. They are working to capacity now. The primary school reached its PAN (Pupil Admissions Number) maximum with children in all years from its Fishbourne catchment area in 2014 and has been 'full' with Fishbourne children ever since	<p>Delete the assumption of "easy access" and pay due regard to present traffic conditions.</p> <p>Remove the wrong premise that Fishbourne facilities require increased population to sustain them and take this into account in any planning decisions.</p>	Object	Mary Hand [7284]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
89	Fishbourne	2502	<p>View to the west from Blackboy Lane is important.</p> <p>Eastern parts of the village have Chichester as their postal address - no need to protect seperate identity here.</p> <p>Important to establish a clear western boundary to Chichester conurbation.</p> <p>The A27 and A259 are both now busy roads. Clay Lane is a rat-run particularly when the A27 is blocked at busy times.</p> <p>Existing E-W travel links are at capacity/no longer fit for purpose.</p> <p>250 projected dwellings are likely to yield at least 500 additional vehicles.</p> <p>It is good to know there is an emerging "Infrastructure Delivery Plan".</p>		Comment	Mary Hand [7284]
89	Fishbourne	3089	<p>Page 116, 6.62: There is a factual error here: "Chichester Harbour is located to the south of the village, with its associated Ramsar, SPA, SAC and AONB designations."</p> <p>Chichester Harbour is not "to the south of the village." The AONB boundary includes the part of Fishbourne up to the A259. This needs to be corrected.</p>	To make the factual correction.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
89	Fishbourne	3090	<p>Page 116, 6.65: Given that Chichester Harbour is part of Fishbourne and the South Downs is 2 kilometres away, in terms of the sentence structure protecting the views and setting of Chichester Harbour AONB should come before the South Downs National Park.</p>	To reword the sentence.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
89	Fishbourne	3187	<p>In order to facilitate safe cycling and walking a continuous, direct, safe and comfortable path must be provided, protected from the traffic; traffic speeds should be reduced to 30mph; route must not be delivered in bits as people need a safe route all the way to their destination; there should be links off the route linking the communities.</p> <p>As there are no shops in the Service Village of Fishbourne, it cannot be considered a sustainable location.</p>		Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	68	<p>I would like to add my objection to the many others who are opposed to the building of houses on Bethwines Farm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of infrastructure - flooding - destruction of wildlife habitats - sewage - the number of houses already built - dependency on cars - loss of agricultural land 		Object	Mrs Katrina Howarth-Brown [6597]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	70	<p>Please explain how you arrive at this housing number - conflicts with NPPF (agricultural land, valued landscapes, communities to decide where development goes)</p>		Object	Mr. Roger Gould [5034]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	75	<p>I would like my strong support for the proposals to build 250 more homes in Fishbourne to be registered.</p>		Support	Dr Diana Brighthouse [6609]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	132	<p>1. We are sandwiched between the National Park and Chichester Harbour (AONB) which is almost 80% of the available land in CDC.</p> <p>2. School capacity</p> <p>3. Lack of Medical facilities</p> <p>4. Flooding-- 4 properties in this Close flooded with raw sewage in June 2012, and a further 250 houses will exacerbate an already over loaded system.</p> <p>5. Roads in Fishbourne are already used as "rat runs" and are not suitable for the CURRENT volume of traffic.</p> <p>6. Once the strategic gap is closed it will set a precedent. Gradually a conurbation between Chichester and Emsworth will evolve.</p>	This area of land MUST NOT BE DEVELOPED	Object	Mr Michael Carroll [6642]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	144	<p>Whilst appreciating that development has been imposed on the village surely we can't allow such a development on Bethwines farm which is the only natural land belt between Fishbourne and Bosham. We must preserve our valuable farm land.</p> <p>Use smaller parcels of land, no natural drainage if develop on large areas.</p> <p>Wildlife corridor should be on Bethwines not Clay Lane.</p> <p>Impact on traffic and schooling</p> <p>No need for houses</p>		Comment	Mrs Helen Kirk [6625]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	182	<p>Please please do not build any more houses in this lovely village on following grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - air quality - traffic generation - leave fields for wildlife - drainage 		Object	Ms Veronica McCredie [4758]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	184	<p>A minimum of 250 further homes in Fishbourne would create increasing problems with the schools, medical and dental services, water treatment sewage, flooding etc. Also the daily congestion on the very busy roads leading into Chichester, particularly on the approach to the Fishbourne roundabout which is already at the heart of daily heavy congestion on the A27.</p>		Object	Patricia Massey [6690]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	210	<p>I wish to object strongly to the plan for building 250 houses on Bethwines Farm, Fishbourne on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - community does not want development - village identity - traffic - grade 2 farmland - There are other issues - school, medical and dental capacity, wildlife, impact on the harbour, noise, pollution, speed of traffic. 		Object	V O'byrne [6705]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	211	<p>Concern regarding proposed development on following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic - lack of public transport - no need for additional housing to support village as school, community centre, pub are at capacity - no improvements in infrastructure - no local employment - maintaining village identity 		Comment	Mrs Helen Todd [6700]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	253	<p>Needs to provide funding for NCN2 along line of A259, as well as cycle links to National Park to the north</p>	Add to Policy for Safe and Segregated cycle provision and funding for NCN 2 and cycle routes to north of sites.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	281	Concerned regarding proposed development on following views: - vitality of village more likely to be preserved by better facilities not more houses - housing would increase car use - negative impact on Fishbourne roundabout - flooding - no need for additional housing - will housing be affordable?		Comment	Mr allan tripp [6590]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	291	Fishbourne has neither the capacity for more homes nor the need to grow further. Infrastructure already overloaded in all aspects and new homes will further exacerbate the A259 access to the A27 roundabout and further damage safety and pollution levels.	Limit the new homes requirement to 200 only on the land identified in the NP with no building on Bethwines Farm.	Object	Ms Lynda Hunter [6740]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	292	Fishbourne has already doubled in size in the last 4 decade with an additional 30% since 2011. We have built a great deal in the village already and local housing need is not identified - rather land offered by developers for their need not ours.	Remove the designation of the wildlife corridor over Clay Lane in favour of an equally good corridor to the west of the village to to enable the village to offer 200 homes in sustainable plots rather than an unsustainable and environmentally damaging build on Bethwines Farm	Object	Ms Lynda Hunter [6740]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	309	concerns over Fishbourne allocation particularly Bethwines Farm: - plan does not meet needs and aspirations of residents - needs to retain rural character - farmland should be kept for producing food - wildlife corridor on bethwines - loss of farmland leads to light and noise pollution, vehicle pollution, flooding, reducing in wildlife, surface run off, over subscribed services		Object	Mr Brian Fleet [6755]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	313	I have grave concerns about - > Maintaining a meaningful gap to both the east and west of the village > to maintain the village's identity and preserve the environment for > wild life > Lack of sufficient infrastructure with roads already rat runs by > vehicles wanting to avoid the Fishbourne Roundabout , a school already oversubscribed and lack of waste water and sewerage facility Fishbourne has already provided more house building than most other villages in the district - enough is enough !		Object	Mr John Tassell [4600]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	387	item 8 in the Policy :provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the {designated}...sites at Chichester Harbour as a result of water quality issues etc.. no mention of Fishbourne Meadows SAC SSSI has been omitted part of Fishbourne is within the AONB so more protection needed against a range of issues item 11 is weak	in item 8 add SSSI and include Fishbourne Meadows SAC in particular; add: provide mitigation to ensure protection against water run off,AIR, NOISE, AND LIGHT etc , -also against disturbance of wild life -item 11: add: Ensure sufficient capacity in the SEWAGE NETWORK and in the relevant Waste Water Treatment Works etc	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	527	I believe the Plan requirement for 250 additional dwellings will have a serious and negative impact: * Any significant increase in village population will be unviable without matching, significant additions to all aspects of local infrastructure and services. Insufficient local retail, school, medical and road provision. There is a continuous rise of "rat run" traffic and roads which are in poor and unsafe condition. * Proposal to meet the Plan's development target for Fishbourne by building on Bethwines Farm. By any criterion this is unjustified and will cause harm. It would adversely change the individual identity Fishbourne (contrary S20).		Object	Mr Chris Coffin [6794]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	536	Concerns over development in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of agricultural land - destruction of nature of area - retain village identity - infrastructure is saturated - flooding - traffic - pollution - school and doctors oversubscribed - no facilities - loss of wildlife - change to character of area 		Object	Mrs Margaretha Lowry [6819]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	545	1.Reject considering Bethwines Farm (250 homes) as a suitable house building site. WHY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - other sites are available - destruction of views and strategic gap - destruction of good quality grade 2 arable/agricultural land should only be used where poorer quality land is not available. - close to high power electrical lines, detrimental to health. - greater sprawl would undermine the nature of the village - SUDS is a major concern, wide such a high water table, flooding and poor drainage - road system is totally incapable of handling this increase - against public opinion. - school already over subscribed 	1.Rather than Bethwines Farm If necessary consider Clay Lane as the preferred house building site for Fishbourne, to prevent the erosion of the countryside gap to Bosham. 2.New planning permissions should contain infrastructure prerequisites. These prerequisites should be securely linked to planning permissions to prevent them being ignored or changed if the land is sold on.	Object	Mr Stephen Page [6591]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	615	Object to Fishbourne allocation on following grounds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - infrastructure (particularly sewage) should be in place before development - need additional planning for run off - the A27 - without a plan for improvements should not increase traffic - opposed to size of Bethwines Farm proposal, Blackboy Lane provides natural western boundary. A single row of houses would be acceptable - field to east of school should be used for school extension 		Object	Mr Philip Farrell [6863]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	639	Concerns over development on basis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - oversubscribed school and active community centre but no shop or doctors - loss of landscape views - increased car usage and traffic - development on Bethwines would harm environment - loss of agricultural land - access to site is problematic - increased pressure on Chichester Harbour - flooding - loss of wildlife <p>Suggest Clay Lane for housing as very unattractive, poor agricultural land, would encourage smaller properties.</p>		Object	Mrs Davina Robinson [6857]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	674	Against any large scale housing development in Fishbourne.	Use unoccupied houses; second homes, etc instead.	Object	Mr Iain Harrison [6899]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	758	250 houses is far too high for this parish. There is no local need for so many houses. Housing should prioritize local need, for affordable housing both to rent and buy. Any other types of housing should not be allowed. The gaps between villages will soon disappear if all development is along the A27 corridor.	Change the number of houses to 50, make all new builds affordable , at least half should be social housing for those on waiting lists. Do not allow any building that will damage the AONB and other sensitive areas. Maintain the wildlife corridors to allow wildlife in the Harbour area and the South Downs to interact.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	826	No mitigation provided for the increase in traffic that 250 dwellings would have on A259/A27. The rail service is infrequent only 1 train stops each way once an hour at peak times, less at other times. No shop or post office. Not suitable for less able 'older people' unless they drive adding to car journeys. School already over subscribed. Local children struggle to get in so have to travel by car to alternative schools. No mention of risk of flooding. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise this with examiner at the appropriate time.	Fishbourne has already taken a huge increase in housing over recent years with no new infrastructure to roads, schools, public transport etc and increased risk of flooding and destruction of open views towards harbour and Southdowns.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	836	The land at Fishbourne is on or below the 5 meter contour and is at risk of flooding as a result of sea level rise consequent on global climate change. Development here risks damaging the Chichester Harbour AONB. Land north of the A27 could be used	ensure that only land north of the a27 is used	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	925	The figure of 250 houses seems to have been arrived at entirely arbitrarily. Indeed, of the sites earmarked, some have now been ruled out by the addition of a wildlife corridor. Bethwines Farm is prime agricultural land of the sort that should be protected from development, not earmarked for it. Fishbourne has expanded considerably in recent years, yet has poor roads and lots of traffic. Blackboy Lane is particularly unsuitable for a large development. You say it is a service village, yet the rail service is minimal, the bus service is under threat of reduction, there is no shop.	The number of houses on the plan should be reduced. The wildlife corridor should be moved so it goes over Bethwines Farm rather than the sites to the east of the village which would be more suitable for housing.	Object	Mr Adam Porter [6971]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	927	Concerns over development in relation to: - distinct separate village identity - keep Bethwines as a productive farm - preserve green space - Nature/wildlife - Lack of suitable infrastructure - Loss of valuable farmland - Noise/pollution concerns - Overcrowding in the village - Local schools (this is already the case - I live opposite Fishbourne Primary School and could not get my children into it) - Flood risk due to loss of natural drainage - Detriment to the rural character of the village identity - Traffic concerns especially A259, Salthill Road, Clay Lane, Blackboy Lane		Comment	Barbara Brooks-Smith [6973]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1057	- housing in Fishbourne detrimental to infrastructure e.g. traffic, school places, dentists, doctors - traffic impact from Clay Lane development - development on Bethwines will be opposed by villagers - impact on residents lives		Object	Mr Bernard Stoneham [5433]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1065	No justification for additional homes or explanation how the number has been arrived at or why in Fishbourne. No case for further growth as village is thriving. Allowing development on Bethwines will: - destroy agricultural land - exacerbate flooding - traffic impacts - increase air pollution - impact sewage		Object	Libby Alexander [7023]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1106	Housing along Clay Lane would be ideal for access purposes speed along Clay Lane is lowered to 30mph throughout. There are other new developments along that section of road. Access to Bethwines Farm via Blackboy Lane would be totally unsuitable and there is no alternative. The waste water works in Apuldram are already struggling to cope. How will another 250 homes help that situation? The alternative these days seems to be on-site treatment which don't work! The drainage problems in Fishbourne over many years has proved that and yet CDC still over allocates homes in areas that are not sustainable.	Release land in Clay Lane	Object	Mrs Ruth Keeley [5401]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1145	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1196	Proposals for housing create the following issues: - Flooding, through increased surface water - Pollution - Sewage capacity - Traffic		Comment	Mr Iain Dodson [6986]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1197	We believe that any development west of Fishbourne has negative implications for wildlife, the strategic gap, the ANOB Chichester harbour, local residents. The quality of life for local residents will be impacted.	Land to the East of Fishbourne should be considered as a higher priority.	Object	Mrs Ali Mobbs [6965]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1198	Object to Fishbourne allocation on following grounds: - lack of facilities - lack of public transport - strain on roads and public transport - no justification as village thriving - loss of agricultural land - loss of wildlife	I suggest that you go back to the drawing board and listen to what we the tax-paying residents know is best. We will accept some housing but we know where it should go. Outsiders with their clipboards, however well-qualified do not know as they have no local knowledge; for them it all looks good on paper & that is enough. Well it isn't enough and you are the only people who can do anything about this and who can call the shots, so I ask you to listen to us, act on what we know and say and do right by the area. This is not nimbyism, this is despair because I love this area & it breaks my heart to see what those who should know better are doing to it.	Object	Mrs Bridget Choutov [6970]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1391	Object to development and concerned about: Increased flooding Loss of quality farm land (impact on UK food security) Inadequate infrastructure to support 250 homes Loss of strategic gap / village identity	No building on Bethwines Farm	Object	Justin Osmond [6896]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1406	Object to 250 dwellings in Fishbourne due to: Lack of resources (school oversubscribed, no local shop meaning more cars needed with every new build) Poor quality roads, no street lighting: You cannot pass 2 cars down much of Blackboy Lane and many potholes. Recent newbuilds in Blackboy Lane caused major problems. Extremely dangerous junction crossroads at Clay Lane/Salthill Road - a fatality waiting to happen. Dangerous busy Fishbourne roundabout with 5 exits! Fishbourne has a major flooding problem already. Morally wrong to build on good quality farm land, (should be protected for future generations)when there is poorer quality land available.	No large developments in Fishbourne; any advantage is greatly outweighed by so many complex disadvantages.	Object	Mrs Georgina Briffa [7131]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1490	The structure of the village can not support a further 250 houses as there is no supporting facilities and no funding is available, nor raisable through this development, for educational, services or transport facilities . The infill of strategic gaps which is a policy of national and local government departments is being breached. The projected area is shown as preferred over an area to the east of the village which has previously been put forward for development because of the newly raised wildlife corridor and the same considerations should be applied to the preferred area taking it out of consideration..		Comment	Mr Richard Young [7109]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1525	Fishbourne Parish Council have been receptive to development during the previous plan and during meetings with CDC over this draft plan. They have offered up space to accommodate 160 homes development on land in the Eastern part of the village - Clay Lane. Sudden inclusion of Wildlife Corridors in Policy S30 puts this into question. These corridors have not been fully thought through and be moved further West. Take the 250 homes quota from AL9, keep to the Parish's proposed maximum 160 and return the 90 homes to SDNP's refused allocation. Re-draft AL9 in line with Fishbourne Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan	<p>Policy 6.62 AONB Chichester is not "to the south of the village" AONB encompasses Fishbourne up to the A259. This needs amending.</p> <p>Alter Fishbourne's designation from a Service Village and place in Rest of the Plan area.</p> <p>Remove a minimum of 250 and replace with a maximum of 160 dwellings. Allocate the 90 additional homes to the SDNP quota.</p> <p>6.65 include Bosham Village to the statement after Chichester City: "Protecting the separate distinct identity of Fishbourne in relationship to surrounding settlements, including Chichester City."</p> <p>Include in point 3 " A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation... "in line with the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan" to include special provision....</p> <p>Remove Point 5 and insert Protect and maintain the arable countryside between settlements.</p> <p>Remove Clay Lane from Policy S30.</p>	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1530	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal identifies a problem with waste water treatment for this allocation. Please see Natural England's comments on S31, which apply to this site, in terms of avoiding an adverse effect on the integrity of Chichester Harbour SPA/SAC/Ramsar from water quality impacts.</p> <p>Clause 8 should be amended as potential issues include recreational disturbance and water quality from foul sewerage.</p> <p>Reference should be made in the supporting text to the Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy which maps important areas for SPA birds, and provides guidance on mitigation.</p>		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1709	The proposed number of dwellings is excessive and not needed, and the lack of proposed improved infrastructure and services is unacceptable. Roads are already busy and in disrepair, the school, dentist and GP are already oversubscribed. There is no justification to build this excessive number of dwellings and the effects of this scale of development will radically alter the village forever.	Withdraw this proposal and begin a sensible conversation with the residents of Fishbourne. There are already many vital improvements which need to be made to the village for the taxpayers who already live and work there. Please also provide the meaningful evidence for this number of new dwellings instead of generic political reasons.	Object	Mr David Farr [7204]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1744	AL9 This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 250 dwelling onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report.	This needs to be considered in the local plan	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1757	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 250 dwelling onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture.	address what road infrastructure provisions will be available.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1801	<p>250 houses need to find a sustainable location. The area on Clay lane has now potentially been removed by the sudden imposition of a Wildlife Corridor.</p> <p>Development on Bethwins Farm is hugely damaging to the village and encroaches on Bosham. It is not supported by the village. It removed important farm land and separates the Harbour from the South Downs. No other land has been identified as deliverable.</p> <p>We propose that this 250 houses is reduced to a more manageable level in consultation with the Parish Council</p>	reduce number of houses to manageable level	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1818	<p>The usual planning language presenting as usual a fait accompli. The "making it nice" stuff is beside the point, which is that Fishbourne has had enough development.</p> <p>6.66 how will you protect the separate district identity of Fishbourne when policy AL9 envisages an "extension of the existing built up areas"?</p> <p>6.66 planning should also take into account noise exposure from the A259 and from Salthill Road, now overused , too narrow, used by farm vehicles, and to avoid Fishbourne roundabout.</p> <p>1. Exactly how can an "extension" of the village be "integrated' with it? It's a contradiction in terms.</p>	Don't inflict a 250 house extension on our village.	Object	Mr Andrew Elliott [7209]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1851	<p>Object on grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - challenge wildlife corridor - pressure on services/infrastructure - traffic - road safety - loss of agricultural land - loss of identity - Fishbourne is overdeveloped 		Object	Mrs A Dennett [6631]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1961	<p>Fishbourne allocation unsuitable due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bethwines Farm productive farmland contributing to providing food for increasing population e.g. salad crops and wheat - Bethwines Farm currently provides an excellent strategic gap between Fishbourne and Bosham - Residential development would increase flooding - Find other land to develop on 	Suggest that the derelict land in Clay Lane located between A27 trunk road and Salthill Road would be a more suitable prospect than prime agricultural land comprising Bethwines Farm located to the west of Blackboy Lane towards Bosham.	Comment	Mr C N Robinson [7242]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	1991	<p>The housing proposed for Fishbourne should be reduced from 250 to recognise limited land available in the village.</p> <p>Your own policies are now acting to promote the destruction of one of the areas viable farms by building in a strategic gap between villages and, leaving the door open for the future construction of 100's of more houses in the future.</p> <p>Rather than destroying the rural character of villages, we should be concentrating on developing Brownfield sites and doing all we can to encourage our tourism industry by providing greater opportunity to take advantage of the coast around the Manhood Peninsula.</p>		Object	Mr Geoff Smith [7245]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2011	<p>Lack of detail as to location of sites raises concerns given sensitivity of area and potential of conflict with legislation protecting designated sites.</p> <p>No indication of timescales of NP review - raises questions of deliverability and could impact upon ability to undertake HRA.</p> <p>Attention must be drawn to details of SWBGS and SRMP to ensure sites that are identified do not conflict with designated site interests.</p>	The RSPB would like clarification as to whether the sites identification process is expected to be completed in time for the submission of the Local Plan, and if not what measures are being taken to ensure that this approach will not affect the overall deliverability of the plan?	Comment	RSPB (miss Chloe Rose) [6981]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2021	Object to AL9 due to conflict with S1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.	No building on Bethwines farm. Build only where the NP has clearly identified suitable and sustainable land for 200 homes in the Village.	Object	Ms Lynda Hunter [6740]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2090	Minerals and waste: It is considered that the Joint Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan are referenced, particularly with regards to safeguarding policies (M9, M10 and W2) and these documents and policies are given detailed consideration when allocating sites. Development at, adjacent or proximal to existing waste or mineral sites / infrastructure should be the subject to consultation with WSCC.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2127	Education: The primary school serving the area is currently at capacity, expansion of the school may be possible, feasibility / options appraisals would need to be undertaken. At the current time pupil place planning indicates that there would be sufficient space or expansion capacity to accommodate the child product from this proposed development for secondary aged pupils. Contributions would be required for expansion of primary and secondary schools and sixth form if feasible and required.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2128	Object on grounds of allocation number; potential coalescence and increased pollution.		Object	Mr Mike Lander [5160]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2143	Flooding: Due to no information on where housing is going to be located so the LLFA is not in a position to comment on proposed housing allocation sites at this stage. It is considered that off-road cycling links to land West of Chichester (off Salthill Road) and to Bosham (off Park Lane) would benefit this community with enhanced sustainable connectivity.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2216	Fishbourne parish falls within the Apuldram WwTW catchment and we would recommend that the policy makes specific reference to the issues that the Neighbourhood Plan group should consider when identifying sites for their Local Plan. We would also recommend that specific reference is made to the Source Protection Zone that covers part of the parish in order to ensure that the groundwater, and in turn the drinkingwater supply, is protected.	Recommend that policy makes ref to issues that NP should consider when identifying sites; and reference to SPZ that covers part of parish to protect groundwater	Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2270	Historic England has no comments on the principle of land being allocated in the revised Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan for a minimum of 250 dwellings. However, we note that one of the specific issues that need to be taken into account in planning for development at Fishbourne identified in paragraph 6.65 of the Plan is "Protecting the heritage assets of Fishbourne and their setting". We welcome the recognition and identification of this issue, but we consider that it should be included as a specific requirement in Policy AL9.	Add the following clause to Policy AL9; "Demonstration that the development would not have an adverse impact on the significance of heritage assets, including listed buildings and the Fishbourne Roman site Scheduled Monument, or the character or appearance of the Fishbourne Conservation Area".	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2309	Policy AL9 'Fishbourne' allocation is not site specific and it is difficult to comment on the feasibility of water supply. Any off site costs will be recovered via the new Infrastructure Charge. Portsmouth Water have public water supply abstractions in the area and development is likely to be located in a source protection zone for our Fishbourne public water supply abstraction. Under this policy, where development is in a source protection zone, the policy should also refer to groundwater quality protection and the additional requirements when using infiltration systems in particular deep bore systems.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2326	1. The proposed wildlife corridor for Clay Lane Fishbourne to be reconsidered, freeing the site for house building if necessary. 2.Reject any building on Bethwines Farm Fishbourne.House building here would reduce the countryside gap with Bosham and generate urban sprawl.It would also reduce valuable agricultural (A2) capacity and have a determinant affect on views across country to the west and to the south downs national park..	1. Bethwines Farm Fishbourne provides the good quality agriculture land which could also fulfil the dual role as a wildlife corridor/environment. This it does in part now, providing a diverse habitat for birds, deer, bats and other species. 2. Make Clay Lane the preferred building site for house building if necessary.	Object	Mr Stephen Page [6591]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2336	Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for Fishbourne Parish. We note that the spatial distribution of the allocated 250 dwellings will be determined through a revision of the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan. Until sites are determined Southern Water is unable to carry out an assessment of the impact of development on the local sewer network. However, in order to minimise flood risk and other impacts on the environment, sewer capacity will need to be considered, as well as wastewater treatment capacity.	Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following amendment to Policy AL9: Ensure sufficient capacity within the sewer network and relevant Wastewater Treatment Works before the delivery of development as required.	Comment	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2363	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Pan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2401	Re policy AL9 I lack the detailed knowledge usefully to comment, but would ask how far the present state of the A259 has been borne in mind in planning both in Fishbourne and further west from Chichester. It is narrow and at times congested now - major development can only exacerbate such problems.		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2406	We consider that the policy wording for the A259 corridor Strategic Site Allocations could be more robust and proactive with regard to conserving and enhancing the National Park. In particular, it could provide more active direction to applicants in order to ensure adverse impacts are minimised locally, and in relation to the National Park. For example, with regard to green infrastructure, each of the A259 Strategic Site Allocation policies (AL7, AL9, AL10 and AL13) include a criteria requiring the provision of green infrastructure. Criterion 5 welcomed but could be reworded to ensure developers consider impact before creating scheme.	Reword GI criteria to 'Identify opportunities are taken for and secure the expansion and provision of multifunctional green infrastructure into the wider countryside and protected landscapes of the South Downs National Park, and Chichester Harbour AONB, including between settlements and facilities.' Criterion 5 welcomed but could be reworded to ensure developers consider impact before creating scheme.	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2474	Object: - lack of criteria as to why allocation - building on Bethwines would be unsustainable - impact on infrastructure - uncertainty over A27	- reassess allocation - take account of community views - provide FPC with traffic flow data - provide confirmation of research on air quality - provide confirmation of delivery of sewage/WW infrastructure - if wildlife corridor not relocated, reduce housing figure	Object	Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan Group (Mr Geoff Hand) [7282]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2477	Object: - 250 undeliverable - traffic congestion - issues of Bethwines - landscape - water quality Apply S24, S25 and S26 to consideration of devt on Bethwines Farm	add "and views to and from Chichester Harbour AONB, Stow Clump, SSSI Kingley Valey and Bow Hill" to criterion 5	Object	Fishbourne Parish Council (Mrs Lucy Wright) [916]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2503	<p>250-plus new houses would alter the population dynamics.</p> <p>Fishbourne has limits set by the A27 and the Harbour Conservancy.</p> <p>If the newly designated "wildlife corridor", takes up space across potential Clay Lane sites it is arguable the resulting shortfall should be absorbed elsewhere.</p> <p>The value placed by residents on the Bethwines site as a village amenity and a delineating gap not to be used for housing was clear at NP stage.</p> <p>The Bethwines location would be tacked on to the existing built up area. Access to "facilities" would be mostly by car using roads already congested and in Blackboy Lane.</p>	The farmland to the west of Fishbourne village should be protected from housing development.	Object	Mary Hand [7284]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2507	<p>Bethwines land is good quality farming land which should be protected.</p> <p>Fishbourne village has historic western boundary, the rural Blackboy Lane.</p> <p>Run-off into the Harbour and proximity means it is particularly affected by tides and ponding of water at high tide by prevailing westerly winds. Standing water in fields is increasingly common occurrence in this area.</p> <p>While pavements and footpaths in existing developments are generally OK, paths between have rarely received adequate maintenance.</p> <p>There are sufficient transport problems already.</p> <p>250 homes-plus would cause issues for Blackboy Lane.</p> <p>Plus the potential roadworks improving the A27 by-pass and the Whitehouse Farm development.</p>	Protection from development for the expanse of land - Betwines Farm - to the west of Fishbourne Village in the CDC Local Plan, now and in future updates.	Comment	Mary Hand [7284]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2558	<p>Without seeing any site allocation maps showing the potential location of the development (other than the HELAA document), we feel it would be difficult for Fishbourne to accommodate the development of an additional 250 houses without having an impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The setting of Chichester Harbour AONB - An impact on water quality in Chichester Harbour SSSI - An increase in recreational disturbance of migrating bird species, particularly at the head of the Fishbourne Channel <p>We recognise that the policy tries to address these issues through the masterplanning process and urge that they are given due weight.</p>	We would wish to see the publication of the allocation map in the earliest instance.	Object	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2665	<p>Makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 250 dwellings onto the A259 and A27.</p> <p>See attached for full detail.</p>		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2743	<p>Fishbourne is not suitable for further large scale housing developments as any likely sites are unsuitable due to the risk of flooding, the loss of agricultural land, the lack of road capacity, and sewage capacity at Apuldram.</p> <p>No proper thought was given to transport in the recent and current developments and there is no reason to believe any new ones will do any better under the current regimen.</p> <p>Already with the numbers of extra dwellings in recent years the local school is turning away pupils.</p>		Object	Stephen Sadler [7313]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2751	Gleeson controls and promotes land to the E of Fbourne - believe that suitably designed resi devt can come forward and would have least impact on surrounding landscape; noise can be mitigated; and is in suitable location to maximise transport links.		Comment	Gleeson Strategic Land (Mr Peter Rawlinson) [855]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2778	SWT notes that policy AL9 includes a specific requirement for development to demonstrate that it would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interests of identified sites and habitats. We support the inclusion of this requirement, although as per the revised NPPF, it should also require net gains to biodiversity. However we question why this requirement is not included in any of the previous site allocations when they clearly will also impact on 'nature conservation interests'. Despite this requirement, the policy still needs to be strengthened	<p>The policy still needs to be strengthened as follows:</p> <p>'Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish</p> <p>6. Expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities;</p> <p>7. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats and that measurable net gains to biodiversity will be delivered;</p> <p>8. Provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Chichester Harbour as a result of water quality issues relating to runoff into a designated site, and avoiding loss of functionally linked supporting habitat...'</p>	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2782	<p>Support so far that parish can accommodate growth. Has ability to deliver above proposed levels - 500 dwellings.</p> <p>The promoted site North-West of Fishbourne (Bethwines Farm) can accommodate 500 dwellings</p>		Support	Fishbourne Developments Ltd [1751]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2822	<p>Objection to Bethwines Farm:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prime farmland. 2. Wildlife (some of which may be protected) and one of the only remaining open spaces in Fishbourne. 3. Resources and infrastructure are already overstretched. 4. Blackboy Lane was built specifically as a lane - not a road - so that it does not have the appropriate structure to accommodate the amount of traffic it would receive. 5. Flooding. 6. Unclear why Bethewine's Farm would be chosen for development rather than the land on the north side of the A259 just west of Tharfield Kennels. 		Object	Ms Claire Greenfield [6592]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2848	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building at Bethwines will substantially increase the traffic in Clay Lane. - Blackboy Lane was never designed for the amount of traffic. - Fishbourne primary school is already at its maximum level. - No shops in Fishbourne. 		Object	Eve & Peter Mulvany [7326]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2873	<p>Consider that leaving allocations to NP is risky, subject to delays and undeliverable.</p> <p>Policy should be modified to allocate promoted Land at Fourways for devt.</p>	Allocate Land at Fourways for development and change settlement boundary to include site.	Comment	Mr and Mis Butterfield and Waldron [7336]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2878	<p>Objection to Bethwines Farm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prime agricultural land. - Skylarks, bats, deer and other wildlife use it as a corridor. - Loss of a valued view. - Increased risk of flooding along the A259. - High water table leading to problems with rising sewage. - Pressure on already crumbling lanes and roads. - No Dr Surgery. - No room at the school - No local shops - Extra traffic on the roads, extra traffic, extra pollution. - Blackboy Lane not suitable for heavy construction vehicles. - Rural setting lost forever. 		Object	Susan Folkes [7333]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	2900	<p>Objection to Bethwines Farm:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Blackboy Lane is very narrow and cannot be widened. 2. School is full. 3. Loss of village identity. 4. Bethwines Farm is good arable land. 5. Bats, Deer, Foxes, Rabbits, Skylarks and many more - need open space. 6. Fishbourne has flooded in the past. 7. Fishbourne has already taken its quota for building in the village and more. 8. Fishbourne Harbour is an AONB. 9. The A27 which is already overloaded. 10. A smaller development on Bethwines Farm, will turn into a larger development of over 1000 homes. 		Object	Matthew Folkes [7338]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3028	Support allocation of 250 dwellings however recommend amend policy wording to make NP review should consider meeting need through allocation of mix of small and large sites		Support	William Lacey Group [1623]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3055	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents against development on Bethwines Farm - Lack of infrastructure - medical facilities, no shops, no post office, shortage of school places, possible reduction in bus services, condition roads. - Traffic getting worse - Blackboy Lane and Clay Lane unsuitable for additional vehicles. 		Object	Mrs J C Fellows [7361]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3081	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clay Lane - too much traffic, unsafe for pedestrians and cycle route. - Drainage problems - new development will take away any natural green fields drainage. - Fisbourne should remain as village and not an extension of Chichester and Bosham. - Blackboy Lane should keep the SPA line as it has been. - The school is at its capacity. - The doctors are at their limit. Chichester hospital is at capacity. - Infrastructure around the village is poor. 		Object	Mr Ronald Gawen [6710]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3091	<p>Object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Major development on the fringe of the AONB. * Affect buffer zone outside the AONB. * Breach of current and emerging AONB Management Plan * SSSI Interest Impact Risk Zone, which affects the SAC, SPA and Ramsar designations. *Wildlife * Views * Highest quality agricultural land * Urbanisation * Light, air, noise, and soil pollution. * Wastewater * Inadequate mitigation 	<p>The Conservancy objects the inclusion of this site pending the publication of the allocation map.</p> <p>Please note that the Conservancy may support moving the allocation of dwellings to a 'settlement hub', which would potentially not be as sensitive to development as Fishbourne Parish.</p>	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3123	<p>Object on the basis of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School at capacity - Apuldram sewage works have no more capacity - Bethwines farm is grade 2 farmland - Bethwines farm is wildlife friendly - Bethwines farm is in designated gap 		Object	Mr Roy Bailey [7365]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3149	<p>Object to Fishbourne allocation on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal against government policy - Infrastructure - Traffic congestion and air pollution - School at capacity - Lack of retail - Poor public transport - Impact on Chichester Harbour AONB, SSSI, SPA and SAC - Lack of information on proposed wildlife corridors 		Object	Alastair Alexander [7366]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3158	<p>Object on the basis of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arable field - Liable to flooding - Sewage, Apuldram limitations - Light pollution, noise and traffic. - Blackboy Lane cannot cope with any more traffic - Loss of wildlife - School is full - No public transport - Doctors oversubscribed 		Object	Mrs Rosamond Ticehurst [7374]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3159	<p>Object on the basis of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fishbourne should not a service village - Primary school is full. Children travelling to Chidham and Southbourne. - No shops, only a few small businesses - No doctors - Village dentist is private - Apuldram at capacity - Flood risk/high water table - Bethwines farm outside settlement and within designated gap - WSCC struggling to maintain roads - Loss of wildlife - Grade 2 farmland should not be built on - NP allocated sites but did not include Bethwines Farm - Major developments will ruin village individuality - House sales slowing down 		Object	Annie Stephens [7375]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3163	Objection to Bethwines Farm: - extends village into open countryside - Clay Lane, Blackboy Lane and Salthill Road unsuitable for current levels of traffic - Urban sprawl from Chichester to Bosham - Pressure on Doctors and School		Object	Maurice Bradbury [7377]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3164	Objection to Bethwines Farm: - Arable land - Loss of strategic gap - High water level - Shortage of school places - Overstretched doctors - Traffic jams - unhygienic atmosphere		Object	Maurice and Jane Young [7378]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3225	Support policy and offer Land east of Clay Lane as available for resi devt (23 dwellings approx.)		Support	The Feltham Family [6885]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3230	Support policy - promote land south of Clay Lane - could accommodate 15 units.		Support	The Smith Family [6886]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3259	Promote land to east of Deeside Avenue, available for at least 50 units. Land is currently identified as community purposes in NP but the land is locked therefore NP proposal is not implementable.	The landowners support the proposed allocation in Fishbourne and wish to make their land available as being able to accommodate at least 50 units. They do have objections in regards to Policy S30, the wildlife corridor, and these are set out in other representations.	Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3276	Support allocation of land for minimum 250 dwellings at Fishbourne as reflects ranking in settlement hierarchy as a larger service village. Prefer principle of having more than one site to meet strategic allocation as part of a dispersed strategy across the District. Spreading development over more than one site assists short term housing delivery and minimises long lead in times. Associated community infrastructure could still be delivered over more than one site in accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan's requirements in policy S12 and the CIL levy.	Policy AL9 - the allocation of 250 dwellings minimum to Fishbourne Parish is supported but the allocation should be spread across more than one site. Spreading development over more than 1 site will assist short term housing delivery and minimise the long lead in times that the very large strategic sites are suffering in the current Key Policies Local Plan. This would not impact on infrastructure delivery because it would still be identified and phased in the IDP as set out in S12. Policy AL9 could therefore state 'A site or a combination of sites will be allocated for development in the revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan....' Alternatively, AL9 could be deleted and the 250 dwelling allocation reassigned to Policy S5 to allow the development to come forward as a dispersed strategy.	Support	Landacre Developments Ltd [7392]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3346	Question deliverability of allocation through NP process		Object	CEG [7397]
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3417	Promoted site at Fishbourne - Land to the rear of 98 Fishbourne Road . We prefer the principle of having more than one site meet the strategic allocation as part of a dispersed strategy across the District. Spreading development over more than 1 site would assist short term housing delivery and minimise the long lead in times that the very large strategic sites are suffering in the current Key Policies Local Plan.	Policy AL9 - the allocation of 250 dwellings minimum to Fishbourne Parish is supported but the allocation should be spread across more than one site. Spreading development over more than 1 site will assist short term housing delivery and minimise the long lead in times that the very large strategic sites are suffering in the current Key Policies Local Plan. This would not impact on infrastructure delivery because it would still be identified and phased in the IDP as set out in S12. Policy AL9 could therefore state 'A site or a combination of sites will be allocated for development in the revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan....' Alternatively, AL9 could be deleted and the 250 dwelling allocation reassigned to Policy S5 to allow the development to come forward as a dispersed strategy.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
90	Policy AL9: Fishbourne Parish	3510	Areas of objection for Fishbourne, Bosham and Chidham are considerable: A27 does not serve communities west of Chichester unless they use the A259 as a feeder road; no major employers in Fishbourne making travel to work a necessity; question employment needs - there is no employment in Fishbourne and no plans to provide it; Where are you going to create new open space? statement on preservation of landscapes is ridiculous set against the building of houses on current landscapes and views; question evidence of local need, demography and transport.		Comment	Mr Andrew Relf [6566]
91	Chidham and Hambrook	49	For the A259 between Chidham and Fishbourne roundabout, the huge growth of 1000 houses in Fishbourne, Bosham and Chidham, amounts to 2000 additional cars using the A259. Allowing for about a one metre+ gap between them, 1000 cars need a stationery road space of about 6000 metres or Fishbourne roundabout to Chidham if lined up. No thought has been given to this problem in the planning strategy, exacerbated by the lack of an upgraded A27.		Object	Mr Andrew Relf [6566]
91	Chidham and Hambrook	837	This land is at or below the 5 metre contour and is at risk of flooding as a consequence of sea level rise from global climate change. This development along with others on the lower coastal plane will exceed the capacity of the A259	Alternative developments on higher ground should be sought	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
91	Chidham and Hambrook	1206	Complete ambiguity re a replacement school. WSCC WILL NOT support a school in Bosham and Chidham. Primary school places = 210 children per 1000 homes. Bosham & Chidham would therefore need 155 places not 420 two schools would provide. AONB restrictions limit available land which will lead to greater density than is recommended or desired. Loss of pasture, fields, woods, hedgerows, important views Unacceptable to use Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land	Clarity over replacement school Traffic infrastructure plan for area	Object	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
91	Chidham and Hambrook	1419	Consideration should be given to including a reference (also in Policy AL10) for the need to take into account any future potential new access onto the A27.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
91	Chidham and Hambrook	1600	There is only one bus service.		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
91	Chidham and Hambrook	1732	I object to AL7 in line with the points made from Chichester Harbour AONB Chichester Harbour Trust Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council	Changes as suggested by Chichester Harbour AONB Chichester Harbour Trust Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
91	Chidham and Hambrook	1802	6.66 to 6.70 AL10 We support the moving of the primary School to a location in the north of Hambrook. 500 houses is too much on this location and the numbers need to be reduced in consultation with the Parish Council. An allocation of 250 is more acceptable. No more development should be undertaken on the land west of Broad Road.	Reduce number of houses	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
91	Chidham and Hambrook	3092	Page 118, 6.70 Chidham & Hambrook: Given that Chichester Harbour is part of Chidham, in terms of the sentence structure protecting the views and setting of Chichester Harbour should come before the South Downs.	To reword the sentence.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	63	<p>Strongly support the identification of the Parish of Chidham and Hambrook as being suitable for a strategic housing allocation.</p> <p>It has a very good bus service and benefits from a railway station on the West both linking Chichester with Portsmouth/Southampton.</p> <p>The village is a suitable location for strategic development as its location supports sustainable transport links and provides the opportunity to develop improved community facilities.</p>		Support	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	137	<p>Concern over development to accept 500 more homes would be problematic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic generated by additional development - drainage - impact on historic environment - impact on natural environment and wildlife - impact on open spaces <p>What is the definition of affordable? developers don't provide much at lower price range</p> <p>Housing should reach certain standards in terms of insulation/environmentally friendly.</p>		Object	Mrs Diane Longbottom [6608]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	180	Objection on grounds that infrastructure should be provided before housing allocation.	Infrastructure needs to be in place BEFORE any more housing development is permitted.	Object	Mr Stephen Tanner [6681]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	254	Point 3 should be expanded to specifically mention NCN2, also links for cycling to connect to north of site.	Expand Point 3 to make Safe and Segregated cycling provision for relevant part of NCN2 and funding of. Also require cycle links to north and south of site.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	529	<p>Para 7.135 does not mention that Hambrook already had large devt which has changed character of area.</p> <p>Pressure on Chi Harbour is increasing, will affect wildlife.</p> <p>Full impact of development must be analysed</p> <p>Skilled work in the area is misleading as industrial units on the Old Marshalls site were not taken up.</p>		Comment	Mr David Oliver [6385]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	827	Chidham/Hambrook is a linear settlement along the A259 & up Broad Road. Access to public transport is very limited unless you walk along way. Not suitable for older people unless they drive. Again no mitigation to how increased traffic from 500 new dwellings will be dealt with on A259/A27 as most will come out at the already over capacity Fishbourne Roundabout. Destroy open views of AONB & SDNP. No mitigation mentioned. Flood risk. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise this with examiner at the appropriate time.	More mitigation required on the above points in future iterations before proper informed comment can be made.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1146	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1182	We have no shop, recreational or sports facilities or medical facilities. The IDP suggests that these will still be based in Southbourne.	Clarity on which schools would be carried forward. Local Traffic study for the A259 and Broad Road in Hambrook	Object	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1235	Centralising the position of the school, commercial shop and medical centre. An opportunity to get the layout for the village right from the outset. A clear decision on this is 'a must' with then housing taking a lead thereafter.		Comment	Miss Sandra James [7079]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1426	Object to allocation on following grounds: - increase of over 50% - change nature of location - destroy agricultural land and AONB - impact of services/facilities/jobs - traffic and parking issues		Object	Amanda Rodgers [7152]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1436	Object to allocation on following grounds: - selection process not followed density/sensitivity benchmarks - coalescence of Emsworth-Chichester - loss of farmland - negative environmental impacts - impacts on infrastructure - development to south of A259 contrary to environmental designations		Object	Mr David Lord [7159]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1438	Object to allocation: - excessive number - already been increase in housing, 500 more is not sustainable - impact on roads - traffic and safety - impact on school - lack of public transport - pollution - impact on infrastructure - unequal number compared to Fishbourne and Bosham - coalescence of settlements - impact on wildlife/landscape		Object	Dr J A Sheppard [7160]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1487	Object to allocation.		Object	Nicky Hales [7172]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1488	Object to allocation		Object	Richard Hales [7173]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1534	Natural England recommends amending clause 9 to add potential recreational disturbance and water quality impacts from sewerage. Please see Natural England's comments on S31 and the HRA regarding waste water quality impacts. We recommend amending the supporting text to refer to the Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS), which identifies sites important for SPA birds, and provides guidance on mitigation. However, the allocation of sites in the parish should follow the 'avoid, mitigate, compensate' hierarchy and seek to avoid sites identified by the SWBGS.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1746	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 500 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report.	This needs to be considered in the local plan	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1758	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 500 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture.	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 500 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1803	6.66 to 6.70 AL10 We support the moving of the primary School to a location in the north of Hambrook. 500 houses is too much on this location and the numbers need to be reduced in consultation with the Parish Council. An allocation of 250 is more acceptable. No more development should be undertaken on the land west of Broad Road.	reduce number of houses	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1847	I do not accept 500 new dwellings should be built in Chidham and Hambrook. Currently there are 961 dwellings, 500 new makes a 55% increase. There is no evidence that 500 new dwellings are needed. Where has the number 500 come from?		Object	Mr Andrew Sargent [6362]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1861	Object to Chidham and Hambrook allocation on the following grounds: 1) The School is full 2) The Doctors full 3) The Roads are full		Object	Mr David Rodgers [7185]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1862	Additional homes in the Chidham and Hambrook allocation disregard the following planning issues: - Countryside - Environment - Infrastructure and services - Roads - Education - Transportation - Amenities - Wellbeing of the public - Affordable housing distribution unclear - A27 issues need higher prioritisation - More time should be given for Plan's formation		Object	John Garrett [7163]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1884	Object to Chidham and Hambrook allocation on the following grounds: - Coalescence of settlements between Chichester and Emsworth - Distribution of housing in the Parish - Density - IDP fails to address transportation - IDP fails to address education - IDP fails to address medical needs - IDP fails to address general amenity needs	The number of houses in the allocation should be reduced	Object	Chidham Sustainability Network (Stephen Morley) [7226]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1914	Objection on basis of coalescence; housing distribution; lack of infrastructure; and sustainability appraisal.	Reduce housing allocation by at least 50%	Object	Mr Andrew Kerry-Bedell [7238]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1917	Object to Orchard Farm, Drift Lane on basis of access. This single track road is already blocked by construction traffic for a single house currently being built. It is not conceivable that access for any construction traffic would be practicable to build any future house in Drift Lane.		Object	Mr Andrew Kerry-Bedell [7238]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	1918	Object to Baileys Fields development on basis development is too large when considering; IDP does not adequately address transport, education, medical and general amenity needs of area; joining of settlements will adversely impact character of villages; distribution of housing based on developers' estimates and not on density benchmarks; potential loss of key landscape views, high quality farmland, deterioration in water quality and disruption to migrating birds.		Object	Mr Andrew Kerry-Bedell [7238]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2027	Object on grounds: loss of agricultural land; disturbed ecosystems; pressure on surrounding road networks; inadequate supporting facilities - public transport, retail, community or leisure facilities; number of empty second homes already within parish; coalescence.	Reduce allocation; Transport and facilities to be organised/consulted with local residents prior to any housing development; affordable housing for single people, disabled and vulnerable adults, new housing to exclude use as second homes or holiday homes.	Object	Kate Simms [6856]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2032	I am very concerned by the amount of housing that is being proposed for the above parish. We have had development after development in Broad Road in the last few years and not all of those houses have been sold. Between Havant and Nutbourne almost every green space has been closed by developers. This isn't solving the problem. We know there is a need for housing, but filling in every space, squeezing in housing in areas where the infrastructure cannot cope surely is not the answer.		Object	Liz & Mike Dinnage [7216]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2091	Minerals and waste: It is considered that the Joint Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan are referenced, particularly with regards to safeguarding policies (M9, M10 and W2) and these documents and policies are given detailed consideration when allocating sites. Development at, adjacent or proximal to existing waste or mineral sites / infrastructure should be the subject to consultation with WSCC.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2129	Education: Primary provision is at capacity, expansion of the school on its existing site is not possible. It is proposed that land for a 2FE primary school be provided. Certainty over the land allocation and sufficient funding will be key drivers in realising this proposal. AL7, AL10 and AL13 are within the same school planning area, cumulative total brings forward requirement for c3 forms of entry additional places. As currently drafted, LP indicates oversupply of school places which could affect viability of all schools in the planning area. Expansion of the secondary school may be possible. Contributions would be required.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2144	Flooding: Due to no information on where housing is going to be located so the LLFA is not in a position to comment on proposed housing allocation sites at this stage. The policy requires 'opportunities' to develop green infrastructure and links to other communities. An opportunity, in conjunction with Highways England, exists to maximise the value of existing infrastructure by creating a new bridleway (for walkers, cyclists and horse riders) on a path using an existing A27 overbridge.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2147	Comments on Chidham and Hamrook allocation: - Designation as a Service Village - The reference to possible relocation and expansion of Chidham Primary School is simply wrong. - Housing density - Mix of housing - Transport congestion - Train service infrequent - Bus service prohibitively expensive - Impact on Chichester Harbour AONB		Comment	Mr Tim Towers [7165]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2162	Concerns relate to increase in traffic and resultant pollution and congestion; current state of public transport; surface water management; allocation of 500 and impact upon existing environment and infrastructure; risk of coalescence.	Primary school provision to meet the needs of increased housing needs to be addressed along with the infrastructure to support it.	Comment	Steven Birch [7228]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2255	Object to Chidham and Hambrook allocation on following grounds: - Unequal distribution of housing - Sustainability appraisal unworkable - Landscape - Density and scale of development		Object	Mr Stephen Johnson [26]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2271	Historic England has no comments on the principle of land being allocated in the revised Chidham and Hambrook Neighbourhood Plan for a minimum of 500 dwellings. However, we consider that Policy AL10 should include a specific requirement to ensure that the allocation of the site or sites in the Neighbourhood Plan conforms with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly paragraphs 184 and 194.	Add the following clause to Policy AL10; "Demonstration that the development would not have an adverse impact on the significance of heritage assets.	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2310	Policy AL10 'Chidham and Hambrook' is a large site and may need to be considered in combination with 'Southbourne' and 'Bosham'. There are no large diameter mains in the area and mains reinforcements may be required.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2364	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Plan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2403	The exit from the cycle track on the southern side of the A259 to the east side of Chidham is presently dangerous because of the road layout and the warning sign about cyclists being several yards too late and often obscured by foliage. Where there is a cycle track in Chidham, parking on that track is not uncommon. There is also a significant gap in the cycle track through much of Chidham. Moreover this is part of a national cycling route, and will become even more significant with more development in Chidham and points west.		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2408	We consider that the policy wording for the A259 corridor Strategic Site Allocations could be more robust and proactive with regard to conserving and enhancing the National Park. In particular, it could provide more active direction to applicants in order to ensure adverse impacts are minimised locally, and in relation to the National Park. For example, with regard to green infrastructure, each of the A259 Strategic Site Allocation policies (AL7, AL9, AL10 and AL13) include a criteria requiring the provision of green infrastructure. Criterion 5 welcomed but could be reworded to ensure developers consider impact before creating scheme.	Reword GI criteria to 'Identify opportunities are taken for and secure the expansion and provision of multifunctional green infrastructure into the wider countryside and protected landscapes of the South Downs National Park, and Chichester Harbour AONB, including between settlements and facilities.' Criterion 5 welcomed but could be reworded to ensure developers consider impact before creating scheme.	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2493	No confidence that 500 homes will give infrastructure required. No mention of upgrading roads serving Chidham and Hambrook Contradiction as to whether devt in C&H will fund new school rather than replacement school. Unclear where early years/child care places will be accommodated.		Comment	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2499	Object: - allocation would increase housing stock by 50% - school capacity issues and no policy on education - no evidence to support allocation - lack of amenities - lack of public transport - nature of landscape	reduce allocation by 50%	Object	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2559	As for policy AL9 at Fishbourne, it is difficult to assess the potential impact of this proposal on Chichester Harbour AONB. We urge that the provision of 500 houses at Chidham and Hambrook should not lead to the erosion of the setting of the AONB, and should not lead to coalescence with neighbouring settlements, particularly Southbourne to the West.	We would wish to see a site allocation map at the earliest instance. We would welcome an additional point in the policy on the prevention of coalescence with the settlement at Southbourne.	Object	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2666	Makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 500 dwellings onto the A259 and A27. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	2781	SWT is concerned about the number of dwelling allocated for this parish, given its current size and proximity to designated sites. We note that unlike for many other strategic allocation policies, there is no recognition in the supporting text of the presence of a Local Wildlife Site within the parish, this should be amended. We also question why recreation disturbance is not noted as an adverse impact on the nearby SPA to be avoided. An allocation of this size will likely result in an increase in visitors to the Harbour.	We recommend the following amendments: 'Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish 6. Expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; 7. Provision of a site for local convenience shopping with opportunities explored to provide flexible space for employment/small-scale leisure use; 8. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats and will deliver measurable net gains to biodiversity; 9. Provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Chichester Harbour as a result of water quality issues relating to runoff into a designated site, and avoidance of loss of functionally linked supporting habitat....'	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	3016	Support proposed 500 dwellings and promote land to meet requirement. If further sites are available they should be allocated. Concern over use of NP to allocate sites.		Support	Sunley Estates Ltd [1789]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	3093	Object on the following grounds: * Major development on the fringe of the AONB. * Affect buffer zone outside the AONB. * Breach of current and emerging AONB Management Plan * SSSI Interest Impact Risk Zone, which affects the SAC, SPA and Ramsar designations. * Wildlife * Views * Highest quality agricultural land * Urbanisation * Light, air, noise, and soil pollution. * Wastewater * Inadequate mitigation	The Conservancy objects the inclusion of this site pending the publication of the allocation map. Please note that the Conservancy may support moving the allocation of dwellings to a 'settlement hub', which would potentially not be as sensitive to development as Chidham & Hambrook Parish.	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	3188	In order to facilitate safe cycling and walking a continuous, direct, safe and comfortable path must be provided and protected from the traffic; there should be links off the route linking the communities. Plan should include provision of housing for younger people with shared communal areas to make living in shared communities an attractive and affordable proposition to attract more young people to stay in the area.	Change Point 2 to "To meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older and younger people"	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	3262	We support both of these policies and the number of houses which they propose should be allocated. (Site submission attached) We are, however, concerned that there may be a conflict between the interests of the two Parishes when considering the possible allocation of this land on account of the land for development being located in the Parish of Southboure while in reality in forms part of the settlement of Hambrook from which it is entered.		Support	Mr & Mrs R Hirlehey [7391]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	3347	Question deliverability of allocation through NP process		Object	CEG [7397]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	3367	For the reasons set out in representations to draft Policies S2 and S3, the allocation in Chidham and Hambrook Parish should be more appropriate to its size, services and facilities. As such the allocation should be reduced to 125, with the remaining 375 allocated to Bosham/Broadbridge, as set out in representations to draft Policy AL7.	AL10 allocation should be reduced to 125 dwellings, and the remainder allocated to Basham/Broadbridge under Policy AL7.	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	3422	Promoted site land at Cox's Barn Farm, Broad Road, Hambrook. We support the principle of having more than one site to meet the strategic allocation of 500 dwellings. Spreading development over 2 or more sites will assist short term housing delivery and minimise the long lead in times that the very large strategic sites are suffering in the current Key Policies Local Plan.	ph 73 of the NPPF2. Policy AL10 - the allocation of 500 dwellings minimum to Chidham & Hambrook Parish is supported but the allocation should be spread across more than one site. Spreading development over 2 or more sites will assist short term housing delivery and minimise the long lead in times that the very large strategic sites are suffering in the current Key Policies Local Plan.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
92	Policy AL10: Chidham and Hambrook Parish	3533	The local plan review has failed to make a proper distribution of housing in the Parish. The so called comprehensive selection process undertaken by the planners in their strategic site allocation exercise and the subsequent approval by CDC is found to be wanting as it is based on developers estimates which have not followed the density benchmarks as per policy DM3 and has also not been modified for locations adjacent to sensitive locations.		Object	Chidham Sustainability Network (Stephen Morley) [7226]
93	Hunston	148	6.77 "Protecting existing views and particularly those of Chichester Cathedral spire and Hunston Copse"; 6.73 "Review sets a requirement of around 200"; These aims are at odds with the plots CDC has identified for possible development. Please see photos of views between Cathedral Spire and Hunston Copse attached. These views are across the plot labelled HHN007 by CDC.	Amend the number in 6.73 to a more sensible number eg 0 - 50	Object	Mr Stuart Solliss [5180]
93	Hunston	149	6.77 "Reducing and providing adequate mitigation impacts for existing biodiversity species and their habitats which are native to the areas of Hunston. Design will need to apply appropriate protection/enhancement of all identified species and habitats;" Mitigation is not good enough! NPPF states "109. The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by " Enhance is the word.	Change this section to read ... "Enhancing biodiversity and habitat in Hunston."	Object	Mr Stuart Solliss [5180]
93	Hunston	181	The number of houses seems excessive. I would question the methodology of how this figure was arrived at. The gap between Hunston and Mundham should be considered and meaningful to ensure separate identities are maintained. Key views to Chichester cathedral from footpaths must be maintained and protected.	Reduce number of houses Commitment to conserving the gap between Hunston and Mundham Protection of amenity value of public rights of way including views Cycle links to free school from village	Object	James Skilling [6685]
93	Hunston	345	Existing traffic problems hugely increased since opening of Chichester Free School, affecting B2145, B2166, A27. Constant flow of huge container trucks and many tractors on B2145. Traffic increases in summer months result in traffic jams. Proposed building in Hunston, Selsey, Pagham would increase traffic, in the region of 1700 vehicles, converging on roundabout north of Hunston, and increase pollution. Lack of pavements in Hunston already endangers lives. Local primary schools are fully subscribed to. Ferrying children farther afield will add to traffic problems. The copse and green spaces support a wide range of wildlife, give areas for walking, encouraging exercise.	Identify Hunston's housing needs to retain semi-rural, village identity. Produce a feasible plan that will mitigate the impact the current proposals will have on the traffic problems arising.	Object	Mrs Sally Bamforth [6748]
93	Hunston	406	As a rural community, Hunstons housing is at capacity, given the lack of development or improvement in providing an infrastructure for safe living.	Consideration of the entire infrastructure of Hunston and the surrounding area. Reconsideration of a housing programme of this size, or abandonment of the plan.	Object	Mrs Jacqueline Ellis [6807]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
93	Hunston	581	The proposal for 200 additional houses represents a grossly disproportionate development for Hunston. It will alter the ethos of the village irreparably, turning it from rural dwelling to a conurbation of Chichester. The B2145 is entirely unable to accommodate the sheer volume of traffic to which it is already subjected; noise and air pollution levels are concerning. Hunston's label as 'service village' is a disservice for a village with a close community of people. The proposal feels arbitrary in its nature, and as such the reasons for objection are broad.	All objections as listed above.	Object	Benedict Broad [6825]
93	Hunston	659	200 houses would make this semi-rural village into a into a small town and with the other local plans we would soon be annexed onto Chichester with no definition and loss of character	200 houses would make this semi-rural village into a into a small town and with the other local plans we would soon be annexed onto Chichester with no definition and loss of character	Object	Ms Hannah Farish [6898]
93	Hunston	664	Local infrastructure plan doesn't consider the impact on the local hospital - as an employee of the local NHS hospital we struggle with the current local population demand on the services - 200 families! - not including the plans for the housing developments in the other surrounding areas! - this needs to be carefully considered and plans for for increasing hospital capacity before ANY further housing plans be made!	Local infrastructure plan doesn't consider the impact on the local hospital - as an employee of the local NHS hospital we struggle with the current local population demand on the services - 200 families! - not including the plans for the housing developments in the other surrounding areas! - this needs to be carefully considered and plans for for increasing hospital capacity before ANY further housing plans be made!	Object	Ms Hannah Farish [6898]
93	Hunston	667	Impact on traffic through flow not considered in the plans - speed, volume and continuous flow - making any extra car volume (potentially 400 extra cars) not reasonable, even creating access onto the road from the proposed building areas would mean new and old residents would struggle to get out onto the B2145.	Impact on traffic through flow not considered in the plans - speed, volume and continuous flow - making any extra car volume (potentially 400 extra cars) not reasonable, even creating access onto the road from the proposed building areas would mean new and old residents would struggle to get out onto the B2145.	Object	Ms Hannah Farish [6898]
93	Hunston	673	My House, as other residents living alongside the road currently feel the foundations shake with the current heavy tonnage and volume of traffic - residents would see this getting worse. Foundations and house structure integrity will be seriously compromised - what is in the plan to consider this ensuring current house values and safety do not deteriorate?	My House, as other residents living alongside the road currently feel the foundations shake with the current heavy tonnage and volume of traffic - residents would see this getting worse. Foundations and house structure integrity will be seriously compromised - what is in the plan to consider this ensuring current house values and safety do not deteriorate?	Object	Ms Hannah Farish [6898]
93	Hunston	903	The suggested sites for more housing in Hunston are on arable land which we cannot afford to lose if we are to continue feeding the population of this country. This country is incapable of producing enough food as things stand. We do not wish to increase our dependency on imports. The Manhood peninsula is known as "God's own country" because of the excellent arable land and the added light which bounces off the sea, encouraging plant growth. Therefore I object to so much land around Hunston being designated for housing which I do not think we need in this area.	Less housing in Hunston	Object	mrs Patricia Carroll [6964]
93	Hunston	909	The B2145 link road between Hunston & Seley is extremely busy at the best of times particularly around the rush hour periods and daily during the summer months. Another 200 homes with all the additional vehicles associated with them will simply add to further congestion. There have already been a number of recent accidents on this road and more traffic will only make this worse.	Perhaps look at sharing the overall spread of new housing more evenly with other local villages.	Object	Mr Steve Hutchings [6712]
93	Hunston	920	We strongly object to the size of the development in Hunston and the major impact it will have on the rural village. The Hunston Copse is a very special place and much wildlife lives here together with the ancient woodland. The culture of the village would change beyond recognition and we have major concerns over the additional traffic congestion and pollution this will inevitably cause.	Consideration should be given to firstly use land that is currently waste land and not build upon land that we need to protect for agricultural purposes - these need to be protected now more than ever given BREXIT! Secondly, assess the size of the development which would undoubtedly destroy the culture of Hunston rural village particularly the massive impact it would have on the Hunston Copse.	Object	Mr Steve Hutchings [6712]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
93	Hunston	1034	<p>Objection summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning Policy - no proper planning rationale for increasing the size of the village by 35%. 2. Housing - 35% increase fundamentally changes the nature of the village. Should not identify it as a "service" village. 3. Traffic: increased traffic on B2145 will mean total gridlock on peninsula. 4. Air Pollution - plan is dangerous for the health of local residents. 5. Infrastructure - flood risk already. 6. Services - local schools are at capacity therefore creating more traffic at peak times. 7. Environment - the plan makes no provision to protect Hunston's ancient woodland and wildlife. 	The number of houses allocated for Hunston needs to be reduced from 200 to a maximum of 50.	Object	Mrs Julie Sabin [7009]
93	Hunston	1266	Paragraph 6.77 includes the specific matters to be taken into account including "protecting existing views and particularly those of Chichester Cathedral spire and Hunston Copse" and also notes "Particular regard should be made to the designated Site of Nature Conservation Interest and Ancient Woodland known as Hunston Copse". Yet there is no mention of these points in Policy AL11 which specifies the requirements to be taken into account when accessing plans for development.	Policy A11 to be amended to protect the views on Chichester Cathedral Spire and Huston Copse	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
93	Hunston	1284	<p>The proposal will impact the village, those living in the village, those travelling through, and those enjoying the facilities within the village by the way the extra traffic and residents</p> <p>We know the extra traffic will simply cause more, and longer tailbacks, and consequently delays and more frustration for users.</p> <p>With more users will come more accidents, and amplify the points raised above, while also putting users at the risk of injury, including potential fatalities</p> <p>We have already noticed the impact the Free School has had on the village, and this proposal will simply be an proposal to far</p>	The proposal needs to be scrapped, and thought needs to be directed at other parts of the city more able to adjust to such plans	Object	Mr Martin Haddow [6821]
93	Hunston	1381	Extra homes increases road traffic on an already busy road system in Hunston and out to the A27	Protect the Manhood Peninsula by not building homes in Hunston	Object	Mrs Judith Woodworth [7134]
93	Hunston	1408	<p>I Tony Horne, and also on behalf of my wife Susan Horne, both domiciled in Meadow Close Hunston wish to object to the proposal of 200 houses being built in our village. When we decided to move to Hunston 4 years ago we understood that we were moving to a small village not an urban sprawl connected to Chichester, which would be the case should this development go ahead.</p> <p>Where we are located in Meadow close the water table is extremely high. Also our beautiful country views would be compromised not to mention the devaluation of our properties.</p>	Fewer houses preferred (given that Hunston is a village not a town) and where houses are to be built please consider locations that are sympathetic to existing properties and sited well away from areas of potential flooding.	Object	Mr Tony Horne [7146]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	150	<p>Excessive and unsustainable increase in housing (+40%) in a village already subject to heavy traffic (on B2145). An 8 fold increase from the 2029 Plan (agreed by the Inspectorate).</p> <p>Protection of green spaces, flood zones, grade 1/2 arable land and impact Hunston Copse and Hunston Conservation Area, and listed buildings</p>	<p>Maximum of 50 (10%) increase. Which is double the original proposal in the Local Plan to 2029 as previously agreed by the Inspectorate.</p> <p>Conditional (not demonstrable) on implementation and completion of Scenario 1 mitigation under the Chichester Local Plan Infrastructure Plan</p> <p>Conditional (not demonstrable) on the implementation and completion of increased waste water capacity at Pagham WWtW which is already at capacity given other development in Arun district.</p> <p>Provisions should be explicit to include 'detailed consideration for the impact on the Hunston Copse and Hunston Conservation Area'</p> <p>Provision of traffic calming schemes to provide protection to pedestrians and improve road safety through the village</p> <p>Some of these points are referenced in 6.71-6.78 but have been omitted in Policy AL11 (blue summary). They should be more explicit in AL11</p>	Object	Mr Tom Fountain [6666]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	152	<p>Too many houses for size of village. Unjustified increase from previous Local Plan (to 2029) of 25.</p> <p>Unsustainable in constrained village with sites of natural and historic interest.</p> <p>Catastrophic impact on traffic congestion on B2145 with no A27 mitigations actually implemented (Council's existing plans not yet funded or implemented)</p>	<p>Reduce number of extra dwellings to maximum 40 in Hunston in line with previous Local Plan to 2029.</p> <p>Prioritise any developments on outskirts of village in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>Reappraise other sites/villages on Manhood Peninsula as development sites for consolidating all developments quotas into a single development rather than ruining several villages.</p>	Object	Mrs Paula Fountain [6667]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	175	<p>Inconsistent decision making on allocation of housing numbers in Hunston:</p> <p>Inconsistencies between previous plan and Councils own consultation exercise of Aug 17.</p> <p>Unacceptable lack of consultation with Parish Council in deriving new numbers.</p>	<p>Reinstate Housing numbers to a maximum of 50 dwellings</p> <p>Change Point 1: Replace 'well integrated' with 'adequately integrated' to allow sustainable extensions to the existing settlement on the outskirts of the village where land is available.</p>	Object	Mr Tom Fountain [6666]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	176	<p>1. Provision of a high quality development to be masterplanned as a sustainable extension....</p> <p>"Sustainable" cannot be applied to housing development on green field sites in the UK which already has an environmental footprint 2x it's land area. "Least environmentally damaging" is a better description.</p>	<p>1. Provision of a high quality development to be masterplanned as a least environmentally damaging extension ...</p>	Object	Mr Stuart Solliss [5180]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	179	<p>I have lived in Hunston for over 30 years and have already seen a massive increase in houses, on the southern side of the village, we have lost some beautiful areas to houses that do not fit in and have ruined our village</p>	<p>if we are forced to have more houses in our village then they should be nicer looking houses, there should be some built on the selsey side of the village to strike a balance, and they should be offered to existing villagers and their families at a Low price to buy and if they are social houses they should be offered to locals who have been forced to leave Hunston or local families, we will also need our own village doctors surgary, Dentist,etc The main road to selsey will also need to be re routed as the huston road is already very busy</p>	Object	mr richard bell-bates [6677]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	189	<p>I do not believe the village could cope with the extra housing.</p> <p>The main road into the village is already very busy & loud and unsafe.</p> <p>The disputation to the village would be massive and have an adverse effect of the current residents.</p>	<p>I know people require housing, but I think a figure of 50 new houses would be better and have less effect on the village.</p>	Object	mr richard wells [6697]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	220	The B2145 runs through this village it's getting so busy , it's very difficult in the summer months to get out of the side roads . The pavements along the road are very narrow and the speed of the traffic makes them unsafe . The infrastructure is not there to support the cars for another 200 houses in this village . Plus all the new housing developments being planned for the Manhood Peninsular. The B1245 can't take much more traffic . Also not forgetting all the pollution this will cause .	Cancel 200 houses or find a different route in and out of Hunston Village .	Object	Mrs Dawn Sudbury [6713]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	221	The field between Southover way and Hunston copse should not be developed for housing as any changes to the area would impact on the copse. This ancient woodland is unique in this area with many large oak trees and a large variety of wildflowers including bluebells. It would cause irreparable damage to its wildlife, flora and fauna to have a noisy building site close to its boundaries.	Any new housing should be built closer to the main road so it minimises the impact on this rural area.	Object	Mrs Linda Rex [6719]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	222	The number of houses suggested would increase the amount of traffic on an already busy B road. Hunston already suffers from too many cars and very large lorries on its busy road. 200 houses would mean an extra 400 cars on the B2145.	Reduce the number of houses to 100 so that there would be a smaller impact on the volume of traffic.	Object	Mrs Linda Rex [6719]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	229	The proposed increase in housing in Hunston of 200 will have further detrimental impact on the B2145. The road is already far beyond it's capacity and the combination of the additional congestion resulting from the Free School, and development further down the road towards and including Selsey, means that the village will be impacted with a significant increase in road movements. We already have slow moving/stationary traffic during peak hours and the additional pollution and risk to pedestrians is unacceptable.	No access from the proposed development down Church Lane and a reduction in the proposed number of dwellings to mitigate the impact on road traffic.	Object	Mr Andrew Sabin [6729]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	230	The proposed development for Hunston on agricultural land would have a highly detrimental effect on the semi rural character of the village and the access to the countryside from the village itself. The ancient woodland in the copse is an important wildlife habitat and the current proposal of a 15m border is wholly inadequate.	Reduce the number of houses proposed and find an alternative to using agricultural land.	Object	Mr Andrew Sabin [6729]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	233	Parts of the proposed land to be used for the development in Hunston are in a Grade 2 flood risk area, and the additional run off from the loss of the natural soak away with the building of the new houses will raise the flood risk for the existing and new build houses.	Reduce the proposed number of new houses and try to find brown field sites instead of agricultural land.	Object	Mr Andrew Sabin [6729]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	237	Change from a semi-rural parish to dormitory for Chichester. Huge impact on wildlife and habitats including protected species. Greatly increased traffic on an already dangerously overloaded B-road.	Decrease the number of houses to a maximum of 100 and build in small developments at the edges of the village so The impact of further traffic is not at one place in the middle of the village. Keeping the new developments in small pockets would sustain the ability of everyone in the village to access our highly valued green spaces and countryside. This would provide greatly needed protection for our precious wildlife.	Object	Mrs Frances Beckett [6711]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	255	Funding for improving Cycle route NCN 88 and links between Chichester and Selsey need to explicitly mentioned in the policy.	Refer to funding requirements for theses cycle routes.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	359	200 houses is too many additional houses for a small village like Hunston to accommodate. We do not have enough Doctors in the Chichester area for starters. Secondly the roads are terrible, more so now the free school is open it has made the B2145 terrible in the mornings.	Unless there are some big changes to the roads with better infrastructure I don't think Hunston can take any more building.	Object	Miss Emma Johnstone [6792]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	419	A housing allocation of 200 for Hunston parish seems to be incompatible with other policies contained in this plan. Namely DM22,DM28,DM29, S29 and S30 concerning Biodiversity, Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure. I do not see evidence given that 200 houses can be achieved whilst also complying with the listed policies.	Modify the Hunston allocation to an achievable level 0-50 dwellings, perhaps.	Object	Mr Stuart Solliss [5180]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	420	<p>A housing allocation of 200 for Hunston parish seems to be incompatible with other policies contained in this plan, namely DM30 "Development and Disturbance of Birds in Special Protection Areas".</p> <p>Land in Hunston, and the wider Manhood, is functionally linked supporting habitat for Chichester and Pagham harbours. Cumulative effects need to be considered.</p> <p>I do not see evidence given that 200 houses can be achieved whilst also complying with this policy.</p>	Modify the allocation to an achievable level 0-50, perhaps.	Object	Mr Stuart Solliss [5180]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	501	<p>Object to: "Land will be allocated for development in the Hunston Neighbourhood Plan for a minimum of 200 dwellings"</p> <p>Comment on: "The emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan findings should be incorporated into development proposals, in particular, social facilities and green infrastructure as well as walking and cycle paths to local facilities so that new developments are well connected to the existing village and surrounding area."</p>	<p>"Land will be allocated for development in the Hunston Neighbourhood Plan for a maximum of 100 dwellings"</p> <p>and</p> <p>"The emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan findings should be incorporated into development proposals, in particular, social facilities and green infrastructure as well as walking and cycle paths to local facilities so that new developments are well connected to the existing village and surrounding area."</p>	Object	Mr Gareth Wright [6836]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	546	Where are new residents going to work!	Where are new residents going to work!	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	563	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hunston does not have the need for 200 houses. This development would completely change the identity of the village. Why the sudden change in allocation between North Mundham and Hunston? Traffic problems - A27 issues unresolved, extra cars using B roads. Air Pollution - increased pollution from extra traffic and housing. Infrastructure - Hunston is in a Flood Risk Area. 6. Schools already at capacity. Medical Services - where will 200 new families register with a GP? Environment & Wildlife. 	-	Object	Mrs Claire Solliss [32]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	578	Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016 - 2035 states that the housing need for Hunston is zero for the plan period.	Change AL11 allocation to reflect the parish need. The parish need is zero. Change Hunston's allocation to zero.	Object	Mr Stuart Solliss [5180]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	582	<p>Housing in Hunston increased by 35% = forcing social change. This will start the process of joining Hunston and N. Mundham</p> <p>Estimates indicate that the developments on the Manhood Peninsular will add 900 cars to the B2145 (4th busiest in England) and 800 to the B2166, these meet at the roundabout north of Hunston.</p> <p>The area is very low lying - major chance of flooding</p> <p>Cars from 200 more homes (plus 250 new homes in Selsey) trying to access the B2145 /A27 is a planning nightmare.</p> <p>The proposals re the junction of the B2145/A27 are totally counterproductive.</p>	<p>Significantly reduce the number of houses proposed in Hunston and the Peninsular.</p> <p>Include some serious, effective traffic mitigation proposals.</p> <p>Include serious, effective road safety improvements.</p> <p>Force the provision of facilities (schools, medical facilities etc) to be provided before development.</p> <p>Force Southern Water to remove surface water from new developments.</p> <p>Carry out a meaningful flood risk survey and force resulting actions required.</p>	Object	Mr Martin Willard [6861]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	612	Proposed amends and additions.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	687	<p>Hunston is a village not an urban area. 200 new houses will effectively join the villages of Hunston and Mundham together thus losing their identities.</p> <p>200 houses have not been identified as being needed.</p> <p>Roads cannot cope with the volume of traffic now and the problem of the A27 remains unresolved.</p> <p>Sewerage and drainage will be compromised.</p> <p>The environment will be affected with air pollution and loss of views and buildings close to Hunston Copse.</p> <p>Schools and medical services are already overloaded.</p>	35 houses have been identified as needed by the village in our local plan. That is sufficient for our needs.	Object	Mrs Carol Jay [6902]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	736	The Hunston Development will cause untold pollution and traffic problems to and from the village-particularly towards Chichester, and the infra structure of the area-water utilities, flood prevention, and services, cannot cope with the influx of the population involved with 200 more houses. In addition the Environment of views, farmland, ancient woodland and the wildlife would be at risk. We would lose our village identity.	Build less houses and leave the plots along the side of the B1245 adjacent to the play park alone! we need our crop fields and grazing-not to mention our views! Do not stop our residents, or those on the Manhood Peninsula from crossing into town over the Whyke Roundabout! Scrap the idea altogether. BUILD A NORTHERN BYPASS!!	Object	Mrs Christina cobden [6912]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	753	Ill thought plan. No consideration given to residents. Simply too many houses for the village to take. Not enough services, doctors, schools etc. Building on arable land which is needed. Building too close to a conservation area & ancient woodland. Traffic on the Peninsula already too high. A27 at a constant standstill needs to be addressed first. It is clear that this local plan very much contradicts all other studies into this area, where CDC has clearly said Hunston can only take a small development. There is no evidence or analysis of any local housing need in our area.	The allocation for this amount of housing must be moved from the Manhood Peninsula to north of Chichester. There is plenty of land to the north of the city where there isn't the massive traffic problem that we have in the south.	Object	Gillian Brooks [6765]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	759	Another 200 houses in Hunston will make traffic problems even worse. the B2145 is the only route to the Selsey area and is already congested. The Free school has exacerbated the problem. More housing along its length will make the situation worse. Bus fares are expensive. Subsidies should be given to these routes to encourage bus use instead of private cars. All housing should only be allowed for definite local need for local people. This could be for older people, young families, single people, but should not include large expensive houses which are not in short supply.	Reduce the number of houses to 50, mostly for local need, affordable, some to rent, at least half for those on council waiting lists. Reduce bus fares to encourage bus use by those travelling to work in Chichester, all along the 51 bus route. Insist that the Free School amend their travel plans to restrict private car use for pupil transport.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	779	* Exceptionally poor notification of a large scheme in our area and no map of proposals found on CDC website. * Complex and unclear way of reporting comments. * Minimum number of properties to be built are proportionally very high, changing the complexion of Hunston completely. * Landscape Capacity Survey has not been considered. * Damage to visually attractive parts of the village and reducing territory for local wildlife. * Additional impact of traffic on roads that are already over capacity * Need for consideration for proper infrastructure. e.g. parking and lack of other pedestrian/cycle paths to Chichester or new school.	* Scrap the consultation process and properly inform all residents of the proposals in their area and providing a meaningful map. People need to be consulted to have a consultation. Re-establish consultation process with new deadlines, once all have been informed and create a far simpler way how to make comments. * Add map for Hunston proposals to CDC website as this seems to be missing online. * Take heed of CDC's Landscape Capacity study in November 2018, consider visual impact on Hunston. * Scrap plans to build so many houses in such a small village. * Seriously consider impact on visual impact on any such development and the damage it will cause to wildlife and local deer population. * Improve traffic congestion currently already in Hunston area and take action to deal with congestion caused by free school. * Improve links particularly for cyclists and walkers to links cycle paths to Chichester, Bognor, Selsey and Birdham and for walkers to improve Hunston canal path and create Hunston foot/cycle path to free school to help with traffic congestion we already have. * Refuse any scheme that doesn't have ample parking.	Object	A Lambert [6934]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	783	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object to the development of the number of houses in this location. * Exceptionally poor notification of such a large scheme. * Complex method of reporting comments. * Infilling could ruin the character of the village while 'estate' development would overwhelm it. * Adverse effect to visually attractive parts of the village and reducing territory for wildlife. * Adverse impact of traffic on roads that are already grid-locked - noise, congestion, air-pollution. * No explanation as to the type of properties being built . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Scrap the consultation process and properly inform all residents of the proposals in their area and providing a map. The consultation process has not been 'sound'. * Re-establish consultation process with new deadlines and create a far simpler way how to make comments. * Add map for Hunston proposals to CDC website as this seems to be omitted online. * Take into consideration CDC's Landscape Capacity study in November 2018. * Take into consideration The HELAA report in August 2018 - No rationale as to the reversal is unacceptable. * Seriously consider impact on visual impact on any such development and the damage it will cause to wildlife and local deer population.The 15 metre margin to protect Hunston Copse is woefully inadequate. * Refuse any housing scheme that does not counterbalance this with an adequate infrastructure - Such as flooding, sewage, drainage, air pollution and medical services. * Improve traffic congestion currently already in Hunston area and take action to deal with congestion caused by new 'free school'. * Improve links particularly for cyclists and walkers to links cycle paths to Chichester, Bognor, Selsey etc, to include canal path. * Refuse any scheme that doesn't have ample parking. * The NPPF is clear that 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.' <p>(para 64, NPPF).</p>	Object	Ms Caroline Lambert [6939]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	791	<p>Maximum 100 houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Low-energy or PassivHaus design. 5 No housing near or visually impacting upon Conservation Area and its setting. 7 Houses and development to include wildlife enhancing features. 	<p>Maximum increase should be no more than 100 houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Houses should be truly low-energy or PassivHaus design, orientated to maximise solar gain, super-insulated, etc etc 5 No new housing near or to visually impact upon the Conservation Area and its setting. 7 All new houses should include wildlife enhancing features such as bat boxes whilst the developments themselves should retain or include trees, ponds and other features. 	Object	Mr Ted Osborne [5459]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	828	<p>There is no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 200 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report. Traffic is already backed up trying to access the A27 in peak times. No school provision so will necessitate increased car journeys as there is no safe pedestrian access from Hunston to the Free school.Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.</p>	<p>Proper mitigation detail needs to be include in the plan.</p>	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	886	<p>Hunston should not be considered as part of the city for housing development. Infrastructure cannot deal with the housing development. Other options such as Mundham or Lavant have better infrastructure options and acces to 'travel on'.</p>	<p>Develop area that have the infrastructure already in place. Develop areas that require housing rather than that do not.</p>	Object	Mr Roderick Gill [6723]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	934	<p>Current local road network will not support this level of development when combined with the proposed changes to the A27</p>	<p>Review this allocation to reduce the number of houses proposed to a level that can be supported by current infrastructure. No proposals are included to improve the local road network.</p>	Object	Pagham Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Swann) [6976]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	944	<p>This statement refers to a MINIMUM number of dwellings; this is open ended and makes effective objection difficult.</p>	<p>Local residents need to be made aware of exactly what is being proposed - we need to be informed of the MAXIMUM number of dwellings planned in order to be able to assess the impact on the village</p>	Object	Mr Robert Lock [6978]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	949	Para 3. Plans for site(s) access will not reduce the need for a large number of vehicles to exit onto the B2145 - an extremely busy 'B' road which is brought to a standstill by the slightest interruption in traffic flow or blockage of the A27. The same is true of the access roads to the Stockbridge and Bognor Road roundabouts. The addition of the +/- 400 vehicles linked to this proposal will cause unacceptable traffic volume and journey time increases plus the inevitable increase in road traffic collisions, air pollution and danger to pedestrian/non motorised road users.	Significant reduction in the proposed number of dwellings or the construction of 'fly-over' access either for traffic travelling east/west on the A27 or north/south on the link roads	Object	Mr Robert Lock [6978]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	970	The B2145 is already overloaded with traffic including large lorries going to businesses on the Manhood peninsular. To build extra houses in this area (not just Hunston but also the coastal villages), will increase the traffic to unacceptable levels, leading to major pollution and poor air quality for all living in the area. Traffic has already increased due to the opening of the Free School in the Carmelite convent, producing major traffic hold-ups in the morning and afternoon, leading to the A27 roundabout north of the convent being frequently blocked with the likelihood of traffic accidents on the A27.	less proposed houses in Hunston	Object	mrs Patricia Carroll [6964]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	996	The increase in dwellings should be only 10% of the current number of 581 dwellings in Hunston ie 58 dwellings and certainly not more than 70 dwellings.	Reduce proposed number of 200 new dwellings to 58 dwellings.	Object	Marija Davies [6768]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1036	Objection summary: 1. Planning Policy - no proper planning rationale for increasing the size of the village by 35%. 2. Housing - 35% increase fundamentally changes the nature of the village. Should not identify it as a "service" village. 3. Traffic: increased traffic on B2145 will mean total gridlock on peninsula. 4. Air Pollution - plan is dangerous for the health of local residents. 5. Infrastructure - flood risk already. 6. Services - local schools are at capacity therefore creating more traffic at peak times. 7. Environment - the plan makes no provision to protect Hunston's ancient woodland and wildlife.	1. 200 houses is not a sustainable extension of the existing village. 3. There are no sustainable transport options to access the proposed new housing. 5. There is no consideration of the impact to the surrounding landscape. 7. it is not possible to demonstrate that development would not have adverse impact on the environment and wildlife.	Object	Mrs Julie Sabin [7009]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1093	I would like " a minimum of 200 dwellings" to be changed to "a maximum of 200 dwellings. 200 dwellings in Hunston increases it's size by 35%, which will change the character of the village completely	Please change the wording to "a maximum of 200 dwellings"	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1095	Environment: Hunston is within the designations of the Chichester and Pagham Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar sites. 200 additional dwellings will have a major impact on both the local environment and the SAC/SPA/Ramsar sites	The number of dwellings needs to be reduced to mitigate any environmental effect	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1096	Housing: The Housing Register lists 22 people needing houses in Hunston, with 14 in Bands A - C. This development does not meet the needs of Hunston residents, it is there to solve CDC's housing allocation problems	Reduce the number of houses allocated to Hunston	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1097	Hunston is a village within Hunston Parish and needs to remain as such. 200 houses will extned the village to become one mass of housing south of Chichester. Road infrastructure cannot sustain the subsequent increase in traffic. The road is already dangerous with the volume of traffic increasing over the years with development of housing in surrounding villages especially Selsey. The road through Hunston was not built for this volume of traffic. Areas of Hunston are already subject to flooding. Can utilities services cope with the increase 200 houses would demand in the area?	Hunston Parish doesn't need 200 houses nor can it cope with. This is a ' locals' village and we only require a small amount of additional housing as identified in the neighbourhood plan for local families within the village.. In addition the issue for the A27 needs to be resolved before any more houses south of the A27 can be considered.	Object	Mrs Carol Jay [6902]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1099	Housing:3. The CDC Landscape Capacity Study November 2018 identifies at section CH30 that sub-area CH30 is medium capacity but it is recommended that only a small amount of development may be accommodated around the existing settlement and provided it is informed by further landscape and visual impact assessment and sensitively integrated into the landscape. This proposal is not a small development	Reduce the number of planned dwellings	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1102	Traffic: The continuing problems with the A27 and increased traffic from new building in Pagham and Selsey, all meeting at the roundabout north of Hunston where the B2166 and B2145 meet, will result in longer and longer traffic queues. Traffic was literally gridlocked in high summer and this will spread throughout the year.	Reduce the number of houses built in Hunston	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1112	Environment: Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats; The planned development on Church Commissioners land would mean the field between Southover Way and Hunston Copse would be developed. Hunston Copse is Ancient Woodland and houses a multitude of wildlife. 15 metre protection zones are totally inadequate to ensure the wildlife can thrive	Do not develop on Church Commissioners land	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1113	Environment: Detailed consideration of the impact of development on the surrounding landscape; The CDC Sustainability Appraisal - October 2018 - states: There would be a "negative impact on village form" and a "potential negative impact on the Archaeological Priority Area".	Reduce the number of houses allocated to Hunston	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1114	Environment: Point 6: Opportunities for the expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; This development will do precisely the reverse by removing current green infrastructure	Reduce the number of houses allocated to Hunston	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1115	Environment - Point 7: Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats; Development abutting Hunston Copse will damage this Ancient Woodland site	Reduce the number of houses allocated to Hunston	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1116	Housing:Protecting existing views and particularly those of Chichester Cathedral spire and Hunston Copse whilst also creating new public viewpoints; This development will result in residents of Southover Way and Meadow Close losing their views of the Cathedral Spire and Hunston Copse	Reduce the number of houses allocated to Hunston and do not develop on Church Commissioners Land	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1117	Services: Currently Mundham, Sidlesham and The Chichester Free School are full at entry level. The Free School has a country wide catchment, so there is no guarantee of places for Hunston residents. This will result in children being driven to schools in central Chichester and beyond, only exacerbating the current traffic problems	Reduce the number of houses allocated to Hunston	Object	Mrs Joan Foster [31]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1147	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1217	This is an extremely high level of increased housing and there has been no prior consultation on this figure and is clearly an attempt by our current District Councillor to look after her own needs in election season, taking into account that Hunston will no longer be a part of her ward. To increase the level of housing by circa. 40% in a relatively short period of time and with very little planning or mitigating actions being offered, especially around the increases in traffic.	The housing allocation needs to be more evenly distributed throughout Chichester - Yes, even in the North!	Object	Mr Chris Vinton [7075]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1286	It is recognised that more homes are needed but for Hunston, the number of homes proposed is far to great.	A reduction in the number of homes in the plan to around 50 to 80 would be more reasonable.	Object	Mr Stephen Baker [7102]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1289	The extra traffic generated by the development will cause the current unacceptable situation to get worse.	Improvements to infrastructure need to be made before development not after and numbers of homes needs to be reduced.	Object	Mr Stephen Baker [7102]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1290	The provision of additional green space/play areas is supported but it must include safe access by foot/cycle. This must also be from the entire village not just the new homes. New residents should also be able to access the entire village safely. This should include for example the existing golf course.		Comment	Mr Stephen Baker [7102]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1292	There is inadequate infrastructure and services to meet the increased demand.	Reduce the number of homes and get on with improving infrastructure and services now.	Object	Mr Stephen Baker [7102]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1294	Hunston is not able to take in the extra levels of traffic and users to the village	Cancel these proposals, and look to implement them in other parts of the city much better prepared	Object	Mrs Loretta Hadow [6822]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1304	200 Houses will change Hunston from rural-village to dormitory of Chichester. Consequences on local traffic through Hunston and on the Manhood Peninsula in general, will be catastrophic causing gridlock.	Changes to the number of houses to reflect the actual housing needs of the Village. NO further proposals for housing development in Hunston or on the Manhood Peninsula until there are clear proposals to massively improve traffic flows on all local 'B' roads and more particularly the A27	Object	Mr Dave Lewis [7108]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1394	I object because the road is already too dangerous and too busy now the Chichester Free school is open. My daughter of 9 goes to the CFS and is too afraid to cycle to school because there is no cycle or pedestrian path along the B2145. We now have to walk through the fields along the Hunston riding stables to get too school, through mud, rain and snow. It's all about earning money for the building companies and contractors and estate agents. I am fed up with not considering the safety of people!!!!	Proper cycling and pedestrian paths to get from Hunston to Chichester along the B2145 so our children can go on their bike or by foot. Traffic lights to cross the B2145 from village hall to the lovely playground where children never are seen playing because the road is too dangerous. The people want to help the environment but have to risk our lives? More traffic will due to more houses will mean more dangerous roads and more death (like the man who died here in Hunston while walking his dog with his zimmerframe)	Object	Miss Debby den Toom [7138]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1404	Too many homes and insufficient infrastructure to support them.	Reduce the number of homes and get on with providing the infrastructure improvements that are badly needed.	Object	Mrs Irene Baker [7145]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1536	Natural England notes that the HRA states that Hunston connects to Pagham WwTW. The Examination of the Arun Local Plan concluded that the headroom at Pagham WwTW would not support all of the housing allocations in Pagham, so connections to other treatment works in Arun were needed. Natural England would not support increasing the discharge consent at Pagham WwTW due to impacts on the SPA/Ramsar. Therefore, there is likely to be a significant effect from the Hunston allocation, in combination with planned development in Arun. Clause 9 should read 'run-off into a designated site' and include waste water quality impacts.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1537	<p>1.Planning Policy. There is no historic or current rationale for 200 houses.</p> <p>2.Housing. The 200 dwellings proposed do not reflect the local need.</p> <p>3.Traffic. The B2145, B2166 and A27 are inadequate. Chichester Free School added unplanned traffic. Additional housing planned for Selsey and Pagham. Traffic increases significantly in summer.</p> <p>Air Pollution. Measured levels are approaching health warning status along the A27 and environs.</p> <p>4.Public Open Space and Play Areas. Any development needs to take into account village needs, existing and future.</p> <p>5.Detailed consideration of the impact on surrounding landscape. Proposals include building on green sites adjacent to existing properties.</p>	<p>1.Policy.Review local need on number and size of dwelling in discussion with Hunston Parish Council.</p> <p>!20 dwellings wuld be a manageable and suitable number for the future. A mix of low rise maisonette style flats, single storey elderly accommodation and a mix of affordable 2 and 3 bed dwellings together with more substantial sizes would provide a healthy mix.</p> <p>2. Housing.Review need in line with housing needs assessment.</p> <p>Ensure the housing developments are in agreement with proposed Hunston Neighbourhood Plan and include agreed natural and substantial green margins.</p> <p>3. Adhere to Local Plan P. 130 and provide adequate mitigation for potential off-site traffic impacts.</p> <p>Consider representation on the A27 required improvements and ensure a scheme is agreed before the substantial implementation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>3continued. Air Pollution. Monitor current levels and implement change to enable sustainable reduction to established safe levels after any additional road traffic.</p> <p>Agreement to implement the Northern A27 route would mitigate the pollution risk, from existing, increased and slow moving traffic.</p> <p>4. Funding from developments to provide a revised village hall, village green and recreation area.</p> <p>5. Impact on surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Consider Parish Council proposals for siting of housing which minimises the impact. Ensure substantial green margins to mitigate impact.</p>	Object	Mr David Betts [7143]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1562	<p>6. Opportunities for the expansion and provision of green infrastructure etc</p> <p>7. Adverse impact on nature conservation.</p> <p>9. Sufficient capacity be available within sewer capacity etc</p> <p>10. Infrastructure and community facilities. Schools, healthcare provision and transport provision are all at very high capacity.</p> <p>11. West Sussex Minerals Plan. Ensure mineral quarrying does not impinge on residential areas.</p>	<p>6. Opportunities. Agree numbers of dwellings and location with the Parish Council to enable this opportunity.</p> <p>7. The possible developments impose and impact on Hunston Copse, a designated Ancient Woodland. A substantial (much more than a proposed 15metres) green margin is required to retain habits and views including those of Chichester Cathedral and the Downs.</p> <p>9. Review all capacity at sewage facilities and infrastructure and ensure improvement. Local evidence of sewage and surface water surcharge opposes providers assurance of existing adequate provision.</p> <p>10. liaise with all providers. Review all services and provide evidence that substantial improvements are to be made to sustain adequate provision for proposed developments.</p> <p>11. Have regard for the rural and village residential character with regard to mineral extraction</p>	Object	Mr David Betts [7143]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1565	<p>*8. Be planned with special regard to the need to mitigate potential impacts etc Agreed. Special attention to quality of water run off to local ponds and low lying areas.</p>		Support	Mr David Betts [7143]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1577	The fields surrounding Hunston Conservation Area, put forward by CDC are unsuitable for development, there is a flood risk 3 on the land west from this area towards the road and in Church lane itself. Access to the site would cross these Flood Risk 3 zones. Building works around HCA would have a negative impact on the area, both visually and cause serious disruption to the wildlife living in the area (eg Water voles). I believe that there are 3 main areas to be considered within the village for building houses, as mentioned in the representation.	In summary the fields surrounding Hunston Conservation Area, put forward by CDC for development are unsuitable for development, because there is a flood risk 3 on the land west from the conservation area towards the road and in Church lane itself. There would be no suitable means of access to the site that didn't cross these Flood Risk level 3 zones. Building works around Hunston Conservation Area would have a negative impact on the area, both visually and from noise pollution and disruption from people and an adverse impact on nature and the wildlife living in the area. I believe after these areas have been discounted for building works then it will be very hard to find enough suitable building sites within Hunston to accommodate 200 houses. However I believe that there are 3 main areas to be considered within the village for building houses; 1 The Old Hunston Dairy, going south out of the village, on the right by Ridgeway Nursery. 2 Chalder Farm, opposite Hunter's Lodge riding school 3 The land behind the public car park, next to Hunter's Lodge riding school. This land could be developed very attractively next to the canal and link in with a well- lit footpath up to the Free school and on into Chichester. Sites 1 and 3 could develop the village without huge visual impact and would link in well with the village, enhancing rather than destroying the character of the village.	Object	Mrs Debbie Barnes [7164]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1612	I believe this plan will irrevocably change the character of this area. Hunston cannot sustain such an increased load on its limited infrastructure - the traffic is already at dangerous levels and pollution levels climbing with the addition of the houses in Farm Close. We have noticed that the drainage system can barely cope as it is. I am against this plan.	Please do not let the character of this village be further damaged by more builds. Traffic levels are already too high as is pollution. Please do not adopt this plan.	Object	Mrs J Rose [7197]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1696	Mitigation for "traffic impacts upon the B2145 Selsey Road" should be broadened to include impacts on the B2166 to Pagham, especially within the context of the scale of development proposed in the Western Arun area.		Comment	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1698	1. Provision of high quality development etc. The proposal to build 200 houses will increase the size of the village of Hunston by 35%. This therefore cannot be seen as a 'sustainable extension of the village' or be considered to 'be able to be well integrated with the existing settlement.' Such a development would completely change the character and nature of the village. Such an 'inappropriate development' would not 'protect the landscape, character and tranquility' of the village. Any developemnt would need to achive the highest environmental standards.	Consider a much smaller development in keeping with a semi-rural village as per the Neighbourhood Plan.	Object	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1708	2. A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation etc.. Hunston has one of the highest percentage (of village population) of people on housing benefit in the area. Whist a mix of population is to be commended, hitherto it has meant that the village has received a lower grant from the district council, leaving our rates corrspondingly higher.	A mix of housing chosen by the village would be more suitable, (and NOT by the developers) as indicated in the draft neighbourhood plan.	Object	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1719	Alter Hunston AL11 as a Service Village and place in Rest of the Plan area Agree with comments from Hunston Parish Council	Alter Hunston AL11 as a Service Village and place in Rest of the Plan area Agree with comments from Hunston Parish Council	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1726	<p>3 Provision of sui...and securing necessary off-site improvements (including highways) to promote sustainable transport options;</p> <p>The current transport system cannot cope. The A27 is a disgrace to the city of Chichester; access from the B2145, the 4th busiest B road in the country, and the B2166 is impossible during rush hours. The situation is exacerbated by the Free School leading to long queues back into Hunston on the B2145 and along the B2166 beyond Runcton. The traffic queues, of course, get even worse in the summer. The A27 will be more at a standstill with additional cars and lorries.</p>	The A27 needs to be fixed/ re-routed BEFORE any housing development is considered below the A27 on the peninsular. There needs to be more joined up thinking with transport and housing policies. The B2145 cannot cope with any more traffic on it without improvements to it and a halt to development along it until suitable transport facilities are available .	Object	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1734	<p>4.Provision of on-site public open space and play areas;</p> <p>The development needs to take into account, develop further and compliment the additional facilities (the recreation ground and village hall) and and not be a token gesture or 'add on' by a developer. These should be suitable for the population of the entire village and be agreed by the village through its Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		Comment	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1739	<p>5. Detailed consideration of the impact of development on the surrounding landscape; Any development needs to respect the existing rural nature of the village and maintain the village's separation from the city. Views and fields therefore should be maintained.</p>		Comment	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1741	<p>6.Opportunities for the expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities;</p> <p>As a village, of course we want to retain this.</p>		Comment	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1747	<p>7.Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats;</p> <p>The proposed 15 m margin around the ancient woodland (Hunston Copse) is insufficient properly to conserve the site.</p>	Give a much larger margin to the ancient woodland.	Object	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1748	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 200 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report.	This needs to be considered in the local plan	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1759	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 500 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan I will wish to raise this with the examiner at the appropriate juncture.	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 500 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1761	<p>9. Demonstration that sufficient capacity will be available within the sewer network, including waste water treatment works, to accommodate the proposed development; It has been suggested that the sewer system, contrary to obvious responses from the provider, Southern Water, are not currently adequate, let alone with more pressure on them. Surface water in such a high water table area will increase problems and impact on the sewage network.</p>		Comment	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1767	<p>10. Provision of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the most up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan;</p> <p>Comment has already been made on the already overloaded B2145, the 4th busiest B road in the country, and the impact any additional housing and subsequent traffic will have on this road, the B2166, where the two roads meet in Hunston and their impact on the already lamentable and shaming A27.</p>	<p>The A27 needs to be re-routed or fixed before any houses are built south of it on the Manhood peninsular.</p> <p>The B2145 needs a plan for all of its traffic, including traffic calming measures, as does the B2166.</p>	Object	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1770	11. Provisions of the West Sussex Minerals Plan, and associated guidance, in relation to the site being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area. Make sure account is taken of all facilities and the residential areas.		Comment	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	1849	Object to the proposal to construct further dwellings on the Manhood Peninsula: potential to lead to severe degradation of the local environment/ increased traffic congestion. Indeed, in these circumstances, the residents are put at some risk owing to the difficulty thus presented for access by the emergency services. The situation might be relieved by the construction of new or improved roads but this will only lead to increased congestion on the southern access to Chichester itself. Moreover, building or upgrading the highway will lead to further degradation of the environment in a sensitive area	Development in the sensitive region of the Manhood Peninsula and Selsey should only be permitted if there is a commitment to provide a light rail link to Chichester and which would connect with all the important transport hubs there (bus, rail) and include a park and ride facility off the A27. This is quite an expensive proposal but nevertheless, the traffic congestion already resulting on summer weekends is totally unacceptable, for both local residents and visitors alike. Moreover, the area is low lying, much of it being less than 10m above sea level. Thus it could be susceptible to problems with flooding should sea levels rise owing to climate change. Governments have outlined a willingness to examine transport solutions with an improved environmental impact. Now is the time to act.	Object	Mr Angus Eickhoff [7212]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2092	Minerals and waste: It is considered that the Joint Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan are referenced, particularly with regards to safeguarding policies (M9, M10 and W2) and these documents and policies are given detailed consideration when allocating sites. Development at, adjacent or proximal to existing waste or mineral sites / infrastructure should be the subject to consultation with WSCC.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2133	Education: Any development within this area cannot currently be accommodated in the existing primary school at North Mundham. Further capacity would be required to accommodate the development, CDC will need to work with WSCC to determine how additional capacity in the area could be accommodated if land is to be allocated. At the current time pupil place planning indicates that there would be sufficient space or expansion capacity to accommodate the child product from this proposed development for secondary aged pupils. Contributions would be required for expansion of secondary schools and sixth form if feasible and required.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2145	Due to no information on where housing is going to be located so the LLFA is not in a position to comment on proposed housing allocation sites at this stage. The village is already well connected for walkers to access the surrounding countryside but there are presently no local cycling or horse riding facilities on the PROW network. A bridleway link to South Mundham (with the potential for future cycle links to Pagham and towards Bognor Regis) and to Sidlesham via the golf course and Brimfast Lane would provide residents and visitors with improved access to the countryside and services.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2217	There are parts of Hunston that fall within flood zones 2 and 3. We would recommend that if possible the policy makes reference to the fact that built development should be located solely in Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible some reference would need to be made to flood risk and the requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan group to fully consider this through their site allocation process. If sites were to be allocated in flood zone 2 or 3 it is likely that the Plan would need to be supported by a Level 2 SFRA or equivalent.		Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2272	<p>Historic England has no comments on the principle of land being allocated in the revised Hunston Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>However, we note that one of the specific issues that need to be taken into account in planning for development at Hunston identified in paragraph 6.77 of the Plan is "Respecting the setting of listed buildings and the Hunston conservation area".</p> <p>We welcome the recognition and identification of this issue, but we consider that it should be included as a specific requirement in Policy AL11.</p>	<p>Add the following clause to Policy AL11;</p> <p>"Demonstration that the development would not have an adverse impact on the significance of heritage assets, including listed buildings, or on the character or appearance of the Hunston Conservation Area."</p>	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2311	Policy AL11 'Hunston' allocation is not site specific.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2340	S23. The proposed increase in housing in Hunston of 200 will have further detrimental impact on the B2145. The road is already far beyond it's capacity and the combination of the additional congestion resulting from the Free School, and development further down the road towards and including Selsey, means that the village will be impacted with a significant increase in road movements. We already have slow moving/stationary traffic during peak hours and the additional pollution and risk to pedestrians is unacceptable.	No access from the proposed development down Church Lane and a reduction in the proposed number of dwellings to mitigate the impact on road traffic.	Object	Mr Andrew Sabin [6729]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2341	S30. There is a rich and varied number of wildlife in Hunston and the surrounding areas but the proposed development in Hunston would have a serious negative impact on the current wildlife corridors. The canal already acts as a hard North/South border to wildlife movement and the proposed development would only further impede wildlife movement.	Reduce the proposed number of houses and find a way to avoid developing prime farmland.	Object	Mr Andrew Sabin [6729]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2342	S28. The B2145 already has very high traffic levels and the combination of the congestion from the new Free School and the proposed development down the B2145 will lead to a significant increase in the slow moving and stationary traffic during peak times with a corresponding increase in pollution levels during those periods.	Reduce the proposed number of new dwellings and bypass the choke points at the top pf the village.	Object	Mr Andrew Sabin [6729]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2365	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Pan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2404	Need to consider: - Cycle access		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2508	<p>Object:</p> <p>Concern over use of 'minimum' - uncertainty over sites and capacity to deliver e.g. flood risk, impact on ancient woodland</p> <p>Flawed allocation e.g. reversal of HELAA</p> <p>Sites are arable used for cattle/crops</p> <p>Use of greenfield sites detrimental</p> <p>Coalescence of Hunston-N Mundham and Hunston-Chi.</p> <p>Traffic impacts</p> <p>Pollution</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Services</p> <p>Lack of sustainability</p> <p>Impact on woodland and wildlife</p>	Change wording to 'maximum of 200 dwellings' or 'about 200 dwellings'	Object	Hunston Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1096]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2667	Makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 200 dwellings onto the A259 and A27. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2678	No evidence that Hunston can accommodate 200 dwellings.		Comment	Devonshire Developments Limited [7116]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2684	The proposed policy sets out detailed policy requirements without identifying the site or location which has been considered suitable for the proposed strategic site. It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan process is not suitable to identify strategic level sites and that these should be identified through the Local Plan review.	The Local Plan should allocate suitable land for development, such as land at Reedbridge Farm, Hunston. This land is suitable, available and achievable as identified by the Chichester Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. Furthermore the documentation we have provided to the Council demonstrates an achievable scheme that would make a significant contribution towards the number of dwellings allocated within Hunston in a sustainable manner that would achieve the Policy requirements set out by AL11.	Object	Spiby Partners Ltd (Chris Spiby) [7302]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2784	Whilst SWT supports the recognition of Hunston Copse LWS in section 6.72, it is not clear why Chichester Canal LWS which also passes through the Parish is not mentioned. there is a particular requirement in section 6.77 for development to protect and enhance non-designated sites and their setting. We question why it is not included in the supporting text of other allocations which may impact on LWS or in the policy wording for AL11. We ask CDC to be more consistent in their recognition of LWS as per paragraph 174 of the NPPF and recommend amendments in this case:	We ask CDC to be more consistent in their recognition of LWS as per paragraph 174 of the NPPF and recommend the following amendments in this case: 'Policy AL11: Hunston Parish 6. Expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitat and that measurable net gains to biodiversity will be delivered; 7. Be planned with special regard to the need to avoid potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar and Pagham Harbour SPA and Ramsar site and the Medmerry realignment including contributing to any strategic access management issues, loss of functionally linked supporting habitat, and water quality issues relating to runoff from a designated site...'	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	2910	Hunston suffers from an exceptionally busy road bisecting it (B2145). Under this plan it has been allocated 200 houses. A large number will change the character of the village. The policy calls for a 'minimum' of 200 houses. Given the small amount of land close enough to the main part of the village to ensure proper assimilation, this should read 'about' rather than 'minimum'. Mention of road improvements to accompany the development mentioned in Para 6.77, 4th bullet, is not reflected in this policy and paragraph and should be a necessary condition.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3126	The settlement hierarchy identifies Hunston to have fewer facilities than Birdham - Hunston is neither larger nor more sustainable and the allocation is inconsistent with policy S3.		Object	D R Pick Grandchildren's Settlement [7364]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3154	Object to Hunston allocation on the following grounds: - Lack of infrastructure - Increase in traffic - Unequal distribution of homes - Tourist economy affected by more development - Impact on food and environment by building on agricultural land - Second homes underoccupied - Impact on The Copse		Object	Mrs Christine Harrison [7372]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3167	<p>Will make the overused B2145 even worse.</p> <p>The number of new houses in Hunston should be 50 at most, directed at local need, affordable, some to rent, and at least half designated for those on council waiting lists.</p> <p>Bus fares should be reduced to encourage bus use by those travelling to work in Chichester.</p> <p>The nearby Free School should be required to amend their travel plans to restrict private car use for pupil transport.</p> <p>Developments should only be permitted where a thorough investigation has been undertaken to show that the benefits outweigh any adverse impact on biodiversity.</p>		Object	Mr Alan Carn [5417]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3190	This plan should include provision of housing for younger people with shared communal areas to make living in shared communities an attractive and affordable proposition to attract more young people to stay in the area.	<p>6.77 Insert a new bullet point: "Particular regard should be taken of the Chichester Free School , located near Hunston"</p> <p>Change point 2 of policy to "To meet specialised housing needs including accomodation for older and younger people"</p>	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3198	<p>Object to Hunston allocation on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flooding - Sewage, drainage and water infrastructure - Traffic congestion - Use of agricultural land (less available for food production) - Should use brownfield sites first 	<p>A lot less new houses and major improvements to sewage and drainage in the village.</p> <p>Northern A27 route and less new houses on Manhood peninsula.</p> <p>A lot less houses - no more than 80.</p>	Object	Mrs Joan Duberley [7379]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3212	<p>Object to Hunston allocation on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Views to countryside - Building on agricultural land - Increase in cars - Pollution from traffic - Affect on wildlife and habitats - Lack of evidence for housing numbers 	<p>Build on suitable brownfield sites.</p> <p>Do not ruin a long established small village in a rural location - what evidence is there for this amount of houses being needed?</p> <p>Build if absolutely necessary on fields just before the new school not swamping already established housing in the village and spoiling the rural location and views over The Copse.</p>	Object	Jill Pagano [7381]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3300	<p>CCE supports the allocation of additional land for a mixed-use form of development including a minimum of 200 dwellings at Hunston, including any amendments to the settlement boundary, to be identified through a revised Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>See attached for site submission.</p>		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3348	Question deliverability of allocation through NP process		Object	CEG [7397]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3369	For the reasons set out in representations to draft Policies S2 and S3, the allocation in Hunston Parish should be more appropriate to its location. As such the allocation should be reduced to 50, with the remaining 150 allocated to Runcton, as a more sustainable location for this level of development due to its proximity and relationship to the HDA and Chichester Food Park.	The allocation at Hunston should be reduced to 50 dwellings, with the remaining 150 allocated to Runcton.	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3387	<p>Hunston has 9 facilities compared with 8 at North Mundham/Runcton but Hunston is allocated 200 units as a strategic allocation and North Mundham has only 50 as a parish housing allocation.</p> <p>On the basis that a dispersed strategy is accepted for Hunston with a reduced allocation of 125 units, 2ha of land adjacent to the existing settlement policy boundary of Hunston is available at Farmfield. The land has an existing access onto the Selsey Road and is immediately available. It could deliver around 50 dwellings and contribute to the needs of Hunston in the early part of the plan period.</p>	Propose a more equal distribution between Hunston and North Mundham/Runcton with 125 dwellings each would better reflect their almost equal ranking in the Settlement hierarchy background paper. The 125 dwellings at Hunston could all be accommodated as extensions to the existing built up area without impacting on its overall character.	Object	Ms Rebecca Newman [7405]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3435	No further development in this village, It is full to capacity now.	No further development in this village, It is full to capacity now.	Object	Beryl Clarke [7408]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3436	The infrastructure is not sufficient to support 250 houses - especially in respect of non vehicular transport modes such as walking and cycling. I object to the very large number of houses in the proposal. This number would completely change the village rural character of Hunston. The 250 houses proposed would entail a great loss of greenspace and the proximity of these to woodland and cultivated areas would be detrimental to peoples health.	1. Do not build more than 100 houses. 2. Make exisiting footpaths and cycle routes connect completely too. e.g Chichester and Mundham without gaps.	Object	Mr David Alan Parsons [7409]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3437	The huge increase in traffic if all these houses are built. Too large a number of new house proposed and the loss of green space.	Less houses.	Object	Janet Parsons [7410]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3438	1. There are already many houses in Hunston 2. With more properties being built near Selsey and in Selsey the main road through Hunston from the A27 also the road from North Mundham through Hunston to Selsey is also getting as busy as the A27.		Object	Mrs Gillian Tennent [7411]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3439	Hunston is big enough. It can take up to an hour to get into Chichester, the road is always congested, buses are delayed have to leave alot earlier for appointments. Also the sewers can't cope. Fields flood badly now.	Less house, becoming an overflow of Chichester.	Object	Mrs C Axworthy [7412]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3440	200 more houses are too many for our small village like Hunston. Plus more cars (at least 400).	Traffic calming. Urgently a footpath Hunston to Chichester would be handy, so we could use our bikes.	Object	Mrs P Harvey [7413]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3441	Object to Hunston allocation on the following grounds: - Too many homes for Hunston - Lack of social housing - Loss of agricultural/food production land - Types of houses not affordable for young people and too large	Split allocation with North Mundham without joining two villages Provision of social housing instead of 3-4 bedroomed detached houses The higher proportion of a lower figure should be homes for local people to rent or to buy at sensible manageable prices. Provide terraced houses, or small blocks of flats as starter homes.	Object	Anne Duffy [7414]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3442	200 houses = 400 cars & visitors, 800 ex people. Will cause extra pollutiion, this will cause health problems for everyone & will have an impact on the copse & wildlife. The buildings will have a huge impact on the environment killing it & wildlife off - green areas help clean our air.	Keep in mind the Environment Act 2018 & clean air strategy.	Object	Sharon Lamb [7415]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3443	A large number of houses in a small village like Hunston will ruin the ethos of our community. B2145 is already an extremely busy road and the only one to Selsey. A small primary school already fully subscribed and no suitable facilities to sustain the addition of a large number of houses ex. Drainage, traffic school, doctors.	Bigger school Doctors surgery Road improvements Drainage	Object	Lynne Rosemary Powell [7416]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3444	Drainage won't be able to cope with more house in Hunston. Also more cars on the B2145, as well as the new Free School traffic.	Road improvements	Object	Terence Robert Powell [7417]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3445	A potential 800 extra people will turn a rural village into a concrete town with no facilities to service them. All medical and frontline services are on their knees and there are none in the village. All schools are over subscribed with long waiting lists.	Improve facilities in towns and claim disused buildings to turn into housing.	Object	stephen lamb [6708]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3446	Building 200 new homes in Hunston village will put added strain on water and sewage services.		Object	Stephen Berriman [7418]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3447	200 extra house being built in our rural village will mean an increase in traffic using the already very busy B2145. Medical and front line services will take longer to reach those in need.		Object	Jennifer Berriman [7419]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3448	Infrastructure at breaking point. Traffic at peak times gridlocked. More pollution. Wildlife & environment killed off. Lane to houses not fit for purpose.	No more houses in Hunston.	Object	Jim Talman [7420]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3449	Roads can not cope now with traffic. Front line services can not cope with any more residents.	Village can not cope with any more houses.	Object	Geraldine Talman [7422]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3450	Object to Hunston allocation on following grounds: - Loss of agricultural land/food production - Balance of nature - Additional housing proposed by Arun DC to add to traffic on B2166 and B2145 - Pollution from increased traffic	- Social housing for rural people working the countryside for food or nature - A27 improvements	Object	Alan Duffy [7421]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3451	The destructive impact on local wildlife will be considerable. Hunston Copse will be lost to local residents behind the new proposed site. There is an unfair allocation of housing compared to other communities. It would increase the size of the village by 35-40% and fundamentally destroy the character of the community. The B2145 is the 4th busiest B road in the UK. It is already heavily congregated and is difficult to turn onto in Hunston. It also makes access to the Selsey Peninsula extremely slow, especially in summertime. The road cannot support more traffic and pollution.	Find an alternative site(s) which would not change the rural character of Hunston and takeaway the natural habitats which we all enjoy. See Hunston Parish local plan for better proposals that would be acceptable to the people of Hunston. A small allocation to Hunston with fairer distribution to other localities, e.g. North Mundham. Identify other locations and agree a smaller number of new houses which will not impact the B2145 so badly.	Object	Sophie Morton [7423]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3453	- Unfair allocation of housing in comparison to other localities. It would increase the size of the village by 35-40% and fundamentally destroy the character of the community. - The B2145 is the 4th busiest B road in the UK. It is already heavily congested and is difficult to turn onto in Hunston. It also makes access to the Selsey Peninsula extremely slow. The road cannot support more traffic and pollution. - There is insufficient access and drainage on the proposed site. - The destructive impact on local wildlife will be considerable. Hunston Copse will be lost to local residents.	A smaller allocation to Hunston with fairer distribution to other localities, e.g. North Mundham. Identify other locations and agree a smaller number of new house which will not impact the B2145 so badly. Identify other sites more suitable in Hunston as agree in the local plan by Hunston Parish Council. Find an alternative site(s) which would not change the rural character of Hunston and take away the natural habitats which we all enjoy. See Hunston Parish Local Plan for better proposals that would be acceptable to the people of Hunston.	Object	Shane Morton [7424]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3463	<p>Increased flooding risk.</p> <p>No indications that current sewage, drainage and water utilities will cope with development.</p> <p>Change from HELAA 2018 allocations not acceptable.</p> <p>Current plans would add 900 cars to B2145 and 800 to B2166 all meeting at the roundabout north of Hunston.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and housing will result in increased air pollution, damaging peoples health.</p> <p>Different numbers proposed from SA of the Site Allocation DPD 2018.</p> <p>We cannot afford to give up productive land.</p> <p>Population of the Peninsula doubles in the summer, current road infrastructure cannot cope.</p> <p>Hunston Copse and surrounding fields support a wide range of wildlife.</p>	<p>Identify other locations to build on where this is not the case (flooding & sewage/drainage).</p> <p>Allocate more of the houses to Mundham.</p> <p>Identify other locations and agree a smaller number of new house which will not impact these roads so badly.</p> <p>Identify other sites more suitable.</p> <p>Find sites that are not used as arable land.</p> <p>Find alternative sites where the road infrastructure would cope with additional housing.</p> <p>Find alternative sites so the habitat of these precious animals remain.</p>	Object	Jacque Morton [7426]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3464	<p>Local schools including Mundham, Sidlesham and the Free School are full.</p> <p>The proposal of houses would increase the population size dramatically. This would change a rural village into a subsection of Chichester and lose its identity as well as crucial land used to harvest crops.</p> <p>The A27 is almost always gridlocked, creating problems down the B2145. New housing would create pandemonium at the roundabout north of Hunston.</p> <p>Without any GP surgeries in the local area, Hunston residents use surgeries in Chichester. 200 new families would have to register there too.</p>	<p>Identify other sites more suitable which have a great accessibility of schools for families.</p> <p>It is unacceptable to have this many new houses compared to Mundham (50 there) so moving some of the proposed houses to there and create a more even spread would be fairer.</p> <p>Identify other locations to put housing to prevent the build up of traffic developing to a unbelievable scale.</p> <p>Build less houses in Hunston so that GPs don't get overwhelmed by the population and are unable to function.</p>	Object	Ben Morton [7427]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3465	Too many houses allocated for Hunston	Half the amount.	Object	Mrs A E M Green [7428]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3466	No building at the end of Southover Way	Housing would be more suited at the main roundabout at the field on the B2145 and B2166. Ideal for access and less traffic through the village.	Object	Mr P J Green [7429]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3467	200 additional houses is a significant increase in dwellings for this village of Hunston relative to its current size. Main concern with impact to road networks and access - the main B road is already too busy and overused for access. Hunston is not a suitable location for this number of homes with limited services for an already packed village. Please consider alternative locations and a significant reduction in the number of proposed dwellings.	Reduction in number proposed dwellings relative to the size of Hunston. Alternative locations to be proposed for these dwellings.	Object	Mr Benjamin Thompson [6940]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3468	The roads and sewers will not be able to take the amount of houses. What about doctors and schools. In particular the main road gets packed in the mornings and at night. In summer it is a lot worse.	No improvements village will not cope.	Object	George Anthony Booker [7430]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3469	There should be no impact on the large number of wild animals in and around the Hunston Copse, including deer, foxes and larger numbers of birds.	There should be no house built on the land surrounding the Hunston Copse.	Object	Brian Snelling [7431]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3470	Location is not suitable for the amount of houses proposed. Traffic is already a nightmare getting out of Hunston in the mornings. This area has already been intruded by the Free School. This village will no longer be a village.	I myself have just moved into a smaller development in North Mundham. Why can't smaller developments be built in more suitable locations! Don't ruin our village!	Object	Katy Bowering [7432]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3471	Although additional housing is needed and I'm not objecting to all new building, I think that the village will be ruined but building near the ancient woodland. Ther is so much wildlife there which is enjoyed by walkers, young and old. There is plenty of other sites available to build. Hunston is beautiful village and loved by everyone. Hunston is becoming too big and has already enough traffic on the roads. Its becoming dangerous on the road, too much traffic.	Building next to Foxbridge would make sense as access on to road would be easy. Also ground on bigger roundabout would be ideal for new builds. We need to keep our villages. The roads cannot take any more traffic!	Object	Mrs Karen Bowering [7433]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3472	We can't afford to lose the woodland and wildlife and the beautiful views that we have. The traffic this will cause will be ridiculous. It is already and issue in the area and has been made worse since the Free School opened. I just think there are other areas this can be built on.	Build on another piece of land, there are other areas which will not destroy our woodland. At this rate Hunston will no longer be a village.	Object	Hannah Bowering [7434]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3473	200 homes will have a significant impact on our local wildlife and additional traffic/congestion will raise local pollution levels. Roads are already too busy and dangerous for people to cross at times. Fully object to this proposal - too many homes given the current size of the village - too significant a step change in the population here.	Fewer homes allocated in Hunston. Alternative locations should be proposed.	Object	Hannah Thompson [7435]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3474	Traffic congestion. Traffic build up on the B2145 nortwards will have a big impact and knock-on effect on traffic into Chichester on already highly congested roads, causing delays and tailbacks. Traffic pollution. Increased traffic will significantly increase air pollution and will be detrimental to childrens health and those with respiratory illnesses, young and old.	Lower numbers of houses in the Hunston area. 200 houses equals at least 400 cars! Significantly reduce the planned number of homes.	Object	Gail Poulton [7436]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3475	200 new homes would change the nature of our community as Hunston and N Mundham would be linked by new homes, instead of by rural land which provides a valuable recreational amenity. Large scale development on good agricultural land will seriously impact the wildlife habitat which links to the ancient woodland at Hunston Copse. Increasing development on the peninsula will add to serious congestion, especially the A27 junction with B2145. We have already seen increased congestion due to CFS traffic. We already have problems with surface water drainage and sewage overload. 200 new homes will add significantly to these problems.	Keep the number and concentration of new house to an acceptable level which avoids turning our cohesive village community into a surburban enclave. Keep housing development in Hunston and surrounding areas in small areas which can integrate into the semi rural village community. Limit the scale of further housing on the B2145 corridor. Fewer new homes especially large concentrations of dwellings.	Object	Brian Poulton [7437]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3483	Object to Hunston allocation on following grounds: Protection of Ancient Woodland Views to the Copse obscured by development Congestion Pollution Increased car use Poor bus service	Changes Save The Copse, retain the views Find alternative smaller sites close to B2145 Better reliable bus service	Object	Mrs Barbara Reeve [4791]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3484	Object to Hunston allocation on following grounds: Lack of infrastructure Traffic congestion Protection of The Copse	Consider other sites	Object	Michelle Peters [7440]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3488	<p>Sewers already inadequate - Southover Way residents often troubled by back-up int their toilets. Fields opposit Spotted Cow flood in winter, High Trees road regularly flooded.</p> <p>New school places for primary children needed now - Mundham school has been full for years and no school in Hunston. Footpaths along Mundham road narrow and dangerous with volume of traffic. No footpath along B2145 between substation and Free School.</p> <p>Skylarks used to be abundant in wheat fields here. All gone now and wheatfields to be built on and green pastures to go as well. Pollution from roads gets worse.</p>	<p>Repair roads. Install more drains. Reduce traffic congestion especially when Free School opening and closing. Provide more parking for staff etc at Free School and more buses for pupils anyway. Stop mineral extraction in area and number of heavy lorries and tractors through village.</p> <p>Better pavements and better lighting. More cycle paths to Chichester, Sidlesham and Selsey. Provision of public toilet in Hunston and cash machine for use when Post Office closed. No cashback available in pub or newsagent.</p> <p>Keep greenfields as they are now. Stop Cardine's Dairy and Church Commission selling them over our head. Foxbridge Farm and village dairy long since gone and we miss them too. We don't want 200 houses. Perhaps 50 on brownfield sites at prices that can be afforded, especially for young and first time buyers.</p>	Comment	Margaret Beazley [7442]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3491	<p>Hunston is low lying and cannot sustain further building without flooding.</p> <p>Even a 30metre margin would affect the air flow in the woods and destroy habitats of Hunston Copse.</p> <p>If CDC can prevent roasting coffee beans for 2hours a week in St James' Industrial Estate due to pollution surely they cannot condone more traffic pollution.</p> <p>I do not wish to live in an extension to Chichester.</p> <p>The B2145 is over used already and the side road inadequate for the volume of traffic.</p> <p>The peninsula can not take any further traffic.</p>	<p>Put in traffic lights outside the Hunston Village Hall for the crossing to the playing fields. This might help slow the traffic which does not understand 30mph.</p>	Object	Marie Tidswell [7443]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3492	<p>Object to Hunston allocation on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pollution levels Speed of traffic and increased accidents Current properties empty Wildlife protection Lack of S106 spends from current developments Canal path unsuitable for travelling to school 		Object	Ms Sandra Pascoal-Lima [5413]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3500	<p>Object to Hunston allocation on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crime Impossible to leave the Manhood Peninsula 	<p>Make sure there are enough houses for local young people. Leave Hunston as it is</p>	Object	G K Stubbington [7445]
95	Selsey	547	<p>Where are the new residents going to work!</p>	<p>Where are the new residents going to work!</p>	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
95	Selsey	1395	<p>B2145 is already too dangerous and would only become more busy and therefore extremely dangerous.</p>	<p>Build proper roads with cycle and foot paths instead of trying to earn more money by contractors and estate agents.</p> <p>Think of our children and elderly!!!!</p>	Object	Miss Debby den Toom [7138]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	100	<p>Selsey's inherent fishing and seaside village charm and attraction to tourists has been undermined by excessive suburban development without sufficient facilities and infrastructure spend for four decades.It lies at the southern tip of a peninsula cut de sac with one country B road in and out and not even a cycle path to another settlement.It's winter population is almost half that of Chichester's and its population the rest of the year exceeds Chichester's substantially if the holiday parks are included, yet it has hardly any of the facilities Chichester can boast of.</p>	<p>Recognise Selsey as a potential honeypot tourism destination, improve its environment and infrastructure, especially cycle routes and reduce the bland suburbanisation of this precious seaside asset.</p>	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	738	Selsey, another "settlement hub", has been badly affected by excessive suburban development in recent years with no improvement to its local infrastructure. The further extensive housing numbers proposed for this fishing and seaside village risk undermining its attraction to tourists. It is important that development of these seaside communities is carefully designed and limited in numbers to prevent over-suburbanisation. It should also be recognised that the geography of the peninsula means that access to and from the coast will always be restricted and subject to severe congestion.		Comment	Miss sarah backhouse [6692]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	830	There is no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 250 dwellings onto the local roads and will impact the transport report. There is only 1 road to Selsey and it is at capacity now especially when trying to access the A27. Many recent settlements in Selsey are already having damp issues and are at significant risk of flooding. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	The transport issue needs to be addressed and included in detail in future iterations	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	840	The land is the lowest point on the Manhood, already plagued by flooding and damp. Development at a reasonable standard likely to be uneconomic. Infrastructure will not support further development	Until land which is more suitable is found, no development should go forward. Seek sites on higher ground	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	947	It is important that this does not become a step towards extending Selsey out along the B2145 or towards Church Norton - the infrastructure facilities in the town are already at capacity (eg health care). Cycling paths and footpaths need to be integrated from initial development and of a standard to support wheelchair access throughout.		Comment	Mr Steve Frampton [6919]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	1148	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	1268	The planned development would be immediately adjacent to the Pagham Harbour SPA and Ramsar site. Policy item 9 requires mitigation to ensure protection but the damage in terms of loss of agricultural land buffer is highly likely to outweigh any possible mitigation and would be contrary to policy S27 - loss of high-quality agricultural land.	increase protection of Pagham Harbour	Object	North Mundham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1193]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	1306	This land is the lowest point in Selsey, at sea level, and current occupants of this land report continued problems with surface water drainage. This land is not suitable for development. Mitigation to render it more suitable would make such development uneconomic. Houses built at East Beach walk adjacent to this site continue to have problems with damp and surface water drainage, and the parcel of land in this proposal continues to have problems which the Flood Action Group have attempted to ameliorate.	From: Flood Local Action Group Selsey We wish to object to proposals to designate the land North of Park Lane and East of the Langmead Factory for Housing. This land is the lowest point in Selsey, at sea level, and current occupants of this land report continued problems with surface water drainage. This land is not suitable for development. Mitigation to render it more suitable would make such development uneconomic. Houses built at East Beach walk adjacent to this site continue to have problems with damp and surface water drainage, and the parcel of land in this proposal continues to have problems which the Flood Action Group have attempted to ameliorate. Please consider this information when revising the Local Plan. We will raise this issue with the examiner if necessary Brendon Hogan On behalf of FLAGS	Object	Flood Action Group Selsey (Mr Brendon Hogan) [7113]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	1539	If Park Farm is regularly used as foraging habitat by brent geese associated with Pagham Harbour SPA, then the first step should be to avoid that impact, and mitigate only if there are no other suitable development sites. Clause 9 should include reference to recreational disturbance and water quality impacts.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	1553	Accessed only by the B2145 which has surpassed capacity. A small town which doubles to over 22,000 in summer. Over subscribed schools and serious flooding risk. Is building more housing on Selsey a longterm solution or just a knee jerk reaction to the Government allocation numbers? Our MP and CDC should be discussing with Westminster the fact that land availability in the South is limited by space and flooding.	Any new development should have a caveat that it is affordable housing for the local community and not to be sold for second homes.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	1716	A minimum of 250 houses is excessive in the context of environmental and access constraints, putting too much pressure on internationally protected habitats at Pagham Harbour, and at Medmerry. Road infrastructure is at capacity at peak times, and with access only available via the B2145, emergency vehicles cannot access Selsey if there is an incident blocking the highway. This risk would increase through further development. Additionally, extra road journeys resulting from the proposed development to access employment, higher education, railway station, shops etc, add to carbon emissions. Development closer to the A259/A27/A3 is more appropriate (eg East of Chichester and Southbourne).	Restrict additional housing development in Selsey to less than 100 (only if required to meet local needs.)	Object	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	1751	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 250 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report.	This needs to be considered in the local plan	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	1752	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 250 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report	This needs to be considered in the local plan	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	1850	Object to the proposal to construct further dwellings on the Manhood Peninsular: potential to lead to severe degradation of the local environment/ increased traffic congestion. Indeed, in these circumstances, the residents are put at some risk owing to the difficulty thus presented for access by the emergency services. The situation might be relieved by the construction of new or improved roads but this will only lead to increased congestion on the southern access to Chichester itself. Moreover, building or upgrading the highway will lead to further degradation of the environment in a sensitive area	Development in the sensitive region of the Manhood Peninsula and Selsey should only be permitted if there is a commitment to provide a light rail link to Chichester and which would connect with all the important transport hubs there (bus, rail) and include a park and ride facility off the A27. This is quite an expensive proposal but nevertheless, the traffic congestion already resulting on summer weekends is totally unacceptable, for both local residents and visitors alike. Moreover, the area is low lying, much of it being less than 10m above sea level. Thus it could be susceptible to problems with flooding should sea levels rise owing to climate change. Governments have outlined a willingness to examine transport solutions with an improved environmental impact. Now is the time to act.	Object	Mr Angus Eickhoff [7212]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2014	Concerns over impact on Brent Geese - site close to Pagham Harbour SPA and over 10 years 900 records of birds at Park Farm and Church Norton Greenlease including brent geese. Area falls outside of SWBGS and would not be picked up by this strategy, until we have full understanding of what fields are used by brent geese we will oppose development on fields potentially used by them for foraging.		Object	RSPB (miss Chloe Rose) [6981]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2040	We strongly oppose this site (or indeed any site on the east side of Selsey Road between Siddlesham and Selsey) being allocated for development. It is just too close to Pagham Harbour, and building on the east side of the road could directly affect the SPA and the bird populations.	If 250 houses are to built north of Selsey then we would much prefer to see them built on the west side of Selsey Road, as the busy Selsey Road does form a natural protective barrier around the western side of the SPA. This would alleviate any additional pressure being created on the Church Norton part of the Pagham Hbr SPA, which is already coming under pressure because of recent or planned housing developments at the northern end of Selsey.	Object	Sussex Ornithological Society (Mr Richard Cowser) [7256]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2088	Minerals and waste: Reference should be made to minerals safeguarding as site is within the sharp sand and gravel safeguarding area.	Reference should be made to minerals safeguarding as site is within the sharp sand and gravel safeguarding area.	Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2134	Education: Further capacity would be required to accommodate the development. Contributions (and possibly land if required) would be sought to meet the pupil product from the development in the most appropriate form once this can be clarified. At the current time pupil place planning indicates that there would be sufficient space to accommodate the child product from this proposed development for secondary aged pupils. Contributions would be required for expansion of secondary schools if feasible and required.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2146	It is unclear why the policy map shows the proposed strategic allocation lies outside of the Neighbourhood Plan proposed settlement boundary. Some explanation for this anomaly would be helpful in the text. The principle concern that the LLFA wishes to highlight is the need to ensure that the necessary foul sewerage infrastructure to support development is in place. It is the LLFA understanding that the Siddlesham WWTW experiences capacity issues currently, in part exacerbated by groundwater infiltration. Cycling links should be provided.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2273	According to our records, the site Land north of Park Farm, Selsey, contains no designated heritage assets. We therefore have no comment on the principle of the allocation, although we would expect its potential for non-designated archaeology to have been assessed, with reference to the Council's Historic Environment Record, in accordance with paragraph 187. This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any planning application that may be submitted for the development of this site.		Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2312	Policy A12 'Selsey' is at the extremity of the distribution system and has seen previous housing growth. Reinforcement of the water mains may need to be provided.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2337	Limited infrastructure to accommodate proposed development. Proposals for 250 dwellings will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network. Southern Water will need to work with the site promoters. Connection of new development ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation.	Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following addition to Policy AL12: Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.	Comment	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2366	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Plan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2407	Need to consider: - Cycle access		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2668	Makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 250 dwellings onto the A259 and A27. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2787	SWT objects to this allocation as we have no confidence that the value of this site as functional linked supporting habitat has been sufficiently assessed. As stated in our comments in relation to the HRA the lack of robust evidence in terms of the usage to farmland in Chichester District by Dark-bellied Brent Geese is concerning. It is irresponsible of CDC to allocate a site for development without sufficient knowledge of whether it is deliverable in terms of the requirements of the Habitat Regulations. Whilst we maintain our objection, if CDC choose to progress the allocation then we request amendments.	Whilst we maintain our objection, if CDC choose to progress the allocation then we request the following amendments: 'Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey 7. Expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; 8. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of adjoining areas and would deliver measurable net gains to biodiversity; 9. Provide mitigation to ensure the avoidance of adverse effects on the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Pagham Harbour and the Medmerry realignment as a result of loss of supporting habitat...'	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2868	Object to allocation - unsustainable, environmental impacts, congestion Suggest alternative site - Land west of the Paddocks, Selsey - see attachments		Object	Thawcroft Ltd [1898]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	2959	6.79 to 6.85 fail to mention Selsey Greenway project, a key part of mitigating growth in vehicle traffic off the Manhood and a potential major tourist attraction. Policy SA12, Item 6, goes some way to rectify the situation, but still does not mention the route by name, which surely handicaps attempts to implement the route in terms of accessing CIL contributions, and obtaining protection and promotion in planning policy.	In sections 6.79 to 6.85, insert a paragraph about promoting the Selsey Greenway. In policy AL12, mention the Selsey Greenway project by name in Item 6.	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	3194	Object on grounds that: plan should include provision of housing for younger people with shared communal areas to attract more young people to the area; more affordable homes are required; pedestrians, cyclists and people using public transport should be given priority when new roads are built or upgraded.	Policy, Point 1, change to: "Provision of a high quality and affordable form of development" 2. change to "To meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older and younger people". 3. Delete "encourage" and replace with "enable".	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	3372	This policy is generally supported - as far as it goes; however, having done some more detailed landscape and design work, Landlink suggest the boundary for Policy AL12 be amended to reflect that shown on the attached plan. For the reasons set out in representations to draft Policies S2 and S3, the allocation at Selsey should be more appropriate to its size, services and facilities. As such the allocation should be increased to a minimum of 480 dwellings, reducing the allocations at East Wittering and Birdham to more appropriate levels.	If the current allocation of 250 dwellings was found sound, the plan for Policy AL12 should be amended slightly, as shown on the attached plan, to reflect the more detailed work that has been undertaken. If the current allocation for the Manhood Peninsula was found sound, then Policy AL12 should be amended to increase the allocation to a more appropriate minimum of 450 dwellings from reductions of the allocations at East Wittering and Birdham and the policy boundary amended accordingly, based on the attached plan. If a larger, more equitable housing allocation of 1400 dwellings was made to the Manhood Peninsula in Policy S4, Policy AL12 should be amended to a minimum 700 dwellings and the site boundary amended accordingly, based on the attached plan and the attached draft policy should replace Policy AL12.	Comment	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
97	Southbourne	28	The AONB south of the A259 should be further protected and not be included in any housing development options		Comment	Mr Don Kent [6546]
97	Southbourne	208	Housing plan and transport study for Southbourne do not seem to be in synch.	CDC to push back on the Government and only proceed with house building until a long term solution is committed by the DfT. A dependency on this should be clearly articulated in the Local Plan.	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
97	Southbourne	382	Once again the language needs to be strengthened. In 6.89, line 2, change "may" to "should", line 3 change "consideration" to "demographic research" In 6.90, bullet point 3, change "consideration" to "investigation". Bullet point 4, delete "potentially" and add "sports/youth facilities and retail units".		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
97	Southbourne	1204	The introductory text for Policy AL13 refers to "around 1,250" new homes whereas the policy itself refers to "a minimum of 1,250" homes. This inconsistency needs to be addressed by amending the introductory text to refer to "a minimum".		Comment	Nova Planning (Mr Patrick Barry) [1195]
97	Southbourne	1420	Consideration should be given to including a reference (also in Policy AL13) for the need to take into account any future potential new access onto the A27.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
97	Southbourne	2050	Objects on grounds that Southbourne already has insufficient infrastructure and there are no definitive plans on how this deficit can be addressed, even before considering how new housing can be accommodated. Particular concerns raised about adequacy of highway network, sewer/drainage system and capacity of doctors surgery. Queries whether the proposed school is in addition to existing or a replacement. Also concerned about potential for merging of settlements due to growth pressures.		Object	Mr Michael Bennett [7261]
97	Southbourne	3094	Page 127-8, 6.90 Southbourne: The Conservancy is unsure what "creating opportunities for new views" means. There is a concern this means replacing rural views with urban views or building upwards to stand-out from the landscape.	To clarify what this means. Furthermore, and under the same bullet point, the Conservancy would appreciate it if the AONB is mentioned before the National Park, since as correctly stated in 6.87, part of Southbourne is in the AONB.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
97	Southbourne	3189	Object on grounds that: In order to facilitate safe cycling and walking, a continuous, direct, safe and comfortable path must be provided protected from the traffic and linking communities; plan should include provision of housing for younger people with shared communal areas to make living in shared communities an attractive and affordable proposition to attract more young people to stay in the area.	Insert at point 2 of policy: "To meet specialised housing needs including accomodation for older and younger people".	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	107	Re Southbourne as a settlement hub - I am concerned that the houses will be built but the infrastructure will not be set in place. Infrastructure has to come first. We are short of facilities in Southbourne already. Very few shops, no youth facilities, a rubbish park (meaning all young families drive to westbourne, fishbourne and emsworth to go to a decent park). Please ensure infrastrucure comes before development, not after.		Comment	Mrs Alice Smith [5409]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	119	6 Change "consideration" to "investigation". 16 Change "as required" to "as it is required".		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	256	The Policy requires to make reference to NCN2 and the need for this site to fund improvements to strategic and local cycle network/	Addition to Policy to provide safe and segregated cycle network along A259 [NCN2] and to connect site to north and Westbourne.	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	323	Concerns about how the infrastructure will cope and the loss of precious green belt and village identity	A serious reduction in the number of proposed dwellings and an improvement in the railway crossing at Southbourne	Object	Mr Martin Brown [6767]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	358	Whilst this policy is supported, as large scale development often allows the largest community benefits, the planning for, assessment and delivery of large scale sites takes a long time. It is therefore important that the number of dwellings is expressed as minimum, as this allows flexibility for smaller sites, if appropriate, to come forward quickly to fill the inevitable 'delivery gap'. Perhaps this should also be recognised in this policy?		Comment	Louise Cutts [225]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	383	AL13, 2, add "disabled accommodation, first-time buyers, single-parent families". AL13, 3, after "access to site(s)" add ", particularly non-vehicular,". AL 13, 6, change "consideration" to "investigation". AL13, 7, add "sports/youth facilities and retail units"		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	413	Examination of the pba Associates Transport Study, AL13 and Policy DM24 do not take into the account of traffic movements and the effects on air quality travelling eastwards during the construction period of the Fishbourne roundabout. The impact from this number of houses in a settlement area would require a clear statement of works duration, diversionary routes that, do not pass through residential AQMAs,, or create the very real likelihood of creating additional AQMAs. (eg Residential areas of St Pauls Road, and the inevitable rat runs through Parklands Estate who will be affected by Whitehouse Farm/ traffic on the B2178).	AL13 & DM24 should be studied taking cognizance of the representation above , such that the Public are informed that during peak traffic period the mitigation that is in place will give assurance that Air Quality will not be adversely affected and hence Public Health has been protected. If this is not adequately addressed in future plans, then with fellow residents, we will raise with the examiner	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	437	Need the infrastructure in the percieved smaller areas before the mass influx of houses and people otherwise existing facilities will be overwhelmed and breakdown.	Everyone accepts progress and development is inevitable however this allocation is not fair and has to be reassessed to a more even spread of houses across Fishbourne, Bosham, Nutbourne/Chidham and Southbourne	Object	Mr Graham Peacock [5557]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	447	I object to the proposal of 1250 new homes. Agricultural land is at risk, the sewerage system cannot cope with more waste unless it is improved. The plan advises that there is insufficient transport, schooling, doctors already. The settlement boundaries need to be kept, to prevent loss of village identity. Transport and employment opportunities need improving. Lack of existing open spaces currently, and less so with development.	Existing settlement boundaries should be respected. Infrastructure should be put in place PRIOR to providing planning consent for further development. More school spaces, doctors appointments, a pharmacy that can meet the demands of new houses, upgraded sewerage systems, More recreational facilities. Protecting current agricultural land. - Providing Allotments to allow villagers to grow their own food etc. Protecting the settlement boundaries of the village to prevent Southbourne being part of a giant "Supervillage" comprising Chichester-Emsworth.	Object	Mrs Cath Jones [5578]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	709	Horrified about plans in Southbourne for following reasons: - 8 times more houses than other areas - potential loss of wildlife - impact on school and other services - traffic impact - possibility of flooding		Comment	Karen Daffern [6910]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	771	Apologies . My representation ID 413 incorrectly stated "Residential areas of Broyle Rd" . This should have stated "Residential areas of St Pauls Rd"		Comment	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	774	It is our duty as citizens of the world to safeguard our green and pleasant land for our children to enjoy in the future. I am saddened that so much of our green space has been filled with housing, robbing our wildlife of their habitat, If planning authorities continue to allow mass development to our green spaces, we will end up with nothing but continual urban sprawl.	The number of 1250 new homes recommended for Southbourne village is unacceptable and very impracticable. Southbourne has already been overdeveloped. No more housing in Southbourne!	Object	Mrs Elizabeth Bond [6927]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	831	The addition of 1250 new dwellings in an area that DOES not have good access to other areas. There is no provision for the road infrastructure impact that this many new dwellings would have onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report. they all have to either go west to Emsworth east to the Fishbourne roundabout which is already at full capacity. Limited employment opportunities so would necessitate the need for travel.Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan. I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	A proper and fit for purpose transport study must be commissioned before comments can be given.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	842	The land in Southbourne is at or below the 5 meter contour and therefore at risk of flooding as a consequence of sea level rise as a result of global climate changes	seek development areas on higher ground	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	877	1- I disagree with the proposed allocation of 1250 houses in Southbourne : it unfairly affects the Southbourne area. The other villages should take a fairer share of the housing allocation, and the burden on Southbourne should be reduced. 2- Traffic, congestion, pollution on A259 and in Stein Road are bad and will get worse. New motorway junction at Southbourne is a mandatory pre-requisite for sustainable development. We also need an improvement to the Stein Road railway crossing (footbridge and if possible car bridge or tunnel as in Emsworth)	1- Reduce housing allocation in Southbourne, with housing allocation more evenly spread across the district. 2- Commit to and budget for a motorway junction before new housing can be built. 3- Improve level crossing at Stein Road before it becomes a major artery in and out of the new developments.	Object	Mr Sylvain DEFER [6949]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	957	I am very anti this housing allocation of 1,250 homes which is nearly four times the original 350 in the current Neighbourhood Plan up to 2029. Also I am very much against any grade 1 or 2 agricultural land being used for building land as the need for home-grown food is likely to escalate with population increase or importation difficulties. Also it has to be borne in mind that inescapably there are Limits to Growth in a finite World, and it appears that from Southampton to Brighton the coastal area is turning into one long traffic-ridden conurbation.	Retention of grades 1 & 2 agricultural land as a strategic agricultural resource.	Object	Mr Jim Jennings [5301]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1040	1250 houses will destroy the 'village feel' of Southbourne, which is one of the main reason for residents enjoying living here. If the residents wanted to live in a town they would have bought houses in an existing urban area. Southbourne has already taken an extra 500+ houses which were agreed as part of the recent neighbourhood plan. Stein Road is more and more crowded and the delays at the level crossing are increasing. Any new housing should not be accessed via Stein Road to preserve the existing residents' quality of life in the village.	Decrease the number of houses allocated to Southbourne and run a road parallel to Stein road off the A259 around Tuppenny Road running north with a bridge over the railway line (ideally this could join up to the A27). The reduced allocated level of houses could be built along this road with no access to Stein road and this could therefore preserve the existing residents' sense of village life and not increase the traffic significantly along Stein Road. (Also the Fishbourne roundabout must be sorted BEFORE any significant new properties are built along the Southbourne-Fishbourne A259 road.)	Object	Mrs Gillian Willis [7011]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1149	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1213	The allocation needs to ensure that housing delivery occurs in the 0 - 5 year period and is balanced over the Plan period.	We suggest that AL13 be updated to include a housing trajectory to ensure an appropriate level of housing delivery in the 0 - 5 year period and balanced delivery over the remainder of the plan period.	Object	Nova Planning (Mr Patrick Barry) [1195]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1363	The development should be thought out to create a village centre for Southbourne where all facilities can be found for all. More public transport to enable people not to use their cars. Green spaces for both people and wildlife and leisure facilities for all.		Comment	Mr Paul Bennett [7014]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1541	Natural England's comments on S31 apply to potential allocations in Southbourne. Reference should be made in the supporting text to the Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy, which maps important sites for SPA birds. These areas should be avoided when allocating sites in the Neighbourhood Plan.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1556	1,250 houses proposed with the two access points onto A27 along the A259 corridors at the already congested Warblington and Fishbourne roundabouts will increase traffic, accident rates, congestion, noise and air pollution. WSCC Reported Accident Records state on A259 Southbourne to Fishbourne 2 Fatal 15 Serious 33 Slight. The huge increase in traffic along this stretch of A259 due to the development numbers will rise. No mention in AL13 the protection against further air, noise or light pollution from the A259 and adjoining roads during or after construction. Only solution, a new access point onto the A27.	Until a Northern A27 alignment is funded with a new access/exit point onto the A27 any new development in Southbourne will increase air and noise pollution levels. The infrastructure has to be put in place prior to the building of this Settlement hub. I agree to all of Southbourne Parish Council's comments.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1727	Proximity to infrastructure in SE Hants makes this a viable choice for development, providing adequate steps are taken to protect Chichester Harbour AONB, and to provide effective wastewater treatment.		Support	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1754	This makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 1250 dwellings onto the A259 and A27 and will impact the transport report.	This needs to be considered in the local plan	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1859	Object to allocation: - impact on noise, traffic, outlook - loss of value to own property - impact on quality of life	Build it somewhere else if at all	Object	David Warren [7221]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	1874	1250 houses in Southbourne allocation need to consider: - Pollution issues with the location of railway road bridge in relation to housing - Sufficient footpath provision for walking to school safely - Railway crossing at Inlands Road already too narrow - Congestion at Stein Road railway crossing - Pollution from traffic will increase the affect of respiratory conditions - Consider the natural environment for wildlife		Comment	Mrs Joanna King [6777]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2015	Lack of detail as to location of sites raises concerns given sensitivity of area and potential of conflict with legislation protecting designated sites. No indication of timescales of NP review - raises questions of deliverability and could impact upon ability to undertake HRA. Attention must be drawn to details of SWBGS and SRMP to ensure sites that are identified do not conflict with designated site interests.	The RSPB would like clarification as to whether the sites identification process is expected to be completed in time for the submission of the Local Plan, and if not what measures are being taken to ensure that this approach will not affect the overall deliverability of the plan?	Comment	RSPB (miss Chloe Rose) [6981]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2037	Object on grounds that potential development to north will exacerbate traffic problems at level crossing; narrow country lanes cannot sustain increased traffic from residential/commercial developments; insufficient infrastructure; coalescence.	Resolve traffic problems that will be caused at level crossing with potential road bridge across railway line.	Object	Ms Christine Brown [7254]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2055	Object on grounds that no provision for expansion of primary school or doctors' surgery; existing congestion poses threat to pedestrians' safety; potential health problems from increased traffic pollution.	Build along the A259 corridor. This leads to more direct access to major roads.	Object	Mrs Helen Turner [7201]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2093	Minerals and waste: It is considered that the Joint Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan are referenced, particularly with regards to safeguarding policies (M9, M10 and W2) and these documents and policies are given detailed consideration when allocating sites. Development at, adjacent or proximal to existing waste or mineral sites / infrastructure should be the subject to consultation with WSCC.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2098	Disadvantages not dealt with in doubling population in village with 1250 dwellings allocation; no provisions for increasing capacity of railway station to deal with potential increase in passenger traffic.	Housing allocation shared more evenly between settlements	Object	Mr John Auric [7266]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2099	Development in Southbourne allocation, specifically sites Land north of Woodfield Park Road and adjacent plot which is south of the railway line and north of the A259, behind Southbourne Road, unsuitable on following grounds: - Incompatible with west of city wildlife corridor - Impact on the amount of green space between Hermitage and Westbourne - Coalescence between Hermitage and Westbourne - Impact on the harbour - Infrastructure - Unequal distribution of housing	Remove sites HSB0006 and adjacent plot HSB0007 from the plan	Comment	Ms Deborah May [6751]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2132	Education: Current primary provision is at capacity, further capacity required - land for 2FE-3FE school and pro rata share of build costs required. AL7, AL10 and AL13 are within the same school planning area, cumulative total brings forward requirement for c3 forms of entry additional places. As currently drafted, LP indicates oversupply of school places which could affect viability of all schools in the planning area. Expansion of the secondary school may be possible. Contributions would be required.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2158	Object on grounds: existing level crossing congestion and potential development to exacerbate problem; narrow country lanes cannot sustain further traffic from potential housing/commercial development; inadequate infrastructure to cope with new development; coalescence.	Road bridge across railway line to resolve traffic congestion at level crossing.	Object	Mr Nigel William Brown [7268]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2159	Object to allocation on following grounds: village already agreed to take 350 houses; impact upon/lack of facilities/infrastructure; traffic congestion and pollution; extending village to north would result in loss of farmed fields.	Do not consider north.	Object	Mr and Mrs Paul and Marilyn Freeman [7269]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2210	Point 16 identifies need to ensure that sufficient capacity is available at the relevant WWTW prior to the delivery of development. This could be expanded to include sewer network capacity. Liaison with Southern Water regarding any necessary phasing of development would be encouraged.		Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2215	The transport infrastructure in Southbourne needs to be improved so that all traffic flows do not end up on the A259. Cycling route and Bridleways need to be improved, as at present all these users are on the A259, and it is not sustainable or safe. An alternative to the level crossing in Stein Road needs to be developed and this needs to take account of cyclists and horse riders too.		Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2231	Objects on grounds of unacceptable increase in size of Southbourne. Concerned that it has been identified on grounds of its distance to Chichester City. Considers that Chichester City is not taking its fair share. Scale of developmet here would harm the setting of the South Downs and Chichester Harbour. Substantial improvements to infrastructure at Southbourne are required. This includes: road crossings, traffic management, wastewater treatment, stormwater discharge into harbour and substantial improvements to public open space away from the harbour.	Put more housing in Chichester itself	Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2274	Historic England has no comments on the principle of land being allocated in the revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan for a minimum of 1,250 dwellings. However, we consider that a specific requirement should be included in Policy AL13 to ensure that the allocation of the site or sites in the Neighbourhood Plan conforms with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly paragraphs 184 and 194.	Add the following clause to Policy AL13; "Demonstration that the development would not have an adverse impact on the significance of heritage assets, including listed buildings, or on the character or appearance of the Prinsted Conservation Area."	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2287	<p>S24. It is very hard to reconcile how the building of over 1,000 new homes in Southbourne on farmland is consistent with the council's aim to protect the countryside, or the stated aim to: "protect the countryside in the plan area from the urbanising impacts of development which can arise from the impact of buildings, structures, lighting, traffic and other activities"</p> <p>The scale of the proposal for Southbourne is wholly inappropriate. Whilst it might be possible to mitigate the effects with a more modest development - it will be impossible to do so with the nature of the proposals outlined.</p>	It is abundantly clear that the council needs to reconsider the scale of the proposed developments in Southbourne and consider a far more modest development as part of the wider plan.	Object	Dr Christine Bowen [6780]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2313	Policy AL13 'Southbourne' is supplied from a different distribution system to Chichester. This is a very large housing allocation and this may need to be considered in combination with 'Hambrook' and 'Bosham'. There are sufficient water resources for all the housing allocated to Portsmouth Water's area of supply. It is the location of the housing site in relation to existing trunk mains and service reservoirs that determines the cost to supply. Local reinforcement of the water mains may be required.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2338	Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for Southbourne Parish. We note that the spatial distribution of the allocated 1,250 dwellings will be determined through a revision of the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan. Until sites are determined Southern Water is unable to carry out an assessment of the impact of development on the local sewer network, however, in order to minimise flood risk and other impacts on the environment, sewer capacity will need to be considered, as well as wastewater treatment capacity.	Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following amendment to Policy AL13: Ensure sufficient capacity within the sewer network and relevant Wastewater Treatment Works before the delivery of development as required	Comment	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2367	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Pan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2372	Concerns re: road infrastructure in Southbourne around railway crossing. Already can't cope with volume of cars which are often gridlocked at school start/finish times particularly. There is insufficient evidence that this has been tackled in the plan. Trains will be no less frequent (so barriers will be down regularly), and increased volume of cars sitting in traffic jams will result in increased pollution also. We are also very concerned about the knock-on effect in terms of traffic in nearby Westbourne village.	Review of number of houses proposed - I can't see how the roads could be improved when there is the issue of the railway crossing. Certainly mini roundabout near farm shop will be no where near sufficient but there is not enough space for anything more substantial	Object	Dr Christine Bowen [6780]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2409	<p>We consider that the policy wording for the A259 corridor Strategic Site Allocations could be more robust and proactive with regard to conserving and enhancing the National Park. In particular, it could provide more active direction to applicants in order to ensure adverse impacts are minimised locally, and in relation to the National Park. For example, with regard to green infrastructure, each of the A259 Strategic Site Allocation policies (AL7, AL9, AL10 and AL13) include a criteria requiring the provision of green infrastructure.</p> <p>Criterion 5 welcomed but could be reworded to ensure developers consider impact before creating scheme.</p>	<p>Reword GI criteria to 'Identify opportunities are taken for and secure the expansion and provision of multifunctional green infrastructure into the wider countryside and protected landscapes of the South Downs National Park, and Chichester Harbour AONB, including between settlements and facilities.'</p> <p>Criterion 5 welcomed but could be reworded to ensure developers consider impact before creating scheme.</p>	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2410	Need to consider: - Cycle provision		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2466	<p>Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - significant increase in housing - cannot presently be accommodated due to infrastructure e.g. require railway crossings before devt; wastewater; open space; traffic congestion <p>Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - does not mention youth provision - should mention improvements of Bourne college facilities/rec ground - should reinstate Ham Brook wildlife corridor <p>Devt should be phased</p>	Specific commitment in the Preferred Approach to the delivery of crossings over the railway, assured delivery of timely and appropriate Wastewater Treatment and specific commitment to the delivery of the Green Ring.	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2535	We object to the lack of comprehensive guidance for the east-west corridor. This should be provided by a new Local Plan Policy & subsequent Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).	The inclusion of a new Policy to provide some co-ordinated support for issues affecting all the Bourne villages, followed by details set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance.	Object	Mrs Sue Talbot [6219]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2537	Policy AL 13 (4) only proposes "Opportunities as they arise to improve the situation relating to the various existing or planned railway crossings". This is too weak. The policy should require the provision of these new rail crossings to support the proposals set out in the current Neighbourhood Plan.	Policy AL13 (4) should be amended to read "Improvements to the situation relating to the various existing and planned railway crossings will be required as part of the phased development"	Object	Mrs Sue Talbot [6219]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2560	<p>1,250 not lead to the erosion of the setting of the AONB, and should not lead to coalescence with neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>Hope that the master planning process will sensitively design the new development with appropriate mitigation of the visual impact on the viewshed between the AONB and South Downs NP. The housing should meet the needs of the community, and should conserve settlement integrity and identity.</p> <p>Adequate provision should be made for waste water treatment.</p> <p>Provision for recreation and particularly dog walking facilities to reduce the recreational disturbance</p> <p>Support the PC's aspiration for a "green ring"</p>	<p>We would welcome an additional point in the policy on the prevention of coalescence with adjacent settlements.</p> <p>Adequate provision should be made for waste water treatment, ensuring capacity at Thornham WWTW.</p> <p>Provision for recreation and particularly dog walking facilities should be accommodated to reduce the recreational disturbance impact on the SPA/SAC, particularly at Prinsted.</p>	Object	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2646	<p>Support vision but not a sufficiently proactive approach to promoting new devt. Need clear strategy set out potential infrastructure improvements required to facilitate residential devt.</p> <p>Devt E of S'bourne could deliver new transport improvements.</p> <p>Cap of 1250 figure not justified, at odds with minimum figure set out in LPR - E of S'bourne could deliver much higher figure.</p> <p>Should be more guidance for NP given such significant level of devt proposed - e.g.broad area of search identifying land E of Southbourne</p>	Identify land E of S'bourne as area of search for NP sites	Comment	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2669	<p>Makes no provision for the road infrastructure impact of a further 1250 dwellings onto the A259 and A27.</p> <p>See attached for full detail.</p>		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2791	As stated for previous allocations and in our general comments, SWT is unclear why concerned as to whether the level of development proposed in AL13 can be absorbed within this parish. We also note, that again both the GI and biodiversity requirements of the plan are unambitious and should be amended	As stated for previous allocations and in our general comments, SWT is unclear why concerned as to whether the level of development proposed in AL13 can be absorbed within this parish. We also note, that again both the GI and biodiversity requirements of the plan are unambitious and should be amended: 'Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish 10. Expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; 11. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats and that measurable net gains to biodiversity will be delivered; 12. Provide mitigation to ensure the avoidance of adverse effects on the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Chichester Harbour including contributing to any strategic access management issues, loss of functionally linked supporting habitat and water quality issues relating to runoff into a European designated site....'	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2807	Allocation of 1250 dwellings is appropriate and justified. The PC should consider allocating small scale sites through the NP to ensure delivery of housing - suggest Land to the north of Gosden Green Southbourne		Support	Hallam Land Management Limited [1696]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	2960	Section 6.90 - Bullet point 6 AMEND TO "as well as the inclusion of cycling and pedestrian routes (in particular an integrated, segregated cycle route running between Chichester and Emsworth - sometimes referred to as the Chemroute);" Policy SA13 - Item 10 AMEND After the end of the present text, insert the same bracketed phrasing as above. Namely (in particular an integrated, segregated cycle route running between Chichester and Emsworth - sometimes referred to as the Chemroute);	Section 6.90 - Bullet point 6 AMEND TO "as well as the inclusion of cycling and pedestrian routes (in particular an integrated, segregated cycle route running between Chichester and Emsworth - sometimes referred to as the Chemroute);" Policy SA13 - Item 10 AMEND After the end of the present text, insert the same bracketed phrasing as above. Namely (in particular an integrated, segregated cycle route running between Chichester and Emsworth - sometimes referred to as the Chemroute);	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3035	Believe that the requirement should be increased to around 3000 dwellings. Suggest development should be to the east of the village.	Increase housing figure to around 3000 dwellings or an appropriate figure between 1250 and 3000. Include criterion stating that development should be focused on the eastern side of the settlement.	Object	Rydon Homes Ltd [1607]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3095	Object on the following grounds: - Major development on the fringe of the AONB. - Affect buffer zone outside the AONB. - Breach of current and emerging AONB Management Plan - SSSI Interest Impact Risk Zone, which affects the SAC, SPA and Ramsar designations. - Wildlife - Views - Highest quality agricultural land - Urbanisation - Light, air, noise, and soil pollution. - Wastewater - Inadequate mitigation	The Conservancy objects the inclusion of this site pending the publication of the allocation map.	Object	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3155	- Against principles of NP. - Traffic - particularly at Stein Road level crossing and pollution created. - Removal of open farmland. Statement of 'before delivery of development' only applies to wastewater. All infrastructure improvements much be in place before building.		Object	Reverend D A Hider [6451]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3260	Land adjacent to Prinstead Lane, Southbourne available for 20 units		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3263	We support both of these policies and the number of houses which they propose should be allocated. (Site submission attached) We are, however, concerned that there may be a conflict between the interests of the two Parishes when considering the possible allocation of this land on account of the land for development being located in the Parish of Southbourne while in reality in forms part of the settlement of Hambrook from which it is entered.		Support	Mr & Mrs R Hirlehey [7391]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3286	AL13 poses significant threat to Westbourne. Suggest policy includes mitigation against road traffic by ensuring a road bridge is built over railway in Southbourne. Devt north of railway will be opposed unless new connection is developed.	Suggest policy includes mitigation against road traffic by ensuring a road bridge is built over railway in Southbourne.	Comment	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3295	Promoting site at Chichester Grain, Priors Leaze Road. We support the allocation of land for a minimum of 1250 dwellings at Southbourne Parish and note from paragraph 6.89 that Southbourne Parish Council is preparing a revised neighbourhood plan for the parish which will identify potential development site(s).	Policy AL13 - the allocation of 1250 dwellings minimum to Southbourne Parish is supported but the allocation should be spread across more than one site. Spreading development over more than 1 site will assist short term housing delivery and minimise the long lead in times that the very large strategic sites are suffering in the current Key Policies Local Plan. This would not impact on infrastructure delivery because it would still be identified and phased in the IDP. Policy AL13 could therefore state 'A site or a combination of sites will be allocated for development in the revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan....'	Support	Chichester Grain Ltd [7394]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3302	CCE supports the allocation of additional land for a mixed-use form of development including a minimum of 1,250 dwellings at Southbourne to be identified through a revised Neighbourhood Plan. See attached for site submission.		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3336	Support the allocation of land for a minimum of 1250 dwellings at Southbourne Parish. 3 promoted sites at 139 Wayside, Main Road, Southbourne (10 dwellings capacity), Land adjacent to Newton, Inlands Road, Southbourne (65 capacity) and land at Gordon Road, Southbourne (30 dwelling capacity). Combined with other larger sites as part of a dispersed strategy, they could contribute to housing supply in the early part of the plan period with the larger sites with longer lead in times coming later.	Policy AL13 - the allocation of 1250 dwellings minimum to Southbourne Parish is supported but the allocation should be spread across more than one site. Spreading development over more than 1 site will assist short term housing delivery and minimise the long lead in times that the very large strategic sites are suffering in the current Key Policies Local Plan. This would not impact on infrastructure delivery because it would still be identified and phased in the IDP. Policy AL13 could therefore state 'A site or a combination of sites will be allocated for development in the revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan....'	Comment	Domusea [1816]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3350	Question deliverability of allocation through NP process		Object	CEG [7397]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3393	<p>Promoting site at 'Land at Woodfield Park Road'</p> <p>Whilst we support the draft policy objective to deliver housing, employment, retail, social and community facilities at Southbourne through the Neighbourhood Plan process, the above policy wording predetermines how the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should distribute the identified local housing need and associated development. The requirement in the above wording for development to address all 16 criteria assumes a single site will come forward, as opposed to a number of sites which collectively could meet the 16 requirements, if planned for in advance.</p>	<p>In order to encourage the objective assessment of all options for the distribution of housing within Southbourne and avoid the exclusion of sustainable sites, such as the 'Land at Woodfield Park Road' the following change should be made to the policy wording:</p> <p>'Land will be allocated for development in the revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan to enable the delivery of a minimum of 1,250 dwellings, along with land to be allocated for employment and community uses subject to further examination of potential sites and including any amendments to the settlement boundary. Development should be dispersed around the settlement to allow the phasing of well-integrated high quality sustainable urban extensions providing good access to facilities and sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>Development proposals will be expected to make proportionate contributions towards the delivery of the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation to include specific provision to meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older people; 2. Provision of suitable means of access to the sites and securing necessary off-site improvements (including highways) to promote sustainable transport options; 3. Opportunities as they arise to improve the situation relating to the various existing or planned railway crossings; 4. Provision of an up to two form entry primary school; 5. Potential expansion of secondary school subject to further consideration; 6. Expansion and provision of community infrastructure potentially to include early years' childcare provision, community hall/centre and expansion of doctors' surgery plus flexible space for employment/small-scale leisure use; 7. Provision of on-site public open space and play areas in accordance with Policy DM34; 8. Detailed consideration of the impact of development on the surrounding landscape, including views towards the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour AONB and their settings, and any potential for coalescence between adjoining or nearby settlements along with a detailed landscape management plan; 9. Opportunities for the expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; 10. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats; 11. Provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Chichester Harbour including contributing to any strategic access management issues, loss of functionally linked supporting habitat and water quality issues relating to runoff into a European designated site; 12. The protection of any other key views; 13. Provision of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the most up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan; 14. Provisions of the West Sussex Minerals Plan, and associated guidance, in relation to sites being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area. 15. Ensure sufficient capacity within the relevant Wastewater Treatment Works before the delivery of development as required. 	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3397	<p>Promoting site Land on Penny Lane.</p> <p>Whilst we support the draft policy objective to deliver housing, employment, retail, social and community facilities at Southbourne through the Neighbourhood Plan process, the above policy wording predetermines how the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should distribute the identified local housing need and associated development. The requirement in the above wording for development to address all 16 criteria assumes a single site will come forward, as opposed to a number of sites which collectively could meet the 16 requirements, if planned for in advance.</p>	<p>In order to encourage the objective assessment of all options for the distribution of housing within Southbourne and avoid the exclusion of sustainable sites, such as the Land at Penny Lane the following change should be made to the policy wording:</p> <p>'Land will be allocated for development in the revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan to enable the delivery of a minimum of 1,250 dwellings, along with land to be allocated for employment and community uses subject to further examination of potential sites and including any amendments to the settlement boundary. Development should be dispersed around the settlement to allow the phasing of well-integrated high quality sustainable urban extensions providing good access to facilities and sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>Development proposals will be expected to make proportionate contributions towards the delivery of the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation to include specific provision to meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older people; 2. Provision of suitable means of access to the sites and securing necessary off-site improvements (including highways) to promote sustainable transport options; 3. Opportunities as they arise to improve the situation relating to the various existing or planned railway crossings; 4. Provision of an up to two form entry primary school; 5. Potential expansion of secondary school subject to further consideration; 6. Expansion and provision of community infrastructure potentially to include early years' childcare provision, community hall/centre and expansion of doctors' surgery plus flexible space for employment/small-scale leisure use; 7. Provision of on-site public open space and play areas in accordance with Policy DM34; 8. Detailed consideration of the impact of development on the surrounding landscape, including views towards the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour AONB and their settings, and any potential for coalescence between adjoining or nearby settlements along with a detailed landscape management plan; 9. Opportunities for the expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; 10. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats; 11. Provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Chichester Harbour including contributing to any strategic access management issues, loss of functionally linked supporting habitat and water quality issues relating to runoff into a European designated site; 12. The protection of any other key views; 13. Provision of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the most up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan; 14. Provisions of the West Sussex Minerals Plan, and associated guidance, in relation to sites being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area. 15. Ensure sufficient capacity within the relevant Wastewater Treatment Works before the delivery of development as required. 	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3400	<p>Promoting site at Cooks Lane.</p> <p>Whilst we support the draft policy objective to deliver housing, employment, retail, social and community facilities at Southbourne through the Neighbourhood Plan process, the above policy wording predetermines how the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should distribute the identified local housing need and associated development. The requirement in the above wording for development to address all 16 criteria assumes a single site will come forward, as opposed to a number of sites which collectively could meet the 16 requirements, if planned for in advance</p>	<p>In order to encourage the objective assessment of all options for the distribution of housing within Southbourne and avoid the exclusion of sustainable sites, such as the Land at Cooks Lane the following change should be made to the policy wording:</p> <p>'Land will be allocated for development in the revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan to enable the delivery of a minimum of 1,250 dwellings, along with land to be allocated for employment and community uses subject to further examination of potential sites and including any amendments to the settlement boundary. Development should be dispersed around the settlement to allow the phasing of well-integrated high quality sustainable urban extensions providing good access to facilities and sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>Development proposals will be expected to make proportionate contributions towards the delivery of the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation to include specific provision to meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older people; 2. Provision of suitable means of access to the sites and securing necessary off-site improvements (including highways) to promote sustainable transport options; 3. Opportunities as they arise to improve the situation relating to the various existing or planned railway crossings; 4. Provision of an up to two form entry primary school; 5. Potential expansion of secondary school subject to further consideration; 6. Expansion and provision of community infrastructure potentially to include early years' childcare provision, community hall/centre and expansion of doctors' surgery plus flexible space for employment/small-scale leisure use; 7. Provision of on-site public open space and play areas in accordance with Policy DM34; 8. Detailed consideration of the impact of development on the surrounding landscape, including views towards the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour AONB and their settings, and any potential for coalescence between adjoining or nearby settlements along with a detailed landscape management plan; 9. Opportunities for the expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; 10. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats; 11. Provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Chichester Harbour including contributing to any strategic access management issues, loss of functionally linked supporting habitat and water quality issues relating to runoff into a European designated site; 12. The protection of any other key views; 13. Provision of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the most up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan; 14. Provisions of the West Sussex Minerals Plan, and associated guidance, in relation to sites being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area. 15. Ensure sufficient capacity within the relevant Wastewater Treatment Works before the delivery of development as required. 	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3404	<p>Promoting site Land on Cooks Lane 2.</p> <p>Whilst we support the draft policy objective to deliver housing, employment, retail, social and community facilities at Southbourne through the Neighbourhood Plan process, the above policy wording predetermines how the emerging Neighbourhood Plan should distribute the identified local housing need and associated development. The requirement in the above wording for development to address all 16 criteria assumes a single site will come forward, as opposed to a number of sites which collectively could meet the 16 requirements, if planned for in advance.</p>	<p>In order to encourage the objective assessment of all options for the distribution of housing within Southbourne and avoid the exclusion of sustainable sites, such as the Land at Cooks Lane the following change should be made to the policy wording:</p> <p>'Land will be allocated for development in the revised Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan to enable the delivery of a minimum of 1,250 dwellings, along with land to be allocated for employment and community uses subject to further examination of potential sites and including any amendments to the settlement boundary. Development should be dispersed around the settlement to allow the phasing of well-integrated high quality sustainable urban extensions providing good access to facilities and sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>Development proposals will be expected to make proportionate contributions towards the delivery of the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation to include specific provision to meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older people; 2. Provision of suitable means of access to the sites and securing necessary off-site improvements (including highways) to promote sustainable transport options; 3. Opportunities as they arise to improve the situation relating to the various existing or planned railway crossings; 4. Provision of an up to two form entry primary school; 5. Potential expansion of secondary school subject to further consideration; 6. Expansion and provision of community infrastructure potentially to include early years' childcare provision, community hall/centre and expansion of doctors' surgery plus flexible space for employment/small-scale leisure use; 7. Provision of on-site public open space and play areas in accordance with Policy DM34; 8. Detailed consideration of the impact of development on the surrounding landscape, including views towards the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour AONB and their settings, and any potential for coalescence between adjoining or nearby settlements along with a detailed landscape management plan; 9. Opportunities for the expansion and provision of green infrastructure into the wider countryside including between settlements and facilities; 10. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats; 11. Provide mitigation to ensure the protection of the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Chichester Harbour including contributing to any strategic access management issues, loss of functionally linked supporting habitat and water quality issues relating to runoff into a European designated site; 12. The protection of any other key views; 13. Provision of infrastructure and community facilities in accordance with the most up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan; 14. Provisions of the West Sussex Minerals Plan, and associated guidance, in relation to sites being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area. 15. Ensure sufficient capacity within the relevant Wastewater Treatment Works before the delivery of development as required. 	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3493	Object on grounds that: new road bridge over railway line required for 1250 new dwellings; sufficient land unlikely to be found anywhere other than north of railway line - existing congestion at level crossing would be made worse; completion rate of 80 dwellings a year would lead to associated construction traffic for next 16 years; separate footbridge on east side of village and closure of existing at-level and uncontrolled pedestrian routes across railway line also required. Policy AL 13 (4) too weak. Policy should require provision of new rail crossings to support proposals set out in current Neighbourhood Plan.	Policy AL13 (4) should be amended to read "Improvements to the situation relating to the various existing and planned railway crossings will be required as part of the phased development"	Object	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3498	Object on grounds that no proposals to manage additional traffic on A259; infrastructure already inadequate; increasing storm water discharges; coalescence should be dealt with in SPG now; green space policy for Bourne area required.	The inclusion of a new Policy to provide some co-ordinated support for issues affecting all the Bourne villages, followed by details set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance.	Object	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3501	The development of 1250 dwellings is likely to generate significant additional pressure on the Harbour and an increase in the need for public green space generally, which is already underprovided in the Parish. Whilst green space proposed in NP via "Green Ring". a comprehensive green space policy for the Bourne area could reinforce its importance and help secure funding.		Comment	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
98	Policy AL13: Southbourne Parish	3504	Object to AL13 because we consider proposed development should deliver rather than address the items listed in the policy.	We request the word "address" in line 5 of the first paragraph (Policy AL13) be replaced by the word "deliver" in order that it dovetails better with Policy S12.	Object	Mr and Mrs Sue and Geoff Talbot [7444]
99	Tangmere	603	Comments and proposed amends.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
99	Tangmere	1411	Tangmere Parish Council wishes to submit a replacement Policy AL14 and associated supporting paragraphs	<p>6.91 Tangmere is the largest village in the area to the east of Chichester City and has a range of local facilities, including small shops, primary school, GP surgery and village hall. It is a focus for employment with the Chichester Business Park located at City Fields Way immediately to the east of the village and a designated Horticultural Development Area to the south east. The village has good road accessibility via the A27; however the provision of public transport is limited.</p> <p>6.92 The adopted Local Plan identifies Tangmere as being capable of accommodating further sustainable growth to enhance and develop its role as a settlement hub. It identifies the Tangmere Strategic Development Location for a development of 1000 dwellings. The Local Plan Review identifies potential for a further 300 to achieve an allocation of 1300 dwellings. Development will be achieved through a carefully Masterplanned expansion which will deliver a number of benefits for the existing community, including: a range of housing types; open space; social and community facilities; and improved public transport services.</p> <p>The Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) vision statement for the village in 2029 is "One Village", which will be achieved by delivering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A broader range of households in the village - Promoting new jobs for the village - A stronger and diverse village centre, a new "heart of the village" - A wider range and improved quality of community facilities - Utilising the village's heritage and green infrastructure assets to shape the future village <p>Tangmere currently has a relatively high proportion of social housing and the TNP called for a diversity of housing tenures, including by providing low cost or shared ownership options (TNP Policy 2iv)</p> <p>6.93 The strategic development location is mainly situated around the western and southern edges of the village and covers approximately 73 hectares. It will provide direct access to the A27 and is relatively unconstrained in physical terms. There are few identified issues in terms of flooding, although part of the land on the southern edge has high groundwater levels. However, regard will need to be paid to the open landscape of the area and views from the South Downs must be carefully protected.</p> <p>6.94 It is estimated that the site has the potential to deliver around 1,300 dwellings during the Plan period, although this number will be determined during the Masterplanning process in order to ensure that community facilities, open space, recreation and infrastructure assets are planned at the outset to match the final size of the development. This is most important when determining the land allocated for the provision of a new Primary School.</p> <p>The primary access will be provided from the existing grade separated junction on the A27 to the west of the village with a connection to the Tangmere Straight. However, it is important to ensure that new development is well integrated with the existing village, both physically and in terms of the community. The TNP identified the provision of an East-West corridor, including the formation of the "Village Main Street" as an extension of Malcolm Road into the site (TNP Policy 2ii) as a fundamental requirement in order to deliver this integration. Additionally the TNP identified the use of open land to the west of Malcolm Road which will contribute positively to achieving the "Village Main Street" and the "Tangmere Sustainable Movement network", (TNP Policy 7)</p> <p>The Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2016) provides design guidance to inform the masterplanning of the Tangmere SDL.</p> <p>6.95 A number of specific issues need to be taken into account in planning the development and site layout at Tangmere, and are included in the TNP at Policy 2.</p> <p>These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Local community aspirations for existing facilities serving the village, including 	Object	Tangmere Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [984]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
		1411		<p>a Village centre around a village main street, improved/expanded local convenience shopping and enhanced social, community, healthcare and recreation facilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Local community aspirations for sufficient land to be safeguarded for a new Primary School in the broad location shown on the TNP Concept Plan to cater for the requirements of the increased size of the village envisaged in the provision of 1300 new homes planned for Tangmere. The TNP policy for the Primary School envisaged 1 school for the whole village, supporting the "One Village" objective. This could therefore require a 2 FE expandable to a 3 FE Primary School to serve the eventual settlement of 2700 dwellings. * Potential landscape sensitivities, particularly in terms of external views of the site into and from the surrounding area, including the National Park, (TNP Policy 2viid and point 4.23); * The potential to provide off-site green links with the National Park and Chichester City, and potential to develop strategic green infrastructure in conjunction with other planned development to the east of Chichester City; * The potential to develop off-site green links with existing and planned employment development at Tangmere (the Chichester Business Park and Horticultural Development Area); * Opportunities to provide substantially improved public transport services linking the village with Chichester City, to improve cycle routes to the city, and to provide better transport links to Barnham rail station and the 'Five Villages' area in Arun District; * Protecting priority views of Chichester Cathedral spire and heritage assets and creating opportunities for new public view points; * Conserving and enhancing the setting of the historic village (particularly the Conservation Area), the heritage of the World War II airfield, including provision for the expansion of the Tangmere Military Aviation Museum (TNP Policy 6) and the potential archaeological/heritage assets of the surrounding area; * Shielding residential properties from noise on the A27, through for example the use of acoustic screening, but also by providing a Structural landscape Belt to the north, north-east and west of the site providing sufficient noise and pollution attenuation in respect of the A27 (TNP Policy 2viid and point 4.23). * The availability of minerals in the vicinity and the need to take account of the minerals safeguarding area. 		
99	Tangmere	1638	<p>Overall it will change the nature of the village as it will be too big and spread out. Policies about parking without considering the real life situations of people will create parking issues. Removal of green space will change the feel of the village and potentially have a knock on effect to overall well-being of residents. With potentially 3000 extra cars, traffic will become an issue particularly at peak times.</p>	<p>Require developers to build each house with space in mind, thinking of how families actually live and what they really do need to fit in. Extra parking spaces. Smaller number of houses so that pressure on the village roads is reduced. Imaginative and large green spaces.</p>	Object	Michelle Stone [7094]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
99	Tangmere	2600	Suggest amendment to paragraph wording 6.92-6.94. Amendments to bullets 1, 5, 7 & 8 of 6.95. See 'Change to Plan'.	<p>Para 6.92: recommended that the reference is revised to "improved public transport services in partnership with the relevant authorities."</p> <p>Amend "Tangmere currently has a relatively high proportion of social housing and it may be appropriate to diversify housing tenures, including by providing low cost or shared ownership options." to reflect increased level of certainty by NP.</p> <p>Para 6.93: amend wording to: "However, regard will need to be paid to the open landscape of the area and to reducing any impact on views from the South Downs."</p> <p>Para 6.94: add at the end of the first sentence of this paragraph that the precise number of dwellings to be delivered will be determined through the masterplanning process.</p> <p>Para 6.95: The first bullet point of paragraph 6.95 could be clarified to ensure that it is consistent with the proposed strategic policies relating to retail development, which we commented on above. We suggest that the following revisions would achieve this: "Local community aspirations for existing facilities serving the village, including transforming the existing village centre into a 'Local Centre' focussed around a village main street, improved/expanded local convenience shopping and enhanced social, community, recreation, primary education and healthcare facilities;" Revise 5th bullet to: "Opportunities, in partnership with the relevant authorities, to provide improved sustainable public transport services linking the village with Chichester City, to improve cycle routes to the city, and to provide better transport links to Barnham rail station and the 'Five Villages' area in Arun District;" Revise 7th bullet to: "Conserving and enhancing the setting of the historic village (particularly the Conservation Area), the heritage of the World War II airfield, including provision for the relocation of existing allotment space that could facilitate the expansion or relocation of the Tangmere Military Aviation Museum and the potential archaeological /heritage assets of the surrounding area;" Revise 8th bullet to: "Noise mitigation measures for residential properties on the A27, through for example the use of acoustic screening;"</p>	Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	257	Support Policy as far as point 7 is concerned.		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	326	There is no justification for the addition of 300 houses to the Tangmere SDL, there are other more sustainable locations to the south of Chichester and on brownfield land.	Transfer the allocation to site in Chichester.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	348	<p>The allocation of 300 houses to the Tangmere SDL is unsustainable and other sites are available in Tangmere and to the south of Chichester.</p> <p>There is no need for additional facilities in Tangmere and they should not be used as a justification for additional development.</p> <p>Tangmere is not a sustainable location considering the A27 problems.</p>	Remove the 300 additional houses from the Tangmere SDL allocation. Add the 'Apron' site to the Tangmere master plan and Neighbourhood Plan.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	604	Proposed amends to Policy for clarification and reinforcement of wording with regards masterplanning and infrastructure provision.		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	832	Tangmere has already grown hugely. It is essential that it has services provided to make it in to real community so that people do not always have to travel further afield,ie more community spaces/ library/ doctors places and enough funding for good education provision.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	1150	Support and welcome the requirement for opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure with links to the wider countryside to be explored. Creating new routes and links is especially important on the Coastal Plain, where an off-road multi-use path network would be of great benefit to all NMUs.		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	1412	Tangmere Parish Council wishes to submit a replacement Policy AL14 and associated supporting paragraphs. See 'Change to Plan'.	<p>Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere</p> <p>Approximately 73 hectares of land to the west of Tangmere is allocated for residential led development of 1,300 dwellings. Development in this location will be Masterplanned as a whole and be expected to address the following site-specific requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be planned as an extension to Tangmere village, that is well integrated with the village and provides good access to existing facilities in order to deliver the policy objectives of the Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan (TNP); 2. A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation to include specific provision to meet specialised housing needs including accommodation for older people and to enable the development to play a key role in widening the demographic profile of the village by rebalancing its mix of housing stock (in line with TNP policy 2iv which proposes at least 40% of the affordable housing being low cost homeownership) ; 3. Incorporate new community facilities to deliver enhanced recreation, open space, primary education and healthcare facilities; 4. Incorporate a "Village Main Street" as an extension of Malcolm Road providing local convenience shopping; 5. Provision of a 2 FE (expandable to 3 FE) Primary School to provide for the population of primary school children generated by housing on the development site in addition to those from the existing village, as outlined in policy 2 of the TNP, and in line with the "One Village" vision in the TNP; 6. Make provision for green links to the National Park and Chichester City, in accordance with the objectives of policy 8 of the TNP. Opportunities should be taken to provide integrated green infrastructure in conjunction with the other strategic sites to the east of the city; 7. Protect existing views of Chichester Cathedral spire and reduce any impact on views from within the National Park; 8. Subject to detailed transport assessment, provide primary road access to the site from the slip-road roundabout at the A27/A285 junction to the west of Tangmere providing a link with Tangmere Road. Development will be required to provide or fund mitigation for potential off-site traffic impacts through a package of measures in conformity with the Chichester City Transport Strategy (see Policy S14); 9. Subject to detailed transport assessment, provide for TNP Policy 9, including the creation of the "East-West corridor" (TNP Policy 2ii) delivering road, footpath, cycleway and bus routes around and within the existing and new village at Tangmere; 10. Make provision for improved more direct and frequent bus services between Tangmere and Chichester City, and improved and additional cycle routes linking Tangmere with Chichester City, Shopwhyke and Westhampnett. Opportunities should also be explored for improving transport links with the 'Five Villages' area and Barnham rail station in Arun District; and 11. Conserve and enhance the heritage and potential archaeological interest of the village, surrounding areas and World War II airfield, including the expansion of the Tangmere Military Aviation Museum (Policy 6 TNP). <p>Development will be dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards. Proposals for development should have special regard to the defined County Minerals Safeguarding Area. Preparation of site plans will require liaison with West Sussex County Council at an early stage to ensure that potential mineral interests are fully considered in planning development.</p>	Object	Tangmere Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [984]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	1693	<p>We support the proposed allocation for 1300 homes and other associated facilities and uses. We agree that there is a requirement for infrastructure (including wastewater and highways works).</p> <p>We agree that there is an imperative to secure a strong design approach with good linkage to the existing village. The NP process represents one proposal for a spatial layout but it should not be construed to represent the optimal or unique solution to meet policy objectives. A requirement to adopt that layout will fundamentally hinder deliverability and the opportunity to realise the housing in the early part of the Plan period.</p>	<p>Para 6.94 should be changed to say: It is estimated that the site has the potential to deliver around 1,300 dwellings during the Plan period; together with supporting community facilities, open space and recreation, and infrastructure. The primary access will be provided from the existing grade separated junction on the A27 to the west of the village with a connection to the Tangmere Straight. However, it is important to ensure that new development is well integrated with the existing village, both physically and in terms of the community. The key vision of the Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2016) is a 'one village' approach. The NP provides INITIAL design guidance to inform the masterplanning of the Tangmere SDL BUT SHOULD NOT RESTRICT OPPORTUNITIES FOR DESIGN FLAIR TO MEET THE POLICY OBJECTIVES.</p>	Object	Heaver Homes Ltd [7183]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	1735	It is important not only to be planned as an extension to the village, but in such a way as to incorporate the new development into a "one village" model as set out in the Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan.		Support	Kirsten Lanchester [5522]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2135	<p>Education: At the current time pupil place planning indicates that there is insufficient space within the primary schools that serve this proposed development. Further capacity would be required to accommodate the development. Land for a 2FE-3FE primary school and pro rata share of the build costs would be required.</p> <p>AL7, AL10 and AL13 are within the same school planning area, the cumulative total brings forward a requirement for c3 forms of entry additional places. The Local Plan, as currently drafted, indicates oversupply of school places which could affect the viability of all schools in the planning area.</p>		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2275	<p>No comments on the principle of the allocation.</p> <p>Site close to heritage assets - HE welcomes criteria 5 and 8.</p> <p>Criterion 8 should be strengthened.</p> <p>This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make on any planning application that may be submitted for the development of this site.</p>	<p>Reword criterion 8 as follows:</p> <p>8. Conserve and enhance the heritage and potential archaeological interest of the village, surrounding areas and World War II airfield, particularly the Conservation Area and the Grade I listed Church of St Andrew and including the expansion or relocation of the Tangmere Military Aviation Museum.</p> <p>Add a new criterion as follows:</p> <p>""Conserve and enhance the setting of the historic village, particularly of the Conservation Area".</p>	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2314	Policy AL14 'Tangmere' housing allocation has increased by 30% and we may need to repeat the modelling that has already been done. There is also uncertainty about the water supply to the HDA which seems to rely on rainwater harvesting for future growth. The housing development and the HDA could have an impact on our source protection zone. Under this policy, where development is in a source protection zone, the policy should also refer to groundwater quality protection and the additional requirements when using infiltration systems in particular deep bore systems.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2339	The existing provision within Policy AL14 relating to wastewater conveyance and treatment is noted, and was supported by Southern Water during historic consultations on the current Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029. However, since OFWAT's new approach to water and wastewater connections charging was implemented from 1 April 2018, we have adjusted our approach accordingly. Southern Water will need to work with site promoters to understand the development program and to review whether the delivery of new infrastructure aligns with the occupation of the development, and this is reflected in the proposed amendments below.	<p>Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following amendment to Policy AL14: Occupation of development will be dependent on the provision phased to align with the delivery of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards.</p>	Comment	Southern Water (Ms C Mayall) [1306]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2368	Opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure links to the wider countryside within these Policies are welcomed. It is particularly relevant to the Coastal Plain where the current provision of multi-user routes is very limited. Improvements in this area would comply with the objectives of the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Plan 2018-2028.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2393	The existing sewage disposal solution is unsustainable under the WFD. The additional housing allocation to Tangmere SDL is unsustainable because brown field sites are available at the same location. Additional facilities at Tangmere are unsustainable.	A new 'Regional' sewage disposal solution needs to be developed by Southern Water. This will include the developments at Southbourne, Hambrook, Bosham and Fishbourne. All Chichester developments to drain to Apuldram for treatment with a long sea outfall at Bracklesham as originally proposed. Tangmere SDL to remain at 1000 houses with additional growth included at the 'Apron' site. Remove references to unsustainable community facilities at Tangmere.	Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2418	We welcome criterion 5 of policy AL14 (Land West of Tangmere). It is a sensitive site due to the impact on clear views of the site from important locations in the SDNP such as the Trundle and Halnaker Hill. We therefore ask that criterion 5 is expanded to emphasise and address the sensitivity of the site		Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2599	Support increased in anticipated capacity. Amendment to policy wording	Amend wording to 'around 1300 dwellings, with the precise number to be determined through the masterplanning process.' Amend third site specific issue to: "Incorporate new or expanded community facilities (including transforming the existing village centre into a new Local Centre) providing convenience shopping. Opportunities will be sought to deliver enhanced recreation, open space, primary education and healthcare facilities;" Amend fifth site specific issue to: "Respect important existing views of Chichester Cathedral spire and reduce any impact on views from within the National Park;" Amend seventh issue to: "Make provision for improved sustainable travel modes between Tangmere and Chichester City, in partnership with the relevant authorities including improved and additional cycle routes linking Tangmere with Chichester City, Shopwhyke and Westhampnett. Opportunities should also be explored for improving transport links with the 'Five Villages' area and Barnham rail station in Arun District; and" Amend eighth issue to: "Conserve and enhance the heritage and potential archaeological interest of the village, surrounding areas and World War II airfield, including provision for the relocation of existing allotment space to facilitate the expansion or relocation of the Tangmere Military Aviation Museum."	Support	Countryside Properties [7291]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2793	Similarly to allocation AL13, we question the size of the allocation for Tangmere. In addition to our standard concerns over the GI and biodiversity requirements, we also note that there is no reference made in the supporting text to the chalk stream priority habitat within the site. This should be rectified.	Concerns over the GI and biodiversity requirements, suggest: 'Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere 4. ...Make provision for green links to the National Park and Chichester City. Provision of integrated green infrastructure in conjunction with the other strategic sites to the east of the city; 5. Protect existing views of Chichester Cathedral spire and reduce any impact on views from within the National Park; 6. Subject to detailed transport assessment, provide primary road access to the site from the slip-road roundabout at the A27/A285 junction to the west of Tangmere providing a link with Tangmere Road. Development will be required to provide or fund mitigation for potential off-site traffic impacts through a package of measures in conformity with the Chichester City Transport Strategy (see Policy S14); 7. Make provision for improved more direct and frequent bus services between Tangmere and Chichester City, and improved and additional cycle routes linking Tangmere with Chichester City, Shopwhyke and Westhampnett. Opportunities should also be explored for improving transport links with the 'Five Villages' area and Barnham rail station in Arun District; and 8. Conserve and enhance the heritage and potential archaeological interest of the village, surrounding areas and World War II airfield, including the expansion or relocation of the Tangmere Military Aviation Museum. 9. Demonstration that development would not have an adverse impact on the nature conservation interest of identified sites and habitats and that measurable net gains to biodiversity will be delivered; Development will be dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards...'	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2901	Support policy, but request uplift in figure to 1500 dwellings. Strategic development policies should support phased approach to delivery of sites to enable early phases to come forward. Object to criterion 2 and 8. Suggest rewording criterion 2. No justification for why expansion/relocation of museum has been included in AL14 as already in NP.	Amend policy to 1500 dwellings. Amend criterion 2: "A range of types, sizes and tenures of residential accommodation, to be informed by the up-to-date housing needs of the Parish and the District at the time of application." Delete criterion 8.	Support	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2926	We are concerned at the lack of any reference here to biodiversity or wildlife which, compared with other policies, suggests it will have no priority in this part of the plan.	Revise this proposal to include measures to protect and enhance biodiversity.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	2961	Developers are routinely digging out hedgerows at site boundaries, and often replacing them with fences. The results are particularly stark at the nearby Shopwhyke Lakes. The loss of these features (and replacement with fences) is fast urbanising Chichester's once rural setting, and taking away biodiversity and small refuges for wildlife habitats.	AMEND Add an extra bullet point to the effect "Retention and enhancement of existing hedging and mature shrubbery alongside boundary roads"	Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3197	Plan should include provision of housing for younger people with shared communal areas to make living in shared communities an attractive and affordable proposition to attract more young people to stay in the area.	Insert at point 2 of Policy: "To meet specialised housing needs including accomodation for older and younger people". Point 7: Delete "Opportunities should be explored for improving transport links" and insert "Make provision for transport links with the Five Villages area....."	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3226	The Pitts Family (one of the landowners of the strategic site) supports the allocation - the site has an independent access with frontage to an adoptable highway and can come forward prior/separately to the allocation. Site is 7.6ha and could accommodate approx. 200 units		Support	J Pitts [6878]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3303	CCE supports the proposed changes to this policy to facilitate the delivery of a residential-led development of at least 1,300 dwellings.		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3323	Welcome allocation of Tangmere - potential to deliver additional housing (circa 1500) within/adjacent to existing allocation should housing requirement increase.		Comment	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3351	Question deliverability of allocation through NP process given failure to deliver on Tangmere's allocation in the current LP		Object	CEG [7397]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3550	A Master Plan should already have been developed for Tangmere based on the original housing allocation of 1000 dwellings. The Government now requires all development to produce a net environmental gain and it is hard to see how this can be achieved by increasing housing density by 30%. The Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan clearly sets out the need for a sustainable movement network and green infrastructure. Increasing the housing density will make it difficult to deliver the wishes of the local population and respect the planning process.		Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
101	Policy AL15: Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere	349	Has the Tangmere HDA boundary been modified to exclude the Business Park and the 'Apron' site? Why has the access road to the new glasshouse site, to the south west of the HDA, been set back to the south of the apron?		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
101	Policy AL15: Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere	2315	Policy AL15 'Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere' Portsmouth Water have public water supply abstractions in the area and the site allocation is likely to be within a source protection zone for our Aldingbourne public water supply abstraction. As above, where development is in a source protection zone, the policy should also refer to groundwater quality protection and the need for caution when using infiltration systems in particular deep bore systems. Please refer to Portsmouth Water's Groundwater Protection Guidance for further information.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
101	Policy AL15: Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere	3184	I believe that high speed broadband should be made a priority for all areas of Chichester District. This is now a normal modern communication expectation.	There are organisations aside from Open Reach who will work with rural communities to develop rural networks and high speed broadband.	Comment	Martyn Chuter [7380]
g. Development Management						
102	Development Management					
103	Housing	384	7.2, second sentence, add "single-parent families and first-time buyers"		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
103	Housing	1763	Mentions "place housing in locations which are accessible by public transport to jobs, shopping, leisure, education and health facilities". CDC should not be accepting the unmet housing needs from within the SDNP but if needed it could be provided to the North of the city in the areas of West Broyle and Lavant to ensure that families are not distanced from their "parent neighbourhood". As a result a strategic site for at least 205 affordable homes should be found in the area to mitigate the unmet needs of the SDNP.	This would also remove the requirement to build on floodplain next to the AONB	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
103	Housing	1804	7.7 We support housing for older people but recommend this is in units in villages as well as in cities. Some people wish to stay in their communities.		Support	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
103	Housing	3186	I support the idea of a mechanism to free up under-used family homes to make best use of housing stock, in particular the promotion of smaller properties close to amenities to enable connectivity of (downsizing older) residents.		Support	Martyn Chuter [7380]
103	Housing	3199	7.2 Insert "This includes housing for families, young people, older people...." 7.7 Insert "Housing for older people must be properly designed to cope with high summer temperatures as older people are significantly more at risk from heat. Older housing stock must be adapted as older buildings" 7.11 Insert "Opportunities should be explored to deliver high quality HMOs that appeal to single people who live alone to use shared facilities (library, music room, laundry, kitchens and entertainment areas). This new type of shared living strengthens bonds between individuals and reduces one impact on the environment."	7.2 Insert "This includes housing for families, young people, older people...." 7.7 Insert "Housing for older people must be properly designed to cope with high summer temperatures as older people are significantly more at risk from heat. Older housing stock must be adapted as older buildings" 7.11 Insert "Opportunities should be explored to deliver high quality HMOs that appeal to single people who live alone to use shared facilities (library, music room, laundry, kitchens and entertainment areas). This new type of shared living strengthens bonds between individuals and reduces one impact on the environment."	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
103	Housing	3203	United Nations are predicting huge numbers of people will become homeless due to failed harvests, water shortages etc. This will lead to mass migration. We need a policy to start planning for this as we have an open coastline.	Needs to have another category for refugees or a new policy needs to be inserted in the plan.	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
104	Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	1212	Essential that sufficient housing is provided for growing numbers of elderly so they do not have to move out of the area if needing more appropriate housing for their needs. As this will require single story dwellings it will have a lower density and consideration should be given to this. The planning process MUST hold developers to account in this delivery or our elderly people will not be able to remain in their communities		Support	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
104	Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	2411	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
104	Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	2468	Local consultation has revealed a shortage of specialist housing, especially for the elderly and the disabled. It is considered that creative policies promoting adaptable "lifetime" dwellings are required to enable the elderly to remain in the community for longer. The Local Housing Needs Survey of the Parish is expected to confirm this.	Add "the disabled" into the policy.	Support	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
104	Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	2670	Needs to mention the requirement for special need of the rural community to the north of Chichester. If 41 homes cannot be built in the SDNP they should be as close to the SDNP as possible. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
104	Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	2761	Welcome support for specialist accom, but suggest that Council seeks to identify number of specialist homes for older people and identify sites.		Support	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]
104	Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	3096	There is no mention of affordability.	To add a reference to affordability.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
104	Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	3191	I agree with the principle of additional purpose built student accommodation for any significant increase in full time student numbers as a means to minimise the impact of student competition in the local housing market (on lower paid local residents).		Comment	Martyn Chuter [7380]
104	Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	3192	Pleased to see primacy of 'an identified need' Whilst the development of larger properties may be the most profitable option for developers, it seems that with the formation of more smaller households and for elderly to downsize, that the greatest need is for smaller properties.		Support	Martyn Chuter [7380]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
104	Policy DM1: Specialist Housing	3373	<p>Policy does not provide specialist housing for agri/horti/rural workers.</p> <p>Suggest amendment to policy wording.</p>	<p>Amend policy wording to; "Policy DM1: Specialist Housing Proposals for specialist needs housing such as homes for older people, people with disabilities, agricultural, horticultural and countryside workers, student accommodation or homes for other specific groups who may require properties that are specifically designed and / or allocated will be supported where: 1. There is a clear identified need; 2. The development is located in an area that is sustainable to meet the social as well as the housing needs of the intended residents; 3. It will not lead to a concentration of similar uses in an area that would be detrimental to the character or function of an area and / or residential amenity; 4. It is in close proximity to everyday services, preferably connecting by safe and suitable walking / cycling routes or public transport for the intended occupier; 5. It can be demonstrated that the development is designed and managed to provide the most appropriate types of support for the target resident; 6. It can be demonstrated that revenue funding can be secured to maintain the long term viability of the scheme; and where appropriate, 7. The scheme is supported by the relevant statutory agencies. Proposals which may result in the loss of specialist needs accommodation will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for such accommodation in the Plan area, or alternative provision is being made available locally through replacement or new facilities."</p>	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	101	Affordable and social housing quotas should be increased for the city of Chichester and other settlements close to the rail network, A27, secondary schooling and employment.	Affordable and social housing quotas should be increased for the city of Chichester and other settlements close to the rail network, A27, secondary schooling and employment.	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	838	There should be an embargo on buy to let and second homes. Housing should provide for local needs at affordable rents so that locals with birth or very longterm family connections and essential workers are not priced out of the area. Too many developments around here are high end second homes or expensive private rentals.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	1214	Chidham and Hambrook have a high number of 4+ bedroom and detached housing. There needs to be a housing needs study to ascertain need as younger, lower income and single people are being priced out of their neighbourhoods.		Support	Mrs Jane Towers [7058]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	1349	The provision of housing to satisfy 'market demand' must be secondary to that required for affordable housing and social housing needed for disabled and or aged citizens.	Reverse the priority proposed by the chart of distribution of housing types so that 'local affordable' housing can be more than 50%. Include the development of public housing for local authority rent.	Object	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	1461	Any new housing that is found to be needed must contain a lot more 'affordable housing' than stated in current policy; and affordable must mean affordable to local residents with regard to local wages and general employment expectations in the Chichester area. During a new planning application for any new development, conditions can be put into place to ensure this happens.		Comment	Mr Graham Dipple [7162]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	1514	Linden Homes and Miller Homes support providing a mix of homes of differing size, types and tenures to meet a range of local needs. However, any such policy has to be flexible enough to recognise the range of needs locally and the specifics of the site and its context. The current, relatively rigid table is not considered to fully provide this flexibility and would not allow home builders to respond effectively to changing market conditions over the plan period, which in the current economic and political climate, can occur quickly.	See representation.	Object	Linden Homes & Miller Homes [6783]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2233	There appears to be confusion in the percentage provision of 4 bed plus market dwellings. The preferred approach promotes up to 20% the HEDNA 25% and the SDNP 5-10%. This issue requires reconciliation. Para 7.7 implies that a number of larger houses will be vacated by older persons downsizing. This would only happen if such provision of suitable smaller accommodation is available. The housing mix fails to reflect the need for smaller homes and those suitable for lifetime occupation.	Housing mix needs to be altered to reflect the need for more affordable and smaller accommodation.	Object	Ms Oona Hickson [5558]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2413	Need to recognise the following: - Resolve homelessness - Young families - Young people moving to the area		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2455	PC support DM2		Support	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2456	Confusion in the percentage provision of 4+ bedroom market dwellings. Preferred Approach promotes up to 20%, the HEDNA recommends 25% and the National Park is promoting 5 to 10%. Difficult to see why the Plan area figure is so much higher than the National Park. The proposed mix is also at odds with the ONS prediction that there will be a rapid rise in single person households up to 2041, emphasising the effect of an aging population.	The market housing 4+ bedroom % needs to be reduced in favour of more single person accommodation. The Parish Local Housing Needs Survey is expected to confirm this.	Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2497	Specialist housing and housing for the elderly will require a lower density as it will be single story. It is essential that there are robust measures that will enable high quality homes to be built to enable elderly people to remain in their community should they need to move into adapted housing more appropriate to their needs. Similarly, life long homes for those with a disability who need specialist housing.		Support	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2517	Plan should include a policy on self and custom build.		Comment	Mr William MacGeagh [5889]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2598	Whilst our client supports the aspiration to achieve an overall housing mix that is broadly balanced throughout the plan period, it would be helpful if a specified mix were not introduced directly into policy. If included either reflect HEDNA evidence or CDC should produce new evidence to justify varying the mix. Para 3 ambiguous - focus and requirements of para should be clarified Encourage CDC to consult on revised Planning Obligations SPD asap. Requirement to apply nationally described space standards subject to appropriate viability evidence.		Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2647	Concern that mix too detailed - should reflect local housing need	Reword to meet local need and character	Comment	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2685	The flexibility within Part 2 of the policy is welcomed. However, this should be subject to viability, to provide sufficient flexibility to avoid inhibiting the delivery of much needed new homes.	Addition to DM1 Part 2 to read - 'c. or this is supported by robust housing market and viability evidence.'	Object	Suez (Sita UK) (Emma Smyth) [11]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2712	Support that Council recognise factors which may mean devt need to depart from housing mix Policy to consider that higher proportion of lower bedroom properties does not reflect demand		Comment	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2721	The flexibility within Part 2 of the policy is welcomed. However, this should be subject to viability, to provide sufficient flexibility to avoid inhibiting the delivery of much needed new homes.	Addition to DM2 part 2 to read - 'c. or this is supported by robust housing market and viability evidence.'	Object	Obsidian Strategic AC Limited, DC Heaver and Eurequity IC Ltd [7312]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2763	Policy which specifies housing mix is overly restrictive and does not offer flexibility - mix should not be in policy. CDC must identify need for accessible homes to ensure it does not compromise viability. If seeking to require proportion of homes built to part M4(2) of Regs, must be justified. Where CDC seeks to apply optional technical standards must be considered in viability assessment. Should justify inclusion of Nationally Described Space Standard.	Suggest policy requires applications for housing devt to have regard to evidence on housing mix but final mix is left to agreement between applicant and developer.	Comment	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2857	Reconcile requirement of criterion 4 with that of policy DM1. Reword criterion. Consideration of concentrating efforts on securing accessibility standards for affordable dwellings as opposed to market housing. Criterion 6 - no transition period for adoption of space standards; nor evidence to justify department from HEDNA requirement to focus on 3/4 bedroom properties. This policy should be a strategic policy.	Move policy to strategic part of plan. Remove criterion 6.	Comment	Persimmon Homes (Mr Joe Maphosa) [1216]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	2897	Approach is supported but policy is over restrictive and does not allow for flexibility to change housing mix. Criterion 6 - no evidence to justify inclusion of space standards through policy - should be removed	Remove criterion 6.	Object	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	3022	Figures in the HEDNA should not be translated into policy to allow flexibility. Justify evidence for Nationally Described Space Standards Identify need for homes to be built to optional technical standards for accessible/adaptable homes and subject to viability assessment.		Comment	Thakeham Homes (Chris Geddes) [7350]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	3031	Wording of policy lacks flexibility - recommend rewording. Nationally Described Space Standards - no justification for inclusion.	Amend policy wording to state housing mix will be agreed on a site by site basis having regard to latest evidence. Unless provide justification, recommend policy amended to state developments should provide an appropriate standard of accommodation having regard to the NDSS.	Comment	William Lacey Group [1623]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	3097	The first word of the policy, "All" contradicts the NPPF (2018).	To reword this sentence.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	3200	7.18 Support the need for smaller units as there are more single-person households due to the breakdown of traditional family units.		Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	3305	<p>We support the objective of draft Policy DM2 (Housing Mix) to provide homes of an appropriate type, size and tenure to address the identified needs and market demand and to support mixed and balanced communities.</p> <p>However, recognising that the NPPF calls for flexibility stating that plans should "be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change" (para. 11), this policy should not stipulate housing mix but instead encourage applicants to have regard to the evidence on housing mix and negotiate an appropriate mix on a site by site basis.</p>		Comment	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	3487	<p>Increase in population above average 65+ should be addressed, and provide an opportunity for increasing the number of those in work and a higher percentage of social and low cost home ownership dwellings provided.</p> <p>No more market housing is built except that with extant permission. Affordable rented housing and low cost home ownership dwellings including specialist housing should be encouraged and actively pursued and to a high design standard.</p>		Comment	Mrs Sarah Headlam [7441]
105	Policy DM2: Housing Mix	3530	Second homes should not be allowed. Policy in place to make sure that all affordable homes are for local people, and a majority to be for social rent, the area where there is greatest need.		Object	Mr Alan Carn [5417]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	215	The policy relating to city centre housing density of at least 35dph was not considered to be particularly helpful, as it is arbitrary and, in practice, density depends very much on site constraints and surrounding context.		Comment	Chichester City Council (Parish Clerk) [786]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	804	Housing densities of 35+ per hectare are city centre highly urbanised environments and totally inappropriate for village locations. On the Western Manhood the area is surrounded by Special Protection Areas as a fact that has been totally overlooked.	Housing densities of 35+ per hectare are city centre highly urbanised environments and totally inappropriate for village locations. On the Western Manhood the area is surrounded by Special Protection Areas as a fact that has been totally overlooked.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	839	Large scale developments are very attractive to developers but planners are very ineffectual at insisting that infrastructure is also put in place, leaving developments isolated with new schools, shops or services leading to more car journeys having to be undertaken.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	1515	Linden Homes and Miller Homes support the premise of policy DM3 which aims to make the best use of land in accordance with the NPPF paragraph 122. However, the policy does not fully recognise that new developments improve the provision of transport links and access to services and hence can, in themselves, provide new opportunities for higher density development.		Comment	Linden Homes & Miller Homes [6783]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	1547	Why and how did CDC come up with the statement "Densities of 35 dwellings per hectare are generally considered appropriate by the Council". Please can we see reference to this in the next draft of the plan.		Comment	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	2276	Historic England welcomes and supports clause b of Policy DM3 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	2457	The Preferred Approach advocates a flexible approach to housing density. While an average of 35 dwellings per hectare is recognised as a reasonable guideline, the Parish Council considers that some areas of a higher density would be appropriate, especially where single person accommodation could include small privet patios, terraces or balconies (for flats) in recognition that not all householders want a large private garden, provided that appropriate public open space is delivered as an alternative. Higher densities, as appropriate, also reduce land take.		Support	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	2648	We are supportive of the approach that a minimum density for new development is provided. This should however be considered in view of the character of the area to ensure development is of an appropriate scale.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	2962	Section 7.25 Parking is a hugely inefficient use of space. "Adequate parking" would be less of a problem if the Plan did more to encourage, in particular, low-car housing including car clubs and home working.		Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	2985	This policy is too narrowly defined and does not make specific provision for appropriate density levels in rural areas and villages which do not have specific statutory protection but still have considerable merit and distinctive character worthy of careful design to protect it. Density levels of 34 units to the hectare would be significantly impactful and out of character in the majority of countryside and village locations in the District and such density levels would rarely be acceptable in any rural or village location. This Policy conflicts with Policy DM28.		Object	Plaistow And Ifold Parish Council (Catherine Nutting) [1223]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	3098	There is not a rationale as to why Chichester District Council generally consider 35 dwellings per hectare as appropriate.	To provide a justification for this level of density.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	3201	7.25 Support the need for smaller units which are more densely arranged to reduce the need to build on green fields. High density housing close to the city and village centres or public transport links is also better for to reduce our carbon footprint. Ideally housing is more dense to enable more open green space to remain.	Insert "...need to create high quality development that has appropriate landscape, pollution and noise buffers"	Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	3306	CCE supports draft Policy DM3 (Housing Density) which requires density is consistent with making the best use of land whilst achieving high quality, sustainable design. We support a minimum average density of 35 dwellings per hectare along with recognition that this may vary depending upon site specific circumstances and could be higher were transport links and access to services is good.		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
106	Policy DM3: Housing Density	3374	Policy DM3 should better reflect revised National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 122 and 123 to achieve appropriate densities.	Policy DM3 should be amended to relate density to the identified need for different types of housing; local market condition and viability; the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services; and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
107	Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	50	This policy fails to follow / include the policy for 'entry-level exception sites' as set out in para 71 of the Framework.	para 7.28, line 1, should be changed to include the word 'rural' before the words 'exception sites' as otherwise it is very difficult to find the definition in the glossary. The wording of the policy and definition in the glossary should be amended to reflect para 71 of the Framework and include a provision for 'entry-level exception sites'. The definition of 'affordable housing' in the glossary should also be changed to reflect the definition in the Framework	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
107	Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	760	Small developments of affordable and social housing are needed, especially in small villages.		Support	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
107	Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	841	There is no mention of mitigation of transport issues. Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, i will raise this with the inspector at the appropriate time.	Transport mitigations plans must be included in any mention of suitable sites.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
107	Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	1611	Paragraph 7.29 and Policy DM4 Conflict directly with the 2018 NPPF definition of affordable housing.	Recommendations : 1. Modify Paragraph 7.29 by removing the sentence "Due to their location, exception sites must be owned and managed by an approved Registered Provider or incorporated Community Land Trust. " since this is in conflict with the NPPF definition of Affordable Housing as described above. 2. Change Sub section 2 Criteria 1. to read : The scheme provides 100% affordable housing (unless a robust justification is provided in line with paragraph 7.34). Affordable housing is as defined in the most recent NPPF. 3. Change Criteria 4 of Policy DM4 to read simply "The proposed scheme is economically viable and deliverable" The requirement for a registered provider, or otherwise is described in the NPPF definition of Affordable Housing.	Object	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]
107	Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	2927	We strongly support significant inclusion of affordable housing in the plan, but this is not strong enough as a general policy.	We seek stronger assurances about the levels of affordable housing in each allocation, which would in turn reduce the need for exception sites.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
107	Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	3099	Page 141, 7.34 Affordable Housing Exception Sites: The term "exceptional circumstances" is too vague.	To use the tests as set-out in the NPPF instead.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
107	Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	3202	7.35 This "local connection" policy should be amended to include step-children step relationships. Some people only have step-children and are prevented from settling near them as this is not seen as a sufficient relationship.		Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
107	Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	3279	Support policy. Has any consideration been given to allowing self-builds or building a couple of properties on exception sites at market price as a revenue model to facilitate the delivery of affordable houses through the CLT?		Support	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
107	Policy DM4: Affordable Housing Exception Sites	3531	Small developments of affordable and social housing are essential, particularly in rural communities.		Object	Mr Alan Carn [5417]
108	Accommodation For Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	765	There is obviously a need for more of these sites.		Support	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
109	Policy DM5: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	102	Large sites for travellers should be allocated within easy access of the A27 and not in areas dependent on tourism		Comment	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
109	Policy DM5: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	390	Policy DM5: Existing traveller sites will be safeguarded for traveller use... is open to misinterpretation	Change to: Existing PERMITTED traveller sites etc.	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
109	Policy DM5: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	2219	We support the specific criteria in this policy to ensure that GTTS sites are not located in areas at risk of flooding.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
109	Policy DM5: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	2277	Historic England welcomes and supports clauses 1 c and 2 e of Policy DM5 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
109	Policy DM5: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	3100	There are a few opportunities for Chichester District Council to strengthen this policy.	<p>To state that unauthorised settlement on unallocated sites may have a significant and adverse impact on the natural and historic environment and will be subject to immediate enforcement action.</p> <p>1 (c) and (e) can be cross-referenced to NPPF paragraph 170. The wording on 1 (c) and 2 (e) states "nationally designated areas of landscape." Given the experience in Birdham, the Conservancy would appreciate specific reference to Chichester Harbour AONB.</p> <p>"Existing traveller sites will be safeguarded for traveller use" should change to "Existing lawful traveller sites will be safeguarded for traveller use."</p>	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
109	Policy DM5: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	3277	<p>Concern that policies are based on inadequate/flawed evidence base.</p> <p>CDC should challenge GTTS needs survey to avoid over provision.</p> <p>Policy should be included to avoid overconcentration of GTTS dwellings in one location e.g. Westbourne, Funtington</p> <p>Policy wording should also refer to existing sites.</p> <p>Concern that Westbourne NP will not carry so much weight if this policy is made.</p>	<p>Include reference to existing sites.</p> <p>Additional intensification should be resisted where there are large groups or considered up to maximum number of 18.</p> <p>Use criteria based approach to extension of sites.</p> <p>New pitches/plots should be enforced.</p> <p>Include ref to state any existing NPS that have been made with specific GTTS policies will retain their validity above this new LP.</p>	Object	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
110	Policy DM6: Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers	54	<p>The end of the paragraph after criterion 6 is confusing. If it is the intention of the LPA to include wording on conditions to the effect that occupiers will be "required to live locally in order to perform their role" then i suggest that this does not meet the required tests for a condition as it is vague, imprecise and unenforceable.</p> <p>The final paragraph / criterion 3 which relates to the removal of agricultural occupancy conditions contradicts what is said in Appendix C in terms of the length of time of the marketing.</p>	<p>Delete the words "and required to live locally in order to perform their role"</p> <p>Delete the word 'minimum' in final para and insert 'between a year and'</p>	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
110	Policy DM6: Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers	72	<p>As made clear in Embleton Parish Council v Northumberland CC [2013] there is no requirement in the Framework to show that the business is viable and the Council have not demonstrated unique circumstances in the District to justify a more onerous approach.</p> <p>Also since the policy relates to not just agricultural businesses but rural businesses generally the specific use of the word agriculture in criteria 1 is not appropriate</p>	<p>delete the word 'agricultural in 1 and insert 'business'</p> <p>delete criteria 3</p> <p>delete criteria 6 or E.14(3) in Appendix C</p>	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
110	Policy DM6: Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers	843	Any dwelling should be of a temporary nature so that the area can be returned to the original state once the activity has ceased. Where a permanent structure is built it must always remain as a tithed status so as to be available to any future worker of the land. Too many mobile homes have been put on paddocks and then after a few years a permanent bricks and mortar dwelling has been built. This is an abuse and not in the spirit of planning rules.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
110	Policy DM6: Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers	2523	Support reintro of qualifying criteria but issue of enforcement. Consider time restriction so permission expires to exclude ELD. Subdivision of land for additional housing also issue In the HDA's the approval of agricultural worker accommodation should be restricted and perhaps limited to a residential caravan on a temporary consent and not lead to a progression to a permanent building as currently happens.		Support	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
110	Policy DM6: Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers	2671	Needs to reflect the unmet housing need from SDNP. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
110	Policy DM6: Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers	3101	The policy wording could be improved. Please refer to Planning Principle 06 for guidance on how to improve the wording of this policy https://www.conservancy.co.uk/page/planning - page 18	Please refer to Planning Principle 06 for guidance on how to improve the wording of this policy https://www.conservancy.co.uk/page/planning - page 18	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
110	Policy DM6: Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers	3368	<p>Policy does not cover provision of specialist housing for agricultural/horticultural/rural workers.</p> <p>Plan should provide for more innovative housing e.g. Walnut Tree Farm which is on edge of Runcton HDA.</p> <p>Suggest amendment of policy wording</p>	<p>Policy DM6 could be amended as follows to allow for specialist rural housing;</p> <p>"Policy DM6: Accommodation for Agricultural and other Rural Workers Development proposals which assist to achieve the overall objectives of the Local Plan or are necessary to meet the accommodation needs of fulltime workers in agriculture, forestry or other businesses requiring a countryside location will be granted where all the following criteria have been addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision on-site or in the immediate vicinity of the agricultural operation, is highly desirable to achieve Local Plan objectives or essential for the operation of the business; 2. No suitable accommodation exists or could be made available in established buildings on the site or in the immediate vicinity; 3. Clear evidence is provided of the economic viability of the business enterprise that the accommodation is intended to support or sufficient justification for specialist housing for rural workers demonstrates the achievement of Local Plan objectives; 4. The accommodation proposed is of a size commensurate with the operational requirements of the business; 5. The siting and landscaping of any new accommodation is well-related to the existing business building/s or other on-site dwellings and minimises the impact to the character and appearance of the countryside, ensuring no adverse impact on designated sites; and 6. The supporting information as set out at paragraph E9 of Appendix C has been provided, to support a new dwelling in the countryside. <p>Where a new dwelling or specialist rural accommodation is granted, this will be the subject of a condition ensuring that the occupation is restricted to a person solely or mainly working, or last working in the locality in agriculture, horticulture, forestry or other rural business and required, or is highly desirable to live locally in order to perform their role.</p> <p>Planning permission for the removal of a restrictive occupancy condition for agricultural or related workers on a dwelling or other rural accommodation will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That there is no longer a continued need for the property on the holding or for the business; 2. There is no long-term need for a dwelling or rural accommodation with restricted occupancy to serve local need in the locality; and 3. The property has been marketed locally for an appropriate period (minimum 18 months) at an appropriate price and for its use as an agricultural or rural worker tied dwelling / accommodation and evidence of marketing can be produced in accordance with Appendix C." <p>Or create specific new policy to allow specialist housing in countryside for provision of housing for agricultural/horticultural/rural workers.</p> <p>Allocate Walnut Tree Farm for specialist housing.</p> 	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
		3368				
111	Local Community Facilities					
112	Policy DM7: Local and Community Facilities	730	Support encouragement of new and improved community facilities, especially sub paragraph 2 which acknowledges that the provision of replacement facilities in certain circumstances provides appropriate mitigation for the loss of community facilities.		Support	St Pancras church (Mr Derek Mumford) [6909]
112	Policy DM7: Local and Community Facilities	845	This should mention the minimum threshold that should be in place for the building/improvements of community facilities.All to often these are put in the plan and only have to be built when the last house is built...surprise surprise the developers don't build the last house...prime example is Graylingwell which was promised a school in the plan,which has still not materialised !!! Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise it with examiner at the appropriate time.	Minimum thresholds must be put in place.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
112	Policy DM7: Local and Community Facilities	1479	In conjunction with Appendix C, we are supportive of this policy which will help protect the district's valued facilities from unnecessary loss in line with paragraph 92 of the NPPF (2018).		Support	The Theatres Trust (Planning Policy Officer) [1009]
112	Policy DM7: Local and Community Facilities	2649	We are supportive of this policy though note that it does not appear to make provision for community facilities to be provided as part of a new development.		Support	Barton Willmore (Rachel Murrell) [7294]
112	Policy DM7: Local and Community Facilities	2672	Should mention a minimum threshold of development that requires improved or new community facilities. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
112	Policy DM7: Local and Community Facilities	2799	Slightly concerned about policy as support text highlights some potential facilities in 7.44 but acknowledges list is not exhaustive. As we progress to the policy wording, the first sentence references land currently or last used for community facilities, public services, leisure and cultural uses. Potential uncertainty as to what is covered as 'a facility', we recommend that the policy includes wording which acknowledges the site/land may form part of Green Infrastructure Network and therefore the integrity of network should be considered. This would be consistent with DM34 approach: Open space, sport and recreation including indoor sports facilities and playing pitches.		Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
112	Policy DM7: Local and Community Facilities	3258	Support policy.		Support	WSCC (Estates) [6889]
113	Transport, Accessibility and Parking	1813	The council has hitherto shown no ability properly to deal with the local transport situation and inparticular the B2145, or an ability to have an impact on national policies where they impact locally, that is the A27, around Chichester. The council obviously need help in developing a coherent Transport Assessment and Travel Plan and needs to re-route the A27 north of the city before any further housing developments take place south of the A27 on the Manhood Peninsular.	No housing should be developed south of the A27 on the Manhood Peninsular until the A27 is re-routed north of the city. The council should seek help when trying to develop a coherent Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for the B2145.	Object	Ms Charlotte Joseph [7186]
113	Transport, Accessibility and Parking	3102	Would like a site for a car park off Dell Quay Road to be allocated n the Plan.	Nevertheless, if Chichester District Council could include the car park allocation at this stage, should the development go-ahead it would be in-keeping with the Local Plan.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	44	I have been involved since the early 1980's in Sussex traffic issues, including the A27 Forum and I predicted that the BABA27 result would not be successful. The Conservative Government have not spent money in Sussex for decades and there has been little done since the Brighton Bypass. I believe from experience that there is a policy, or a non written agenda that money will not be spent on the south's transport infrastructure. This lack of investment brings the actual and proposed increase in housing and transport problems into sharp focus. See full representation.		Comment	Mr Andrew Relf [6566]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	123	In prioritising sustainable transport links, existing footpaths/cycle ways such as Centurion Way should be preserved and enhanced		Comment	Mr Ian Bartle [4921]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	258	Point 1 of policy should refer to Sustainable transport networks. and provision	Point 1 to add 'sustainable' transport...	Object	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	389	item 7 : Where development is likely to have a significant impact on an Air Quality Management Area etc omits possible creation of new AQMAs.	item 7 add Where development is likely TO CREATE NEW AQMAs or to have a significant impact on an AQMA etc	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	858	If development is to minimise traffic generation, pollution, congestion and environmental damage, then the proposed diversion of Centurion Way by the White House Farm Developers must be opposed.		Comment	Ms Valerie Briginshaw [6946]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	897	Please include as additional point 7.53 Developments must maintain and enhance existing cycle ways and footpaths. Existing direct linear cycle routes and footpaths must not be diverted to follow lengthier routes around the perimeter of developments. Neither should these paths be rerouted along roads as an alternative to maintaining a dedicated motor-vehicle free footpath or cycleway. In particular Centurion Way (National Cycle Route 88), Salterns Way, Chichester to Bognor Regis (National Cycle Route 2) and Chichester to Emsworth (National Cycle Route 2), must not be dissected, lengthened or degraded due to development of the area.		Comment	Mr Mark Record [6963]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	953	DM8 - 2 With reference to the existing permission for the West of Chichester Whitehouse Farm development - this WILL create residual severe cumulative impacts on surrounding areas. How can residents expect CDC to implement this policy in future?		Comment	Liz Sagues [6982]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	1826	Criteria 2 should be expanded to state that any development must not impact existing footpaths, rights of way or cycle paths		Comment	Mr Bruce Brechin [7213]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2082	The PROW network can provide vital means for communities to interact and encourage sustainable local access. The policy requirement to create 'links between new development and existing pedestrian, cycle and public transport networks' is welcomed. However, establishing links into surrounding existing development should not be overlooked also - the greater the permeability, the greater the use.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2417	Agree with this policy, note the following issues: - Cycling routes - Bus services - Parking		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2580	We would wish to emphasise the importance of established cycle routes, especially Centurion Way, and the absolute necessity of their upkeep and development in accordance with NICE guidelines. NB The overall local transport plan requires a greater focus on increased public transport plus pedestrian and cycle routes.		Comment	Lavant Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1116]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2597	Final sentence of para 4 of policy is ambiguous and clarification is sought over meaning "requisite infrastructure"		Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2764	No ref to parking provision required - unsound as does not comply with legislation that prevents CDC from setting policy in SPDs.	Provide details of parking provision required.	Object	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2862	Criterion 4 - policy is unnecessary for resi devts - amend policy wording Criterion 6 - include parking standards as an annex to the plan.	Include parking standards in annex to the plan. Amend criterion 4 to reflect the need for charging points in non-residential development.	Comment	Persimmon Homes (Mr Joe Maphosa) [1216]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2911	Policy DM8: It is vital that the criteria listed in sub-paras 1 to 7 of this policy are fully and rigorously adhered to.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2928	In terms of point 7, it is not enough to simply require an air quality assessment. The policy should also require any necessary air quality management and mitigation measures arising from the development, and identified in the AQ assessment, to be carried out and secured by planning condition or by legal agreement.	The policy should also require any necessary air quality management and mitigation measures arising from the development, and identified in the AQ assessment, to be carried out and secured by planning condition or by legal agreement.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	2963	Concentrating only on "the availability of car parking" is an invitation to developers (and planners) to only think about car-dependent developments. The last Plan failed to safeguard the bottom end of Centurion Way, and the low-traffic link from there to the city.	7.50 add a final phrase "Conversely, developments that reduce land take for car parking will be welcomed if they can robustly demonstrate that they are planned around a low car dependency lifestyle." Policy DM8 - Item 4 CHANGE TO "through the creation or safeguarding and enhancement of links".	Object	MR William Sharp [7072]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	3032	Parking standards should be set out in the plan and supported by evidence	Parking standards should be set out in the plan and supported by evidence	Comment	William Lacey Group [1623]
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	3103	It says under point 2: "Development ...should not create or add to problems of ...air pollution, or other damage to the environment." Practically, this is a policy set-up to fail because development under DM8 will almost certainly lead to increased air pollution, at the very least.	Reword the policy.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
114	Policy DM8: Transport, Accessibility and Parking	3204	<p>7.55 change to "The availability of car parking and bus services have a role in improving accessibility to necessary local...."</p> <p>Policy: Insert "In order to achieve this criteria, a Local Integrated Transport Plan will be adopted by the Council to ensure uptake of sustainable transport modes is achieved".</p> <p>Point 4: Change to: "Other ultra-low emissions vehicles which should be placed on the road and take away space from pedestrians."</p>	<p>7.55 change to "The availability of car parking and bus services have a role in improving accessibility to necessary local...."</p> <p>Policy: Insert "In order to achieve this criteria, a Local Integrated Transport Plan will be adopted by the Council to ensure uptake of sustainable transport modes is achieved".</p> <p>Point 4: Change to: "Other ultra-low emissions vehicles which should be placed on the road and take away space from pedestrians."</p>	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
115	Employment	1765	7.61 Makes no mention of perhaps the best employment site that should be part of this plan which is in the current adopted plan of Westhampnett (for residential) South of Goodwood aerodrome. This site needs to be included as it would serve the North and the hard to reach rural communities that would currently have to utilise 2 transport modes (bus) to get to the proposed employment sites in the plan.	The adopted plan need to consider Westhampnett (for residential) and South of Goodwood aerodrome (for employment)	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
115	Employment	3310	Para 7.54 refers to regularly reviewing existing employment sites. The Tannery site in Westgate has not been assessed. It is not preferred location for offices and it should be released for housing.	Suitability of the Tannery site in Chichester should be reviewed to reflect conclusions of HELAA and should be referred to having potential to deliver approx. 30 units.	Object	West Sussex County Council [1416]
115	Employment	3547	Support paragraphs 4.59, 7.57, 7.58, 7.60 and DM9, but propose that these should also apply to the need for affordable housing within the city's urban area and within reach of all facilities by foot and cycle. Poor quality employment uses should be relocated to locations on the periphery of the city.		Comment	Mr John Templeton [7371]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	459	Why restrict this policy to employment in classes B1-B8? Why not include retailing and leisure and other institutions as sources of employment? This has led to unnecessary inflexibility (e.g. in turning down gym applications), and has encouraged employers to move out of the district e.g. to Portsmouth.	Add classes A2, D1 and D2 to the B use classes covered by this policy. As automotive retailers are already widely permitted in areas of employment land, consider whether wording is possible to permit some restricted retail activities, which by their nature need a warehouse-style or garage building instead of a shop.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	745	Object to the additional requirement that "the use does not prejudice the operation of and market attractiveness of the wider employment area." Draft Appendix C does not provide guidance, or any definition of, "the benchmarks" against which "market attractiveness" is judged. In general, this policy does not fully reflect principles embodied in Central Government policy (Use Classes Order and GPDOs), which enable the change of use of offices to residential. However, the opportunity for proposed leisure or community uses on existing employment sites is welcomed.	Clarify what is meant by "market attractiveness" in Appendix C. Re-number second group of sub paragraphs 1 - 3 in this policy to avoid future confusion.	Object	St Pancras church (Mr Derek Mumford) [6909]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	807	On the Western Manhood major employment sites have been or are being redeveloped for housing: Cobham Microwave Earnley Concourse South Downs Holiday Park The Royal Oak Pub	On the Western Manhood major employment sites have been or are being redeveloped for housing: Cobham Microwave Earnley Concourse South Downs Holiday Park The Royal Oak Pub	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	1154	Why have you removed areas near Goodwood that will have no adverse affect on the area and full fill criteria laid down and yet other areas like AL6 have been included that do not full fill the criteria.Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan, I will raise this with the examiner at the appropriate time.	All suitable areas need to be reinstated.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	1241	The policy needs to make provision for mixed use development to include higher value uses in response to the Council's own viability evidence.	Include additional criteria within the policy to support alternative non-employment uses where: 1) these uses are part of a mixed use development which retains an equivalent existing provision; or 2) development would remove existing employment uses that are harmful for environmental reasons (inc. incompatibility with neighbouring land uses)	Object	Nova Planning (Mr Patrick Barry) [1195]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	1620	Support exemption for change of use of employment sites to leisure or community use. These facilities are crucial and lacking in the city centre in particular and often do create employment as a by-product.		Support	Anna Khoo [7196]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	2611	Support policy but para 7.59 at odds - Harbour Management Plan not a DPD or a robust policy approach and should not be referenced. Lengthy marketing periods can leave empty properties creating no employment when change of use could create employment/further benefits. Para 7.59 should recognise relevance of complimentary uses which support viability of marinas.	Amend wording para 7.59 to 'marine related and supporting and ancillary uses' Reword policy to: Existing employment sites will be retained to safeguard their contribution to the local economy. Changes of use which retain or increase employment will be supported. Planning permission will be granted for residential uses on land or floorspace currently or previously in employment generating uses where the following criteria are met: 1. It has been demonstrated based on reasonable evidence (which could include marketing evidence, occupier evidence or site specific conditions) that the site is no longer required and is unlikely to be re-used or redeveloped for employment uses to meet future demand; or 2. There is an overriding community, tourism or leisure benefit from the proposed alternative use which cannot be met elsewhere and that the use does not prejudice the operation of and market attractiveness of the wider employment area; or 3. For B1(a) uses that the sequential test set out in national policy has been met.	Support	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	2673	Make no real concrete provision of meeting employment needs of rural communities. Real opportunity to provide routes of employment that support disconnected north of CDC area within SDNP. AL4 should be considered. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	2766	Welcome general approach but not clear how sequential test will be demonstrated: 1. which sequential test is it? 2. sequential test refers to new town centre uses not loss of older uses - not consistent with national policy	delete part 3 of the policy.	Support	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	3104	Under points 1. and 2. it is unclear what "no material increase in noise levels" and "unacceptable levels of traffic" means. It is unclear how this would be enforced. The Conservancy would also like the policy to be extended to include this text: "Existing marine, coastal and water-based employment sites will be retained to safeguard their contribution to the local economy. Planning permission will only be granted for alternative uses if the site can be demonstrated to be not-fit-for-purpose for a marine-related business and that any marine related business is unviable."	To clarify points 1. and 2. and to add the text about marine sites.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	3147	The scale of development required for RR expansion could not be realistically delivered through DM9 - not a suitable alternative to a bespoke criteria based policy for strategic allocation linked to future expansion.	Incorporate criteria based policy for future possible expansion of RR	Comment	Rolls-Royce Motor Cars Limited [1784]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
116	Policy DM9: Existing Employment Sites	3311	Policy wording is overly rigorous and could prevent appropriate development from coming forward.		Object	West Sussex County Council [1416]
117	Policy DM10: New Employment Sites	461	Why restrict this policy to employment in classes B1-B8? Why not include retailing and leisure and other institutions as sources of employment? This has led to unnecessary inflexibility (e.g. in turning down gym applications), and has encouraged employers to move out of the district e.g. to Portsmouth.	Add classes A2, D1 and D2 to the B use classes covered by this policy. As automotive retailers are already widely permitted in areas of employment land, consider whether wording is possible to permit some restricted retail activities, which by their nature need a warehouse-style or garage building instead of a shop.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
117	Policy DM10: New Employment Sites	940	7.61 refers to AL6 for employment space; not required: see comments under Meeting Business and Employment Needs paras 4.56 and 4.57, and under AL6 Land SW of Chichester	remove AL6 from 7.61	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
117	Policy DM10: New Employment Sites	1157	Why include completely new areas when existing suitable areas exist.	Plan needs to include all suitable areas and remove those that are not by existing developments.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
117	Policy DM10: New Employment Sites	2079	Whilst mentioned earlier in the Plan in respect of a number of specific sites, this policy should specifically aim to provide, as a matter of course, suitable walking and cycling infrastructure to encourage local sustainable access. This infrastructure may need to extend outside a site boundary so as to provide safe and convenient connection to existing infrastructure.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
117	Policy DM10: New Employment Sites	2316	'New Employment Sites' Development proposal should be compatible with other policies in the Plan, in particular DM9 'Existing Employment Sites' to ensure that the development is otherwise acceptable. Policy DM9 states that development should 'not generate unacceptable levels of water pollution' and this should include groundwater pollution. This requirement should also be applied to Policy DM10, especially when the site is in, or close to, a source protection zone.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
118	Retail	1685	Support paragraph 7.73.		Support	Chichester BID (Mr Colin Hicks) [7190]
119	Policy DM11: Town Centre Development	549	I support encouraging more residential development in upper storeys, despite the capacity problems on waste water treatment. This may need a change to the application of the policy on Wastewater Management (S31), as residential city centre developments have been positively discouraged in the past due to the lack of capacity at Apuldram Wastewater Treatment Works.		Comment	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
119	Policy DM11: Town Centre Development	976	Support paras 1 to 4 of policy and revision to shopping frontages. Out of town retail developments should be resisted. Para 7.69 references the Shopfront and Advertisement guidance note, but often development does not conform within Conservation Area. Case officers do not seem to know existence of guide. Do applicants know of it?	Ensure case officers are aware of the shop front guide and that it is enforced in their decisions. Strengthen enforcement to rule on unauthorised shopfronts	Comment	Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (Mr Alan Green) [788]
119	Policy DM11: Town Centre Development	1159	The town centre is dying due to demise of actual shops to buy things in. If you continue to agree to coffee shops and eateries and fail to incentivise retail outlets the town will die.	No more licenses for eateries in central Chichester.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
119	Policy DM11: Town Centre Development	1681	The East Street primary retail policy area is too long and should terminate more or less at the end of the pedestrian area.	The secondary shopping areas should begin earlier on East Street	Object	Chichester BID (Mr Colin Hicks) [7190]
119	Policy DM11: Town Centre Development	3018	Support secondary shopping frontages which include promoted site, which support commercial uses at ground floor and re-use of vacant floorspace at upper levels.		Support	Charities Property Fund [7349]
119	Policy DM11: Town Centre Development	3137	Whilst I support the alteration of retail frontages in Crane Street and in most of South Street from primary to secondary frontages, I consider that the properties on the west side of South Street between the Vacars Hall/Crypt and Canon Lane should remain as primary frontages.	Retain Nos 14-23 South Street as primary retail frontage.	Comment	Mr John Templeton [7371]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
120	Policy DM12: Edge and Out of Centre Retail Sites	259	Support this policy.		Support	Sustrans (Mr Ian Sumnall) [6728]
120	Policy DM12: Edge and Out of Centre Retail Sites	443	Your policy of developing Portfield and similar 'out of town' 'retail offerings' is gradually stripping the town centre of shops. Therefore it would make sense to allow any empty shop which has not been sold/re-let within a certain timescale to be redeveloped into housing.		Comment	Jane Church [5904]
120	Policy DM12: Edge and Out of Centre Retail Sites	456	Whilst the objective, to ensure a lively retail scene in the city centre, is commendable, we should also support local citizens with larger more affordable shops, not just expensive independent boutiques. This especially applies to clothing. Currently I drive to adjacent districts (Bognor, Havant and beyond) to buy clothes, when I would much prefer to be able to buy clothes in Chichester. This could mean allowing a strictly limited number of large clothing shops in edge-of-town locations, to complement the expensive boutiques in the city centre.	Add a statement that flexibility will be shown in Chichester retail warehouse parks, subject to overall limits (to be proposed by the planning officers), to permit a limited number of large clothing shops in edge-of-town locations.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]
120	Policy DM12: Edge and Out of Centre Retail Sites	1162	Out of centre retail units do have a detrimental effect on Chichester city centre. We do not need any more. The city centre parking is very expensive and there is less and less retail so people go to buy items on the edge of town where there is convenience and free parking.	Redesignate the earmarked Portfield site from more retail to housing. Reduce car parking charges in the city centre or give 2 hours free parking like Bognor to encourage footfall.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
120	Policy DM12: Edge and Out of Centre Retail Sites	2419	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
121	Built Tourist and Leisure Development	3105	Page 158, 7.80 Built Tourist and Leisure Development: Given the comparative sizes of Chichester Harbour and Pagham Harbour, Chichester Harbour should be listed first, and Pagham Harbour second.	Reword the sentence.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
122	Policy DM13: Built Tourist and Leisure Development	296	Council policy has prevented us of disposing of a business we cannot afford to run. Even though they advised us in writing that no other business use could be considered for the properties.		Comment	Mrs. Sherryl Plumb [6743]
122	Policy DM13: Built Tourist and Leisure Development	808	This statement is contrary to fact as in the case for Bracklesham.	This statement is contrary to fact as in the case for Bracklesham.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
122	Policy DM13: Built Tourist and Leisure Development	1543	In line with the HRA recommendations, this policy should make it clear that tourist accommodation must contribute to relevant strategic access management strategies to mitigate recreational disturbance to SPAs.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
122	Policy DM13: Built Tourist and Leisure Development	2080	Whilst mentioned earlier in the Plan in respect of a number of specific sites, this policy should specifically aim to provide, as a matter of course, suitable walking and cycling infrastructure to encourage local sustainable access. This infrastructure may need to extend outside a site boundary so as to provide safe and convenient connection to existing infrastructure.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
122	Policy DM13: Built Tourist and Leisure Development	2278	Historic England welcomes, in principle, clause 2 of Policy DM13 but considers that the policy should be, in the first instance, to avoid adverse impact on the historic environment as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework. We consider that the wording used in Policies DM3 and DM5 would be appropriate.	Reword clause 2 of Policy DM13 as: "Is located so as not compromise the essential features of nationally designated areas of landscape, historic environment or nature conservation protection".	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
122	Policy DM13: Built Tourist and Leisure Development	2421	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
122	Policy DM13: Built Tourist and Leisure Development	2614	<p>Policy approach at odds with DM9 and does not recognise attraction of District is countryside/coastal setting.</p> <p>Comfortable with this approach only if Marina becomes a settlement hub. Otherwise too restrictive.</p> <p>Suggest policy rewording</p>	<p>Reword policy to:</p> <p>Elsewhere in the plan area, small scale development for tourism and leisure development will be granted where the above criteria have been met and where it can be demonstrated that the scale and use is appropriate to the location.</p> <p>Larger scale tourism or leisure development facilities will be permitted elsewhere in the plan area where it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding and compelling justification in terms of enhancing visitor use and/or appreciation of a specific feature or location of significant recreation or leisure interest. Proposals will need to demonstrate the requirement for and compatibility with a specific or countryside location.</p>	Comment	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
123	Caravan and Camping Sites for Tourism	3106	The Conservancy would support seasonal closures of caravan and camping sites within 1 kilometre of the AONB in accordance with the overwintering bird season, between 1 October and 31 March.	To introduce seasonal closures.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
124	Policy DM14: Caravan and Camping Sites	57	<p>The continued use of the word 'winter' for caravan storage is old hat. Storage is generally year round and it is more sustainable to allow caravan owners to store their caravans either on or near to the sites that they tour to as opposed to taking them home after each trip. Indeed most, if not all, recent permissions for caravan storage have been year round.</p> <p>Winter caravan storage should not be limited solely to existing caravan sites.</p>	<p>In penultimate paragraph of Policy DM14 delete 'use of parts of existing caravan sites for winter'.</p> <p>At end of the para insert 'The use of existing caravan sites, previously developed land and for agricultural diversification will be particularly encouraged.'</p>	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
124	Policy DM14: Caravan and Camping Sites	1544	The second part of this policy needs amending, as the period of occupancy is not necessarily dependent on the degree of protection desirable to reduce disturbance to designated site. Instead, it should be made clear that caravan or camping accommodation needs to contribute to the relevant strategic access management strategy. In line with CDC policy, a pro rata contribution may be made if the site is not open for part of the season.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
124	Policy DM14: Caravan and Camping Sites	2081	Whilst mentioned earlier in the Plan in respect of a number of specific sites, this policy should specifically aim to provide, as a matter of course, suitable walking and cycling infrastructure to encourage local sustainable access. This infrastructure may need to extend outside a site boundary so as to provide safe and convenient connection to existing infrastructure.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
124	Policy DM14: Caravan and Camping Sites	2220	We support the particular reference to restricting the occupancy of these sites in flood risk areas. However, there is no specific mention that flood risk areas should be avoided where possible. We would recommend that this should be included within the policy criteria.	Include mention that flood risk areas should be avoided where possible.	Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
124	Policy DM14: Caravan and Camping Sites	2423	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
125	Horticultural Development	3107	<p>Page 163, 7.97 Horticultural Development:</p> <p>The biggest source of light pollution around the City of Chichester is from large-scale greenhouses. This should be much better regulated.</p>	hat great weight is attached to the issue of light pollution when applying DM15.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
126	Policy DM15: Horticultural Development	351	A map of the revised Tangmere HDA should be provided. This should be based on an up to date plan with the latest glass house proposal shown to the south west.		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
126	Policy DM15: Horticultural Development	1402	Horticulture is an important part of the local economy and needs greater support. As property values in the HDA's are inflated due to low availability and the proposal to institute compulsory purchase orders has not been activated over the last several years, the industry is short of development possibilities. The controls on glasshouse and other protected cultivation needs to be relaxed and investment encouraged outside the HDA's.		Comment	Mr Simon Davenport [7100]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
126	Policy DM15: Horticultural Development	2222	We are pleased to see specific reference to the need to demonstrate adequate water resources are available and/or water efficiency measures.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
126	Policy DM15: Horticultural Development	2317	Policy DM15 'Horticultural Development' Developments at Tangmere HDA have relied on infiltration to dispose of excess surface water. This policy states that development should 'not generate unacceptable levels of water pollution' and this should include groundwater pollution. Portsmouth Water have public water supply abstractions in the area and the potential impacts must be assessed for any SUDS. The EA 'Abstraction Licencing Strategy' (ALS) may give an indication about the availability of groundwater but it does not cover the derogation of existing supplies.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
126	Policy DM15: Horticultural Development	2369	There is an opportunity within the Runcton area to enhance and upgrade routes for NMUs should the land be used for housing at a later date.		Comment	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
126	Policy DM15: Horticultural Development	3267	<p>Policy limits business opportunities within the HDA in relation to concept of 'food cluster'. HDA should be enlarged particularly at Runcton to accommodate warehouse/packhouse structures.</p> <p>Amend policy wording.</p>	<p>Amend policy wording to:</p> <p>"Policy DM15: Chichester Food Cluster Large scale horticultural glasshouses and related B Class Uses will be focused within the existing Horticultural Development Areas at Tangmere and Runcton. The Sidlesham and Almodington Horticultural Development Areas or Chichester Food Cluster will continue to be the focus for smaller scale horticultural glasshouses. Within designated Horticultural Development Areas, as shown on the Policies Map, planning permission will be granted for new glasshouse, polytunnel and related development where it can be demonstrated that the following criteria (1-7) have been addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no significant adverse increase in noise levels resulting from machinery usage, vehicle movement, or other activity on the site, which would be likely to unacceptably disturb occupants of nearby noise sensitive properties or be likely to cause unacceptable harm to the enjoyment of the countryside; 2. The proposal does not generate unacceptable levels of soil, water, odour or air pollution and there is no significant adverse impact resulting from artificial lighting on the occupants of nearby sensitive properties or on the appearance of the site in the landscape; 3. New planting is sufficient to benefit an improvement to the landscape and increases the potential for screening; 4. Adequate vehicular access arrangements exist or will be provided from the site to the road network to safely accommodate vehicle movements without detriment to highway safety or result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity; 5. The height and bulk of development and associated ancillary development, either individually or cumulatively, does not damage the character or appearance of the surrounding countryside, and mitigation measures are included to address any detrimental effects e.g. in order to mitigate the height and bulk of new horticultural structures; 6. It can be demonstrated that adequate water resources are available or can be provided and appropriate water efficiency measures are included; and 7. Acceptable surface water drainage capacity exists or can be provided as part of the development including sustainable drainage systems or water retention areas. <p>Outside HDAs</p> <p>Planning permission will be granted for glasshouse, polytunnel and related development including the extension to existing Horticultural Development Areas where the above (1-7) and following criteria (8-11) have been addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. There is a horticultural justification for the development and it can be demonstrated that the proposal cannot be accommodated within existing HDAs; 9. The land is sufficiently well drained, level and of a quality to be suitable for horticultural development; 10. Necessary infrastructure and services are available or will be provided; and 11. The proposal ensures that long views across substantially open land are broadly retained or otherwise mitigated." <p>If Policy S11 is altered to extend the Runcton HDA incorporating other changes suggested above, there should be little requirement for the Policy wording</p> 	Object	Kingsbridge Estates Ltd [1705]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
		3267		<p>'Outside HDA's.</p> <p>The Policies Map DM15 requires amending to accommodate the loss of circa 10ha plus the additional circa 20ha for future growth and diversification of the food cluster.</p>		

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
126	Policy DM15: Horticultural Development	3375	<p>Policy as drafted limits business opportunities within the HDA in relation to the concept of a food cluster - enlarge the HDA particularly at Runcton to accommodate warehouse/packhouse structures.</p> <p>Suggest amend policy wording.</p>	<p>Amend policy wording to: "Policy DM15: Horticultural Development or Chichester Food Cluster Large scale horticultural glasshouses and related B Class Uses will continue to be focused within the existing Horticultural Development Areas at Tangmere and Runcton. The Sidlesham and Almodington Horticultural Development Areas or Chichester Food Cluster will continue to be the focus for smaller scale horticultural glasshouses. Within designated Horticultural Development Areas, as shown on the Policies Map, planning permission will be granted for new glasshouse, polytunnel and ancillary related development where it can be demonstrated that the following criteria (1-7) have been addressed: 1. There is no significant adverse increase in noise levels resulting from machinery usage, vehicle movement, or other activity on the site, which would be likely to unacceptably disturb occupants of nearby noise sensitive properties or be likely to cause unacceptable harm to the enjoyment of the countryside; 2. The proposal does not generate unacceptable levels of soil, water, odour or air pollution and there is no significant adverse impact resulting from artificial lighting on the occupants of nearby sensitive properties or on the appearance of the site in the landscape; 3. New planting is sufficient to benefit an improvement to the landscape and increases the potential for screening; 4. Adequate vehicular access arrangements exist or will be provided from the site to the road network to safely accommodate vehicle movements without detriment to highway safety or result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity; 5. The height and bulk of development and associated ancillary development, either individually or cumulatively, does not damage the character or appearance of the surrounding countryside, and mitigation measures are included to address any detrimental effects e.g. in order to mitigate the height and bulk of new horticultural structures; 6. It can be demonstrated that adequate water resources are available or can be provided and appropriate water efficiency measures are included; and 7. Acceptable surface water drainage capacity exists or can be provided as part of the development including sustainable drainage systems or water retention areas. Outside HDAs Planning permission will be granted for glasshouse, polytunnel and ancillary related development including the extension to existing Horticultural Development Areas where the above (1-7) and following criteria (8-11) have been addressed: 8. There is a horticultural justification for the development and it can be demonstrated that the proposal cannot be accommodated within existing HDAs; 9. The land is sufficiently well drained, level and of a quality to be suitable for horticultural development; 10. Necessary infrastructure and services are available or will be provided; and 11. The proposal ensures that long views across substantially open land are broadly retained or otherwise mitigated."</p>	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
127	Sustainable Design and Construction	1806	7.105 We strongly support all forms of renewable energy. All new properties should be built with solar panels. Renewable should be encouraged as part of the planning process.		Support	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
127	Sustainable Design and Construction	3205	Object on grounds that: Homes Quality Mark 4 stars is not good enough; as an absolute minimum, CDC should demand the recommended UKGBC requirement of all new homes going forward and working towards carbon zero.	7.101 - Delete "will be encouraged". Change second sentence: "Developers will implement appropriate mitigation and adaptation initiatives"	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	58	Criteria 2 has been superseded in March 2015 and it appears to relate to the old CSH level 4. The Deregulation Act 2015 amended the Planning and Energy Act 2008 and removed clause 1(c) which allowed LPAS to have a requirement in a Development Plan that development should comply with energy requirements that exceed the energy requirements of the building regulations.	Delete criterion 2.	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	520	The plan should acknowledge the need for the area to become carbon neutral in order to prevent climate change. Manchester has committed that all new buildings will be net-zero carbon. This should be included in the Chichester Plan.		Comment	Sam Pickford [6841]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	761	This policy is not ambitious enough in its sustainable options. It doesn't acknowledge the need for new buildings to be carbon neutral to prevent climate change. Some areas such as Manchester have committed to all new buildings being carbon neutral. CDC should do the same.	Make all new buildings carbon neutral.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	863	Given the imminent threats of climate change, we need to do much more than commit to at least 10% of energy sources to be renewable. This is not nearly enough, we should be aiming for a much higher percentage which in the not too distant future should reach 100%.	Substantial increase in the % age of energy in new buildings that should be provided by renewable sources.	Object	Ms Valerie Briginshaw [6946]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	954	There must be much higher requirement for on-site energy creation, ie through solar panels, heat pumps, energy-neutral building design, etc.		Comment	Liz Sagues [6982]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	1091	Within the time scale of the plan 2016-2035 there is a target for zero carbon homes. The plan does not meet these requirements and I object to the unsustainable design of developments.	Zero carbon homes and with renewable energy sources are essential.	Object	Mrs Claire Wilton [6733]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	1165	More detail required as to sustainability. All new builds should be built with renewable energy. Solar panels as standard and yet the vast majority are not.	It should be a condition of planning that all new houses have solar panels as standard.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	1225	Homes Quality Mark 4 stars is not good enough! The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) has pledged to ensure that all new buildings erected in the city region will be 'net-zero' carbon by 2028. The World Green Building Council (WorldGBC) has called on the built environment sector to set ambitious targets that eliminate carbon emissions for building portfolios by 2030, in order to meet the targets of the Paris Agreement.	Add a point that from 2028 all new dwellings shall be 'net-zero' carbon.	Object	Mr Tom Broughton [7077]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	1318	My clients site at Clappers Lane supports the objectives of Policy DM16. With regard to this Policy the orientation of the majority of the homes will maximise solar gain, the buildings will be constructed using highly efficient thermal installation, a number of low carbon initiatives will be incorporated with the aim of achieving a reduction in CO2 emissions by 10%. SUDS will be utilised on the site incorporating a management train which improves water quality before it leaves the site and be beneficial to wildlife in terms of surface storage in the wetland habitat.	My clients site at Clappers Lane should be included in the Plan to support the delivery of the objectives set out in Policy DM16.	Object	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	1516	Linden Homes and Miller Homes support sustainable design and construction and strive to minimise the environmental impact of development during construction and post occupancy and hence the aspirations of the policy are supported. However, Policy DM16 is overly prescriptive in terms of the standards and considerations that are required to reduce energy demand.	See full representation.	Object	Linden Homes & Miller Homes [6783]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	1545	Natural England advocates a target of 100l/person/day. This is in line with Southern Water's policy. Whilst we note that Portsmouth Water supplies most of the District, Southern Water supplies the northern part.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	1940	7.100 to 7.104 Policy DM16 The standard set out here in terms of sustainable design is not high enough. All new developments, all new houses should be built to a zero carbon standard. This may not be popular with developers but it is essential for the long term good.		Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	2223	We support the requirement for new development to achieve a water usage of a maximum of 110litres per head per day. For completeness we recommend that point 5 should be expanded to include compensation as well as make reference to net gain. This is in line with NPPF para 170. We support the requirement in point 8 with regard to measures to adapt to climate change.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	2318	Policy DM16 'Sustainable Design and Construction' covers the use of Building Regulations to control water use. Portsmouth Water have an aspiration to reduce overall water use to 100 litres/head/day and this policy will help to achieve that aim.		Support	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	2427	Note the following: - Any new building should have to incorporate solar panels		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	2596	Wording of para 4 considered prescriptive and inflexible. No reference to 'fabric first principles'		Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	2752	It is desirable to specify a build height restriction for the city.		Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	2768	Part 4 of policy not consistent with NPPF, suggest policy rewording	Reword policy to: 4. The energy supplied from decentralised energy supply will be maximised to ensure that at least 10% of the predicted residual energy requirements of the development, after the standards in point 2 and point 3 are achieved, is met from such sources, where feasible and viable.	Comment	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	2802	We are pleased to see this policy acknowledge biodiversity and encourage CDC to ensure the wording reflects the ethos of measurable net gains to biodiversity in paragraph 174b of the NPPF. SWT therefore make the suggested amendments to bullet point 9: 9.The natural environment and biodiversity will be protected and/or where appropriate provision will be made for improvements to deliver measurable net gains to biodiversity areas and green infrastructure;	SWT therefore make the suggested amendments to bullet point 9: 9.The natural environment and biodiversity will be protected and/or where appropriate provision will be made for improvements to deliver measurable net gains to biodiversity areas and green infrastructure;	Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	2863	Criterion 1 - no evidence to justify requirement for higher water efficiency Criterion 6 - should be removed	Remove criterion 6.	Comment	Persimmon Homes (Mr Joe Maphosa) [1216]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	2902	Object to 10% of energy from renewable resources. Suggest amend policy wording	Amend policy wording to : "Where possible, suitable, feasible and viable, the energy supplied from renewable resources will be maximised."	Object	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	3024	Requirement for 10% of energy to be renewable is not consistent with the NPPF which states that development should comply with local requirements for decentralised energy where this is feasible and viable - amend policy.	Amend wording of policy	Comment	Thakeham Homes (Chris Geddes) [7350]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	3033	Support aims of policy but no evidence provided to justify some of policy requirements	Recommend wording of this policy be amended to state that compliance with these standards will be sought as a minimum unless it is demonstrated as being unfeasible	Comment	William Lacey Group [1623]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	3166	This policy is weak in its sustainability requirements. Doesn't acknowledge the need for new buildings to be carbon neutral in order to combat climate change.		Object	Mr Alan Carn [5417]
128	Policy DM16: Sustainable Design and Construction	3193	The 'push' for higher standards for new dwellings is a positive and welcome proposal, for energy efficient, sustainability and affordability reasons.		Support	Martyn Chuter [7380]
129	Stand-alone Renewable Energy	3109	Page 168, 7.106 Stand- alone Renewable Energy: "Proposals should therefore be accompanied by a landscape assessment appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposal and its setting, especially near the South Downs National Park and designated areas, such as the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty."	Suggested rewording: "Proposals should therefore be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposal and its setting, especially near Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and/or the South Downs National Park."	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
130	Policy DM17: Stand-alone Renewable Energy	521	The plan should put aside space for renewable energy as a priority. We need space for wind turbines, battery storage and more solar panels on the roofs. Provision may be required on the coast for enabling the connection of an off-shore wind farm.		Comment	Sam Pickford [6841]
130	Policy DM17: Stand-alone Renewable Energy	762	This plan is not nearly ambitious enough. Biomass and energy crops should not form part of this section. They are not sustainable and use agricultural land to produce energy that could come from wind and solar.	Take out biomass and energy crops. Restrict anaerobic digestion to use waste food etc only. Set aside space for wind and solar generation. Promote small scale locally owned energy schemes. Encourage solar panels on roofs, by installing on council buildings .	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
130	Policy DM17: Stand-alone Renewable Energy	864	"Development proposals will be granted for renewable energy" - the Council needs to be much more proactive and positively encourage such proposals, for reasons of the climate change emergency.		Comment	Ms Valerie Briginshaw [6946]
130	Policy DM17: Stand-alone Renewable Energy	1226	As Clair Perry, Energy Minister has recently said: 'From power stations to solar panels, the future is local' This means that space in the area has to be found for siting these renewable energy developments. The area has a good wind resource and an excellent solar resource and biomass. Also, provision may be required on the coast for enabling the connection of an off-shore wind farm and other marine generation. Moving to more electric heating and electric cars, so electricity consumption increasing. Space also has to be found for large batteries.	In the same way that space is allocated for housing and employment development. Space should also be allocated in the plan for renewable energy developments.	Object	Mr Tom Broughton [7077]
130	Policy DM17: Stand-alone Renewable Energy	2279	Historic England welcomes and supports clause 1 of Policy DM17 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
130	Policy DM17: Stand-alone Renewable Energy	2426	The policy requirement for demonstrating no significant adverse impact upon landscape or townscape character is welcomed. We request reference is also made specifically of views of the SDNP.	Include specific ref to views of SDNP	Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
130	Policy DM17: Stand-alone Renewable Energy	3206	Object to reliance on off-site renewable energy as this wastes the potential of on-site use of roofs, ground source pumps; area has a good wind resource and an excellent solar resource and biomass; provision may be required on the coast for enabling the connection of an off-shore wind farm and other marine generation; Moving to more electric heating and electric cars, space also has to be found for large batteries.	Change 7.105 to: "To ensure that the Council embraces effective energy efficiency and the use of on site and off site renewable energy in all new development". Insert extra sentence in Policy: "The Local Plan will provide space for renewable energy developments including on shore wind and large battery storage."	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
131	Flood and Water Management	391	This item is astonishing as it encourages development in Flood zones. The Environment Agency through grants and levies on Lead Local Flood Authorities (WSCC in this case) decided by its Regional Flood Control Committees is doing what it can to reduce flood risk to residential development. This item is in opposition to that!	This item needs to be completely rephrased so as to reflect a much more defensive and restrictive sense.	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
131	Flood and Water Management	3208	Object to 7.110 and 7.111 - Flood resistance and residence measures should be matched with flood prevention measures. Plan should not provide for building on the flood plain and many more measures should be included to prevent flooding occurring.		Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
132	Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	392	This policy encourages rather than discourages development in flood prone areas, Amazed to see 'Appropriate flood warning and evacuation plans may be required to ensure that any additional risks etc ...Who would contemplate acquiring property or locating a business in such a risk area?	The policy must first and foremost refer to a requirement to satisfy Policy S27	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
132	Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	844	The Flood risk Assessment document has only considered the effect of climate change on rainfall and fluvial discharge. An assessment of the implications of sea level rise on coastal communities and the level on development along the coastal inlets and the Manhood Peninsular should be made	Additional review of the implications of sea level rise over the period of the plan should be made	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
132	Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	1171	AL6 is Flood plain risk 3. Other less flood risk sites to the north have been removed because of their flood plain 2 status. Hypocrisy ! Unless this is adequately addressed in future iterations of the plan. I will be raising it with the examiner at the appropriate time.	Re instate all suitable sites and remove those that are not suitable under Government guidelines.. Goodwood/North land is suitable under Government guidelines.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
132	Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	2225	Review this policy alongside the strategic policy to ensure they are complementary. No reference to Sequential Test - appears that a number of criteria of policy 42 of adopted LP have been removed - reconsider this for next iteration of the plan. Wish to see specific policy that provides for the protection and enhancement of water quality - consider whether one overarching policy would be better.		Comment	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
132	Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	2319	Policy DM18 'Water Management' using SUDS needs to take account groundwater quality and should avoid direct infiltration into the chalk aquifer. This is especially important within the source protection zones.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
132	Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	2511	In view of Bosham Parish Council's representations relating to surface water flooding at AL7, it is considered that this policy should include an additional criterion making it clear that development proposals will need to outline a robust strategy for addressing surface water drainage and flood risk.	include an additional criterion making it clear that development proposals will need to outline a robust strategy for addressing surface water drainage and flood risk.	Object	Bosham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [749]
132	Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	2561	We would wish to see inclusion of the regional policy framework for flood risk and shoreline management (the Solent Shoreline Management Plan) and the aspiration to create new guidance for East Head to Emsworth.	We would wish to see inclusion of the regional policy framework for flood risk and shoreline management (the Solent Shoreline Management Plan) and the aspiration to create new guidance for East Head to Emsworth.	Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
132	Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	2760	Should be blanket provision against building on land lower than 1.5 mtrs above sea level to protect against effects of sea level rise.		Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
132	Policy DM18: Flood Risk and Water Management	3110	It would be helpful to include the sequential test here. "Appropriate flood warning and evacuation plans may be required to ensure that any additional risks relevant to development have been considered."	Add the sequential test. Change the wording to: "Appropriate flood warning and evacuation plans will be required to ensure that any additional risks relevant to development have been considered."	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
133	Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	1808	7.118 We strongly support the retention of the AONB. VERY Limited development should be allowed on existing sites. Marine businesses must be retained and sites not used for development of housing. Conservancy must always be consulted on harbour development issues		Support	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
133	Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	3111	Page 172, 7.119 Chichester Harbour AONB: The wording of 7.119 could be improved.	"Chichester Harbour Conservancy has produced an AONB Management Plan on behalf of the constituent Authorities (Havant Borough Council, Chichester District Council, West Sussex County Council and Hampshire County Council). The Conservancy has also produced an AONB Landscape Character Assessment, 18 Planning Principles (to help guide development applications in the AONB), and a Sustainable Shorelines: General Guidance document (to help advise on sea defences). The AONB Management Plan identifies the special qualities of the landscape and provide the framework for the management and ongoing spatial planning of Chichester Harbour AONB. In 2017 the Council adopted the Joint Chichester Harbour AONB Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD provides guidance for development proposals and expands on the vision, objectives and policies of the adopted Development Plan Documents for Chichester District Council and Havant Borough Council."	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
133	Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	3112	Page 172, 7.120 Chichester Harbour AONB: "Applicants are encouraged to seek pre-application advice from Chichester Harbour Conservancy for proposed development including intertidal structures, reclamation and dredging, increases in the resident fleet or moorings and dry berth transfers."	Change "including" to "particularly".	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
133	Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	3209	Object to 7.118 - This highly productive farmland should not be developed. Allow more sensitive building of affordable houses in the SDNPA especially supporting those villages whose facilities might otherwise be under threat of closure.	Change 7.121 to "Communities within the AONB and SDNPA have development needs". Add "All development in the AONB comes at a risk of making wildlife and biodiversity unviable if wildlife corridors are not maintained."	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	59	s85 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 as amended provides a duty to have regard to conserving or enhancing the natural beauty. The requirement in criterion 1 is onerous as there will be cases where it is impossible to demonstrate 'enhancement', particularly for more minor development.	Change wording of 1 as follows: 'The natural beauty and locally distinctive features of the AONB is conserved or enhanced'	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	103	Views of the cathedral from the harbour, any part of the AONB and Salterns Way cycle path should be protected		Comment	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	393	The second sentence in the introduction is weak Note that the Third Review of the Chichester Harbour Management Plan 2019-2024 is about to be published and will likely supersede its current Management Plan before the Chichester Local Plan Review comes to Examination.	Change to: Planning permission will be granted where it has been demonstrated that ALL THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE SATISFIED:	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	810	The A286 Southern Link will have a major impact on the AONB and views from it toward the Cathedral.	The A286 Southern Link will have a major impact on the AONB and views from it toward the Cathedral.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	1066	Should be safeguarded for future generations. Nothing should be permitted that would endanger it such as mass developments which would harm waters, disturb wildlife, cause pollution.		Comment	Libby Alexander [7023]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	1236	Given the area of land that is taken up by AONB's in the UK, it must be capable of taking its share of considered new housing development, especially when in doing so the land within the AONB can be enhanced. It is essential that the requisite statutory bodies work collectively to get the right approach here assuring development is measured within an AONB, this in my view can mean small scale development where the views are protected and with land enhancement assured.		Comment	Miss Sandra James [7079]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	2428	We request criterion three also identifies the relationship by way of intervisibility between the AONB and SDNP.	Change criterion 3 to identify relationship by way of intervisibility between AONB and NP	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	2562	We welcome the inclusion of the dedicated policy for Chichester Harbour AONB and urge that it is given sufficient weight consistently throughout the delivery of the Local Plan.		Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	2615	Premier delivers quality devt in sensitive locations. Policy approach should be no more onerous than NPPF. Chi Harbour Management Plan should be amended as not statutory/consistent with NPPF. Propose policy rewording	Reword policy to: Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) The impact of individual proposals and their cumulative effect on Chichester Harbour AONB and its setting will be carefully assessed. Planning permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The natural beauty and locally distinctive features of the AONB are conserved and enhanced; 2. Proposals reinforce and respond to, rather than detract from, the distinctive character and special qualities of the AONB as defined in National Policy; 3. Either individually or cumulatively, development does not lead to actual or perceived coalescence of settlements or undermine the integrity or predominantly open and undeveloped, rural character of the AONB and its setting; 4. The development is appropriate and contributes to the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the area and its communities or is desirable for the access, use, understanding and enjoyment of the area and Opportunities for remediation and landscape improvements to address existing harm will be taken as they arise.	Comment	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	2656	Support the general principles of Policy DM19 however, urge the Council to ensure that where new suitable development is proposed in the AONB, its designation alone is not used as a reason to prevent sustainable development coming forward. if proposals meet AONB management plan then planning permission should be granted. policy requirements should be considered proportionally to scale of devt.		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	2929	Policy needs to more closely linked to national policy as set out in NPPF paragraph 172. Policy fails to explain purpose of AONB designation and implications this has for the control of new development. We agree that "The flatness of the landscape makes the AONB particularly vulnerable to visual intrusion from inappropriate development, both within or adjacent to the boundary, which can often be seen from significant distances across inlets, the main harbour channels, or open countryside." And it is therefore right that the District Council will have particular regard to these characteristics in determining development proposals affecting the AONB."	The policy should explain the purpose of the AONB designation and the implications this has for the control of new development , particularly the tests for "major development" which may be acceptable in exceptional circumstances.	Object	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
134	Policy DM19: Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	3113	a) The Conservancy notes the deletion of certain words from the existing Local Plan compared to what is proposed: Existing Local Plan "Planning permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated that all the following criteria have been met:" Proposed Local Plan "Planning permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated:" b) The Conservancy strongly supports the inclusion of point 3, but notes it conflicts with some of the wider housing allocation policies. c) "5. The development is consistent with the policy aims of the Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan and Joint Chichester Harbour AONB SPD."	a) The Conservancy hereby asks that "demonstrated that all the following criteria have been met:" is reinstated, so the policy is not weakened. c) It is suggested that policy point 5. is reworded as follows: "5. The development is in accordance with the policies of the Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan and the Joint Chichester Harbour AONB SPD."	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
135	Development Around The Coast	3210	Change 7.122 to "villages and hamlets should be protected and enhanced and actions brought forward by the Plan to combat climate change in line with Government policy as outlined by the Committee for Climate Change."	Change 7.122 to "villages and hamlets should be protected and enhanced and actions brought forward by the Plan to combat climate change in line with Government policy as outlined by the Committee for Climate Change."	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
136	Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	104	The coastal communities of the peninsula provide a small scale seaside village quality that offers a valuable and unique tourism attraction on the south coast. Therefore development in these communities needs to be carefully designed and limited in numbers to prevent over-suburbanisation.The Plan must also recognise that the peninsula geography means access to and from the coast will always be restricted and subject to severe congestion during busy tourism days between April and October (and possibly more if the tourism season extends).Any additional housing on the Manhood will worsen this unresolvable situation so must be considered with caution.		Comment	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]
136	Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	812	Policy DM20 appears not to apply to the Manhood Peninsula as the draft Plan does not address any of these points.	Policy DM20 appears not to apply to the Manhood Peninsula as the draft Plan does not address any of these points.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
136	Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	1020	There is ambiguity between Policies DM19 and DM20. Much of the coastline in the Local Plan area lies within Chichester Harbour AONB and Policy DM19 should apply, not the less demanding requirements of Policy DM20.	Make clear that Policy DM20: Development around the Coast does not apply to coast within Chichester Harbour AONB. In these cases Policy DM19 should be applicable.	Object	Mr Keith Martin [4610]
136	Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	1177	As comment DM19. over development...and we have reached that point of coastal areas and areas around the sensitive harbours are endanger of destroying the very thing that encourages people to the area and also increase risk of flooding to existing and any new properties and endangering the water quality of the harbours.	No more development of areas of sensitive areas around the coast and harbours. We need smaller less intrusive developments not great big 250 + houses. Just because they are cheaper and more attractive to developers. Sensitivity before Profit.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
136	Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	2226	We support this policy and the requirement to safeguard a strip of land behind existing or proposed sea defence or coastal works. Please note that the Environment Agency would seek a 16 metre buffer behind any of our tidal defences. We support the specific requirement to ensure that development for boat or marine use would not be detrimental to water quality.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
136	Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	2280	Historic England welcomes and supports clause b of Policy DM20 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
136	Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	2617	Para 7.127 too restrictive. Propose rewording. ..Council will permit development associated with marine employment, leisure, tourism and related uses, provided that it does not: a. jeopardise the safety and ease of navigation on the water or have a detrimental impact on the regime of the river; b. adversely affect nature conservation, landscape or heritage interests; or c. cause a reduction of water quality. See 'Change to Plan' for full policy wording.	Reword policy to: At boatyard and marina sites within the coastal area the Council will permit development associated with marine employment, leisure, tourism and related uses, provided that it does not: a. jeopardise the safety and ease of navigation on the water or have a detrimental impact on the regime of the river; b. adversely affect nature conservation, landscape or heritage interests; or c. cause a reduction of water quality. Development or redevelopment will be permitted incorporating floorspace not restricted to boat-related uses, where such a use is appropriate to, and needed to secure the future of a boatyard or marina and it is demonstrated that the development will complement the use of the site and/or the enjoyment of the water.	Comment	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
136	Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	2808	Whilst SWT strongly supports the inclusion of this policy, we are concerned that the reference to protecting biodiversity it only in relation to the designated sites. The coast may include areas of biodiversity value, such as priority and irreplaceable habitats (for example vegetated shingle and saltmarsh), which sit outside the designated sites. We therefore recommend amendment to bullet point 1	We therefore recommend the following amendment to bullet point 1: 'Planning permission will be granted for development in the coastal area, outside of Settlement Boundaries, where it can be demonstrated that all the following criteria have been addressed: 1. There are no harmful effects on or net loss of nature conservation or areas of geological importance, in particular within the Chichester and Pagham Harbours and Medmerry Realignment (including no adverse effects on the associated European designated sites);'	Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
136	Policy DM20: Development Around The Coast	2930	It is hard to relate this policy DM20 (development outside settlement boundaries on the coast) to policy S24 (policies for development outside settlement boundaries in the countryside) . Please can you explain how S24 and DM24 sit together and whether they provide a consistent approach to the control of development outside settlement boundaries?	Please can you explain how S24 and DM24 sit together and whether they provide a consistent approach to the control of development outside settlement boundaries?	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
137	Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	2281	Historic England welcomes and supports paragraph 7.129 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
138	Policy DM21: Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	60	<p>Since there is no specific policy on extensions to houses in the countryside I assume this policy would apply in such cases. If it does then i suggest criterion 5 could be repeated in a separate para pertaining to residential alterations.</p> <p>Criterion 2 is over restrictive. Economic and community uses should be discounted if they are EITHER inappropriate or unviable. It is nonsensical to require a viable but inappropriate use!</p> <p>Change wording of penultimate para on isolated homes to better reflect NPPF para 79. A conversion is development' so dont need both words. NPPF does not use the word 'special'</p>	<p>In criterion 2 insert '/or' after the word 'and' in last line before the word 'unviable'.</p> <p>Insert a new para dealing with residential alterations along the lines of:</p> <p>'For householder development the form, bulk and general design of the building/alteration/extension is in keeping with its surroundings and the proposal and any associated development will not harm its landscape character and setting'</p> <p>Change penultimate para to read:</p> <p>'Development that would create new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless one or more of the circumstances as outlined in Government policy apply.'</p>	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
138	Policy DM21: Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	1209	The policy does not reflect the NPPF which places no priority over economic or commercial re-uses of rural buildings over residential re-uses. The NPPF states that all uses can be acceptable and does not set out a requirement for the viability of economic or community uses to be proven first before residential uses can be considered.	Delete criterion 2.	Object	Mr Alan Hutchings [7035]
138	Policy DM21: Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	2282	Many farm buildings that are now redundant for modern farming needs are likely to be of historic interest - it is acknowledged that farm buildings are generally under-represented on the National Heritage List for England. Historic England considers that Policy DM21 should include stronger protection for such buildings as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	<p>Add a new criterion to Policy DM21 as follows:</p> <p>"Features of architectural or historic significance are retained and, where the building forms part of a historically significant complex of buildings, consideration is given to the future use(s) of those buildings and the impact of the proposal on the integrity and character of the complex".</p>	Object	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
138	Policy DM21: Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	2662	<p>Support the main objective of DM21, however, they urge more flexibility to the policy to make it workable and to avoid existing disused or redundant buildings lying empty where they do not strictly meet the criteria of the policy.</p> <p>Consider rewording policy to be less restrictive.</p>	<p>Reword part 5 of policy to:</p> <p>"The building is capable of conversion and is able to maintain is form, bulk and general design. Where alterations are proposed, the resulting form, bulk and general design of the building is in keeping with its surroundings and the proposal and any associated development will not harm its landscape character and setting."</p>	Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
138	Policy DM21: Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	2810	The supporting text to this policy does not highlight that buildings in the countryside may be valuable for biodiversity. SWT feel that this should not be overlooked as changes to use or reuse may impact that biodiversity. This matter is also not addressed in the policy wording, therefore we propose the wording in the form of an additional bullet point	<p>We propose the following wording in the form of an additional bullet point:</p> <p>6. The biodiversity value of the site has been assessed and measures have been taken to ensure it is conserved and measurable net gains delivered.</p>	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
138	Policy DM21: Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside	3114	<p>The policy wording could be strengthened.</p> <p>"Development will need to ensure it is sensitive to its surroundings, respect the landscape setting and character of the locality. Sites within or adjoining the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will need to demonstrate that the design and scale of the proposal is in keeping with the special designation."</p>	"Development will need to ensure it is sensitive to its surroundings, respect the landscape setting and character of the locality. Sites within or adjoining the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will need to demonstrate that the design and scale of the proposal is in keeping with the special designation."	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
139	Development in the Countryside	61	There is no mention of supporting live/work units in appropriate situations in the countryside	Include a para supporting live/work units	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
139	Development in the Countryside	707	Whereas, the general principles relating to the re-use of land in the Countryside is supported, it should be a consideration in the determination of any proposal of existing use values, the need to potentially relocate to more suitable premises and that there will be a requirement for open market housing to support the delivery of these sites.	The policy as drafted needs more flexibility in order to be able to work as intended. The policy would benefit from the inclusion of wording stating that each application be treated on its own merits, to allow for some open market housing to support the development proposed.	Object	Woodmancote Farm Contractors [6907]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
139	Development in the Countryside	1809	7.134 to 7.140 DM22 This plan has no provision for the building of eco communities. There are sites in the rural areas or just outside the SPA (Bosham for example) that could be used to develop high quality eco villages.	More eco sites	Object	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
139	Development in the Countryside	3213	In order to reduce the need to travel, it would be harmful to restrict the range of goods sold. If people in rural communities don't have so far to travel to access a range of produce this will reduce Greenhouse gas emissions.	7.139 Delete the phrase "Where necessary, the Council will restrict the range of goods sold".	Object	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	62	Policy is over restrictive and contrary to NPPF. Should not be a requirement to demonstrate that the need cannot be met within or adjacent to settlements. There is no mention of encouraging development on PDL within the policy although it is referred to in supporting text at 7.137.	Include para on encouraging live/work units Policy should echo NPPF paras 83 and 84 and also encourage development on PDL Amend final para to read: 'Development that would create new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless one or more of the circumstances as outlined in Government policy apply.'	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	705	Whereas, the general principles relating to the re-use of land in the Countryside is supported, it should be a consideration in the determination of any proposal of existing use values, the need to potentially relocate to more suitable premises and that there will be a requirement for open market housing to support the delivery of these sites The policy as drafted needs more flexibility in order to be able to work as intended. I attach some draft proposals for the Woodmancote Farm Contractors yard, which would require such flexibility in order to come forward.		Comment	Woodmancote Farm Contractors [6907]
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	1179	You need to encourage small scale development within the countryside otherwise it will die. CDC should insist that SDNP take back their housing allocation to ensure that the SDNP does not stagnate and die.		Comment	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	1664	I support this policy but hope that paragraph 7.136 can be better incorporated into the wording of the policy.		Support	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	1783	In the event that the housing land supply is insufficient to meet the Objectively Assessed Housing Need and thus the Council need to find additional sites (potentially from outside existing settlements) to meet the housing need then priority should be given to sites that are adjacent to, but outside of, the settlement boundary.	Add a clause to DM22 (and or S24) covering the eventuality that if there is insufficient land supply to meet the objectively assessed housing need then appropriate development should be permitted on sustainable sites adjacent to, but outside of, the settlement boundary.	Object	Mr Nick Way [5110]
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	2430	We consider that the wording of this policy could be more proactive by including wording to direct people to 'respect and respond to the National Park landscape, its setting and purposes prior to development design'.	Amend wording to direct people to 'respect and respond to the National Park landscape, its setting and purposes prior to development design'.	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	2618	If Marina not incorporated into settlement boundary this policy is too restrictive. Suggest reword policy.	Reword policy to: Within the countryside, outside Settlement Boundaries, development will be permitted where it is compatible with a countryside location, is for employment uses within the B Use Class, within or immediately adjacent to existing employment sites, or is for tourism/leisure development. Planning permission will be granted for sustainable development in the countryside where it can be demonstrated that all the following criteria have been addressed: 1. The proposal is well related to an existing farmstead or group of buildings, or located close to an established settlement or developed site or, for employment uses within the B Use Class, an existing employment site; 2. The proposal is complementary to and does not prejudice any viable agricultural operations on a farm and other existing viable uses; and 3. That the scale, siting, design and materials of the development would have minimal impact on the landscape and character of the area. Applications for retail development in the countryside will be considered where it has been demonstrated that the appropriate sequential and/or impact assessments have been undertaken. Local/small scale farm shops will be permitted provided they sell goods that have predominantly been produced on the farm. Development/conversions that would create new isolated homes in the countryside will be avoided unless there are special circumstances as outlined in Government guidance.	Comment	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	2664	Support general principles but should be more flexible to allow development in the countryside where it can be demonstrated to be sustainable and supports the vitality and character of rural areas.		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	2711	Revise policy to ensure plan flexibility e.g. edge of settlement boundaries	Revise policy to ensure plan flexibility e.g. edge of settlement boundaries	Comment	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
140	Policy DM22: Development in the Countryside	2812	The supporting text to this policy does not acknowledge biodiversity value of the wider countryside. SWT feel that this should not be overlooked as building in the countryside outside the settlement boundaries may significantly impact biodiversity. This matter is also not addressed in the policy wording and suggest wording in the form of an additional bullet point	Suggest the following wording in the form of an additional bullet point: 4. The biodiversity value of the site has been assessed and measures have been taken to ensure it is conserved and measurable net gains delivered.	Object	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
141	Pollution and Contamination					
142	Lighting					
143	Policy DM23: Lighting	202	To avoid light pollution glare and spillage on new build sites I suggest all lighting be at a low level, if necessary and motion activated. This would save expense and be more environmentally friendly.		Support	Mrs Trish Mackinnon [6698]
143	Policy DM23: Lighting	1324	Bosham Football Club will source within its approval for a new development to include floodlights that meet current standards to minimise unnecessary glare and spillage. If it is to be a inclusive facility and meet the S12, S21 and S32 policy. Location will yet to be defined through working with the District Council and Parish Council. Options to be considered. This will then meet the required short fall of identified facilities for the Open Space Pitch Study, DM32.		Comment	Bosham Football Club (Mr Neil Redman) [748]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
143	Policy DM23: Lighting	2432	The reference to the South Downs International Dark Skies Reserve is welcomed. However, proposals that aren't immediately adjacent to the Reserve may have significant adverse impact, for example due to the site's particular visibility within the landscape or sky glow; we suggest that wording is amended to reflect this.	Amend wording to refer to impact of proposals that aren't immediately adjacent to Reserve	Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
143	Policy DM23: Lighting	2814	We support the inclusion of a lighting policy and welcome the acknowledgement in section 7.142 that wildlife can be impacted by lighting schemes. However we do not feel that this is clearly translated into policy and as a result it may not be effective. The NPPF clear states in paragraph 180c planning policies and decisions should 'limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation'. Therefore we propose amendments to policy DM23 bullet point 3:	We propose the following amendments to policy DM23 bullet point 3: 3. 'There is no significant adverse impact on neighbouring development, or the wider landscape or nature conservation; and'	Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
143	Policy DM23: Lighting	2931	This policy restricts development where it has a harmful impact on the wider landscape, but would benefit from an explicit reference to protecting the AONB.	Add an explicit reference to protecting the AONB.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
144	Air Quality	394	Air Quality needs to be dealt with more robustly in the Local Plan Review The emergence of new AQMAs must be closely monitored. Mott MacDonald used a HE agreed way of quantifying air quality effects of different road options: this should be replicated in any future reports. CDC should remain vigilant against any increase in numbers of AQMAs. CDC must continue to pursue a northern A27 bypass.	Air Quality improvement must receive a higher profile and be more robustly addressed in CDC policies. Improvements must be more clearly quantified in any future reports. CDC must continue to pursue a northern bypass, importantly for air quality, but also for a number of other traffic and economy related reasons.	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
144	Air Quality	1811	7.144 We support the need to continue increased air quality monitoring. CDC does have in its powers to affect this by careful planning of houses, parking and commercial development. The proposed new relief road exiting onto the Fishbourne roundabout is unlikely to improve air quality.		Support	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	178	No confidence in Development Proposals being declined on grounds of impact to current AQMAs	Stop waffling on and start to push back on Government.	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	470	The Peter Brett Associates (PBA) report states in the Executive Summary: Air Quality (page xvii) that ..."Within existing AQMAs, with the Local Plan traffic in place, there are no predicted exceedances of NAQOs." In Appendix G: Air Quality Assessment of the same report, Tables 4.1 and 4.6 show that the levels of NO2 at Stockbridge have consistently exceeded maximum levels since 2012. On page xvi of the Executive Summary, Table 1 shows that Stockbridge ranks 5th in priority of construction. Therefore, it will be many years before any expected improvement in Air Quality at Stockbridge. This is completely unacceptable.	1) Add an additional criteria to Policy DM24: For existing AQMAs, where implementation of the Local Plan is likely to delay reductions of Air Quality levels below the permitted NAQO maximum, then mitigation measures, implementation plans, and timing to meet the permitted NAQO maximum must be identified. 2) Amend criteria #4: Where development is likely to have a significant negative impact on an Air Quality Management Area, or other areas of poor air quality then an air quality assessment will be required to identify the potential impact on the area and detail the mitigation measures, implementation plans, and timing required to prevent any negative impact.	Object	Mr Neil Hipkiss [6831]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	474	Para 4: Where development is likely to have a significant negative impact on an AQMA...etc add: OR IS LIKELY TO CREATE NEW AQMAs, etc	add: OR IS LIKELY TO CREATE NEW AQMAs, etc	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	516	This policy as it is not detailed enough. I would like to see more monitoring and more measures to be included in this policy to ensure actions are taken. These should include Clean Air Zones introduced, cleaner buses, car free day, workplace parking levy, anti-idling zones, increased pedestrianised areas in our villages and towns, better joined up cycle network		Comment	Sam Pickford [6841]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	629	Air Quality will further deteriorate as a result of the proposed plans. Stockbridge already exceeds the recommended air quality levels and development on this scale will increase the problem. This has serious health implications for residents.		Comment	Mr Philip Waters [6820]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	763	The policy is not nearly forceful enough. It allows for developments to assess air quality, to put in mitigation measures, but still permits them. They should not be allowed until after improvement in air quality has taken place.	Prohibit developments which will result in a worsening of air quality. Do not accept mitigation measures in areas where it is clear that the air quality is all already unacceptable, but insist that the air quality is improved before any new development can be considered.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	772	Policy DM24 Air Quality + S28 Pollution + Statement in Para 1.2.1 do not appear to be an integrated or coherent approach. The statement on using the IP model, with the AM and PM peak hour models, would have the effect of flattening the spikes that occur in AQMAs in peak times where the NO2 & fine particulates, will be at their highest pollution levels. Recent medical evidence has reported that being exposed to the spikes are when the public, and particularly children, are at greatest risk.	On the next iteration of the Transport Plan, CDC environmental officers should scope in the need for AM & PM peak hour pollution data during the construction period for each of the A27 corridor junctions as rat runs will go through AQMAs and predictably adversely affect other residential areas.	Object	Mr Robert Marson [6129]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	813	Air Quality has not been addressed in the past. Even though the planned developments on the Manhood Peninsula have already been met, that is in the first five years of the adopted Local Plan, as yet none of the required mitigation has been put in place and there is no scheduled plan to do so. Jacobs 2013.	Air Quality has not been addressed in the past. Even though the planned developments on the Manhood Peninsula have already been met, that is in the first five years of the adopted Local Plan, as yet none of the required mitigation has been put in place and there is no scheduled plan to do so. Jacobs 2013.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	846	The policy must take into account medical research which has demonstrated that particulate pollution from cars (petrol hybrid and electric) has profound deleterious effect on health which is directly related to the distance from the road. This particularly affects the very young and the elderly, increasing rates of respiratory disease and dementia. This policy should ensure that housing is not built adjacent to the A27	Include a policy that there must be buffer zones ideally planted with low growing trees between the A27 and other major roads and any development	Object	Dr Lesley Bromley [6552]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	923	AL6 is already part of the Stockbridge Air Quality Management Area and would be a pollution triangle surrounded by the A27, A286 and the proposed SLR, not to mention the changes to the Fishbourne and Stockbridge junctions at either end. Any dwellings are going to be surrounded on all sites with associated health risks and rather than mitigating will cause significant damage.		Comment	Mr Mark Shepherd [6967]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	1121	Air Quality Management Areas have been identified in three locations, however I am surprised this is not expanded further to include most of the A27 roundabout junctions. The stationary traffic build-up from Emsworth to Fishbourne roundabout every weekday of a few miles must have a significant local air pollution impact and local evidence of pollution impact on soot and particulates eg from NO2 suggests further impact assessments are warranted. I would request a more thorough and regular air pollution monitoring approach is adopted.	. I would request a more thorough and regular air pollution monitoring approach is adopted, that is not dependant on development works and rather provides a long-term view of the traffic air pollution from the A27.	Object	Mr Nathan Day [6572]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	1403	Chichester already has 3 AQMAs, the most of any area in West Sussex, the majority of Chichester's schools are close to these and, on the walking routes, resulting in them breathing these pollutants. The extensive use of sat nav is causing traffic to find routes avoiding the gridlock on the A27, resulting in the ever-increasing risk to pollution in the City and surrounding area 4.1% of Chichester's deaths are attributed to air pollution. Policy DM 24 is just going through the motions and not actually fully relating it to Chichester's major issue, the 48% of through traffic on the A27.	Scrap it and Peter Brett's unsubstantiated statements and start again.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	1483	<p>Representation #470 also refers.</p> <p>In an article in the Times on 5th Feb 2019 (copy att.), references are made to the harm caused by pollutants, specifically to children.</p> <p>The Stockbridge and Whyke junctions are both adjacent to schools with (in total) almost three thousand pupils with ages ranging from 4-19 years.</p> <p>Stockbridge is an AQMA that has exceeded recommended NO2 levels for many years.</p> <p>The DEFRA spokesperson quoted in the article also referred to "...new primary legislation on air quality".</p> <p>It is simply not good enough to "maintain" current levels of air pollution through the plan period.</p>	<p>1) Add an additional criterion to Policy DM24:</p> <p>For major road infrastructure adjacent to schools, plans must be developed and implemented to ensure that pollutants are below the NAQO maximum.</p> <p>2) Add an additional criterion to Policy DM24:</p> <p>Any future reductions in maximum Air Quality metrics (e.g. through legislation introduced by DEFRA), must be acted upon and plans developed and implemented to ensure that Air Quality is within new permitted levels. Priority must be given to areas that are either already outside existing maxima and/or are adjacent to schools.</p>	Object	Mr Neil Hipkiss [6831]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	1529	<p>Chichester has a known air pollution problem that has never been adequately addressed. We can not continue to ignore this issue, only requiring an air quality assessment with possible mitigations detailed. This is not good enough, action is needed.</p> <p>There is considerable scientific evidence about the negative impact this has on the development of children's organs, link to dementia and such. This policy doesn't do enough for local people in this respect.</p> <p>The Stockbridge AQMA is located near 3 schools and a local plan must do better to ensure equality and that resident's health is not being adversely impacted.</p>	<p>Change point 4 to:</p> <p>4. No development can take place where it is likely to have a negative impact on an Air Quality Management Area, or other areas of poor air quality</p> <p>Add in the point:</p> <p>Where there is the potential for any deterioration in air quality then an air quality assessment will be required to identify the potential impact on the area and detail the mitigation measures required that must be implemented before any potential impact can take affect</p>	Object	Heather McDougall [6651]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	1531	<p>Paragraphs 4 and 5 state that where development or traffic is likely to have a "significant impact" on air quality an assessment will be required. It does not quantify how the judgement of "significance" will be made nor what decision would be made based on adverse assessments. The creeping pattern and cumulative effect of air pollution sources is just as damaging as one significant addition. There could be a temptation to allow a deterioration in air quality if development would provide lots of Section 106 funding.</p> <p>Makes no commitment to take prevailing wind direction into account when locating such developments.</p>	<p>REMOVE: the word "significant".</p> <p>RECOGNISE: the importance of cumulative effects of a number of different sources.</p> <p>ADD: a presumption against approval where the development will lead or add to an overall reduction in air quality.</p> <p>ADD: The prevailing wind direction in relation to existing residential, educational, hospital and business/work locations will be taken into account when determining the site for development or traffic/roads which may contribute to a deterioration in air quality.</p>	Object	Mr and Mrs A Martin [5053]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	1772	I can see no recommendations for the reduction in air pollution and the management of AQMA.	The only solution is to endorse the mitigated Northern route and separation of through and local traffic which will remove the AQMAs. Nothing in this plan will solve this problem as it currently stands.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	1774	I can see no recommendations for the reduction in air pollution and the management of AQMA.	The only solution is to endorse the mitigated Northern route and separation of through and local traffic which will remove the AQMAs. Nothing in this plan will solve this problem as it currently stands.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	1864	<p>- Stockbridge Roundabout has frequently breached air quality limits in recent years and continues to do so.</p> <p>- Link road will contribute to increased air pollution</p>		Comment	Jennie Horn [7223]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	1980	No recommendation for reduction in air pollution.		Comment	Mr Anthony Tuffin [5052]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	2227	We are pleased to see that this policy recognises that new development may be located near to existing uses that may be potentially polluting to housing. It is important that the onus should be on the developer/applicant to manage any impact to ensure that they don't leave the existing user affected, e.g. by complaints.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	2429	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	2679	No recommendations for the reduction in air pollution and the management of AQMA. See attached for full detail.		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	2912	Policy DM24: mainly as a result of the huge increase in traffic over the last few years, and because of the ever-growing congestion on the A27 causing increased traffic within the City, Chichester's air quality is notoriously poor, particularly in the vicinity of one of our primary schools. Much of this pollution will disappear when a proper northern bypass is built, as it inevitably will be one day.		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	3211	There are a large number of deaths and illnesses connected to air pollution. Plan needs to include more detail on how air pollution risks will be mitigated.	7.147 insert "these include but are not limited to; planting, change to cleaner buses, anti-idling campaigns, School Streets, Car Free Days, Car Free Zones, sale of masks to vulnerable sectors of society, making registration to Sussex Air alerts compulsory to major employers in the area and schools, introduction of workplace parking levy policy". Policy, insert "6. Measures to reduce air pollution will be pursued by WSCC and CDC. These measures include but are not limited to clean air zones, work place parking levy, cleaner buses, anti-idling zones, School Streets, increasing pedestrianisation of the city centre, adoption of car free day".	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	3454	Concerned about air quality in the Stockbridge Road locality		Object	A + D Lygo-Baker [7425]
145	Policy DM24: Air Quality	3535	The Council should be looking at REDUCING the pollution levels rather than increasing them to the detriment of the local population.		Comment	Penny Kirk [6567]
146	Noise	924	Whilst I agree with the policy to minimise noise disturbance, at the risk of being repetetive AL6 with proposed development and road construction adjacent to dwellings and the Chichester Harbour AONB is ill thought out as a suitable location to avoid such impact.		Comment	Mr Mark Shepherd [6967]
146	Noise	1044	Excess noise is subjective and difficult to define against other background noise. Success of mitigation measures is not assured. Thus further measures after implementation may be necessary. Much more assessment and modelling needs to be carried out before any planning permission is granted and/or highway improvements demanded.	-The Policy should spell out requirements and standards more clearly. -When noise levels due to development are forecast to be in excess of what is acceptable, there should be clear planning remedies, including refusal or limits to the scale of planning permissions-including highway measures. If post implementation noise levels are in excess, compensation and sound proofing must still be available to sensitive receptors.	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
147	Policy DM25: Noise	219	I fail to see how it is possible to control noise disturbance on new developments on construction and the subsequent use where vehicle noise and general noise associated with modern living.		Comment	Mrs Trish Mackinnon [6698]
147	Policy DM25: Noise	1466	What is an "acceptable level" of noise pollution? Aspects of this plan increase noise pollution. Where is any reference to industry standards, DMRB and DEFRA's END-Action Plans designed to managed environmental noise and its effects, including reduction if necessary, and preservation of quiet areas.	This Policy needs redrafting to include all of these key factors.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
147	Policy DM25: Noise	2431	Agree with this policy		Support	Mr John Newman [5206]
148	Contaminated Land					
149	Policy DM26: Contaminated Land	2228	We support this policy as drafted.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
150	Historic Environment	395	in 7.162 there is no mention of the Chichester Harbour AONB the SDNP and south downs are mentioned three times-the Harbour AOINB is not mentioned	in 7.162 in the fourth character area (coastal plain) include the Chichester Harbour AONB as a locally distinctive character area, in 7.163 add a fifth bullet listing the AONB as having several views and vistas which should be protected	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
150	Historic Environment	1605	"The Coastal Plain framed with the backdrop of the South Downs to the north" This includes a lovely view of the grandstand at Goodwood racecourse.		Comment	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
150	Historic Environment	1812	7.154 WE are concerned that insufficient care is taken with preserving the historic environment whilst understanding that careful redevelopment needs to take place. We support retain the fabric of old buildings but allowing design to move the sites forward.		Comment	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]
150	Historic Environment	2283	Historic England welcomes and supports, in principle, paragraphs 7.154 - 7.161. However, we consider that paragraph 7.154 should be reworded to clarify the distinction between designated and non-designated heritage assets (the latter including buildings on the Local Buildings List for Chichester).	Reword paragraph 7.154 as follows: "There are a large number of "Heritage Assets" (as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework), both designated and non-designated, in the plan area. Designated assets are Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas and Registered Historic Parks and Gardens. Non-designated assets include archaeological sites (although the remains may be of national significance equivalent to scheduled monuments, and which should be considered subject to the policies for scheduled monuments) and non-listed buildings which have been identified as locally important, such as those on the Local Buildings List for Chichester City and 'positive' buildings within Conservation Areas."	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
150	Historic Environment	3115	Page 186, 7.162 Historic Environment: Chichester Harbour has a rich historic environment. It is a shame this is not recognised on the list of four locally distinctive character areas. Meanwhile, the National Park is mentioned on three of the four areas, for some reason, despite being outside the scope of the Local Plan area. Such is the lack of recognition of the historic environment and heritage assets of Chichester Harbour, the Conservancy considered objecting to this policy, but eventually resolved to issue comments and allow Chichester District Council to remedy the oversight.	There are five Conservation Areas in Chichester Harbour AONB within Chichester District, at Bosham, Dell Quay, Fishbourne, Prinsted, West Itchenor, and West Wittering. These should be cited.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
151	Policy DM27: Historic Environment	930	Secondly could I comment on the Historic Environment section. The guidance notes prepared by CDC can be very useful (eg shopfronts) but regrettably seem to regularly be ignored by both applicants and planning officers with permission being granted for applications which clearly do not comply. Stronger enforcement and education where necessary is vital for such guidance to be effective.		Comment	Mr Clive Sayer [6517]
151	Policy DM27: Historic Environment	977	With no Conservation officers, historic environment work is getting behind. The CACA is not complete over two years on. Several proposals for additions to local list are not signed off 2 leaving buildings without protection. Policy DM27 should state about protecting assets as well as conserving and enhancing.	Complete processing of outstanding Local List applications, appoint Conservation Officers, and reword the policy to provide for protecting the assets	Comment	Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (Mr Alan Green) [788]
151	Policy DM27: Historic Environment	1367	Halnaker resident. Fully support but conservation policies need to be enforced and monitored. Many changes requiring planning under Article D contravene this policy. More education is required especially to owners or prospective owners of listed or conservation area properties of their responsibilities and liabilities.		Support	Mr David Leah [6440]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
151	Policy DM27: Historic Environment	2284	Supports DM27 in principle. Criterion e should specify wholly exceptional circumstances Policy could be more detailed in terms of considerations when assessing development proposals affecting heritage assets e.g. policies in West Oxfordshire LP.	Reword clause e. of Policy DM27 as follows; "Development involving substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets will only be granted in exceptional circumstances (wholly exceptional circumstances for designated assets of the highest significance) i.e. where it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the circumstances in paragraph 195 of the National Planning Policy Framework apply. More details of the considerations to be taken into account when assessing development proposals affecting the different types of heritage asset. We would be pleased to work with the Council on a revised policy or policies.	Comment	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
151	Policy DM27: Historic Environment	2713	Policy more onerous than NPPF. Suggest replace 'and' after 'conserves' with 'or'	Replace 'and' after 'conserves' with 'or'	Comment	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
151	Policy DM27: Historic Environment	3214	Insert "5. Development does not harm or damage existing trees and hedges which act as valuable carbon sinks, homes for wildlife, and protect the city from heat."	Insert "5. Development does not harm or damage existing trees and hedges which act as valuable carbon sinks, homes for wildlife, and protect the city from heat."	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
152	Natural Environment	1101	Please never consider making a new Northern by-pass that would endanger wildlife, (movement of deer across roads in particular etc) and have a negative affect on all fauna and flora. It would also create light polution in the south downs against planing policy and the local Planetarium sky at night studies.		Comment	Mr mark Jeffries [6943]
152	Natural Environment	3116	Chichester Harbour is the largest natural harbour in South East England. The Local Plan should specify setting of Chichester Harbour AONB.	This fact should be included. 1. There is no adverse impact on the openess....setting of Chichester Harbour AONB or the South Downs National Park.'	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	218	Your statement on your LPR - seeks to reduce the impact on development on the natural environment - it is further stated that open views are important this is at odds with your policy when Barratt homes has options on all the fields to the South of Church Farm Lane and either side of Stubcroft Lane There are many instances where development in this area has caused considerable harm to the environment and to individual home owners and I have never heard of any compensation being offered how would appropriate compensation be awarded?		Comment	Mrs Trish Mackinnon [6698]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	906	What is meant by "no adverse impact" please can you quantify what this emotive term actually means in planning terms. 2. Stronger statement needed 4. The best graded agricultural land is protected. 5 . land between settlements are not built on.	1. reworded quantifying the statement in planning terms Change 2. Development enhances Change 4. The best graded agricultural land is protected against all development 5. underdeveloped land between settlements WILL NOT BE BUILT ON.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	1191	Policy should refer to protecting views of the AONB	Remove AL6 and acknowledge the equal importance of Chichester Harbour AONB.	Object	Mrs Fiona Horn [6652]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	1368	it is very hard to see how this policy can be adhered to with the extent of development proposed.		Comment	Mr David Leah [6440]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	1959	Biodiversity is an essential feature of the natural environment, treating it separately in the plan risks conflict between the policies.	Insert at 7.169 a paragraph as follows: the council undertakes to scrutinise Environmental Impact assessments for their thoroughness and veracity and consider the development along with others in the vicinity, in order to also evaluate cumulative impacts. Biodiversity references should be made throughout the policy, in particular, poorer quality land to be assessed for its biodiversity potential.	Comment	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	2398	Welcome the requirement in policies S26 (Natural Environment) and DM28 (Natural Environment) to ensure that development proposals have no adverse impact on the openness of views and setting of the SDNP.		Support	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	2515	At the present time the Landscape Capacity Study is in draft form only and its conclusions are currently based on a summer assessment. It would be the case that the same assessment during the winter months would yield a greater degree of landscape sensitivity. The evidence base, as currently published, is not robust and the AL7 policy wording "development of a minimum of 250 dwellings..." is not based on robust and credible evidence.		Object	Bosham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [749]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	2563	The policy wording in point 1. does not include reference to Chichester Harbour AONB, which it should do	Include reference to Chichester Harbour AONB alongside the South Downs National park in the first number point in the policy wording.	Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	2595	Attempting to make decision on basis of perceived rather than actual impact is ambiguous and open to subjectivity.	Revise para 5 to: "The individual identity of settlements is maintained and the integrity of predominantly open and undeveloped land between settlements is not undermined."	Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	2715	Policy should ref potential for mitigation measures through devt and how this can address impacts. Question use of the word 'perceived' in criterion 5 - this would be challenging for decision-makers		Comment	Gladman (Mr Mat Evans) [851]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	2769	Part 5 of policy inconsistent with NPPF para 16.	Delete part 5 of policy.	Comment	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Behrendt) [7316]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	2816	SWT notes that in section 7.169 of the supporting text the mitigation hierarchy is mentioned, although not explicitly referenced. Our concern is that although the text mentions mitigation and compensation, the need to first avoid impacts through location and/or design of development is not clearly set out. We remind CDC that the first step in the mitigation hierarchy is to avoid. We therefore proposed that this is made clear in the supporting text through amendments to section 7.169	We propose the following amendments to section 7.169: '7.169 Development proposals must take account of international, national and local designations as part of their application. The mitigation hierarchy sets out that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from development cannot be avoided through locating to an alternative site with less harmful impacts or by well thought out design, then mitigation should be delivered or as a last resort compensation, otherwise planning permission should be refused. Exceptions will only be made where no reasonable alternatives are available and the benefits of development clearly outweigh the negative impacts. Where a development proposal would result in any significant harm that cannot be avoided or mitigated, appropriate compensation will be sought.	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	3034	Criterion 5 - unclear how an applicant can demonstrate compliance with 'actual and perceived' or how an officer can assess this with consistency	Remove criterion 5.	Comment	William Lacey Group [1623]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
153	Policy DM28: Natural Environment	3170	<p>The wording of the environment policy is hopelessly weak. Vague terms such as " is not unduly compromised", "significant harm", "may be occasions..." are all open to interpretation, and could easily be navigated through by a determined developer.</p> <p>"Unduly" and "significant", need to be taken out, and 'may be on occasions' needs to be specific. The proposals need to be much more robust. It should be stated that valuable and productive agricultural land will not be sacrificed for development.</p> <p>All proposals in the local plan need to demonstrate that they will have a net zero impact on climate change.</p>		Object	Mr Alan Carn [5417]
154	Biodiversity	1781	<p>7.171 "The Council is currently identifying and mapping components of the local ecological networks, including the sites designated for wildlife, priority habitats and the wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them."</p> <p>As this is a work in progress I am unable to comment on the content at this consultation and therefore the wildlife corridors in the plan and any assumptions have not been consulted on and will need to be prior to the delivery to the inspector/examiner.</p>	As this is a work in progress I am unable to comment on the content at this consultation and therefore the wildlife corridors in the plan and any assumptions have not been consulted on and will need to be prior to the delivery to the inspector/examiner. This is essential as Ap6/AL6 is untested.	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	204	Has the area around Church Farm Lane and Stubcroft Farm and Stubcroft Lane been mapped by the Council? I would suggest that it is imperative to do so as it is an area of outstanding diverse wildlife habitat with recently recorded red list species and as previously mentioned should be protected by the proposed wildlife corridor from East Head to Medmerry. Fields to the West of Piggery Hall Lane and south of Church Farm Lane and Stubcroft are under threat of possible building deveopment.		Comment	Mrs Trish Mackinnon [6698]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	764	This policy is acceptable until the last paragraph. It will allow developments where it can be shown that the benefits of development outweigh adverse impact on biodiversity. It does not say who is to make this judgement.	Remove point 6 entirely. Do not permit development that has an adverse impact on biodiversity.	Object	Mrs Stephanie Carn [5416]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	1360	The views and protected habitat, particularly along the canal must be protected!		Comment	Mrs Janet Osborne [7124]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	1626	Natural England welcomes the inclusion of a net gain policy, in line with the NPPF. We suggest inclusion of measures to aid implementation of the policy - use of the Defra biodiversity metric and net gain plans.		Support	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	1779	The Council is currently identifying and mapping components of the local ecological networks, including the sites designated for wildlife, priority habitats and the wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them." As this is a work in progress I am unable to comment on the content at this consultation and therefore the wildlife corridors in the plan and any assumptions have not been consulted on and will need to be prior to the delivery to the inspector/examiner. This is essential as Ap6/AL6 is untested.	As this is a work in progress I am unable to comment on the content at this consultation and therefore the wildlife corridors in the plan and any assumptions have not been consulted on and will need to be prior to the delivery to the inspector/examiner. This is essential as Ap6/AL6 is untested.	Object	Mrs Claire Stratton [7081]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	1791	Mitigation of harm or adverse impact is accepted elsewhere in this policy but is missing from point 5	"...or mitigated" should be appended to DM29.5 ie "Any individual or cumulative adverse impacts on sites are avoided or mitigated;"	Object	Mr Nick Way [5110]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	1834	Strongly support.		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	1968	Emphasis on need to protect biodiversity. Biodiversity extends beyond ecological networks and wildlife corridors.	<p>Developments should be required to take account of and incorporate biodiversity.....</p> <p>Planning permission should only be considered for development.....</p> <p>Planning obligations will be imposed.....</p> <p>Needs recognition that mitigation/compensation will not be adequate to make up for loss of biodiversity.</p>	Comment	Ms Ann Stewart [7066]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	2074	The measures to safeguard and enhance the biodiversity value of development sites are welcomed, including seeking net biodiversity gain.		Support	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	2229	We support this policy as drafted and are pleased to see that specific reference has been provided to ensure that net gain in biodiversity is actively pursued. Consideration should be given to the current Government consultation on mandating biodiversity net gain in all new development and whether this may require further strengthening of the policy wording.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	2320	Policy DM29 'Biodiversity' Portsmouth Water has legal duties to protect and where practical enhance biodiversity and has an active program of work on it's own land. This work is now expanding to include projects on other people's land in association with 'Catchment Management' activities. We would look to CDC for support in areas such as Bosham Stream, Lavant Stream and Fishbourne Stream where schemes could be developed in partnership with local housing developments.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	2818	<p>The Sussex Wildlife Trust is supportive of Local Plans having policies in place to protect, conserve and enhance and deliver net gains to biodiversity. Therefore we welcome CDC continued commitment to biodiversity through the inclusion of this policy.</p> <p>We support CDC's statement in section (7.172) which recognises that conserving biodiversity must not be limited to protected/designated sites. We are proposing that the term prevent in this section is changed to avoid in order to align better with the mitigation hierarchy as per the NPPF</p>	<p>Please see amendment below to section (7.172):</p> <p>'172 All new developments are encouraged to take account of and incorporate biodiversity into their features at the design stage, including integral bat and bird boxes and hedgehog accessible fencing and gravel boards. The Policy below protects sites of biodiversity importance, which contain wildlife or geological features that are of special interest. Exceptions will only be made where no reasonable alternatives are available and the benefits of development clearly outweigh the negative impacts. Where a development proposal would result in any significant harm to biodiversity and geological interests that cannot be avoided prevented or mitigated, appropriate compensation will be sought. Conserving biodiversity is not just about protecting rare species and designated nature conservation sites. It also encompasses the more common and widespread species and habitats, all of which make an important contribution to quality of life. The Council will seek to preserve and enhance the biodiversity and geological diversity of the plan area by working with partners to implement the aims and proposals of the Chichester Local Biodiversity Action Plan and the Nature Conservation Strategy.'</p> <p>We make the following proposed changes to the wording of the biodiversity policy.</p> <p>'Planning permission will be granted for development where it can be demonstrated that all the following criteria have been addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning applications should be supported by relevant environmental information, which is informed by appropriate up-to-date ecological information, prior to determination 2. All development should ensure the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * International, National and Locally designated sites * Marine habitats and other Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitats * Irreplaceable Habitats * Protected and priority species * Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) * Wildlife corridors and stepping stones 3. If significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided (by locating development on an alternative site with less harmful impacts or through design), then such harm should be adequately mitigated. Where it cannot be adequately mitigated then such harm must be compensated for. Where it cannot be compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. 4. The proposal has incorporated features that enhance biodiversity as part of good design and sustainable development, and identifies and pursues opportunities for achieving a measurable net gain in biodiversity;...' [the rest continues as written in the PAP] 	Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	2932	<p>Issues with net gain. We are disappointed that Chichester DC does not appear to want to take a lead on this topic and set a standard for other authorities. Given the time scale of the plan (to 2035) it is very likely that the statutory requirement for net gain will be in place, and we would wish to see the principle more firmly established in this plan. This would also be consistent with the statements made in Section 5 on Design Standards and Policy DM18 on Sustainable Design and Construction.</p>	<p>Remove the statement that suggests that biodiversity can be damaged legitimately under your policy. Such damage should be considered only in very exceptional circumstances. Net gains in biodiversity should be written into every policy for every site allocation.</p>	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	3117	Chichester Harbour has an extensive network of biodiversity which is nationally and internationally important. Yet there is no mention of Chichester Harbour in this policy. Chichester District Council are also advised that a developer in Chidham cleared a site of all trees before submitting a planning application (17/03626/OUT). This practice completely undermines the policy. The LPA should undertake a biodiversity audit to form a baseline and monitor developments against this policy to demonstrate the net gains in biodiversity required by the NPPF.	The biodiversity value of Chichester Harbour is recognised. Further consideration should be given to abuses of the planning system to better manage cases like the above. A biodiversity audit is commissioned so as to provide baseline data from which to measure progress.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
155	Policy DM29: Biodiversity	3285	Support policy.		Support	Westbourne Parish Council (MR Roy Briscoe) [6562]
156	Development and Disturbance of Birds in Special Protection Areas					
157	Policy DM30: Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas	815	Medmerry must also be included.	Medmerry must also be included.	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
157	Policy DM30: Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas	1369	support		Support	Mr David Leah [6440]
157	Policy DM30: Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas	1632	Natural England suggests that the policy is made clearer by: - moving background explanation to the supporting text; - remove reference to the Pagham LNR Management Plan; - separate out and expand the parts of the policy relating to functionally linked land.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
157	Policy DM30: Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas	2436	We note that the SRMP mitigation solution is reflected in Policy DM30 and we look forward to continuing to work with CDC and other members of the SRMP on this matter.		Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
157	Policy DM30: Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas	2564	We welcome the inclusion of the policy on recreational disturbance and fully support the comprehensive text. Our reservation is that the policy and mitigation scheme described can only have a limited impact on the effects of recreational disturbance in reality. Therefore we urge that other measures are implemented as detailed throughout the plan to provide alternative public open spaces, particularly for exercising dogs, as standard practise for each new housing development.		Support	Chichester Harbour Trust (Nicky Horter) [7286]
157	Policy DM30: Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas	2568	We are struggling to understand why the buffer zone around Pagham Harbour is smaller than that around Chichester Harbour.		Comment	Friends of Pagham Harbour (Mr Francis Parfremment) [6213]
157	Policy DM30: Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas	2819	We would like to highlight a matter relating to the text within the policy. The text refers to bullet points a and b however the bullet points are numbered not letter and therefore this needs amending, this error occurs twice in the policy.	We would like to highlight a matter relating to the text within the policy. The text refers to bullet points a and b however the bullet points are numbered not letter and therefore this needs amending, this error occurs twice in the policy.	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
157	Policy DM30: Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours Special Protection Areas	2933	We are pleased to see the inclusion of this important issue in such an important bird area. However, we are puzzled by the suggestion that mitigation strategies are realistic in this context. There is no indication of what the package of measures (b) might be. Some examples might be helpful. Any such proposal will be very carefully monitored by many organisations and local people. Transparency in these processes is essential.	Further details should be provided of any mitigation measures deemed to be acceptable, and stronger statements made that the need for such mitigation will be avoided.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
158	Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows	2756	Specific protection for hedgerows required to protect against loss of character and creeping urbanisation brought in by bland fencing.		Comment	MR William Sharp [7072]
159	Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	205	The Barratt vision will cover many fields and East Wittering and Bracklesham will merge into one huge housing estate if this is allowed it is unavoidable that the ancient hedgerows and indigenous tress and plants will be torn out denuding animal habitat. This should be avoided at all cost and I would dispute that 15 meters is enough of a buffer between new development and woodland. My impression is that very few new housing developments have adequate screening with hedges and trees, planners should take care that this is achieved.		Comment	Mrs Trish Mackinnon [6698]
159	Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	550	We need better protection and replanting for trees in public spaces in Chichester city centre, specifically around the city walls, in West Street by the cathedral, and to replace the trees recently killed on New Park Road. Although the policy states that replanting is required, I see no replanting of the trees recently felled in West Street. The forward thinking of past generations should be continued today for the benefit of future generations. It is not enough just to prevent privately-owned trees from being cut down; I would like to see more focus on the trees in public spaces.	Add a clarification to the policy to ensure this policy applies to changes in the public realm and public spaces, not just to private developments.	Object	Mr Robin Kidd [6674]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
159	Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	1326	'Valued' trees is a very loose term and should be defined more clearly. A tree may be valued by a local community which others might think less important.	Define a 'valued tree' and ensure that local views on nearby trees are sought. Where trees are felled appropriate replacements should be as close to the site of the fallen trees as possible. There should be a presumption in favour of retaining existing trees (whether 'valued' or not.	Object	Mrs Lynne Friel [4991]
159	Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	1370	Support		Support	Mr David Leah [6440]
159	Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	1836	BUT please demonstrate how the Plan will deliver Government tree-planting targets.		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
159	Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	2824	Support the policy and welcome the wording in bullet point 4, which highlights the need for a buffer in relation to ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees. Bullet point would benefit from stating the need to also avoid impacts on Ancient Woodland and Ancient/veteran trees as per paragraph 175 of the NPPF and Natural England's ancient woodland standing advice.	SWT recommends the following amendments: '4. Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of Ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees should be refused. Where development proposals have the potential to impact these habitats/features, a minimum buffer of 15 metres will be required between the development and ancient woodland or veteran trees; and'	Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
159	Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	2934	We welcome the inclusion of this issue and trust that the 'exceptional circumstances' will be extremely rare. Item 2 is unacceptable. The myth that you can replace protected trees, non-protected trees, woodlands and hedgerows is truly unsustainable, and therefore in conflict with your policy statements. The timescale to replace these features properly is much longer than the timescale of your plan.	Remove references to replacement of mature and protected trees, hedgerows etc, or include clarification that this will be permitted only in very exceptional circumstances, and that a net biodiversity gain will be required in any such process.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
159	Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	3118	Under point 1, to change "existing valued trees" to "existing valued and statutorily protected trees".	To reword the policy.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
159	Policy DM31: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands	3215	Insert "6. A tree planning and hedgerow planning policy is to be adopted by the council to reduce the risk of climate change, offer shade and reduce urban heat effect, reduce risk of flooding."	Insert "6. A tree planning and hedgerow planning policy is to be adopted by the council to reduce the risk of climate change, offer shade and reduce urban heat effect, reduce risk of flooding."	Comment	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
160	Green Infrastructure	869	Add new para relating to "Local Green Spaces" and how their designation will be enabled and supported (e.g. through Neighbourhood Plans and Site Allocations DPD). Ref: NPPF aras 99- 101. Para 7.189, last sentence. Replace with "See Maps S30a and S30b."		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
160	Green Infrastructure	2437	Suggest amendment to wording at paragraph 7.185: include more detail re; Medmerry re-alignment as a new bullet point, In particular, it is an intertidal habitat created in 2013 to compensate for historic losses.	Para 7.185: 'Medmerry realignment, which is intertidal habitat created in 2013 to compensate for historic losses across the Solent to SSSI and Natura 2000 sites'. Para 7.187: '...This is particularly relevant to Chichester and Langstone Harbour and Pagham Harbour and the impact of recreational pressure on the birds that use these Special Protection Areas. Any negative impacts that the development may have should will be weighed against the benefits of the proposal. This may include looking at whether the assets are surplus to requirements, if the proposal impacts on a small area or corridor or if a wider need exists for the development and there is no alternative location....'	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	124	In protecting and preserving green infrastructure, wildlife corridors such as Centurion Way should be preserved.		Comment	Mr Ian Bartle [4921]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	206	If/When planning is granted on green field sites in rural areas they should be in keeping with the adjacent farm land. Mown park areas should not be considered in keeping and are environmentally unfriendly to wildlife.		Support	Mrs Trish Mackinnon [6698]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	859	Point 4 below refers to the need to prevent dissection of cycle paths, public rights of way and eco corridors. This is absolutely crucial since cycle paths, footpaths and eco corridors should enhance G I,		Comment	Ms Valerie Briginshaw [6946]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	870	Add new para relating to how Local Green Spaces will be supported, enabled and designated (e.g. through Neighbourhood Plans and Site Allocations DPD).		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	919	Please add the following text to point 4. In particular Centurion Way (National Cycle Route 88), Salterns Way, Chichester to Bognor Regis (National Cycle Route 2) and Chichester to Emsworth (National Cycle Route 2), must not be dissected, lengthened or degraded due to development of the area. Existing direct linear cycle routes and footpaths must not be diverted to follow lengthier routes around the perimeter of developments. Neither should these paths be rerouted along roads as an alternative to maintaining a dedicated motor-vehicle free footpath or cycleway.		Comment	Mr Mark Record [6963]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	1126	National Planning Policy Framework directs that, 'planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users . The Centurion Way route needs to be protected from unreasonable changes and incorporate light maintenance along the route.		Comment	Chichester and District Cycle Forum (Mr Ian Smith) [7054]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	1137	Disappointing that the wording omits to mention that prows are defined by Natural England, and also recognised nationally, as multifunctional 'green corridors', and are therefore part of GI. Providing a multi-use prowl or recreational route around the periphery would comply with NPPF, para 98. It is good to see public rights of way, and bridleways mentioned in Point 4 of the Policy, although the wording "do not lead to the dissection of the linear network" appears to be rather negative, much better to tell someone what they should do "The proposals protect, and contribute to the improvement of"		Comment	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	1371	Support		Support	Mr David Leah [6440]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	1522	Linden Homes and Miller Homes support the draft policy's aims, demonstrated by the incorporation of significant new green infrastructure within the proposals for the site, including a country park and green corridors. It is though important that the policy does not unduly hinder other policy aims, such as the implementation of key infrastructure, and this should be recognised clearly within the policy.		Comment	Linden Homes & Miller Homes [6783]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	1831	As currently written the paragraph states "Development that will harm the green infrastructure network will only be granted if it can incorporate measures that avoid the harm arising or sufficiently mitigate its effects." "sufficiently mitigate" is open to interpretation and needs to be better defined.	I would suggest that the wording should be amended as follows "sufficiently mitigate without any negative or adverse effects to current users"	Object	Mr Bruce Brechin [7213]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	1837	Strongly support.		Support	Ms Paula Chatfield [6280]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	2078	Whilst it is recognised the policy proposes support subject to not 'dissect[ing] ... the linear network of cycle ways, public rights of way, bridleways ...', the policy could lend support to establishing new routes as part of the Green Infrastructure network itself.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	2230	We support policy.		Support	Environment Agency (Mrs Hannah Hyland) [909]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	2370	Para 7.185 - the examples should specifically include PRow. Bullet point 4 - more positive wording to recognise the improvement proposals could make to the access networks is preferred.		Comment	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	2433	We suggest that this policy could benefit from specifically citing that green infrastructure should be 'multifunctional'. We also recommend reference to opportunities to make better green infrastructure connections in line with Lawton Principles of 'bigger, better, more joined up', to ensure these spaces can function and therefore deliver benefits.	Include term 'multifunctional'	Comment	South Downs National Park Authority (Ms Lucy Howard) [1292]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	2826	<p>SWT supports the inclusion of a policy to enshrine the importance of green infrastructure in the CDC Local Plan. Having looked at the supporting text we note that reference is made to the GI checklist from the Delivering Green Infrastructure Local Plan Area document (2016). Although this document was a step down from the promised SPD, we hope the document has offered valuable guidance to developers. We recommend to CDC that reference to the Checklist is made within the policy, so developers are aware of it and the benefits of using it.</p> <p>Recommend the policy wording is made more ambitious.</p>	<p>We also recommend that the policy wording is made more ambitious as follows to ensure that CDC are able to deliver the requirements of the NPPF to 'plan for green infrastructure':</p> <p>'All development will be expected to contribute towards the provision of additional green Infrastructure, and the protection and enhancement of existing green infrastructure.</p> <p>The existing green infrastructure network must be considered at an early stage of the design process for all major development proposals. Masterplans should illustrate how the development incorporates the existing green infrastructure network, and any new green infrastructure.</p> <p>Planning permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated that all the following criteria have been addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposals maintain and, incorporate improvements to the existing network of green infrastructure, or the restoration, enhancement or creation of additional provision areas; 2. The proposals will create new green infrastructure which is integrated into the development design and meets the needs of the communities within and beyond the site boundaries; 3. The proposals contribute to improving the health and well-being of the local and wider community; 4. The proposals do not lead to the dissection of the linear network of cycle ways, public rights of way, bridleways and ecological corridors; and 5. Where appropriate, the Council will seek to secure via planning obligation provision for the future management and/or maintenance of green infrastructure. <p>Development that will harm the green infrastructure network will only be granted if it can incorporate measures that avoid the harm arising or where this is demonstrated as not possible or sufficiently mitigate its effects. It is recommended that applicants refer to the GI Developer Checklist within the Chichester District Council document - Delivering Green Infrastructure in the Local Plan Area (2016).</p> <p>The Council will expect that a legal agreement is entered into where it is necessary to secure green infrastructure provision, or to ensure the long term sustainable management of green infrastructure. Unless stated elsewhere the Council will normally not be responsible for the long term maintenance and management of green infrastructure.'</p>	Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	2935	It might be helpful if this Policy had a slightly different name to avoid confusion with S29 which seems to refer to the Strategic Sites. We welcome the protection and improvement of green infrastructure in the plan, as well as the requirement not to dissect the linear network of cycle ways, rights of way and ecological corridors, subject to our comments on S14.	It might be helpful if this Policy had a slightly different name to avoid confusion with S29 which seems to refer to the Strategic Sites.	Comment	CPRE Sussex (Mr Graham Ault) [6956]
161	Policy DM32: Green Infrastructure	3216	Insert at point 1: "and the protection and enhancement of existing green infrastructure including Salterns Way, Centurion Way and other existing cycle routes." Change Point 4 to: "The proposals do not lead to the dissection of the linear network of cycle ways, public rights of way, bridleways and ecological corridors especially Salterns Way, Centurion Way and the Chichester to Bognor and Chichester to Emsworht and Chichester to Selsey cycle routes."	Insert at point 1: "and the protection and enhancement of existing green infrastructure including Salterns Way, Centurion Way and other existing cycle routes." Change Point 4 to: "The proposals do not lead to the dissection of the linear network of cycle ways, public rights of way, bridleways and ecological corridors especially Salterns Way, Centurion Way and the Chichester to Bognor and Chichester to Emsworht and Chichester to Selsey cycle routes."	Support	Mrs Sarah Sharp [6629]
162	Canals	1022	We object to the limited scope of the statements in 7.194 and 7.195 given the opportunities that the former Portsmouth and Arundel Canal provides in terms of active leisure pursuits, historical interest, and wildlife, in line with the Council's policies set out elsewhere in the Preferred Approach consultation papers (see Wildlife Habitats (2.26), and Green Infrastructure 5.61 - 5.63, DM 32 and Policy S29).	We propose a rewording of paragraphs 7.194, 7.195, and a proposed new paragraph 7.196, as follows: 7.194: There remains a further significant length of the former Portsmouth and Arundel Canal within the plan area (between Hunston and the plan area boundary east of Colworth) where there are currently no proposals for restoration. Nevertheless much of this alignment forms the route of a public right of way which extends eastwards into Arun District. 7.195: These remains are important early 19th Century historic features (road bridges, swing bridges, canal bed and towpaths) in the landscape of the coastal plain and warrant protection and, where feasible, enhancement to facilitate the cultural and historic understanding of the area. They also provide the opportunity for leisure and tourism pursuits. (New) 7.196: Proposals for development or reinstatement of canal features that have been historically buried may need an archeological survey and public rights of way re-considered so as to restore a route as near to the original canal path as possible, and working around existing and continued occupation (eg housing, industry, infrastructure, transport links).	Object	Friends of the Old Ford to Hunston Canal (Mr Richard Boulter) [6995]
163	Policy DM33: Canals	76	As Chairman of Chichester Ship Canal Trust, I am pleased to see DM33 Canals, which recognises the value of the work we are doing and a context for future restoration. Other chapters on Historic Environment and Green Infrastructure will also be useful support to us.		Comment	Chichester Ship Canal Trust (Mr Ian Milton) [801]
163	Policy DM33: Canals	1025	We object to the poor ambition of the draft DM33 policy on Canals. The Council should start from the goal of reinstating a continuous right of way along its section of the disused Portsmouth and Arundel Canal as part of a green corridor. The Council should encourage proposals which would seek to realign public footpaths as close to the original canal towpath as possible. As demand for green space increases alongside housing developments, the Colworth to Hunston section of the Canal presents an opportunity for public authorities to meet their objectives to enhance the potential for outdoor leisure activities.	We propose a rewording of DM33, second paragraph, as follows: Development will be permitted where this will preserve and enhance the remaining line and configuration, and features within it, of the Portsmouth and Arundel Canal. Where past developments have diverted the line of rights of way from the original towpath and route of the canal, developments would be welcomed that seek to reinstate public rights of way closer to the original route.	Object	Friends of the Old Ford to Hunston Canal (Mr Richard Boulter) [6995]
163	Policy DM33: Canals	2285	Paragraph 7.195 of the Plan notes that the remnants of canals "are important early 19th Century historic features in the landscape of the coastal plain and warrant protection". Historic England agrees with this statement, but Policy DM33 makes no mention of protecting the historic significance of the remaining canal sections.	Reword the first paragraph of Policy DM33 as follows; "Development that makes provision of through navigation or enhancement of the Chichester Ship Canal and the Wey and Arun Canal will be supported where it meets environmental, ecological, historical and transport considerations."	Object	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
163	Policy DM33: Canals	2450	Difficulty in riding a bicycle along the canal towpath.		Comment	Mr John Newman [5206]
163	Policy DM33: Canals	2619	Policy should recognise/support canal's historic use for houseboat living - explicitly reference house boats. Suggest rewording policy.	Reword policy to: Development that supports the further use and enhancement of the Chichester Ship Canal and the Wey and Arun Canal will be supported where it meets environmental, ecological and transport considerations. This includes improvements to the existing houseboat population and further houseboat development on the canal.	Comment	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
163	Policy DM33: Canals	3119	To note that the Chichester Ship Canal is an existing wildlife corridor with a high recreational value.	To reword the policy.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
164	Open Space, Sport and Recreation	871	Comments on inadequacy of reduced open space area standard and inconsistency regarding persons per dwelling calculations.	Restore overall level of open space provision to 3.6Ha/1000. Unless clear reasons to contrary exist, revise table 7.1a to reflect higher WSCC used population per dwelling figures.	Object	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
164	Open Space, Sport and Recreation	2453	Object due to issues in the supporting evidence. Chichester Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Southbourne Parish - Policy SA13 page 90 section 15.4 In the title, play space (children) is given, when the project is actually children and youth combined. The heading needs to be amended to Play Space (Children and youth) Chichester Open Space, Sport Facilities, Recreation Study and Playing Pitch Strategy: Open Space Study Sub Area Analysis (Part 2 of 2) Page 13 table 4 This table says there is good provision for childrens play space, when section 2.3 table 3 shows there to be a shortfall throughout the district.		Object	Southbourne Parish Council (Mrs Caroline Davison) [6771]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	1138	We support the aim to "seek to retain, enhance, improve access and increase the quantity and quality of....rights of way including improvement of links to them." Point 1 - Support requirement for development to contribute to new links to the existing rights of way network, which should be multi-use. Support the aim to secure on-site provision secured via S106 agreements to provide links to the existing rights of way network to meet any identified shortfalls, and request that these links will be "as inclusive as possible, often the aim will be to achieve at least bridleway status."		Support	British Horse Society (Mrs Tricia Butcher) [757]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	1208	Open Space - There is a deficiency of all types of open space at the moment. With the continuing plan to put more and more housing into smaller spaces, the need for Open Space becomes more important. The new standard should be dropped in favour of retaining the previous standard.	Retain previous Standard.	Object	Mrs Gail Powell [6365]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	1313	The football Club and Parish Council will endeavour to work on a solution when it can be supported, if the District Council are in a facilitating role. The deficits in the Pitch study report should be included in the policy for the Parish. Feasibility study commissioned to locate potential sites.	Where the open space study has identified a deficit of open space study and recreational provision the should be a requirement of any new strategic development to rectify this situation in addition to making provision for the new proposals. If no suitable site is available which can be immediately bought into use. The scale of the provision should be in accordance to the deficits identified in the open space study. The strategic options state, "They serve to highlight issues, but do not necessarily resolve how they may be delivered". The policy should address this issue by involving neighbourhood plans and implement a co-ordinated plan to address the need for new provision of open space, which is multi-use for the community - The club wish to increase its youth provision, as currently we are restricted. The Council should facilitate this and action in their policy.	Object	Bosham Football Club (Mr Neil Redman) [748]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	1372	Support		Support	Mr David Leah [6440]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	1517	It is recommended that the policy also better recognises the opportunities that can arise from relocating open space. Additionally, it is suggested that the policy, or its supporting text, give recognition to the benefits of sharing of sports facility space in particular between different users. The policy is not, and nor are the tables 7.1-7.3 to which it refers, clear in regards how very local need will be considered when requiring new open space or sports provision to be provided.		Comment	Linden Homes & Miller Homes [6783]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	1997	The policy pledges that there will be new open space, sport and recreation facilities created whenever there is development that leads to an increase in the local population. This is an important principle that we, as a school, fully support. School-age children need access to nature, to playing fields and to community buildings that can host clubs and other organisations. Without this, the proposals could lead to a reduction in the quality of life for local children and a less cohesive community.	Where dwellings are built in close proximity to a school, as could be the case for Bishop Luffa School, we would like there to be consideration of the existing community use of the school and how the new development could compliment that. We would also support the involvement of local sports clubs in determining how we can offer a full range of sports across the city, and not duplicate existing provision. An example of this is the lack of a running track in Chichester, whilst there are multiple all-weather pitches.	Support	Bishop Luffa School (Mr Austen Hindman) [7199]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	2018	Sport England would therefore request that the value of sport to the economy is reflected within the Local Plan.		Comment	Sport England (Ms Laura Hutson) [1308]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	2019	This policy requires rewording in order to be in line with the NPPF. First, it suggests that all criteria must be met, then states that either 1 or 2 must be met - this contradicts each other. The sentence regarding exceptions should also be reworded to ensure that it is clear that any new development considered to outweigh the loss should be for alternative sports and recreational provision rather than for any other type of development, in order to be in line with national policy. Without the proposed rewording Sport England will object to this policy.	This policy requires rewording in order to be in line with the NPPF.	Object	Sport England (Ms Laura Hutson) [1308]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	2286	Historic England welcomes and supports clause 3 of Policy DM34 as part of the positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Support	Historic England (Mr Martin Small) [1083]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	2371	The aim to retain, enhance, enhance access and increase the quantity and quality of PROW and the links to them is supported. This would be of great benefit to all NMUs is all new routes/links are multi-user.		Support	West Sussex Local Access Forum (WSLAF) (Graham Elvey) [7280]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	2514	Object to reduction of open space requirement and no evidence to support this. It is considered that the new standards should not form the basis for the open space requirements at Highgrove Farm and that the previous standards should be retained to address the unique circumstances of Bosham.		Object	Bosham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [749]
165	Policy DM34: Open Space, Sport and Recreation including Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitches	2828	We welcome bullet point three within this policy, which recognises the importance the afore mentioned assets may provide for biodiversity and within the green infrastructure network.		Support	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
166	Equestrian Development					
167	Policy DM35: Equestrian Development	2076	It is appreciated why the Plan would wish to require future equine development to be 'well related to or has improved links to the existing bridleway network'. However, this will add to the pressure of use on the existing bridleway network, which is not extensive outside of the South Downs, so will increase degradation of paths. Future developments must, therefore, accept to contribute in some way, acceptable to the local highway authority, to mitigate the additional impact to be created so all lawful users are not disadvantaged.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
167	Policy DM35: Equestrian Development	2322	Policy DM35 'Equestrian Development' can have a direct impact on water quality including groundwater quality. Portsmouth Water support the protection of water courses and aquifers.		Support	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
167	Policy DM35: Equestrian Development	2536	Concerns over high level equestrian related development on the Peninsula, especially on the settlement boundary margins, within the ex LSA estates, and associated with gypsy sites. Much of this development is often deemed as "agricultural use" when it is really a "change of use". The use for "horse culture" often removes high quality land from agricultural/ horticultural use, despoils the land creating a strong visual intrusion often close to residential areas. Seek clarity - true recreational nature of horsekeeping and how often large numbers of horses kept on a small acreage might be exercised.	Policy should ensure that the change of use is properly applied and enforced.	Comment	Sidlesham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1287]
167	Policy DM35: Equestrian Development	2829	Due to the often rural nature of Equestrian Development, we propose an amendment to bullet point 4 of the policy to ensure potential impacts to biodiversity are captured	We propose the following amendment to bullet point 4 of the policy to ensure potential impacts to biodiversity are captured: 'The proposal, either on its own or cumulatively, with other horse related uses in the area, is compatible with its surroundings, and adequately protects water courses, groundwater, biodiversity and the safety of all road users;'	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
167	Policy DM35: Equestrian Development	2986	It is accepted that large equestrian businesses do provide some rural employment, often at minimum wage. However the Parish Council is concerned that this Policy provides no protection for and retention of viable agricultural land and farm units, meeting the need for food production. This rural Parish has seen the loss and break up of a number of farm units arising from change of use to equestrian and pressure for further associated development.		Comment	Plaistow And Ifold Parish Council (Catheine Nutting) [1223]

h. Glossary

168	Glossary	51	The definition of 'affordable housing' as set out in the glossary does not accord with the definition in the Framework and this is wholly unacceptable. As currently set out the definition of the Council is far to restrictive.	The definition of 'affordable housing' in the glossary should be changed to reflect the definition in the Framework	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
168	Glossary	55	Amend definition of affordable housing. Amend rural exception sites definition.	Amend definition of affordable housing. Amend rural exception sites definition	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
168	Glossary	396	National Park-omits to mention that the SDNP is outside the Local Plan Area	add: The South Downs National Park lies outside the Local Plan Area.	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
168	Glossary	1653	The Glossary Definition of Affordable Housing is completely at odds with the NPPF 2018 definition of Affordable Housing.	<p>The Preferred Approach Glossary Definition of Affordable Housing should emulate the NPPF definition as follows :</p> <p>Affordable housing: housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market (including housing that provides a subsidised route to home ownership and/or is for essential local workers); and which complies with one or more of the following definitions:</p> <p>a) Affordable housing for rent: meets all of the following conditions: (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Social Rent or Affordable Rent, or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable); (b) the landlord is a registered provider, except where it is included as part of a Build to Rent scheme (in which case the landlord need not be a registered provider); and (c) it includes provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. For Build to Rent schemes affordable housing for rent is expected to be the normal form of affordable housing provision (and, in this context, is known as Affordable Private Rent).</p> <p>b) Starter homes: is as specified in Sections 2 and 3 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and any secondary legislation made under these sections. The definition of a starter home should reflect the meaning set out in statute and any such secondary legislation at the time of plan-preparation or decision-making. Where secondary legislation has the effect of limiting a household's eligibility to purchase a starter home to those with a particular maximum level of household income, those restrictions should be used.</p> <p>c) Discounted market sales housing: is that sold at a discount of at least 20% below local market value. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Provisions should be in place to ensure housing remains at a discount for future eligible households.</p> <p>d) Other affordable routes to home ownership: is housing provided for sale that provides a route to ownership for those who could not achieve home ownership through the market. It includes shared ownership, relevant equity loans, other low cost homes for sale (at a price equivalent to at least 20% below local market value) and rent to buy (which includes a period of intermediate rent). Where public grant funding is provided, there should be provisions for the homes to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for any receipts to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision, or refunded to Government or the relevant authority specified in the funding agreement.</p>	Object	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]
168	Glossary	2116	Includes Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs) but not Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs). SNCIs are now known as LWSs.		Comment	West Sussex County Council (Mrs Caroline West) [1038]
168	Glossary	2830	<p>SWT recommends inclusions/amendments to the glossary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Inclusion of the definition of Ancient or veteran tree * Inclusion of the definition of Brownfield Site Green infrastructure definition to included blue assets * Inclusion of term Protected Species * Rename the term Sites of Nature Conservation importance as Local Wildlife Site * Inclusion of the definition for Sequential Preferable Site 	<p>SWT recommends the following inclusions/amendments to the glossary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Inclusion of the definition of Ancient or veteran tree * Inclusion of the definition of Brownfield Site Green infrastructure definition to included blue assets * Inclusion of term Protected Species * Rename the term Sites of Nature Conservation importance as Local Wildlife Site * Inclusion of the definition for Sequential Preferable Site 	Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
168	Glossary	2903	AH - no reason why CDC has deviated from definitions of affordable housing in the NPPF.	Update definitions to reflect NPPF 2018.	Comment	Bloor Homes Southern [1910]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
168	Glossary	3120	There is no definition of Brownfield Site, Coastal Squeeze, Countryside Gap, or Cultural Diversity.	To add these definitions. In particular, it is unclear what is meant by a Countryside Gap.	Comment	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (Dr Richard Austin) [796]
i. Appendices						
169	Appendices					
170	Appendix A - Plan Area Sub-Area Maps	306	Why is the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) not included on the map? Why is the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) not included on the map?		Comment	Mr Robert Styles-Forsyth [6752]
170	Appendix A - Plan Area Sub-Area Maps	568	I object to the fact that the Chichester Harbour AONB, RAMSAR, SPA and SSSI site is omitted from the Map describing the East-West Corridor, yet the SDNP takes precedence. In planning policy terms AONBs are equal to National Parks. Chichester Harbour AONB was designated in 1964 under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.	Include in the Maps the Chichester Harbour AONB. Put the AONB key above the National Park as it should take precedence in this as the SDNP is not included in this Local plan.	Object	Mrs Zoe Neal [6675]
170	Appendix A - Plan Area Sub-Area Maps	573	The Chichester Harbour AONB is neither referenced nor indicated in these maps while it is within the local plan area. Why are there recurring references to the SDNP throughout this document when it is not inside the plan area..	removal of references to the SDNP throughout Local Plan Review when not relevant to the particular narrative.	Object	Mr Pieter Montyn [6557]
170	Appendix A - Plan Area Sub-Area Maps	2913	Appendix A Map A1: Is a perfect representation of how the development of our district has suffered from the requirements of the SDNP and as previously observed, shows that inevitably, there will be continuous development eventually from Southbourne to Tangmere		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
170	Appendix A - Plan Area Sub-Area Maps	2990	Plaistow AND IFOLD Parish Council draw CDC attention yet again to the wrong name being used for this Parish. Map A3 and Map B1 both only refer to Plaistow , please can you amend and amend your records as this is a constant mistake. Also Map 4.1 Key Diagram only shows the settlement of Ifold and not Plaistow even though they are designated one service village.		Comment	Plaistow And Ifold Parish Council (Catheine Nutting) [1223]
170	Appendix A - Plan Area Sub-Area Maps	3349	SB3 - consider areas identified as part of the adopted Site Allocations DPD are misleading, should simply be accorded settlement boundary status as they are already developed. Plan should be changed to include site at Lagness Road which forms a logical settlement boundary extension and is contiguous with existing development.	Amend settlement boundary in accordance with attached plan and include site at Lagness Road within the settlement of Runcton.	Object	Mr and Mrs R Ellis [7401]
171	Appendix B - Designated Rural and Non-Rural Areas	307	This map is incorrect, there are several areas marked as Non Rural/Urban when they are currently farmed and have been farmed since the 18th century. For example the land between Apuldram and Stockbridge south of the A27. This land is part of the coastal plain, and not protected by the alluvial fan deposits under Chichester with fingers extending down Stockbridge Road and Hunston.	The area under the proposed Stockbridge Link Road is Rural. It is supporting various endangered species, it is not suited to building, it is more suitable to open field agriculture.	Object	Mr Robert Styles-Forsyth [6752]
171	Appendix B - Designated Rural and Non-Rural Areas	356	Hunston is designated "Non-rural" this is utterly ridiculous. What percentage of land in a Parish needs to be arable farmland, grazing grassland, equestrian paddock, woodland etc. in order to be designated Rural? Mundham and Sidlesham are designated rural. How is Hunston different?	Change the designation to rural.	Object	Mr Stuart Solliss [5180]
172	Appendix C - Appropriate Marketing	56	The final sentence in E.4 is over restrictive as it requires marketing to end, whereas it should be able to continue. The required discounting of an agricultural property in E.13 is also onerous. The discount is typically in the range of 25 - 33 %. It is NOT at least 30%	Change wording to the following: "If the period of marketing has ended then that end date must be within nine months prior to the date the planning application was submitted." Change wording of discount in E.13 by deleting 'of at least 30%' and inserting 'typically between a quarter and a third'	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
172	Appendix C - Appropriate Marketing	73	Object to E.14 (3) as made clear in Embleton Parish Council v Northumberland CC [2013] there is no requirement in the Framework to show that the business is viable and the Council have not demonstrated unique circumstances in the District to justify a more onerous approach. The requirement on viability should be removed.	remove E.14 (3)	Object	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
172	Appendix C - Appropriate Marketing	1478	The Trust is supportive of this guidance. To enhance it further we recommend an additional requirement that seeks valuation, particularly for community and cultural facilities, to be based on existing use without development potential.		Support	The Theatres Trust (Planning Policy Officer) [1009]
172	Appendix C - Appropriate Marketing	2613	Should only apply for CoU from employment-resi, otherwise too onerous/unrealistic. 2 years marketing extensive, unjustified, causes unnecessary financial burden.	Amend to: 'The site/premises has been actively marketed for business or similar uses at a realistic rent/price for a reasonable period based on the nature and size of the site/premises, the local/use-specific economic market and the current economic climate.'	Comment	Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd [1941]
173	Appendix D - Shopping Frontages					
174	Appendix E - Monitoring Framework	2323	Policy S12 covers the provision of infrastructure but it is not clear how records of completed projects will be collected or stored. Policy S26 covers biodiversity improvements and Natural England should be consulted on priorities and record keeping. Policy S31 covers water consumption which is only available for the whole Company area in the WRMP Annual Review.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
174	Appendix E - Monitoring Framework	2513	Appendix E should include a requirement that the District Council discusses Southern Water's current 5 year investment programme and only allow commencement of development when suitable infrastructure enhancements have taken place.	Appendix E should include a requirement that the District Council discusses Southern Water's current 5 year investment programme and only allow commencement of development when suitable infrastructure enhancements have taken place.	Object	Bosham Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [749]
174	Appendix E - Monitoring Framework	2687	Appendix E and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan incorrectly refer to the land east of Chichester as SA3, this should be corrected to site AL3 accordingly.	Amend reference to SA3 to AL3 as per the main document	Comment	Suez (Sita UK) (Emma Smyth) [11]
174	Appendix E - Monitoring Framework	2720	Appendix E and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan incorrectly refer to the land east of Chichester as SA3, this should be corrected to site AL3 accordingly.	Amend reference to SA3 to AL3 as per the main document	Comment	Obsidian Strategic AC Limited, DC Heaver and Eurekaquity IC Ltd [7312]
174	Appendix E - Monitoring Framework	3195	On the monitoring framework, why is only monitoring travel to work the preferred indicator? Why does it not also consider for leisure/recreation/refreshment? the use of alternative sustainable modes will feed to public health measures.		Comment	Martyn Chuter [7380]

j. Sustainability Appraisal

175	Sustainability Appraisal	64	The difference between Option 1 and 1A is said to be that option 1A reduces the scale of development on Manhood and redistributes it to Southbourne, Hunston and Tangmere. However for some reason Chidham and Hambrook allocation reduces from 600 in Option 1 to 500 in Option 1A and there is no explanation or justification for this reduction. The 600 unit allocation for Hambrook in Option 1 should have been carried forward in Option 1A as it has a railway station and the 700 bus route. Then reduce 200 unit allocation for hunston to 100 as less sustainable		Comment	Mr Stephen Jupp [227]
-----	--------------------------	----	--	--	---------	-----------------------

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
175	Sustainability Appraisal	151	Update AL11 to reflect current reality of village and in the context of new development proposals Despite Hunston being a 'Service' village it has very few services which will avoid travel from new developments		Comment	Mrs Paula Fountain [6667]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	576	This SA appears to me, a general member of the Chichester community, a well researched & thought out document. I support what it represents for the 2035 Local Plan.		Comment	Mr Michael Joyner [5586]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	994	Option 1A preferred due to lack of infrastructure on the Manhood Peninsula. Land grading challenged. Argument for higher density development within settlement boundaries that better meets local needs.		Comment	Mr Keith Martin [4610]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	1437	We welcome the SA and the fact that it has directed the preferred approach towards the lower dwellings per annum, and the spatial strategy focusing on existing settlement hubs.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	1922	The Sustainability Appraisal and Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives are contradictory in respect of Chidham and Hambrook and particularly relating to the natural environment. Refer to Parish Council's response on Policy S26/DM19.		Comment	Mr Andrew Kerry-Bedell [7238]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	2096	Object on grounds that SA is questionable on whether option has positive or negative impacts on ie; biodiversity; disadvantages not mentioned in relation to potential increase in population from allocation of 1250 dwellings in Southbourne; lack of information on railway infrastructure for Southbourne dealing with potential increase in passengers from new developments.	Shares new housing more evenly between settlements to limit obvious damage that is going to be caused to natural habitats by this Local Plan review	Object	Mr John Auric [7266]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	2265	- Allocation for Chidham and Hambrook is not consistent with the sustainability evidence. - Fails to make a proper distribution of housing in the district.		Comment	Mr Stephen Johnson [26]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	2501	Agree with judgements on points 1a, 4b, 5a, 6a, 9, 10a-12b, 13a, 13b but with additions. Believe that C&H is less suitable for large scale housing		Comment	Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council (Mrs Jane Towers) [6650]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	2506	Would appear that allocation of 200 houses conflicts judgements made in SA		Comment	Hunston Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1096]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	2602	Suggest changes to scores (see attachment)		Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	2676	Next iteration of the SA should test strategic levels of growth at North Mundham		Comment	Devonshire Developments Limited [7116]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	2681	The sustainability assessment makes no mention of site AP6 anywhere on the strategic sites list and as such has not been assessed as a strategic site and should be excluded from the plan. See attached for full detail.		Comment	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	3037	SA assessment of impact of 800 dpa is flawed - see attachment.		Comment	Rydon Homes Ltd [1607]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
175	Sustainability Appraisal	3196	Pleased to see that the criteria 6A and 6B are included. Pleased that percentage of residents who travel to work on foot or cycle (indicator 22) is used to inform SA objectives 4 and 6 but why does this not include also for those attending retail/entertainment/refreshment offers?		Comment	Martyn Chuter [7380]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	3328	Object. No comparative assessment of reasonable alternatives to the sites proposed to be allocated in the LPR. The SA has not considered potential for development of additional land that forms part of Westhampnett/NE Chichester SDL		Comment	CEG [7397]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	3554	The allocations AL7 should be split between High Grove and the French Gardens site which has lower transport impact and is equally or more sustainable than the High Grove site. I have included an illustrative plan of how 25 houses would look.	Include an allocation of houses to the French Gardens site as part of the Strategic Parish Allocation.	Object	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]
k. Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map						
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	352	There should be a map of the Tangmere HDA to confirm the boundary and the latest glass house developments.		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	436	Removal of the field from the Strategic Plan is a a very positive move		Support	Mrs Alison Potts [5305]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	861	Additions to Eastern Wildlife corridor to provide sufficient corridor width and inclusion of significant Green Network features to reinforce function of this corridor i.a.w. Policy S30 and its supporting text as well as NPPF para 174.		Support	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	862	Map AL3. Given Springfield Park has been allocated for development in the recently adopted Site Allocations DPD, for similar economic purposes for which the Fuel Depot site immediately to the West has been granted, should this site not also be included in an extension of the Settlement Boundary?		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	1457	The map should be amended to include all of our client's land, as set and and shown, on the attached document.	1. We believe the text of the policy should be amended to have an additional sentence added at the end of the first paragraph to say: "The final quantum of employment space and number of dwellings will be determined by an up-to-date market assessment to determine the viability of the proposals, the need for additional commercial floorspace and the demand for more housing at the time of submission." 2. The plan in the policy map for AL6 should be altered to include all of the land outlined.	Comment	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd. [7061]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	2294	We note that the existing Settlement Boundary passes through our property (White Poplars), leaving part of the land inside and part outside. We feel this to be completely illogical and would request that all of our property is included within the Settlement Boundary. As stated above, we feel the boundary should be moved to include all of our land. Two documents are attached illustrating the situation. One is a Land Registry document, the other is an enlargement of the map used in your consultative document. In each case our boundaries are marked in red.	We feel the boundary should be moved to include all of our land.	Comment	Simon Fletcher [7274]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	2601	Proposed amendments to Tangmere legend and boundary.	<p>The legend provided stating "Existing Strategic Site Allocation" is misleading as it is not identical to that the adopted Policies Map. We recommend that the legend is revised to clarify this, for example, by adding "(including minor boundarychanges)" to the legend.</p> <p>Land west of 'Kimkarlo', Church Lane We note that the small parcel of land to the west of 'Kimkarlo' on Church Lane is proposed to be omitted from the policy boundary of the Tangmere SDL (Policy AL14). Given that this parcel now benefits from a planning permission for the construction of two dwellings, this proposed change is supported.</p> <p>Land north of 24 & 25 Saxon Meadow It is noted that the proposed definition of the policy boundary for Policy AL14 omits a small parcel of land to the north of 24 and 25 Saxon Meadow. This land is included within the current definition of the Tangmere SDL within the adopted Policy Map. Our client can see no reason to omit this land and it is recommended that it is reinstated, consistent with the existing definition of the Tangmere SDL boundary.</p>	Comment	Countryside Properties [7291]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	2680	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SB1 should include an employment space and residential site as an exception site for unmet SDNP housing need. - S16 Goodwood buffer and adjoining land to be made a strategic site for employment space. - S30a & S30b are draft corridors as the biodiversity study is incomplete at consultation and will need to be re-consulted on. - AL1 is incomplete as presented. Settlement boundary should extend to include sites to the north to accommodate unmet need from SDNP. - AL4 the land proposed for removal should not be removed as a strategic employment site. <p>See attached for full detail.</p>		Object	Mr Mike Dicker [6558]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	2688	The proposed amendment to the Settlement Boundary include adjacent sites but not the proposed allocation AL3. Given that the Local Plan Review identifies the site as AL3 as a planned extension to Chichester, the site should be included within the Settlement Boundary.	Amend Settlement Boundary to include Strategic Site AL3.	Comment	Suez (Sita UK) (Emma Smyth) [11]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	2723	The proposed amendment to the Settlement Boundary include adjacent sites but not the proposed allocation AL3. Given that the Local Plan Review identifies the site as AL3 as a planned extension to Chichester, the site should be included within the Settlement Boundary.	Amend Settlement Boundary to include Strategic Site AL3.	Comment	Obsidian Strategic AC Limited, DC Heaver and Eurequity IC Ltd [7312]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	2914	Wildlife Corridors : Maps East and West of City Strategic Wildlife Corridors: while agreeing that it is important to ensure that there are wildlife corridors for any new development, these must be so designed and planned so that all options for improving the development of our City are retained. In particular, that all possible routes for building a better A27 are safeguarded, and that wildlife corridors are not invoked to prevent such a development		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	2915	Map AL4: I can see no justification for removing this very large and suitable area (marked in green) from the Strategic Site Allocation. If the justification is that contained in Policy S16, I have already commented on the flawed assumptions above. Noise from the airfield is regrettably not concentrated just within proximity to the airfield. Every fine day, winter and summer, we on the Manhood peninsula have to suffer aircraft and helicopters from Goodwood conducting low level passages, or noisy and persistent aerobatics, above our houses		Comment	Councillor Christopher Page [7337]

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	2921	Map SB1 - should be redrawn to include West of Chichester allocation as it has permission, and to include suggested sites north of Brandy Hole Lane and west of Plainwood Close	Map SB1 - should be redrawn to include West of Chichester allocation as it has permission, and to include suggested sites north of Brandy Hole Lane and west of Plainwood Close	Object	N/A (Mr D G Phillips) [7340]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	3007	SB1 and AL3 are supported.		Support	Danescroft Land Ltd (Mr Aidan Robson) [7342]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	3266	Exclusion of Vinnetrov Business Park from HDA Policy area is supported.		Support	Kingsbridge Estates Ltd [1705]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	3327	Map S15 Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield - needs amending to remove part of land from site - see attachments	Amend S15.	Object	CEG [7397]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	3379	DM15 - believe that Runcton HDA is too small, inappropriate in configuration and unacceptable for development. See attached plan for details. Remove 2.3 ha of land at Church Field. Where land has been removed, need to extend HDA to replace this.	Amend DM15 map to remove Church Field, but to include Tuppens and Forebridge to replace lost HDA land and extend provision.	Object	Landlink Estates Ltd [1764]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	3405	Plan SB1 shows a proposed settlement boundary amendment for Chichester City. It includes land at the Fuel Depot Bognor Road within the new extended boundary as it is an allocated site for B1, B2 and B8 employment use in the adopted Site Allocations DPD under Policy CC7. Our clients land at the adjacent Springfield Lorry Park is also allocated for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses in the adopted Site Allocations DPD under Policy CC8. However unlike the Fuel Depot site, the Lorry Park is not included within the proposed settlement policy boundary amendment on Plan SB1.	Plan SB1 should be revised to include the allocated Lorry Park site within the proposed settlement policy boundary for Chichester City.	Object	South by East Property Development [1889]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	3406	We object to the inclusion of The Barn Little London within any shopping frontage. It has no direct retail street frontage and its location has low pedestrian flows. Its continued vacancy adds nothing to the vitality or viability of Chichester's retail centre. It is failing to attract both tenants and visitors and is not justified for inclusion in either a secondary or primary retail frontage. Its exclusion would provide more flexibility in securing an alternative commercial reuse and in turn, provide some economic benefit to the centre.	The Barn should be excluded from the proposed primary and secondary shopping frontages on Plan DM11a.	Object	South by East Property Development [1889]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	3520	Plan SB1 Definition of the City Boundary (Plan SB1) should not simply be a red line on a plan, but supported by clear policies and proposals to encourage the boundary to be enhanced and defended.		Comment	HMPC Ltd (Mr Haydn Morris) [112]

I. Habitats Regulation Assessment

177	Habitats Regulation Assessment	2583	NE concurs with the findings of HRA in that the Local Plan Review is likely to have significant effects on European sites through the following pathways for impact: water quality, recreational disturbance, urbanisation, loss of supporting habitat (functionally linked land), coastal squeeze and air quality. Would add that there is potentially a pathway for water resources impacts in the north of the District. We agree that the sites identified in section 4.5 are those at risk of likely significant effects. We also agree that policy mitigation measures are available to address the identified impacts, and that some amendments to policy wording is necessary to be able to conclude no adverse effect on integrity of European sites. We welcome the commitment to further work on air quality impacts.		Comment	Natural England (Mrs Alison Giacomelli) [1178]
-----	--------------------------------	------	--	--	---------	--

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
177	Habitats Regulation Assessment	2869	<p>SWT not confident that the plan is deliverable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no assessment of whether possible to avoid all significant adverse effects given the amount of development proposed in such close proximity to internationally designated sites. Lack of data on Dark-bellied Brent Goose. - Habitat Regulations clear that the precautionary principle should be applied when it comes to likely significant effects and deliverability, SWT concerned about 5YHLS. - Refer to Arun DC application P/140/16/OUT regarding functionally linked supporting habitat. 		Comment	Sussex Wildlife Trust (Ms Jess Price) [977]
177	Habitats Regulation Assessment	3524	Groundwater abstraction in the coastal plain will require an impact assessment under the Habitats Regulations.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]