

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: - 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 communittees 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 is 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	Plaistow 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 (Catherine 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. There are 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. There are 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 if it 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	WSCC (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	<p>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).</p>		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	<p>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.</p>	Remove	Object	Mr Robert Probee [6773]
50	Transport Infrastructure	1680	<p>CDC needs to work with HE for a long term strategy.</p>	<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	<p>CDC needs to work with HE for a long term strategy.</p>	<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 distribution. 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 Birdham Road to A27 Fishbourne.</p> <p>Additional traffic onto a roundabout that's complex to navigate and dangerous already is unacceptable.</p> <p>Issues from the Stockbridge Roundabout will simply be transferred to the fishbourne Roundabout 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.</p> <p>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 accessilbity 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 form 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 NPF 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 Apuldram 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]