

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3488	<p>Sewers already inadequate - Southover Way residents often troubled by back-up in their toilets. Fields opposite Spotted Cow flood in winter, High Trees road regularly flooded.</p> <p>New school places for primary children needed now - Mundham school has been full for years and no school in Hunston. Footpaths along Mundham road narrow and dangerous with volume of traffic. No footpath along B2145 between substation and Free School.</p> <p>Skylarks used to be abundant in wheat fields here. All gone now and wheatfields to be built on and green pastures to go as well. Pollution from roads gets worse.</p>	<p>Repair roads. Install more drains. Reduce traffic congestion especially when Free School opening and closing. Provide more parking for staff etc at Free School and more buses for pupils anyway. Stop mineral extraction in area and number of heavy lorries and tractors through village.</p> <p>Better pavements and better lighting. More cycle paths to Chichester, Sidlesham and Selsey. Provision of public toilet in Hunston and cash machine for use when Post Office closed. No cashback available in pub or newsagent.</p> <p>Keep greenfields as they are now. Stop Cardine's Dairy and Church Commission selling them over our head. Foxbridge Farm and village dairy long since gone and we miss them too. We don't want 200 houses. Perhaps 50 on brownfield sites at prices that can be afforded, especially for young and first time buyers.</p>	Comment	Margaret Beazley [7442]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3491	<p>Hunston is low lying and cannot sustain further building without flooding. Even a 30metre margin would affect the air flow in the woods and destroy habitats of Hunston Copse.</p> <p>If CDC can prevent roasting coffee beans for 2 hours a week in St James' Industrial Estate due to pollution surely they cannot condone more traffic pollution.</p> <p>I do not wish to live in an extension to Chichester.</p> <p>The B2145 is over used already and the side road inadequate for the volume of traffic.</p> <p>The peninsula can not take any further traffic.</p>	Put in traffic lights outside the Hunston Village Hall for the crossing to the playing fields. This might help slow the traffic which does not understand 30mph.	Object	Marie Tidswell [7443]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3492	Object to Hunston allocation on following grounds: Pollution levels Speed of traffic and increased accidents Current properties empty Wildlife protection Lack of S106 spend from current developments Canal path unsuitable for travelling to school		Object	Ms Sandra Pascoal-Lima [5413]
94	Policy AL11: Hunston Parish	3500	Object to Hunston allocation on following grounds: Crime Impossible to leave the Manhood Peninsula	Make sure there are enough houses for local young people. Leave Hunston as it is	Object	G K Stubbington [7445]
95	Selsey	547	Where are the new residents going to work!	Where are the new residents going to work!	Object	Mr Graeme Barrett [30]
95	Selsey	1395	B2145 is already too dangerous and would only become more busy and therefore extremely dangerous.	Build proper roads with cycle and foot paths instead of trying to earn more money by contractors and estate agents. Think of our children and elderly!!!!	Object	Miss Debby den Toom [7138]
96	Policy AL12: Land North of Park Farm, Selsey	100	Selsey's inherent fishing and seaside village charm and attraction to tourists has been undermined by excessive suburban development without sufficient facilities and infrastructure spend for four decades. It lies at the southern tip of a peninsula cut de sac with one country B road in and out and not even a cycle path to another settlement. Its winter population is almost half that of Chichester's and its population the rest of the year exceeds Chichester's substantially if the holiday parks are included, yet it has hardly any of the facilities Chichester can boast of.	Recognise Selsey as a potential honeypot tourism destination, improve its environment and infrastructure, especially cycle routes and reduce the bland suburbanisation of this precious seaside asset.	Object	Dr Carolyn Cobbold [6612]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3226	The Pitts Family (one of the landowners of the strategic site) supports the allocation - the site has an independent access with frontage to an adoptable highway and can come forward prior/separately to the allocation. Site is 7.6ha and could accommodate approx. 200 units		Support	J Pitts [6878]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3303	CCE supports the proposed changes to this policy to facilitate the delivery of a residential-led development of at least 1,300 dwellings.		Support	Church Commissioners for England [1858]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3323	Welcome allocation of Tangmere - potential to deliver additional housing (circa 1500) within/adjacent to existing allocation should housing requirement increase.		Comment	Seaward Properties Ltd [7119]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3351	Question deliverability of allocation through NP process given failure to deliver on Tangmere's allocation in the current LP		Object	CEG [7397]
100	Policy AL14: Land West of Tangmere	3550	A Master Plan should already have been developed for Tangmere based on the original housing allocation of 1000 dwellings. The Government now requires all development to produce a net environmental gain and it is hard to see how this can be achieved by increasing housing density by 30%. The Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan clearly sets out the need for a sustainable movement network and green infrastructure. Increasing the housing density will make it difficult to deliver the wishes of the local population and respect the planning process.		Object	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
101	Policy AL15: Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere	349	Has the Tangmere HDA boundary been modified to exclude the Business Park and the 'Apron' site? Why has the access road to the new glasshouse site, to the south west of the HDA, been set back to the south of the apron?		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
101	Policy AL15: Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere	2315	Policy AL15 'Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere' Portsmouth Water have public water supply abstractions in the area and the site allocation is likely to be within a source protection zone for our Aldingbourne public water supply abstraction. As above, where development is in a source protection zone, the policy should also refer to groundwater quality protection and the need for caution when using infiltration systems in particular deep bore systems. Please refer to Portsmouth Water's Groundwater Protection Guidance for further information.		Comment	Portsmouth Water Ltd (Miss Beth Fairley) [7273]
101	Policy AL15: Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere	3184	I believe that high speed broadband should be made a priority for all areas of Chichester District. This is now a normal modern communication expectation.	There are organisations aside from Open Reach who will work with rural communities to develop rural networks and high speed broadband.	Comment	Martyn Chuter [7380]