

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
g. Development Management						
102	Development Management					
103	Housing	384	7.2, second sentence, add "single-parent families and first-time buyers"		Comment	Mrs Marilyn Hicks [6585]
103	Housing	1763	Mentions "place housing in locations which are accessible by public transport to jobs, shopping, leisure, education and health facilities". CDC should not be accepting the unmet housing needs from within the SDNP but if needed it could be provided to the North of the city in the areas of West Broyle and Lavant to ensure that families are not distanced from their "parent neighbourhood". As a result a strategic site for at least 205 affordable homes should be found in the area to mitigate the unmet needs of the SDNP.	This would also remove the requirement to build on floodplain next to the AONB	Object	Mr Dominic Stratton [7082]
103	Housing	1804	7.7 We support housing for older people but recommend this is in units in villages as well as in cities. Some people wish to stay in their communities.		Support	Harbour Villages Lib Dems Campaign Team (The Organiser) [7118]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
		3267		<p data-bbox="1481 107 1656 134">'Outside HDA's.</p> <p data-bbox="1481 174 2356 264">The Policies Map DM15 requires amending to accommodate the loss of circa 10ha plus the additional circa 20ha for future growth and diversification of the food cluster.</p>		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

h. Glossary

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

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

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

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

j. Sustainability Appraisal

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

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

	Chapter/Policy	ID	Representation Summary	Representation Change to Plan	Type	Respondent
175	Sustainability Appraisal	3196	Pleased to see that the criteria 6A and 6B are included. Pleased that percentage of residents who travel to work on foot or cycle (indicator 22) is used to inform SA objectives 4 and 6 but why does this not include also for those attending retail/entertainment/refreshment offers?		Comment	Martyn Chuter [7380]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	3328	Object. No comparative assessment of reasonable alternatives to the sites proposed to be allocated in the LPR. The SA has not considered potential for development of additional land that forms part of Westhampnett/NE Chichester SDL		Comment	CEG [7397]
175	Sustainability Appraisal	3554	The allocations AL7 should be split between High Grove and the French Gardens site which has lower transport impact and is equally or more sustainable than the High Grove site. I have included an illustrative plan of how 25 houses would look.	Include an allocation of houses to the French Gardens site as part of the Strategic Parish Allocation.	Object	Mr Thomas Procter [6329]

k. Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map

176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	352	There should be a map of the Tangmere HDA to confirm the boundary and the latest glass house developments.		Comment	Mr Paul Sansby [6764]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	436	Removal of the field from the Strategic Plan is a a very positive move		Support	Mrs Alison Potts [5305]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	861	Additions to Eastern Wildlife corridor to provide sufficient corridor width and inclusion of significant Green Network features to reinforce function of this corridor i.a.w. Policy S30 and its supporting text as well as NPPF para 174.		Support	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	862	Map AL3. Given Springfield Park has been allocated for development in the recently adopted Site Allocations DPD, for similar economic purposes for which the Fuel Depot site immediately to the West has been granted, should this site not also be included in an extension of the Settlement Boundary?		Comment	Councillor Simon Oakley [4593]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	1457	The map should be amended to include all of our client's land, as set and and shown, on the attached document.	1. We believe the text of the policy should be amended to have an additional sentence added at the end of the first paragraph to say: "The final quantum of employment space and number of dwellings will be determined by an up-to-date market assessment to determine the viability of the proposals, the need for additional commercial floorspace and the demand for more housing at the time of submission." 2. The plan in the policy map for AL6 should be altered to include all of the land outlined.	Comment	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd. [7061]
176	Schedule of proposed changes to the policies map	2294	We note that the existing Settlement Boundary passes through our property (White Poplars), leaving part of the land inside and part outside. We feel this to be completely illogical and would request that all of our property is included within the Settlement Boundary. As stated above, we feel the boundary should be moved to include all of our land. Two documents are attached illustrating the situation. One is a Land Registry document, the other is an enlargement of the map used in your consultative document. In each case our boundaries are marked in red.	We feel the boundary should be moved to include all of our land.	Comment	Simon Fletcher [7274]

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

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

I. Habitats Regulation Assessment

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

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