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# Introduction and Summary

* 1. This Statement of Consultation explains how Chichester District Council has undertaken consultation and stakeholder involvement to produce the Local Plan 2021 - 2039. It explains how on-going consultation and engagement has shaped the Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan. This statement is a legal requirement prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Regulations require that the documents published for consultation on a local plan should include a statement setting out:
* which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under Regulation 18 (1);
* how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under Regulation 18;
* a summary of the main issues raised by representations made pursuant to Regulation 18; and
* how any representations made pursuant to Regulation 18 have been taken into account
  1. This Statement explains how consultation has been carried out over the various stages of preparation of the local plan as it has evolved. It includes an explanation of how the Council has come to prepare a local plan with associated development plan documents (DPDs) as this aids understanding of the consultation that has been undertaken. It explains the consultation that has been undertaken at each stage of the plan’s evolution, including the methods used, the people involved, the outcome of the consultation and how this has influenced the local plan.

**Local Plan 2021 - 2039[[1]](#footnote-1)**

* 1. In July 2015, the Council adopted the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 which provided new planning policies and a strategy to deliver nearly 7,400 new homes and 25 hectares of employment land. However, due to uncertainty about delivery of future infrastructure the Plan was not able to meet the full identified housing need for the area. To address this, the Council committed to undertake a Local Plan review within five years with the aim of identifying further sites to meet the unmet housing need. In addition to providing further housing, the Local Plan 2021 - 2039 considered other development needs and where necessary updated adopted planning policies.

**Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**

* 1. The Council has undertaken consultation and engagement in accordance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The most recent version was published in January 2024. As the document was produced in accordance with the statutory procedures required, including an explanation of consultation undertaken, it is not considered necessary to repeat those in this Statement.
  2. The SCI outlines who should be consulted at each stage of the Plan’s production and the types of methods which could be used for effective involvement and can be viewed at: <https://www.chichester.gov.uk/article/35376/The-Local-Plan---evidence>

**Hard to reach groups**

* 1. The Council is committed to engaging with hard to reach groups. Officers from the Council have attended workshops and public meetings. In addition to the workshops, a series of promotional events, using an un-staffed exhibition, have taken place in schools, colleges and the university, in order to target the hard-to-reach group of young people. Officers also attended a variety of community events to promote the Local Plan.
  2. Promotion of the Local Plan consultation has also been undertaken through the medium of posters, postcards, leaflets, social media, and videos placed on the website.
  3. More detail on how each consultation stage was undertaken is given under each section later in the document.
  4. In 2018 and 2022 the Council published a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). This work was undertaken by Opinion Research Services and Peter Brett Associates on behalf of the local authorities across Coastal West Sussex, the South Downs National Park Authority and West Sussex County Council. Along with Stakeholder workshops held with planners, officers from local authorities and representatives from the Travelling community to discuss appropriate assessment of need, interviews were completed with stakeholders and households within the Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople community to assess both current and future accommodation needs.

**Consultation database**

* 1. At the start of the previous Local Plan (2014-2029) consultation, the Planning Policy team compiled a database including the following bodies:

**Specific Consultation Bodies** (those we have to consult to meet the statutory requirements) such as adjoining councils and agencies such as the Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England and utility providers. Please refer to the appendices for more detail.

**General Consultation Bodies** which are voluntary bodies, bodies representing the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups, bodies representing the interests of different religious groups, bodies that represent the interests of disabled persons and local business groups. In addition to the general consultation bodies, that database includes hard to reach groups and those who have expressed a desire to be involved such as agents, developers and landowners, national groups and members of the public.

* 1. The list has been kept up to date for use during iterations of the Local Plan 2021-2039 and has been added to as the plan process advances.

**Duty to Cooperate**

* 1. The Local Plan 2021 – 2039 has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, which sets a legal duty for the council and other public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis on planning issues which affect more than one local planning authority

**Overview of the consultation undertaken**

* 1. There have been a number of consultation documents produced in order to establish key issues, consider strategic options, prepare alternative strategies, update adopted policies and determine new key policies. Consultation and engagement has taken place as outlined below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Consultation on Issues and Options document | 22nd June 2017 – 3rd August 2017 |
| Consultation on Preferred Approach DPD (Reg 18) | 13th December 2018 – 7th February 2019 |
| Consultation on Statutory Public Consultation DPD (Pre-Submission) (Reg 19) | 3rd February 2023 – 17th March 2023 |

* 1. It is important to emphasise that consultation was not restricted to the periods outlined above; it has been on-going since 2017. During and between the consultation periods the council has undertaken consultation with town and parish councils, residents’ associations, along with other stakeholders including developers, landowners and infrastructure providers.

# Issues and Options

22 June to 3 August 2017

**Brief introduction to the consultation**

* 1. The purpose of the Issues and Options Consultation was to seek comments and information to help shape the Local Plan Review and produce a draft Preferred Approach Local Plan Review document.

The document included sections on:

* a vision for how the District should evolve over the plan period;
* proposed housing distribution for the three sub-areas identified in the adopted plan;
* strategic and non-strategic housing development options for settlements;
* employment land allocations; and
* transport and access strategy.
  1. The consultation documents consisted of three components:
* **A Local Plan Review: Issues and Options consultation document**. This document set out the need for review of the adopted plan, overall strategy, area based strategic policies and strategic delivery policies for the Local Plan area. The introduction to the document explained what the consultation was about, how to get involved and what happens next.
* **An Initial Sustainability Appraisal.** This document included an assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of options for policies considered against the sustainability objectives. The report sets out the information that fed into the Council’s decision making process.
* **An Initial Habitats Regulations Assessment**. The objective of the assessment was to identify any aspects of the Local Plan that would cause and adverse effect on the integrity of European sites, either in isolation or in combination with other plans and projects, and to advise on appropriate policy mechanisms for delivering mitigation where such effects were identified.
  1. The above documents can be viewed at: <http://www.chichester.gov.uk/article/30930/Issues-and-Options---consultation-June-2017>

**Methods of consultation**

* 1. A press release was sent to all newspapers within the District. An advert was placed in the Chichester Observer and the consultation was publicised on the homepage of the Chichester District Council website. A letter and/or email were sent out to everyone on the consultation database.
  2. The consultation document and response form were available on the council's website, and consultation responses were invited via the online consultation portal, via email or in writing.
  3. The documents were made available at the council's usual deposit points:

Chichester District Council offices, Midhurst Area Office and Selsey Area Office (including computers for public internet access) Public libraries: Chichester, Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey, Southbourne, Witterings and mobile libraries.

**A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation**

* 1. A total of 2,389 responses were received from 269 consultees, with the highest frequency of comments related to the strategic development locations as seen in the consultation for the adopted Local Plan.
  2. The following summary sets out some of the matters raised by respondents:

Sites Promoted

* 30 sites promoted – mix of new and previously known.
* Range in capacity from 22 to 2000 dwellings.

Strategic Development Locations

* Oving/Tangmere should not take more development.
* Main preferences for strategic development at Southbourne, Hambrook/ Nutbourne, SE of Chichester and E of Chichester/Shopwyke area.
* Other suggested locations: West of Chichester SDL, Chichester city (including car parks), East of Chichester, South Downs National Park, North of Plan area, Goodwood and Boxgrove.

Non-strategic Development Locations

* Preference for 250-500 dwellings at Chichester city, SE of Chichester, Southern Gateway area, Tangmere (within and outside of SDL).
* Suggest that Bosham, Boxgrove, Oving and West Wittering should not accommodate much development.

General themes

* Infrastructure is critical and should be provided before housing.
* Decisions on A27 are required before housing can be allocated and OAN is established.
* North of plan area should take fair share of housing.
* Development should be located near key transport links.
* Bosham and Broadbridge should continue to be treated as one service village.
* Focus should be on maximising the use of brownfield land.
* Developers/agents would like to see an allocation of strategic and non-strategic sites to ensure delivery and no slippage, whilst majority of residents/parish councils would prefer sites to be allocated through neighbourhood plans.

**Next steps – developing a preferred approach**

* 1. As a result of the call for sites during 2017, a Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment was completed to update previous SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) work and review availability of sites for allocation and whether these sites were deliverable. These assessments were made available for review by Councillors ahead of publication on the council website in September 2018.
  2. Responses from this consultation were used to inform draft strategic policies and land allocations in the Preferred Approach Plan.
  3. Following this consultation, the Planning Policy team acknowledged concerns from members of the public over the ease of use of consultation software and other options were reviewed prior to the next consultation. Parish Councillors from areas voicing the most concern were invited to attend demonstration meetings prior to a decision on a replacement being made.
  4. Between June–August 2018 meetings were held with individual parish councils to discuss completed evidence base studies and the resulting proposed strategic site allocations and parish housing numbers for the plan period. Parish Councillors were asked to consider whether the preference would be to address housing numbers through the development of a neighbourhood plan, or through CDC site allocations.

# Preferred Approach

13th December 2018 to 7th February 2019

**Brief introduction to the consultation**

* 1. The purpose of the Preferred Approach consultation was to seek the views on the council’s proposals for strategic development locations for new homes, a set of area-based strategic policies and the detailed strategic delivery policies designed to provide the policy framework for the emerging draft Local Plan Review. The document included sections on:
* the overall strategy;
* an overarching vision and strategic objectives for how the District should evolve over the plan period;
* a set of visions for the three sub-areas identified in the strategy in relation to the housing requirement for the plan period;
* proposed locations for housing; a settlement hierarchy and development strategy; area-based strategic policies and strategic delivery policies.

**Who was invited to make representations?**

* 1. All consultees registered on the Planning Policy database were consulted. This included all statutory consultees, agents, developers and interest groups.
  2. Please refer to Appendix D for a full list of statutory consultees who provided a response to this consultation.

**How were they invited to make representations?**

**Consultation documents**

* 1. The consultation documents consisted of three components:

**A key policies consultation document: Draft Local Plan Review 2016-2035 Preferred Approach:** This document set out the overall strategy, area based strategic policies and strategic delivery policies for the Local Plan area. The introduction to the document explained what the consultation was about, how to get involved and what happens next.

**A Schedule of proposed changes to the Policies Map: Preferred Approach:** This document set out proposed changes to the adopted Policies Map, including changes to settlement boundaries and proposed strategic site allocations.

**An Initial Sustainability Appraisal:**This document included an assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of options for policies considered against the sustainability objectives. The report sets out the information that fed into the Council’s decision making process.

* 1. The above documents can be viewed at: [Preferred approach - consultation December 2018 - Chichester District Council](https://www.chichester.gov.uk/article/30923/Preferred-Approach---consultation-December-2018).

**Methods of consultation**

* 1. A press release was sent to all newspapers within the District. An advert was placed in the Chichester Observer and the consultation was publicised on the homepage of the Chichester District Council website. An email was sent out to all consultees prior to the consultation, with a letter posted to those without email addresses.
  2. The Preferred Approach consultation document and response form were available on the Council's website, and consultation responses were invited via the online consultation portal, via email or in writing.
  3. The documents were made available at the council's usual deposit points:

Chichester District Council offices and South Downs (Midhurst) Council Offices (including computers for public internet access) Public libraries: Chichester, Selsey, Southbourne.

* 1. The consultation was publicised in Initiatives and via the council’s Facebook and Twitter accounts.
  2. Publicity materials including posters, leaflets and postcards were distributed to Members, parish councils and a variety of locations around the District.Freestanding banners were displayed in the reception at East Pallant House, for the duration of the consultation.
  3. Parish councils were invited to meetings with Officers at East Pallant House to discuss the policies most relevant to their Parish, including housing numbers and site allocations.
  4. The Planning Policy Manager attended Local Community Forums to talk in detail about the Local Plan Review and answer questions.
  5. The Planning Policy team held 10 public exhibitions around the District, where Officers were able to provide information about the Local Plan Review and answer questions from the public. A total of over 800 people attended these events.

**A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation**

* 1. A total of 3208 responses were received from 729 consultees. The range of comments covered most aspects of the Plan,with the highest frequency relating to parish housing requirements, strategic development locations and transport and accessibility.
  2. The following summary sets out the Policies with the highest number of representations and some of the main matters raised by respondents:

Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035

* Policy should include all strategic allocations so that if the allocated site does not come forward, other sites can be permitted to deliver the number required.
* Total policy figures:
  + Should be higher as land is available
  + Should be higher as there is an over reliance on strategic sites
  + Any allocation over 100 should be strategic.
* Objections to individual housing figures:
  + Figures should be lower - due to lack of infrastructure, loss of character, lack of demand
  + Figures should be higher – parish more sustainable than another, no evidence for those with a 0 figure, site submissions included.
* Neighbourhood Plans
  + Too much emphasis on delivery through neighbourhood plans
  + Insufficient time allocated to take neighbourhood plans to examination
  + Support as an approach to deliver small sites.

Policy S23: Transport and Accessibility

* Concerns over funding.
* Objections to proposed Stockbridge Link Road.
* A27 improvements:
  + General objection to junction improvements
  + Objections to hamburger roundabouts
  + Objections to no-right turns
  + Opposition to the closure of link to Terminus Road
  + Reference to previous northern route of A27 proposal - both support and objection.
* Policy should seek to improve pedestrian and cycle routes.
* Concerns of impact on wildlife habitats, landscape, noise pollution, air quality.
* More should be done to improve public transport links and promote electric cars to support climate change targets.

Policy AL6: Land South-West of Chichester (Apuldram and Donnington Parishes)

* Concerns of insufficient evidence to demonstrate suitability/deliverability in light of known constraints. Need for further testing.
* Objections on grounds of impact on environment and designated sites.
* Objections on grounds of impact on infrastructure:
  + Impact of link road
  + Need for better public transport/walking/cycling links to city centre and links to Salterns Way
  + Need for more GP spaces, schools.
* Objection on grounds of conflict with other policies within the plan.

Policy AL11: Hunston Parish

* Objections to housing number:
  + Insufficient evidence to support number
  + Numbers should be delivered in North Mundham
  + Alternative smaller sites should be found
  + Additional sites submitted.
* Site should have appropriate housing mix – starter homes, homes for the elderly.
* Objections on grounds of impact on wildlife habitats, character of the village, coalescence and landscape.
* Objections on grounds of impact on infrastructure:
  + Impact of congestion on B2145
  + Need for better public transport/walking/cycling links to Chichester, Sidlesham and Selsey
  + Need for more GP spaces, schools.

Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs

* Objection to number of houses proposed:
  + Plan should deliver higher number:
* Objection to calculation of housing need
* Increase from adopted figure should not be capped
* Plan should include unmet need from neighbourhood authorities
  + Plan should deliver lower number:
* Should be based on 2016 ONS projections
* Insufficient infrastructure
* Should not deliver SDNP unmet need.
* Concerns of insufficient evidence to demonstrate suitability/deliverability in light of known constraints in Plan Area. Need for further testing.
* Objections to distribution of housing numbers across the 3 plan areas.
  1. Representations made during the consultation were published online on 14August 2019, with a paper copy of all representations made available at East Pallant House on this date.
  2. Summaries of the Council’s initial responses to the representations made were published online on 17 March 2021, with a paper copy of these documents made available at East Pallant House on this date.

**Next steps – developing the Proposed Submission**

* 1. In March 2021 the Local Development Scheme was updated with a report to Councillors setting out the reasons for the need to amend the timetable. This included the need for more detailed feasibility work on the Transport Study, and need for work to progress on a Statement of Common Ground with Southern Water.
  2. A ‘Local Plan and Strategic Infrastructure Update’ was considered by Councillors in July 2021. This set out the findings of the further transport work and wastewater discussions. It concluded that the Stockbridge Link Road was not fundable or deliverable through the Local Plan process and should not be proceeded with unless or until there is a significant change in circumstances. Therefore, an alternative ‘infrastructure constrained’ approach to development was proposed as the way forward. Council agreed that: the full package of A27 mitigation measures would not be progressed (in the absence of significant external funding); that the Local Plan was unable to meet full housing needs; and that the strategy should focus on delivering as much development as possible based on the capacity of the plan area to accommodate development within an affordable and deliverable package of transport mitigation taking into account all sources of available funding.
  3. The council had an advisory visit from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in July 2021. Advice from this visit was considered by Councillors in July 2021.
  4. Councillors were invited to a workshop in January 2022 at which an approach to testing a distribution based on 535 dwellings per annum in the south of the plan area (9,630 over the plan period) was informally agreed. Following this, further transport evidence work has been undertaken, along with continuing discussions on the emerging approach with National Highways and West Sussex County Council as Local Highway Authority. This work has informed the proposed approach to transport set out in the publication version of the Local Plan.
  5. Discussions with Southern Water on wastewater infrastructure have also continued, with a [Statement of Common Ground on wastewater](https://www.chichester.gov.uk/dutytocooperate) being agreed between the council, Southern Water and Environment Agency in November 2021.
  6. Throughout the process, affected parish councils have been kept informed both by email/letter and through meetings with officers where proposals may have an impact on work on developing neighbourhood plans.

**Main changes since the Preferred Approach**

* 1. Responses from the Preferred Approach consultation and further evidence work were used to inform the policies and land allocations in the Proposed Submission Plan.
  2. The proposed submission Local Plan has been restructured by topic, so strategic and development management policies can be read together, rather than in two different sections of the Plan.

Changes to Allocations Policies:

* Strategic development allocations have been amended.
* AL6 Land to the South West of Chichester and AL12 Land North of Park Farm, Selsey have been removed from the Plan.
* A10 Land at Maudlin Farm has been included.
* Parish housing numbers have been amended.
* East Wittering and Hunston Parishes no longer have a housing figure.
* Non-strategic parish numbers have been amended.
* Birdham and West Wittering no longer have a housing figure.
* AL6 Land South West of Chichester has been removed, and replaced by A20 Land South of Bognor Road as the employment allocation.

# Strategic Wildlife Corridors Consultation

Between 30 July and 10 September 2021

**Brief introduction to the consultation**

* 1. The Chichester Local Plan Review Preferred Approach introduced proposals for strategic wildlife corridors to ensure the connectivity of habitats between and within the South Downs National Park and Chichester and Pagham Harbours.
  2. The Preferred Approach proposed a strategic policy for the corridors, in addition to identifying the boundaries for six corridors across the East-West corridor. Four of these corridors were proposed to the west of the city: Hermitage to Westbourne, Chidham to East Nutbourne, Broadbridge to East Ashling, and Fishbourne to West of Chichester; and two corridors to the east of the city: Westhampnett to Pagham Harbour and Aldingbourne and Elbridge Rife to Pagham Harbour.
  3. During the Regulation 18 consultation on the Preferred Approach, further evidence was submitted to the council in respect of the proposed locations of the corridors. As a result of this further evidence, and further survey work that was undertaken in Summer 2019, three amendments were proposed to the Strategic Wildlife Corridors as follows:

1. Proposed inclusion of the Nutbourne to Hambrook Strategic Wildlife Corridor
2. Proposed amendment to the route of the Pagham Harbour to Westhampnett Strategic Wildlife Corridor
3. Proposed amendment to the route of the Aldingbourne and Elbridge Rifes Strategic Wildlife Corridor.
   1. The council undertook a Technical Consultation on these proposed amendments for a six week period from 30 July 2021 until 10 September 2021.

**Who was invited to make representations?**

* 1. The consultation documents, which included a document setting out the proposed changes and the justification, and background studies to support the proposals, were published on the council’s dedicated webpage[[2]](#footnote-2) and the consultation portal[[3]](#footnote-3). The consultation was technical in its nature, so targeted at wildlife groups, relevant statutory organisations (including the South Downs National Park Authority, Natural England and the Environment Agency), parish councils affected by the proposed changes, landowners with affected sites in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, and organisations who submitted representations on the Strategic Wildlife Corridors policy during the consultation on the Preferred Approach.
  2. The purpose of the consultation was to invite individuals and groups to review the available public evidence supporting the proposed changes, and for individuals and groups to provide any further technical evidence that may support the proposed changes, in order to determine whether the proposed amendments should be progressed into the next iteration of the Local Plan Review.

**A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation**

* 1. A total of 38 responses were received to the Technical Consultation, including representations from the Environment Agency, South Downs National Park Authority, Chichester Harbour Conservancy, Sussex Bat Group, Sussex Ornithological Society, Sussex Wildlife Trust, a number of developers, parish councils, and other interested parties. A summary of the representations received is set out in Appendix C.

**Next Steps – developing the Proposed Submission Policy**

* 1. The representations received to the Technical Consultation helped inform the Policy NE4 Strategic Wildlife Corridors in the Local Plan Proposed Submission. A summary of the response to the amendments and the way forward for the Policy is as follows:

*Proposed inclusion of the Nutbourne to Hambrook Strategic Wildlife Corridor*

* 1. There was strong support for the inclusion of the Nutbourne to Hambrook Strategic Wildlife Corridor, including from Southbourne and Chidham and Hambrook Parish Councils. No evidence was submitted to the council as part of the consultation which questioned the inclusion of this corridor and therefore it is taken forward into the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

*Proposed amendment to the route of the P**agham Harbour to Westhampnett Strategic Wildlife Corridor*

* 1. A mix of responses were received to the proposed amendment to the route of this corridor. Comments were received questioning the age and quality of evidence, and alternative evidence was submitted on behalf of those promoting the site for development. Others provided further information regarding the assets and species present. Following the responses and evidence received, a revised boundary has been prepared which excludes part of the wooded area included within the site identified for development under Policy A8 Land East of Chichester in the Proposed Submission, which is focused upon maintaining a North-South link.

*Proposed amendment to the route of the Aldingbourne and Elbridge Rifes Strategic Wildlife Corridor*

* 1. The proposed amendments to the route of this corridor were supported, with some suggestions for boosting the integrity and function of the corridor through tree planting and habitat creation initiatives. No evidence was submitted to the council as part of the consultation which questioned the proposed amendment to this route and therefore it is taken forward into the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

# Proposed Submission – Regulation 19

3 February 2023 to 17 March 2023

**Brief introduction to the consultation**

* 1. Following the Regulation 18 Preferred Approach consultation that took place between 13th December 2018 – 7th February 2019, the responses received and further technical work were considered to aid the preparation of a Proposed Submission Local Plan. The Plan was published prior to its submission to the Secretary of State to allow for representations to be made on its soundness and legal compliance.

**Who was invited to make representations?**

* 1. All consultees registered on the Planning Policy database were consulted. This included all statutory consultees, agents, developers and interest groups.

**How were they invited to make representations?**

**Consultation documents**

* 1. The consultation documents consisted of 4 components:

**A policies consultation document: Local Plan Proposed Submission 2021 - 2039:** This is the document that the council intends to formally submit to the Secretary of State for independent examination. This document sets out the overall strategy, area based strategic policies and strategic delivery policies for the Local Plan area. The introduction to the document explains what the consultation was about, how to get involved and what happens next.

**A Schedule of proposed changes to the Policies Map:** This document sets out proposed changes to the adopted Policies Map, including changes to settlement boundaries and proposed strategic site allocations.

**A Sustainability Appraisal:**This document includes an assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of options for policies considered against the sustainability objectives. The report sets out the information that fed into the council’s decision making process.

**Habitats Regulations Assessment:** The objective of the assessment is to identify any aspects of the Local Plan that would cause an adverse effect on the integrity of European sites, either in isolation or in combination with other plans and projects, and to advise on appropriate policy mechanisms for delivering mitigation where such effects were identified.

* 1. A **Statement of Representation Procedure**, which sets out details of the representation period, where documents can be obtained and how representations can be made is available on the council's Local Plan website and was sent to all consultees via email or post at the start of the representation period.
  2. An **Equalities Impact Assessment,** which includes an assessment of the policies within the consultation document to ensure they do not discriminate against any particular people or groups is available on the council’s Local Plan website. It addresses issues relating to particular groups of people and how any negative impacts of the Local Plan would be mitigated.
  3. The representation form and Guidance Notes for the representation form are also available on the council's Local Plan website, were sent out to consultees via email, and were available in hard copy at the deposit points. The guidance notes provide more information on legal compliance and soundness, as well as more general advice, in order to aid consultees in making representations.
  4. The above documents can all be viewed at: [www.chichester.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.chichester.gov.uk/localplan).

**Methods of consultation**

* 1. An advert was placed in the Chichester Observer and the consultation was publicised on the homepage of the Chichester District Council website. An email was sent out to all consultees prior to the consultation, with a letter posted to those without email addresses.
  2. The Proposed Submission consultation document and response form were available on the council's website, and consultation responses were invited via the online consultation portal, via email or in writing.
  3. The documents were made available at the council's usual deposit points:

Chichester District Council offices and South Downs (Midhurst) Council Offices (including computers for public internet access) Public libraries: Chichester, Selsey, Southbourne, Petworth and Midhurst.

* 1. The consultation was publicised via the council’s Facebook, Twitter and Instagram accounts.
  2. Posters were distributed to Members, parish councils and a variety of locations around the District.Freestanding banners were displayed in the reception at East Pallant House for the duration of the consultation.
  3. Parish Councils were invited to an ‘all parishes’ meeting with officers at the start of the consultation period to listen to a briefing on the Plan and have the opportunity to ask questions.

**A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation**

* 1. Appendix E provides a summary of the responses received on the Chichester Local Plan Proposed Submission Policies (Regulation 19) as required by Regulation 22 (c) (v) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). A total of 2405 representations were received. Representations made against supporting text have been incorporated into each policy commentary.
  2. Full details of the council’s proposed modifications, including factual updates and clarifications which are not in response to representations, are set out in the ‘Council’s suggested modifications schedule’ and accompanying appendices. Further detail on the justification and evidence behind the council’s approach is set out in a suite of Background Papers on key issues. The Foreword to the Plan will be updated for the final version.

# Appendix A: Issues and Options Consultation

Table Summary of Responses

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Representations | Yes | No |
| 1 | 79 |  |  |
| 2 | 52 | 49 | 3 |
| 3 | 43 |  |  |
| 4 | 61 | 20 |  |
| 5 | 62 | 51 |  |
| 6 | 80 | 51 |  |
| 7 | 39 | 29 |  |
| 8 | 58 | 42 |  |
| 9 | 73 |  |  |
| 10 | 50 |  |  |
| 11 | 227 |  |  |
| 12 | 87 | 28 |  |
| 13 | 74 |  |  |
| 14 | 61 |  |  |
| 15 | 52 | 11 |  |
| 16 | 68 |  |  |
| 17 | 58 | 47 |  |
| 18 | 44 | 25 |  |
| 19 | 21 |  |  |
| 20 | 29 | 5 |  |
| 21 | 22 |  | 11 |
| 22 | 23 |  |  |
| 23 | 18 | 2 |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Representations | Yes | No |
| 24 | 26 | 11 |  |
| 25 | 33 |  |  |
| 26 | 71 | 56 |  |
| 27 | 44 | 26 |  |
| 28 | 42 |  |  |
| 29 | 30 | 10 |  |
| 30 | 32 |  |  |
| 31 | 23 |  |  |
| 32 | 60 | 39 |  |
| 33 | 40 | 18 |  |
| 34 | 27 |  |  |
| 35 | 67 | 55 |  |
| 36 | 42 | 27 |  |
| 37 | 35 |  |  |
| 38 | 43 | 32 |  |
| 39 | 36 | 30 |  |
| 40 | 33 | 18 |  |
| 41 | 18 |  |  |
| 42 | 65 | 42 |  |
| 43 | 38 | 20 |  |
| 44 | 35 |  |  |
| 45 | 29 sites promoted |  |  |

Representation summary reports:

<https://www.chichester.gov.uk/media/29243/Results-of-Consultation--Main-Issues-raised-Questions-1-to-10/pdf/LPR_Issues_Options_Summary_Q1_to_Q10.pdf>

<https://www.chichester.gov.uk/media/29244/Results-of-Consultation--Main-Issues-raised-Questions-11-to-20/pdf/LPR_Issues_Options_Summary_Q11_to_Q20.pdf>

<https://www.chichester.gov.uk/media/29245/Results-of-Consultation--Main-Issues-raised-Questions-21-to-30/pdf/LPR_Issues_Options_Summary_Q21_to_Q30.pdf>

<https://www.chichester.gov.uk/media/29246/Results-of-Consultation--Main-Issues-raised-Questions-31-to-40/pdf/LPR_Issues_Options_Summary_Q31_to_Q40.pdf>

<https://www.chichester.gov.uk/media/29247/Results-of-Consultation--Main-Issues-raised-Questions-41-to-45/pdf/LPR_Issues_Options_Summary_Q41_to_Q45.pdf>

# Appendix B: Preferred Approach Consultation

Table Summary of Responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Representations | Support | Object | Comment |
| Part One (strategic policies and allocations) | 2742 | 389 | 1444 | 909 |
| Part Two (development management policies) | 401 | 92 | 136 | 173 |
| Appendices to document | 25 | 1 | 12 | 12 |
| Sustainability Appraisal | 17 | 0 | 2 | 15 |
| Policies Map | 20 | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| Habitats Regulations Assessment | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

Representation Summary Reports:

<https://www.chichester.gov.uk/media/34902/Part-1-Responses/doc/Part_1_Responses_for_website.docx>

<https://www.chichester.gov.uk/media/34903/Part-2-Responses/doc/Part_2_Responses_for_website.docx>

# Appendix C: Strategic Wildlife Corridors

Table Summary of Responses

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Representations | Support | Object | Comment |
| Technical Consultation Document | 30 | 15 | 3 | 12 |
| Map 1 Proposed Nutbourne to Hambrook Corridor | 8 | 7 | 0 | 1 |

Representation Summary Report:

<https://www.chichester.gov.uk/media/37892/Strategic-Wildlife-Consultation-Responses-Summary/pdf/Strategic_Wildlife_Consultation_Responses_Summary.pdf>

# Appendix D: Statutory Consultees

Issues and Options Consultation

Responses were received from the following Statutory Consultees:

|  |
| --- |
| **Statutory Consultee** |
| Thames Water Utilities Ltd |
| Savills obo Thames Water |
| West Sussex County Council |
| Education and Skills Agency |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust |
| Sport England |
| Southern Water |
| Historic England |
| Natural England |
| Highways England |
| Environment Agency |
| Havant Borough Council |

Responses were received from the following Parish Councils:

|  |
| --- |
| **Parish** |
| Chichester City Council |
| Westbourne Parish Council |
| Earnley Parish Council |
| Southbourne Parish Council |
| West Wittering Parish Council |
| Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council |
| Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council |
| Fishbourne Parish Council |
| Oving Parish Council |
| Bosham Parish Council |
| East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council |

Preferred Approach

Responses were received from the following Statutory Consultees:

|  |
| --- |
| **Statutory Consultee** |
| Adur & Worthing Councils |
| Arun District Council |
| Chichester Harbour Conservancy |
| East Hampshire District Council |
| Environment Agency |
| Highways England |
| Historic England |
| Homes England |
| Horsham District Council |
| Marine Management Organisation |
| Natural England |
| Portsmouth Water Ltd |
| South Downs National Park Authority |
| Southern Water |
| Sport England |
| Waverley Borough Council |
| West Sussex County Council |

Responses were received from the following Parish Councils:

|  |
| --- |
| **Parish** |
| Bosham Parish Council |
| Boxgrove Parish Council |
| Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council |
| Donnington Parish Council |
| Earnley Parish Council |
| East Wittering & Bracklesham Parish Council |
| Fishbourne Parish Council |
| Oving Parish Council |
| Pagham Parish Council |
| Plaistow And Ifold Parish Council |
| Southbourne Parish Council |
| West Wittering Parish Council |
| Westbourne Parish Council |

# Appendix E: Chichester Local Plan Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) - Summary of responses received

This Appendix provides a summary of the responses received on the Chichester Local Plan Proposed Submission Policies (Regulation 19) as required by Regulation 22 (c) (v) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). Representations made against supporting text have been incorporated in the relevant policy commentary. New text is shown in **bold and underlined.** Deleted text is shown as **~~struck through~~**.

# [Chapter 1: Introduction](#_Toc125988796)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **79** | **Support:** | **59** | **Object:** | **20** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Some respondents made general comments, expressed concern about particular aspects of the Local Plan or summarised their more detailed objections to other sections of the Local Plan.
* Several respondents (including Manhood Peninsula Action Group, Boxgrove Parish Council) referred to changes in the Plan strategy, Government commitments and environmental issues since the Preferred Approach Local Plan consultation and that there should have been a further round of Regulation 18 consultation before the Regulation 19 stage or that progress on the Local Plan should be delayed pending the outcome of the Government consultation on changes to the NPPF.
* Several respondents, mainly those promoting development sites, stated that the Local Plan should be meeting the identified housing need for the Plan Area in full in addition to unmet needs of neighbouring authorities. The respondents argued that insufficient justification either through the evidence base or Statements of Common Ground had been put forward not to do so.
* A site promoter questioned whether by the time of adoption, the Plan period would cover the minimum 15 years as required by the NPPF for strategic policies.
* Several respondents suggested that the Local Plan should do more in respect of climate change.
* Some respondents felt that the Local Plan should not override made Neighbourhood Plans.

The council is satisfied that this section of the Plan is sound and no modifications are proposed other than factual updates and matters of clarification. In response to the comments on climate change, as this is a cross-cutting issue, a Climate Change Background Paper has been prepared to set out how the Local Plan addresses the issue.

# [Chapter 2: Vision and Strategic Objectives](#_Toc125988801)

[**Characteristics of the Plan Area – A Spatial Portrait**](#_Toc125988802)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **59** | **Support:** | **21** | **Object:** | **38** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* One respondent suggested that the way the Local Plan refers to landscape character was inconsistent and should adhere to the European Landscape Convention definition (Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council).
* A number of respondents suggested that the spatial portrait should give greater emphasis to particular issues including road based public transport (Stagecoach South), Chichester Neighbourhood Plan (Chichester City Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group), hospitality and visitor economy (Goodwood Estates Ltd) and coastal/marine leisure economy.
* Several respondents made objections on the basis that the scale and/or location of development proposed in the Local Plan appeared to be contrary to statements made in this section of the Plan.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below combined with factual updates, this section of the Local Plan is sound.

To address the representation regarding reference to the coastal/marine leisure economy it is proposed to add at the end of paragraph 2.21 the following: **The rich and diverse coastline of Chichester Harbour supports both tourist activity and provides an ideal location for businesses linked to the marine sector.**

From 22 November 2023 all designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) were renamed ‘National Landscapes’. However, all references in the plan to ‘Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty’ will remain as AONB as this is the legal designation. A footnote is to be added to the reference to the Chichester Harbour AONB at paragraph 2.23 as follows: **‘Whilst this has been renamed ‘Chichester Harbour National Landscape’ it is referred to in the Local Plan as ‘Chichester Harbour AONB’ to reflect its legally designated status - which remains unchanged’.**

[**Local Plan Vision**](#_Toc125988804)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **49** | **Support:** | **21** | **Object:** | **28** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Parish councils generally broadly support the vision but have concerns about whether the proposed strategy/overall housing number will deliver it/aligns with it (seeking a lower housing number).
* Developers consider the housing target in the plan is too low to deliver the vision.
* Concern about the level of development in the East West Corridor (residents, parishes in the corridor, Chichester Harbour Trust) Parish councils, individual residents and some landowners/developers consider the climate emergency is not sufficiently addressed.
* A housing developer wants brownfield land to be prioritised.
* Individuals concerned about infrastructure.
* Some comments relate to other parts of the plan e.g. horticultural policies, objectives, structure of the document.
* One parish council requests an additional policy specific to the North of the Plan Area.
* Natural England suggest additional wording about water scarcity.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

Para 2.33 will be amended to clarify the scope of the Building Regulations and update references to consultation on the Future Homes and Buildings Standard.

Amend first part of paragraph 2.33: “**~~Targets for~~ Minimum energy performance requirements, maximum** CO2 emissions, fabric energy efficiency **and~~,~~** primary energy rates **~~and building emissions rates~~**for new and existing buildings are set through Building Regulations **~~which requires (Reg 25B) that all new buildings are “nearly zero energy”~~.** The **~~2022~~ 2021** update**~~s~~** to Approved Document Part L, **incorporating 2023 amendments,** which provides further detail of the requirements, form**s** part of the …”

Amend final sentence of paragraph 2.33: “This is an interim step prior to the full Future Homes and Buildings Standard**s** which are due to be implemented in 2025, **– ~~with~~** consultation **~~during~~ on the changes proposed began in December** 2023.”

In the Vision, add wording to bullet point 1:“…high summer temperatures**, water scarcity**”.

In paragraph 2.46 insert “**and other constraints**” after “Medmerry Compensatory Habitat”.

In para 2.48, insert “**including marine related leisure**” after “tourism”.

[**Strategic Objectives**](#_Toc125988805)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **96** | **Support:** | **36** | **Object:** | **60** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Comments on supporting paragraphs largely repeat those made against the Vision or other policies.
* Comments seek reference to neighbourhoods plans, a need for more facilities for young people, request that policies specify minimum standards, concerns about the location of development, object to Chidham and Hambrook being a service village, concerns about infrastructure, seek additional reference to marine leisure, seek an additional policy for the North of the Plan Area, seek greater flexibility of uses in horticultural areas, site promoter says the lower housing number doesn’t; reflect objectives of Local Strategic Statement (LSS2).
* Kirdford Parish Council want an objective for water neutrality.

**Objective 1:**

* Support from Sussex Wildlife Trust, National Highways.
* Residents concerned about flooding and new development on the Manhood.
* Residents and some parish councils and other organisations support but say the policies won’t deliver – seek better bus services, higher building standards – beyond Building Regulations, less housing in their area.
* Residents want the plan to set out more about the climate expected in 2039 and mitigation and adaptation, including potential need to relocate homes from coastal areas.
* Govia Thameslink suggests additional wording relating to active travel.

In response to the comments additional wording is proposed in the previous section to explain the relationship to building regulations. The plan doesn’t allocate any new development to the Manhood and other policies ensure flooding is considered.

**Objective 2**

* Support from developer, Sussex Wildlife Trust, Govia Thameslink.
* SDNPA seek additional reference to conserving and enhancing the SDNP.
* Parishes and other organisations say the amount of housing close to the Harbour/ in the North of the Plan Area conflicts with this and want a lower housing number.
* Goodwood Estates and Kirdford PC seek more detail.
* Natural England suggest additional wording on SuDS and water neutrality.

In response to the comments, modifications are proposed to refer to water neutrality and the South Downs National Park (SDNP). Detailed matters are set out in other policies.

**Objective 3**

* In principle, support from developers, Govia Thameslink, some residents.
* Residents and organisations say housing is too expensive and that housing should only be on brownfield land.
* Residents and others seek higher design standards, including energy efficiency.
* Kirdford PC want reference to accessibility standards and note overlap of design element of this objective with Objective 6.

In response to the comments, the final sentence will be removed to reduce duplication. The objective is intended to deliver affordable housing so the objections on this basis are unclear – there is not sufficient brownfield land available. A more detailed explanation of the relationship to Building Regulations is proposed as set out in response to comments on the Vision. Design standards and accessibility requirements are set out in the design chapter.

**Objective 4**

* Support from National Highways, Govia Thameslink.
* Residents and organisations object to greenfield development and housing.
* A resident wants reference to marine leisure.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council want more leisure facilities for young people in the city.
* Goodwood Estate want greater recognition of the contribution of Goodwood Estate and Rolls Royce to the local economy.
* Kirdford Parish Council want jobs and employment floorspace targets for villages and rural areas.

In response to the comments, additional wording is proposed to refer to marine leisure, hospitality and bespoke vehicle manufacturing. The employment data, based on district level forecasts, does not allow a reliable disaggregation of the requirement to village level.

**Objective 5**

* Support from Govia Thamelink and a resident, with a proposed wording change on active travel from Govia Thameslink.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council say additional housing won’t help deliver this.
* Kirdford Parish Council want specific targets for health indicators and life expectancy.
* Goodwood Estate want land outside of settlements protected from development, including the designation of landscape gaps.

In response to the comments the wording change suggested by Govia Thamelink can be made as a minor modification. Life expectancy and health indicators, as set out in the Health Impact Assessment show life expectancy and health indicators above the national average – in this context, a target to improve rather than achieve a specific level is considered appropriate.

**Objective 6**

* Support from some parishes and Govia Thameslink.
* Natural England and Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council want additional reference to landscape character.
* Goodwood Estate want development management policies to require compliance with National Design Code.
* Kirdford Parish Council feel the objective should say more about heritage and also comment on Policy P1, saying it doesn’t mention local design codes.

In response to the comments, wording is proposed to refer to designated landscapes. Revisions to Policy P1 will pick up the point about local design codes. Policy P1 already covers the National Design Code.

**Objective 7**

* Support from National Highways, Govia Thameslink and some parish councils, although Govia Thameslink suggest some wording edits.
* Some residents, parishes and organisations support the policy but lack confidence in delivery.
* Residents, action groups and some parish councils object due to current infrastructure deficits. Needs of existing residents should be addressed first. One seeks a new station at Oving. Others say the A27 should be the priority and others are concerned about wastewater and/or integrated transport.
* Natural England propose additional wording about nature based solutions.

In response to the comments, wording will be added to cover nature based solutions. The wording from Govia Thameslink has been considered and some amendments made to Objective 7. No other changes are considered necessary as the Objective is to work with those who deliver infrastructure, to ensure timely delivery of key infrastructure needed to support delivery of new development.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below (and other minor modifications still being finalised) that the objectives are sound:

Supporting text and objectives proposed to be modified as follows:

Minor corrections are proposed to the paragraphs on LSS2. In paragraph 2.52 Strategic Objective 1 should read**:** Delivering Sustainable **Economic** Growth. In paragraph 2.53 the period covered by LSS2 should say to 2015-**2025.**

Objective 1: In the first sentence of the second paragraph of Objective 1, delete text from “**~~designed to….open spaces~~**” and replace with: **“with local access at the core of the design linked by high quality active travel, walking and cycle routes that also link to bus stops and, where available, railway stations where access is required to facilities that cannot be provided locally.**

Objective 2:Amend end of first sentence:“…. Habitat, and protecting wildlife and landscape character **and conserving and enhancing the Chichester Harbour AONB and South Downs National Park and their setting**.”

Amend final sentence: “**~~All~~ Where** relevant**,** developments will **~~also~~** be nutrient neutral **and/or water neutral** to protect water quality.”

Objective 3: Delete final sentence as covered by Objective 6: **~~Good design will consider climate change, help to reduce crime and the fear of crime, create beautiful places accessible to all, build communities, and be well integrated with existing communities and facilities.~~**

Objective 4 second paragraph: “… tourism **(including marine related leisure), hospitality, bespoke vehicle manufacturing** and…”

Objective 5: Replace “**~~opportunities for active travel~~”** with **“with active travel designed into communities”.**

Objective 6: Add “**incorporating the special qualities of designated landscapes where required**” to end of 1st sentence of second paragraph.

Objective 7: In second paragraph, delete “**~~transport~~**” and replace with “**active travel infrastructure, public transport**”. In the third paragraph insert: “Highway improvements will be **designed in line with the hierarchy for the road user, with priority for people walking, cycling and using public transport, so that people choose active travel or active travel combined with public transport as the obvious way to access what they need. These measures will ~~delivered to~~ mitigate congestion, including ~~measures to~~ mitigat~~e~~ion of** potential impacts on the A27 through a monitor and manage process. **Nature based solutions will be used where these are appropriate**.”

A table will be added to Appendix F showing how each policy links to the vision and objectives of the plan.

# [Chapter 3: Spatial Strategy](#_Toc125988806)

[**Policy S1 Spatial Development Strategy**](#_Toc125988809)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **137** | **Support:** | **108** | **Object:** | **29** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Promoters of sites made representations that the Plan should be making non-strategic allocations rather than leave that to Neighbourhood Plans.
* A number of respondents suggested that there was insufficient justification for not meeting the housing need in full.
* A number of respondents commented that the Manhood Peninsula should be a focus for more development with the making of housing allocations at East Wittering, Selsey and Hunston.
* The scale of development proposed for the northern part of the plan area and the individual parishes was generally opposed by residents and parish councils with the converse view expressed by site promoters who considered that a higher dwelling number was appropriate.
* Representations from residents and local organisations (including Chichester Harbour Trust, Chichester Harbour Conservancy, Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council) were concerned that there was too much development proposed for the east-west corridor, which would have detrimental impacts on landscape (particularly the setting of the AONB), environment, loss of agricultural land, settlement character.
* Several respondents objected on the basis that there was little reference to the development of brownfield sites.
* Residents and promoters of sites suggested that Chichester city should be the focus for more development.
* Several respondents sought clarification of the Policy wording, including the use of the term ‘small scale’ and Bellway Homes suggested that it was unclear whether point 7 related to the entire policy or just non-strategic provision.
* Arun District Council objected on grounds that the development strategy did not deal with cross boundary developer contributions and infrastructure needs.
* Horsham District Council supported the policy but wanted to see justification for the referenced infrastructure constraints.
* Several respondents suggested that the strategy should be more positive in addressing climate change and addressing nature recovery.
* The South Downs National Park Authority commented that references in the reasoned justification to the South Downs National Park should also acknowledge the setting of the National Park and Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council suggested that it should be clarified that the north of the plan area also lies to the east of the National Park.
* Kirdford Parish Council suggested a number of changes to the Key Diagram to clarify the use of terminology.

In respect of the comments regarding development of brownfield land development, whilst brownfield land is available, it is not possible for the majority of new development to be accommodated on brownfield sites. Where brownfield land is available, assessed as being suitable and consistent with the growth strategy, it has been allocated for development. Further brownfield sites may be identified through Neighbourhood Plans.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below, the Policy is sound. Further detail on the background to the spatial strategy and distribution of housing is set out in the Housing Distribution Background Paper.

To address the comments from the South Downs National Park Authority and Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council, the following amendments are proposed:

Amend second sentence of paragraph 3.19 to read: ‘Opportunities for development in this area appear to be limited due to land availability, landscape considerations, **including the setting of the National Park,** settlement patterns and available infrastructure.’

Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.21 to read**:** ‘The north of the plan area covers those parts of Chichester District which lie north **and east** of the South Downs National Park boundary **and includes its setting.’**

To address the representation from Bellway Homes, it is proposed to clarify that Point 7 applies to the whole policy: In Policy S1, remove numbering from point 7.

To address the representation from Kirdford Parish Council, it is proposed to amend the wording of point 3 of the policy to read: ‘**~~Where opportunities arise, s~~ S**upporting the villages and rural communities in the North of the Plan Area.’

To address the comments from Kirdford Parish Council, it is proposed to make the following changes to the Key Diagram (these are shown in Appendix 1 of the ‘Council’s suggested modifications schedule’): On map 3.1 Key Diagram change the name of the map box titled **~~‘North of the Plan Area’~~** to ‘**Hammer/Camelsdale’**.

In the Key Diagram legend, write the acronyms HDA, BLD, SWC and SAC in full.

[**Settlement Hierarchy**](#_Toc125988810)

[**Policy S2 Settlement Hierarchy**](#_Toc125988811)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **50** | **Support:** | **31** | **Object:** | **19** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* There was broad support for the settlement hierarchy, although there were some objections to the classification of individual settlements notably Loxwood, Plaistow and Ifold, East Wittering/Bracklesham, Chidham and Hambrook, Wisborough Green from respondents seeking to either limit growth or to allocate additional development sites.
* Some respondents suggested that other settlements or locations should be identified as service villages in particular Chichester Marina should be considered as part of Birdham service village or a service village in its own right (Premier Marinas Limited), Sidlesham should be identified as a service village (Greenwood Group Ltd) and South Mundham considered as part of North Mundham service village (Church Commissioners for England).
* Several respondents, primarily site promoters, suggested that a review of settlement boundaries should be undertaken as part of the Local Plan preparation and not left to Neighbourhood Plans.
* The Bosham Association made a representation that the Plan should not be making allocations on sites outside of settlement boundaries.
* The Plan should reflect that target housing numbers are no longer mandatory (Bosham Parish Council).
* Site promoters made representations that a greater amount of growth should be allocated to service villages and also that the north of the plan area could play a more significant role in rebalancing development needs.
* Representations were also made by site promoters that housing allocations should be made in Selsey.
* Some respondents suggested the wording of Policy S2 should be amended to clarify the function/role of settlements in each tier of the settlement hierarchy.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below, the Policy is sound.

To correct a typographical error, in first line of final paragraph of Policy S2, remove capitalisation of '**rest'**. The updated evidence, which continues to support the settlement hierarchy, is set out in the Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper.

# [Chapter 4: Climate Change and the Natural Environment](#_Toc125988812)

[**Stand-alone Renewable Energy**](#_Toc125988813)

[**Policy NE1 Stand-alone Renewable Energy**](#_Toc125988814)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **15** | **Support:** | **9** | **Object:** | **6** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The South Downs National Park Authority sought additional wording to ensure that views into and out of the SDNP are considered.
* Landlink Estates Ltd objected to Policy NE1 due to the lack of evidence on the potential for renewable energy production and how it would be impacted by other land use policies in the Plan, specifically the Strategic Wildlife Corridor. They also sought additional references in the Plan to low carbon energy and heat.
* Residents and the Mayday! Action Group raised concerns about the delivery of habitat enhancements and avoiding habitat loss.
* There was also some support for the policy, including from Environment Agency, Natural England and Chichester Harbour Conservancy, with the latter keen to ensure that sites should be able to be returned to their former use.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below, that the Policy is sound. The modification to the supporting text addresses the comment made by Chichester Harbour Conservancy about the ability to return sites to their former use. The policy modification to include views into and from the South Downs National Park addresses the objection from the South Downs National Park Authority.

Proposed modification:

Paragraph 4.1 - Change as follows: "…This Plan **is** support**~~s~~ive** **of large renewable energy schemes provided these can be delivered with any significant adverse impacts appropriately mitigated. The council acknowledges that there may be instances where the benefits of a scheme outweigh the adverse impact. The council also recognises that in many cases, the development site can be returned to its original use if changes in renewable technology mean that the scheme is no longer required. ~~development that promotes these objectives. An important element in this is to ensure that the council embraces effective energy efficiency and the use of off-site renewable energy in all new development, helping to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and therefore climate change.~~  The council’s Climate Emergency Detailed Action Plan and its Annual Progress Report provide details of the council’s plans in relation to renewable energy generation within the district including annual progress made in relation to planned actions. The council continues to work collaboratively with other district councils and West Sussex County Council in relation to climate action.”**

Add to criterion 1 after landscape or townscape character**: “views into and from the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour AONB”.**

Change third paragraph of policy to read**: “**All development proposals should take the opportunities available to provide for new or enhanced habitats **to meet Biodiversity Net Gain requirements ~~within the site of the proposed development~~.”**

Change final paragraph to read: “The social, **~~and~~** economic **and environmental benefits** ……”

[**Natural Landscape**](#_Toc125988815)

[**Policy NE2 Natural Landscape**](#_Toc125988816)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **20** | **Support:** | **8** | **Object:** | **12** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Several parish councils, residents’ associations/action groups and Chichester Harbour Conservancy were generally supportive of the principle of the policy but raised concerns in relation to the conflict between the allocated sites and parish housing numbers and the need to avoid the loss of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and Wisborough Green Parish Council raised concerns about the deliverability of their parish numbers without impacting on BMV land or the landscape respectively.
* Chichester Harbour Trust supported the Policy but raised inconsistency with the delivery of housing on greenfield sites.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy and the South Downs National Park Authority suggested wording amendments to the supporting text and policy.
* Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council suggested criteria to strengthen the policy wording to protect the character of settlements and landscapes, particularly the South Downs National Park.
* Portsmouth Water support the policy.
* Natural England supported the principle of the policy but sought amended wording in relation to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment requirements.
* Developers felt the policy was too restrictive and sought clarification in relation to losses of BMV agricultural land as well as requesting temporary uses be treated differently.

The council is satisfied that subject to the proposed modifications below, that the Policy is sound.

The coalescence of settlements is covered by Policy NE3 and the Sustainability Appraisal considers the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

Modifications have been proposed to address representations from Natural England, South Downs National Park Authority and Chichester Harbour Conservancy, which also partially address concerns from Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council. Clarity has also been provided in relation to losses of best and most versatile agricultural land.

Proposed modifications to supporting text:

Paragraph 4.7: Change as follows**:** “…. guidelines relating to development. **~~Chichester Harbour Conservancy’s~~ The** Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan (the Management Plan) **prepared by Chichester Harbour on behalf of Local Authorities;** Chichester Harbour AONB Landscape….... provide important guidance for development proposals in the **Chichester Harbour** AONB) … are material planning considerations in the assessment of development proposals for land within the **Chichester Harbour** AONB.**”**

Paragraph 4.8: Add to paragraph:“….For proposals not in accordance with the Development Plan, that will result in the loss or likely cumulative loss of 20 hectares or more of best and most versatile agricultural land, the council will **in accordance with Section 18 and Schedule 4(y) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015,** consult with Natural England and have regard to “Natural England’s Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land (2021)” and any subsequent guidance.”

Paragraph 4.9, Change to read**:** “In the event, proposals must provide mitigation measures in respect of their potential impact on the local **character and setting of the protected** landscape which should include appropriate design principles...”

Criterion 4: Delete word “**significant**” to reflect NPPF paragraph 180b and paragraph 001 of Natural Environment Planning Practice Guidance.

Delete criterion 5 to avoid duplication with Policy NE13.

Change penultimate paragraph as follows: “For **large-scale proposals ~~larger schemes in identified character areas,~~** Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIA**s**) may be required. The LVIA should be used to identify, **describe** and assess the **likely** significan**t~~ce of the~~** effects of **~~change resulting from the development~~ a project** on **~~both~~** the landscape **(including the direct and indirect change to the landscape’s sensitivity, character and condition) as well as the ~~as an environmental resource and on the views and~~** visual amenity **and visual receptors. LVIAs may also be required for small-scale development proposed within the setting of the Chichester Harbour AONB or South Downs National Park.** Further……”

Final paragraph insert: “All development proposals affecting the natural landscape will be required to meet criteria contained in other relevant policies, especially: Landscape Gaps; **Strategic Wildlife Corridors;** Chichester Harbour AONB;”.

[**Landscape gaps between settlements**](#_Toc125988817)

[**Policy NE3 Landscape Gaps between settlements**](#_Toc125988818)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **23** | **Support:** | **9** | **Object:** | **14** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Support for principle of landscape gaps from local communities but concern expressed over need for boundaries to be identified, including for areas in the north of the plan area. Need for boundaries is also reflected in representations from the development industry.
* Physical separation of various settlements has been eroded but opportunity remains to ensure some separation or sense of place to be retained. Longer term protection could be achieved through specific designation.
* Concern that identified housing allocations (for example Policy A11 Land at Highgrove Farm) conflict with policy as will other potential uses (including for example solar farms).
* As landscape is referenced in the title, suggest policy should make reference to 'landscape character', as this is where the 'gap evidence' is derived from.

Support generally for the principle of the policy although it is recognised there is a need for precise boundaries to be clearly identified. At this stage, the intention is for the detailed location and boundaries of landscape gaps to be considered and assessed through either the subsequent Site Allocations DPD that will follow on from the Local Plan or be undertaken as part of a relevant neighbourhood plan. It is considered a modification relating to the inclusion of reference to ‘landscape character’ would be beneficial to the overall policy and therefore the following modification is proposed.

Amend second sentence of Policy NE3 to read – “**Including by taking account of the landscape character, ~~T~~t**heprecise boundaries of gaps will be defined in either a Site Allocations DPD or through neighbourhood plans.”

**[Strategic Wildlife Corridors](#_Toc125988819)**

[**Policy NE4 Strategic Wildlife Corridors**](#_Toc125988820)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **55** | **Support:** | **17** | **Object:** | **38** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and Southbourne Parish Council supported the policy but sought wider corridors. Residents and Chichester Harbour Conservancy also sought wider or a more extensive network of corridors, including on the Manhood Peninsula.
* Chichester Harbour Trust considered it unambitious and weak.
* Mayday! Action Group sought definitions of a minimum width and close proximity.
* Some residents, Wisborough Green Parish Council, Portsmouth Water, Goodwood Estate, The Woodland Trust, South Downs National Park Authority, Environment Agency supported the policy.
* One resident objected that it was contradictory and unclear.
* A resident raised whether the boundaries are definitive or could be defined through Neighbourhood Plans.
* The Bosham Association sought larger corridors.
* Kirdford Parish Council sought mention that the corridors stop before the north of the plan area boundary and should be extended to the north of the plan area.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust, Sussex Ornithological Society and RSPB supported the principle but queried the narrowing of the Pagham to Westhampnett corridor and questioned the evidence and justification for the changes.
* Natural England supported with suggested modifications to refer to nature recovery strategies.
* Developers/site promoters and landowners sought clarification of the supporting text (para 4.18) and the policy and considered that: the corridor could be accommodated within development sites; the wording is inconsistent with NPPF para 186 a); the ‘integrity’ test relates only to Appropriate Assessments, the requirement to demonstrate that there are no sequentially preferable sites outside the corridor should be removed. They also queried: the validity of the evidence supporting the corridors; the use of ‘close proximity’; the requirement to extend and enhance corridors; the addition of an additional constraint to development and highlighted the conflict of use of ‘no adverse effect’ with para 185 of the NPPF (stating para 186 as correct threshold). They also requested various amendments to boundaries to remove existing sites and allow flexibility for breaks in the corridor where they are currently of low ecological value.
* Landlink Estates Ltd sought the deletion of the policy on the basis that: the impact of the corridor on the delivery of net zero and renewable energy sites had not been assessed; the sequential approach was unjustified; and the SA did not consider implications of removing BMV land within the corridors.

Discussions have taken place with Natural England and the Environment team at the council to consider the issues raised in the representations, such as how the policy interrelates with other proposed policies in the plan and national policy, as well as to take account of recent planning decisions that relate to the wildlife corridors and clarifications relating to the wording itself. The Strategic Wildlife Corridor Background Paper sets out the justification for the corridors and for the amendments suggested following the Regulation 19 consultation.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Include following sentence at end of paragraph 4.17 to address representation from Natural England: “**Regard should also be had to the Draft Sussex Bat Special Area of Conservation Planning and Landscape Scale Enhancement Protocol (2018) or any subsequent updated guidance.**”

Para 4.18 Deletion of wording relating to land outside the corridor “Within the corridors it will be necessary to demonstrate that **~~no land outside the corridor is available for development and~~** the development will not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the corridor.”

Additional paragraphs to be inserted after existing paragraph 4.18:

**“An assessment of the impact of development will be undertaken on a case-by-case basis, as the quantity and quality of habitat present will differ across sites and the impact will be different according to the type and scale of development proposed.**

**For applicants, this will mean that an assessment of habitat features within the site will need to be undertaken, to establish what features are present (for example, treelines, hedgerows, ditches, watercourses), how features can be retained, protected, and enhanced to ensure that connectivity for wildlife can be facilitated across the site. Applicants will need to have regard to the connectivity of the corridor as a whole; whilst it is not within the ability of an applicant to enhance features on land not within their ownership, the wider connectivity and integrity of a corridor is essential to its functionality.”**

Amend Policy to remove reference to sequential approach as follows:

**“**Development **proposals within, or in close proximity to, strategic wildlife corridors, as shown on the Policies Map,** will only be permitted where **~~it~~they can demonstrate they** would not lead to an adverse **~~effect~~impact** upon the ecological value, function, integrity and connectivity of the strategic wildlife corridors**, and protects and enhances its features and habitats.**

**~~Development proposals within strategic wildlife corridors will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that:~~**

1. **~~There are no sequentially preferable sites available outside the wildlife corridor; and~~**
2. **~~The development will not have an adverse impact on the integrity and function of the wildlife corridor and protects and enhances its features and habitats.~~**

**~~Development proposals outside, but in close proximity to the strategic wildlife corridor will be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that:~~**

1. **~~The development will not have an adverse impact on the integrity and function of the wildlife corridor; and~~**
2. **~~The proposal will not undermine the connectivity and ecological value of the corridor.~~**

All proposals for new development (with the exception of householder applications) within or in close proximity to wildlife corridors should take opportunities available in order to extend and enhance those corridors.”

[**Biodiversity**](#_Toc125988821)

[**Policy NE5 Biodiversity and Biodiversity Net Gain**](#_Toc125988822)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **44** | **Support:** | **21** | **Object:** | **23** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Bosham Association objected to the lack of definition of ‘stepping-stones’ and to farmland not producing measurable biodiversity net gain (BNG), as well as requesting removal of Policy A11.
* Chichester Harbour Trust supported the Policy but raised concerns about deliverability due to development close to Chichester Harbour
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council supported in principle but raised concerns about pre-emptive clearing and the definition of the baseline for measuring gain as well as the use of off-site mitigation.
* Goodwood Estate proposed a change to set a minimum standard of gain reflecting size and past form of development.
* An agent (Stephen Jupp) suggested clarifying the scope of the policy.
* The Woodland Trust supported the policy but suggested a minimum of 10% with up to 20% onsite net gain where achievable.
* The RSPB supported the policy but also sought a minimum of 20% BNG.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy supported the policy and sought clarification of ‘locally off-site’ and suggested a focus on where enhancement most needed.
* Wisborough Green Parish Council supported the policy intent.
* Portsmouth Water supported the policy.
* Premier Marinas supported in principle but sought amendment to add reference to relevant biodiversity metric 3.1.
* Chichester Tree Wardens supported the policy but requested additional wording to refer to ancient trees.
* Environment Agency supported the policy and the reference to SuDs but sought additional references to Local Nature Recovery Strategies and providing a buffer for watercourses.
* Wates Developments and Seaward Properties supported the policy. Obsidian Strategic AC Ltd, DC Heaver and Eurequity IC Ltd proposed changes to allow off-site provision and considered the requirement to avoid ‘any adverse impact’ too onerous. Countryside Properties supported in principle but sought more flexibility and deletion of introductory paragraph. Gladman Developments Ltd objected and suggested an amendment to point 1d) to allow for off-site mitigation under a last resort scenario and suggested an amendment to refer to extended implementation timetable for small sites. Suez supported in principle but sought amendment to replace references to ‘any adverse impact’’ with ‘significant harm’ and sought more flexibility in relation to off-site provision outside the district. The Home Builders Federation and Metis Homes sought changes to reflect the extended timetable for small sites to implement BNG. Bellway Homes considered Points c) and d) too prescriptive and duplication of the metric 3.1 and sought flexibility. Thakeham Homes sought flexibility in relation to off-site mitigation in neighbouring areas.
* The Sussex Wildlife Trust supported in principle but sought changes to the policy wording for consistency with NPPF, a more ambitious target and consideration of how BNG will work for phased development.
* Mayday! Action Group objected to the principle of mitigating harm.
* Residents raised objections linked to strategic site allocation Policy A14.
* Natural England supported the policy but sought reference to an SPD to provide further detail of implementation and a hook to Local Nature Recovery Strategies.

The council is satisfied that subject to the proposed modifications below, that the policy is sound. The policy requirement of a minimum of 10% BNG is consistent with national policy and would not prevent higher levels of BNG being achieved if opportunities are present on a site. Pre-emptive clearance and establishing a baseline are both addressed by the Biodiversity Metric and it is not considered necessary to repeat measures in the Metric within the policy.

A minor change is proposed to clarify that the policy applies to all development proposals except those exempt as defined within the statutory framework for BNG. A minor amendment is proposed to include reference to ancient trees in response to the comments from Chichester Tree Wardens. Minor amendments are also proposed in response to Environment Agency and Natural England’s comments.

A further amendment is proposed that enhances flexibility by allowing for off-site provision outside of, but neighbouring, the Local Plan Area, recognising that BNG can contribute to wider nature recovery plans as well as local objectives. This will partially respond to some of the concerns from developers about flexibility.

It is not necessary to include reference to the small site implementation timetable as this will have concluded prior to the Plan’s adoption. A factual amendment is proposed to criterion 1b) to reflect that using the Small Site Metric is a matter of choice. References to maintenance of enhanced or created biodiversity features have also been proposed in 1e) in response to internal officer discussions with development management and environmental strategy colleagues.

Following formalisation of the statutory framework for BNG since the Regulation 19 consultation and the recent publication of draft PPG guidance, a minor change is proposed to Policy NE5 to recognise the pre-commencement nature of the general BNG condition to be applied to relevant proposals. In addition, a proposed amendment to 1. g) seeks to clarify the extent to which irreplaceable habitats are considered within the BNG metric.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Supporting text at end of para 4.22 with addition of wording **“Guidance for developers is provided (and will be updated as necessary) to inform development proposals and biodiversity plans.”**

Introductory sentence of policy: “All development shall ensure the conservation, protection, enhancement and restoration of biodiversity, avoiding **or mitigating** any adverse impacts on the condition...”

Point E. of policy add **“Protected and** Priority Habitats and Species”,

Second paragraph of policy after “…protection and recovery of priority species populations.”, insert **“Regard will be had to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy to inform opportunities for nature recovery.”**

At start of third paragraph add “**Unless exempt ~~D~~ d**evelopment proposals will be permitted **~~where it can be demonstrated that~~ subject to** the following criteria **~~have been~~ being** met:…”

Point 1b) - For minor development of 1 – 9 dwellings or on sites of less than 0.5 hectares the Small Sites Metric (or future equivalent) **~~will~~ can** be applied;

**Point 1c)** “…elsewhere within **the** Chichester **~~District~~ Plan Area**)…”

New point **1d)** to be inserted between current points 1c) and 1d) – “**Where agreed appropriate, off-site provision outside but neighbouring the Plan Area may be acceptable provided land is deliverable in areas of strategic significance for biodiversity, such as those identified within Local Nature Recovery Strategies;”**

Point 1.d) – “**~~Where appropriate, a~~ A**s a last resort, and with the agreement of the local planning authority that on or **~~local~~** off-site provision is not possible, applicants will be required to purchase credits for biodiversity gain through the national biodiversity credit scheme;”

Point 1e)- **“**Development **proposals** will provide for the long-term management **and maintenance** of biodiversity features retained**, ~~and~~** enhanced **or created** within the site or for those features created **or enhanced** off-site…”

**Point 1.g) – “Losses to ~~D~~d**esignatedsites and irreplaceable habitats are **not calculated within ~~excluded from~~** net gain metrics as they are irreplaceable.”

Point 3c) - “Irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland (as shown in the policies map and **ancient or** veteran trees…” and 3 c)i. “…including ancient woodland and **ancient or** veteran trees…”

3e) i. remove **~~“where possible”~~** from end of last sentence.

[**Chichester’s Internationally and Nationally Designated Habitats**](#_Toc125988823)

[**Policy NE6 Chichester’s Internationally and Nationally Designated Habitats**](#_Toc125988824)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **22** | **Support:** | **11** | **Object:** | **11** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Residents and the Bosham Association objected on the basis of lack of acknowledgement and mitigation for impact on harbours from sewage pollution from wastewater treatment works (WwTWs), related to objection to Policy A11.
* A resident objected to lack of reference to HRA findings in relation to foraging distances of barbastelle bats, related to objection to Policy A14.
* Chichester Harbour Trust support the policy but consider it incompatible with development allocated on east-west corridor.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy, Portsmouth Water, Goodwood Estate, Environment Agency and Wisborough Green Parish Council, South Downs National Park Authority, Bellway Homes support (with suggested change to policies map to show zones of influence).
* Southern Water proposed minor wording change for consistency.
* Premier Marinas support in principle but raised viability concerns relating to mitigation.
* Natural England requested additional wording relating to coastal squeeze resulting in intertidal habitat loss and queried how the policy relates to nationally designated habits, as well as minor factual corrections.
* Kirdford Parish Council sought strengthening of policy specifically on greenfield sites, impact on Ebernoe SAC and bat protocol.

The council is satisfied that subject to the proposed modifications below, that the policy is sound. Nitrate pollution from WwTWs to the Harbour is covered by Polices NE16 and NE19. Site allocation specific issues are considered under the relevant policies. The wording clarification sought by Southern Water and the changes sought by Natural England are proposed as modifications.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Paragraph 4.27 to add reference “…and the Solent **Maritime SAC and Solent** Coast SPAs”.[Correct typo referencing Policy NE18 to NE19 (nutrient neutrality)].

Paragraph 4.28“Evidence demonstrates that there are **~~two~~** particular pressures on these harbours: nitrate pollution**, loss of intertidal habitat due to inappropriate coastal management,** and recreational disturbances impacting upon the designated bird populations.”

Paragraph 4.31 - “The Arun Valley SPA, SAC and Ramsar site lies within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone which is **partly** served by supplies from groundwater abstractions near Pulborough...”

Policy title change to **-** “Chichester’s Internationally and **~~Nationally~~ European** Designated Habitats”and introductory sentence “…on internationally **and** European **~~and nationally~~ ~~important~~ protected** habitat sites including:”

Point a) – **“Water neutrality in the Sussex North Water Resource Zone – Arun Valley SPA,~~and~~ SAC and Ramsar”**

Point c) “…zones of influence for Chichester **and Langstone** Harbour**s** SPA**,** and Solent…”

Addition of new critierion between existing b) and c) as follows:

**“c) Coastal Squeeze in Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA and Ramsar, Solent Maritime SAC and Pagham Harbour SPA and Ramsar**

**Development proposals on the coast at Chichester and Langstone Harbours and Pagham Harbour, including those relating to the shoreline management of harbour-fronting properties, have the potential to adversely impact the integrity of intertidal habitats as a result of coastal squeeze, and are therefore required to provide appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures in accordance with Policy NE12 (Development around the Coast)”**

[**Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours and Solent and Dorset Coast Special Protection Areas and Medmerry Compensatory Habitat**](#_Toc125988825)

[**Policy NE7 Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester and Langstone Harbours, Pagham Harbour, Solent and Dorset Coast Special Protection Areas and Medmerry Compensatory Habitat**](#_Toc125988826)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **12** | **Support:** | **8** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council, RSPB, Sussex Wildlife Trust, a local resident, Bellway Homes, Wates Developments and Seaward Properties support the policy.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy proposed inclusion of reference to Harbour condition review in supporting text and strengthening wording in relation to the AONB Management Plan.
* Mayday! Action Group supported in principle but commented on importance of connectivity to the AONB and the accountability of the Bird Aware Solent Mitigation Strategy.
* Church Commissioners for England sought flexibility in case position on nutrient neutrality changes.
* Natural England sought changes to improve the clarity of the policy and supporting text.

The council is satisfied that subject to the proposed modifications as set out below, that the policy is sound.

The proposed changes partially address comments from Chichester Harbour Conservancy as, in the absence of updated national guidance regarding the anticipated strengthening of AONB Management Plan duties, the use of ‘have regard to’ is considered by the Council to be consistent with current guidance and therefore appropriate in this context. This position was accepted by the Conservancy. The proposed changes fully address comments from Natural England.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Para 4.34 to include a hyperlink to the Natural England Condition Review of Chichester Harbour Sites at end of paragraph.

[**http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5535304204419072**](http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5535304204419072)

Para 4.39 (second sentence), change as follows: **“All ~~D~~d**evelopment**~~s~~ (not just residential or tourism related)** on or adjacent to these areas **~~can have an impact on~~ could potentially impact** the SPAs**,** separate **~~to~~** and **in** addition**~~al~~** tothe impact of recreational disturbance” to improve clarity. [Correct typo within first sentence of para 4.39 from designed to **designated**]”

Addition of new paragraph titles and modifications to the Chichester and Langstone Harbours and Solent and Dorset Coast SPA section of Policy NE7 to improve clarity as follows:

**Recreational disturbance**

It is Natural England’s advice that all net increases in residential development**, either alone or in combination with other developments,** within the 5.6km zone of influence are likely to have a significant effect on the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA **by means of recreational disturbance affecting bird species ~~either alone or in combination with other developments~~**and will need to be subject to the provisions of Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)…”

**“Loss or degradation of functionally linked habitats**

The provisions of this policy do not exclude the possibility that **any development ~~some residential~~** scheme**~~s~~** either within or outside the zone of influence **may ~~might~~**require further assessment under the Habitats Regulations. Where mitigation for any impact upon **~~supporting~~ functionally linked** habitats is required this should follow the guidance given in the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy.”

Addition of new paragraph titles and modifications to the Pagham Harbour section of Policy NE7 to improve clarity as follows:

**“Recreational Disturbance**

Net increases in residential development**, either alone or in combination with other development,** within the 3.5km zone of influence are likely to have a significant effect on the Pagham Harbour SPA **by means of recreational disturbance affecting bird species ~~either alone or in combination with other developments~~** and will need to be subject to the provisions of Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).”

“**Other considerations**

The provisions of this policy do not exclude the possibility that **~~some residential~~any development** scheme~~s~~ either within or outside the zone of influence **~~might~~may** require further assessment under the Habitats Regulations. For example, large schemes, schemes proposing bespoke or alternative avoidance/mitigation measures, or schemes proposing an alternative approach to the protection of the SPA and/or the Compensatory Habitat where there is survey or other evidence that the site is used as **functionally linked ~~supporting~~**habitats by SPA species, including Brent Geese.”

Remove the sentence (from 6th paragraph in policy**) “~~Net increases in residential development, which incorporate appropriate avoidance/mitigation measures, which would avoid any likelihood of a significant effect on the SPA, will not require Appropriate Assessment”~~**to avoid contradiction of AA screening process.

Remove reference to LNR Management Plan within point a) to separate from mitigations.

[**Trees Hedgerows and Woodlands**](#_Toc125988827)

[**Policy NE8 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands**](#_Toc125988828)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **19** | **Support:** | **11** | **Object:** | **8** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council, Wisborough Green Parish Council, Portsmouth Water, Woodland Trust, RSPB, Sussex Wildlife Trust, Natural England, Goodwood Estates, Rolls Royce and a local resident all support the policy in principle.
* The Woodland Trust sought increased root protection area buffers for veteran trees.
* Rolls-Royce sought amendment to requirement for street trees to reflect NPPF paragraph 131 (now paragraph 136) footnote.
* Chichester Tree Wardens sought amendment to paragraph 4.41 to include smaller trees in definition of valued trees, clarification of how Plan will meet Government tree planting targets and sought an SPD.
* Obsidian Strategic AC Ltd, DC Heaver and Eurequity IC Ltd, Bellway Homes and Suez (Sita UK) all sought removal of reference to ‘protected trees, groups of trees and woodlands and hedgerows’ as irreplaceable habitats as it does not accord with the NPPF definition of irreplaceable habitats.
* Metis Homes objected to the 15m minimum buffer zone specified in the policy as too specific and presumptive.
* Mayday! Action Group objected to detail of policy and how it would be implemented;
* Sussex Wildlife Trust sought addition of ‘direct or indirect’ loss in accordance with para 33 of Natural Environment PPG.

The council is satisfied that subject to the proposed modifications as set out below, that the policy is sound. Changes to the policy address the issue raised by developers in relation to the reference to irreplaceable habitats and street trees. The amendment to criterion 5 addresses the issue raised by the Woodland Trust as it recognises that a larger buffer zone may be required for ancient woodland or veteran trees.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Paragraph 4.42: Change document reference as document current referred to has been superceded: ‘Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: **advice for making planning decisions ~~protecting them from development~~**’.

Criterion 2 to read -“Development resulting in the **direct or indirect** loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and **ancient ~~trees~~ and** veteran trees **~~protected trees, groups of trees and woodland and hedgerows~~)** should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy in accordance with relevant legislation, policy and guidelines;”

Add at end of criterion 5: **“Where assessment shows other impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, the proposal is likely to need a larger buffer zone.”**

Criterion 6 to read as follows - “All major development proposals will be required to provide street planting **unless there are clear, justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate.”**

Criterion 10, after native species, add “**, cultivars and near native species**”.

[**Canals**](#_Toc125988829)

[**Policy NE9 Canals**](#_Toc125988830)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **6** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Comments were generally supportive of the principle of Policy NE9, including from Natural England and Portsmouth Water.
* Natural England sought a clarification of the supporting text (para 4.47) relating to canals not being subject to nature conservation designations.
* Premier Marinas were generally supportive but wanted an additional reference to development proposals supporting the further use and enhancement of the canals, and making it explicit that this would include improvements to the existing houseboat population and further houseboat development on the canal.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modification proposed below the Policy is sound and will preserve and enhance the canals within the plan area.

The supporting text at para 4.47 will be amended by deleting the last sentence: **~~‘Development proposals within the vicinity of and which may impact the canals may be subject to Appropriate Assessment’.~~** to address the objection from Natural England.

[**The Countryside**](#_Toc125988831)

[**Policy NE10 Development in the Countryside**](#_Toc125988832)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **36** | **Support:** | **13** | **Object:** | **23** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The Bosham Association and the parish councils for Bosham and Chidham and Hambrook objected on the basis that the allocations in the Plan were contrary to Policy NE10.
* Chichester Harbour Trust supported the policy.
* Mayday! Action Group objected to criterion 4 on the basis that it could lead to coalescence of settlements. Goodwood Estate also sought more protection from areas at risk of coalescence.
* Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council and Wisborough Green Parish Council supported the policy but sought the inclusion of wording - that development should require a countryside location and meet essential, small scale and local need that cannot be met elsewhere.
* A resident objected to criterion 1 on the basis that it is too onerous and inconsistent with paragraph 85 (now 89) of the NPPF in relation to opportunities to access a site by walking, cycling and public transport.
* Church Commissioners for England sought removal of criterion B due to inconsistency with the NPPF in relation to the reuse and conversion of existing buildings.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy raised minor points in relation to the wording of the supporting text.
* CEG and the Landowners (D C Heaver and Eurequity IC Ltd) sought a revision to Chichester City’s settlement boundary to include approved residential development Land north of Madgwick Lane.
* Premier Marinas and Kingsbridge Estates & Landlink Ltd wanted additional support for employment and horticultural uses.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust objected and sought inclusion of additional wording to ensure impact on natural environment is recognised.
* Natural England supported the Policy and sought amendments to criteria 1 and 3 to include references to green infrastructure and Nature Recovery Networks.
* Drayton Investments Ltd proposed Drayton Waterside Site as a better fit with the Policy than the Policy A20 Bognor Road allocation.

The council is satisfied that subject to the amendments proposed below, that the policy is sound.

The allocations are in line with the spatial strategy which has been informed by settlement hierarchy evidence, as well as site availability, suitability and environmental and other constraints. Protection from coalescence is covered by Policy NE3 and employment and horticultural development are also covered by specific policies which would be applied. As the Plan should be read as a whole, there is no need for additional cross referencing. Settlement boundaries were reviewed to support the Regulation 18 stage of the Local Plan Review and a further review will be undertaken following adoption of the new Local Plan.

Additional wording is proposed to ensure consistency between the wording in Policy S2 ‘Settlement Hierarchy’ which refers to development in the Rest of the Plan area requiring a countryside location or meeting an essential local need or supporting rural diversification. This will address the objection from Plaistow & Ifold and Wisborough Green parish councils.

Amendments to criteria 1 and 3 are proposed to address points raised by Sussex Wildlife Trust and Natural England.

Proposed modifications are:

Paragraph 4.51: Change to read: “…its landscape qualities including the special **qualities ~~characteristics~~** of Chichester Harbour and **character of** Pagham Harbour...”

Insert at paragraph 1 of the policy: “Outside settlement boundaries as defined on the policies map, planning permission will be granted for sustainable development in the countryside **which requires a countryside location or meets an essential, small scale, and local need or supports rural diversification and,** where it can be demonstrated that all the following criteria have been met:”

Adding to criterion 1**:** “**any** opportunities”and at end of criterion**: “and linking to green infrastructure”**

Amending criterion 3 as follows**:** “Proposals conserve and enhance the key features and qualities of the rural and landscape character of the countryside setting **including biodiversity whilst avoiding any adverse impact upon Nature Recovery Networks”.**

[**The Coast**](#_Toc125988833)

[**Policy NE11 The Coast**](#_Toc125988834)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **17** | **Support:** | **7** | **Object:** | **10** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chichester Harbour Conservancy support but suggest some minor technical corrections and adding reference to Coastal Partners.
* Minor corrections from the Environment Agency to reflect name changes of schemes.
* A resident wants more detail about Shoreline Management Plans
* An agent wants non marine related uses to be allowed.
* A campaign group says biodiversity will be wiped out and another that the policy doesn’t address the impact of building close to the Harbour.
* Natural England support the approach but suggest additional detailed wording for the supporting text and policy.

Modifications to this policy have been discussed and agreed with Natural England. The subsequent policies cover development on the coast.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

Paragraph 4.63: “**In June 2022 the council joined Coastal Partners; a partnership of local authorities set up to manage coastal flood and erosion risk.** The council **also** works closely with a number of organisations and authorities to effectively manage and promote the coastal environment and its waterways. For Chichester Harbour this includes joint work with Havant Borough Council, Hampshire County Council, West Sussex County Council,and Chichester Harbour Conservancy, who manage Chichester Harbour for **~~nature conservation and~~** landscape, **the occupation of leisure and recreation, and the conservation of nature**.”

Paragraph 4.64:“…. Chichester Harbour **SSSI and European ~~designated~~** sites **(SAC, SPA, Ramsar).**

Paragraph 4.65: “… poor quality. **Much of this loss is due to hard coastal defences that constrain natural processes, habitats moving landward as sea levels increase, particularly in response to climate change – this is known as coastal squeeze.** There have been dramatic declines in many over-wintering and breeding bird species, **due in part to habitat loss and disturbance**……”

Paragraph 4.66:“…. Natural England is working with a number of partners including **Chichester Harbour Conservancy,** the Environment Agency, the council and Southern Water **~~to implement these actions~~ ~~many of which are outside of the planning system and as such not dependent on Local Plan policies~~ and not all actions to be implemented are linked to Local Plan policies. The Government’s national** [**Environmental Improvement Plan**](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1168372/environmental-improvement-plan-2023.pdf)[[4]](#footnote-4)**published in early 2023, sets out targets and actions for restoring nature and the benefits it provides, to protect 30% of our land and sea for nature by 2030**.”

Paragraph 4.67:“The council **also works ~~has a similar working relationship~~** with Arun District Council with regard to Pagham Harbour **(SSSI,SPA, Ramsar**)….”

Paragraph 4.68“Two Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) set the strategic framework for managing the future of the coastline **in a sustainable way**. Strategies and projects will be established**~~/~~** **and** delivered by a range of organisations and groups in the context of the relevant SMP subject to necessary permissions and assessments, including environmental. **These SMPs are non statutory and implementation is subject to funding.**”

Paragraph 4.69: “Across the Solent, the **~~Regional~~** Habitat Compensation **and Restoration** Programme (**HCRP~~RCHP~~**), led by the Environment Agency in partnership with Natural England, **Coastal Partners**, local authorities …”

Paragraph 4.70: “…. through the REACH (Restoring Estuarine and Coastal Habitats) project, **~~and a range of organisations are involved in~~ which is a local delivery of the national** ReMeMaRe (Restoring Meadows, Marsh and Reef)[[5]](#footnote-5) project which has maps of potential for **restoration of** saltmarsh, seagrass and oyster reefs. Once specific schemes are identified they will be included in the Infrastructure **Business~~Delivery~~** Plan and Nature Recovery Strategies.

Policy NE11:

Add to end of first paragraph: “Undeveloped areas of low lying land around Chichester Harbour are prioritised for opportunities that actively restore coastal habitats or work with natural processes to address climate impacts and loss of biodiversity.”

In the first bullet: “ … wetland habitats to help meet the 30 by 30 targets set out in the Environmental Improvement Plan 2023[[6]](#footnote-6);…

In the paragraph after the bullets**:** “**~~Regiona~~l** Habitat Compensat**~~ory~~**ion **and Restoration**”

In the next paragraph insert“… opportunities for **coastal/wetland** habitat….”

[**Development Around the Coast**](#_Toc125988835)

[**Policy NE12 Development around the Coast**](#_Toc125988836)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **21** | **Support:** | **6** | **Object:** | **15** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chichester Harbour Conservancy and other respondents, including residents and parishes consider the 25m setback is insufficient.
* A resident considers the approach to marine businesses is too restrictive and that marketing is not always necessary. A business suggests the 25m is too restrictive.
* Environment Agency suggest using highest astronomical tide rather than mean high water, seek clarification about the setback for replacement buildings and that buildings are designed so that they can be moved further back.
* An action group says flood risk assessments are out of date.
* Natural England support the approach but suggest additional detailed wording for the supporting text and policy, including setting buildings further back, including replacements, with reference to the National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping (NCERM).

Modifications to this policy have been discussed and agreed with Natural England.

The council is satisfied the policy is sound subject to the following modifications:

Para 4.74: “….landward side of **any sea~~the~~** defences **~~it maintains~~**. **A~~This~~** 16 metre strip of land is required for access for maintenance, **emergency works** and/or…”

Para 4.75: “…open coast.**~~and to allow for future erosion at a rate of 0.1metres per year around Chichester and Pagham harbours~~**

Para 4.76. Add a new sentence to the end of the paragraph:“**The National Coastal Risk Management work of the Environment Agency[[7]](#footnote-7) is also a consideration, particularly around Chichester Harbour where setting back development can make space for nature and floodable areas.**”

Policy NE12:

Amend criterion 1: “There are no harmful effects on or net loss of nature conservation or areas of geological importance within the Chichester and Pagham Harbours and Medmerry Compensatory Habitat including no adverse effects on the i**ntegrity of ~~associated~~** European **~~designated~~** sites;”

Add new criterion between 1 and 2: **2. Development would not result in or exacerbate coastal squeeze of any coastal designated site or prevent managed realignment necessary to protect the sites;**

Amend criterion 2: “**~~The development provides recreational opportunities, that do~~** **Development does** not adversely affect the character, environment and appearance of the coast and Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty**~~or result in adverse effects of integrity to European designated wildlife sites~~**;”

Amend criterion 6: “Where relevant, the development would result in improvements to or redistribution of moorings, marine berths or launch on demand facilities (dry berths) in the harbours**, whilst also ensuring that any small scale loss of intertidal habitat within the designated sites is compensated for**; **~~and~~**

New criterion 8: **The development can demonstrate consideration of and adaptation to future climate scenarios and their potential impacts, including, but not limited to, shading, surface water flooding, erosion, wind blown sand, wave driven shingle, and**

New criterion 9: **The development does not hinder coastal processes with regard to designated sites.**

Amend second paragraph: “A strip of land of at least 16 meters immediately behind the landward edge of **any ~~the~~** existing or proposed sea defence or coast protection works should be kept clear to allow access for maintenance or repair”.

Amend third paragraph“Around **Chichester Harbour and Pagham Harbour ~~the open coast~~** new **and replacement** buildings should be setback **in line with expected property lifetime and estimated undefended erosion rates (based on NCERM), and** at least 25 metres from the **highest astronomical tide to account for erosion and make space for nature, including floodable areas which could return to saltmarsh.”**

Amend fourth and fifth paragraphs: **“Around the open coast, development should be setback at least 25m from the** landward edge of the existing or proposed sea defence or coast protection works, in order to prevent storm damage to buildings.

**~~Around Chichester Harbour and Pagham Harbour the 25 metre setback should be measured from the mean high water level to allow for future erosion.”~~**

Delete sixth paragraph: **~~“Replacement buildings will be permitted unless there is evidence that the existing or demolished property has been damaged as a result of the effect of wind and waves. Replacement buildings should be set further back wherever possible.”~~**

Amend criterion a): “Jeopardise the safety and ease of navigation on the water or have a detrimental impact on the regime of **any~~the~~** river;”

Amend criterion b): “Harm nature conservation **(particularly in relation to loss of intertidal habitat)**, landscape or heritage interests; or”

Delete **“~~A marketing report as set out in Appendix C will be needed to show that the site is no longer needed for its current use~~.”** from last paragraph.

[**Chichester Harbour AONB**](#_Toc125988837)

**Policy NE13 Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **22** | **Support:** | **6** | **Object:** | **15** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* This policy is generally supported.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy suggest minor wording edits and considers the setback insufficient.
* A resident queries the setback and suggests a map is needed.
* A business objects to the setback.
* Parish councils and other organisations say allocations are inconsistent with this policy.
* A site promoter with a site in the AONB says sites there shouldn’t be discounted (referring to HELAA).
* SDNPA would like an equivalent policy for the National Park.

In response to the representations - the setback is covered in more detail in NE12 which is subject to modifications – cross referencing in this policy is unnecessary. Minor wording edits from CHC are also proposed. The Chichester Harbour AONB is entirely within the plan area, unlike the National Park.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound but proposes the minor modifications set out below:

Para 4.81 “… **~~produced~~published** an AONB Management Plan… “and”… **~~18~~19** Planning Principles…”

Policy NE13 delete criterion 6: **“~~6. New development is set back at least 25m from the mean high water level in line with Policy NE12, with replacement buildings set further back whenever possible”~~**

[**Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula**](#_Toc125988915)

[**Policy NE14 Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula**](#_Toc125988916)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **6** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The Environment Agency supported the policy.
* Natural England supported the policy and suggested a minor correction to the wording of the supporting text, and the addition of reference to future nature recovery networks in criterion 4 of the policy.
* Landlink Estates Ltd sought the inclusion of a coastal change management area and queried the lack of inclusion of the ‘Resilience and Adaptation – ICZM 2021’ document in the evidence base. They suggested a re-worded policy to address climate change adaptation.
* The Chichester and District Cycle Forum sought more detail on cycle routes and funding.

The council is satisfied that subject to the proposed modification below to address the comment from Natural England, that the policy is sound.

The policy recognises the need to increase resilience to climate change but as the Shoreline Management Plan policy is to ‘hold the line’ at Selsey, there is no requirement for a coastal change management area to be identified or to relocate communities.

In response to the Chichester and District Cycle Forum, transport infrastructure is sufficiently covered by Policies T1 – T3 and funding provision through Policy I1 and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan which contains details of transport schemes (updated annually through the Infrastructure Business Plan – allowing new schemes to come forward if required to support development).

Proposed modifications:

Change reference at second bullet point at 4.84 to read “Chichester **and Langstone** **Harbours ~~SAC~~** SPA/Ramsar site**~~s~~**, and Pagham Harbour SPA/Ramsar site**~~s~~** and Marine Conservation Zone, Solent and Dorset Coast SPA, Solent Maritime SAC, Selsey Bill and The Hounds MCZ, the Chichester Harbour AONB, the Medmerry Compensatory Habitat and the Chichester Canal.”.

Criterion 4 of policy to read: “All development proposals should seek to enhance the distinctive character of the Manhood Peninsula, having particular regard to the ecology **(including the potential to contribute to any nature recovery networks)**, landscape and heritage of the area.”

[**Flood Risk and Water Management**](#_Toc125988917)

[**Policy NE15 Flood Risk and Water Management**](#_Toc125988918)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **24** | **Support:** | **6** | **Object:** | **18** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The Environment Agency recommended various technical modifications to the policy.
* Natural England were supportive of the policy.
* National Highways requested that the Strategic Road Network be specifically referred to in the policy.
* Manhope were reluctantly supportive but considered that the implications of the SFRA are poorly understood and that significant restrictions should be placed on new development until the flooding and wastewater implications are better understood.
* Mayday! Action Group didn’t consider that the council’s evidence was up to date or aligned with the approach Natural England are taking to shoreline management.
* Thakeham Homes suggest similar amendments to the Environment Agency and hence that comment is addressed by the amendments which flow from the EA representation.
* Two other developers requested technical wording changes to the policy.
* A number of comments were submitted in relation to flooding related issues with respect to Saxon Meadow in Tangmere.

Amendments to the policy are proposed to address most of the Environment Agency recommendations. However, some of the recommendations were felt to go beyond the remit of the policy.

While the council agrees with National Highways that preventing flooding of the SRN is important, the council considers that the policy already provides the right framework for address that concern.

The council does not consider that such restrictions as suggested by Manhope would be justifiable or reasonable.

The council has commissioned a new SFRA, and the Shoreline Management Plan remains valid, and hence the council’s approach is considered to be based on the most up-to-date evidence, which addresses concerns from Mayday! Action Group.

The flooding issues raised in relation to Saxon Meadow in Tangmere are felt to be excessively detailed to be considered under this policy and are more pertinent to the site-specific Policy A14.

In order to respond to the representation by Chapman Lily Planning on behalf of Bellway Homes, in the first paragraph of the Policy:“Development will be directed to areas at lowest flood risk applying the sequential test and **~~where relevant~~** the exception test **where relevant**.”. This is proposed as it is correct that the sequential test will not always be required, in the case of allocations in the Local Plan for example, or if the proposal is for water compatible development.

In response to the representation by Turley obo Countryside Properties, two amendments are proposed as follows, amend criterion 1: “New site drainage systems are designed to cope with **residual flood risks ~~events that exceed the normal design standard~~**, such as by considering flood flow routing and using temporary storage areas” and amend criterion 2: “There is no increase in **~~either the volume or~~ the** rate of surface water run-off leaving the site. Where development is on a brownfield site, run off rates should be reduced to match **~~those on~~**greenfield **rates~~sites~~** wherever possible.”

The other amendments below respond to the recommendations made by the Environment Agency:

Paragraph 5: “Elsewhere, new development should be set back at least 8m from fluvial watercourses **(including when within culverts)** …”

Add an additional criterion (f):

“**f. Where applicable, any loss of flood storage from any source of flooding in the fluvial floodplain should be compensated for on a level-for-level basis, ideally on-site. Compensation should be hydraulically and hydrologically linked to the floodplain, but not within it.”**

Amend criterion 4: “For vulnerable development, finished floor levels should be **~~no lower than~~** **a** **minimum of whichever is higher of 300mm above the**:

* + **~~300mm above average ground level of the site~~**
  + **~~300m above the adjacent road level to the building~~**
  + **~~300mm above predicted significant fluvial/tidal flood level (Fluvial 1 in 100 year / Tidal 1 in 200 year plus latest climate change allowances) for the lifetime of the development.~~**
  + **average ground level of the site**
  + **the adjacent road level to the building**
  + **predicted significant fluvial/tidal flood level (Fluvial 1 in 100 year / Tidal 1 in 200 year plus latest climate change allowances) for the lifetime of the development.”**

[**Water Management and Water Quality**](#_Toc125988919)

[**Policy NE16 Water Management and Water Quality**](#_Toc125988920)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **39** | **Support:** | **9** | **Object:** | **30** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council sought a moratorium on development until sewage infrastructure upgrades are in place, sought restrictions on Thornham, raised water supply issues and that Southern Water should be a statutory consultee on large planning applications.
* Southbourne Parish Council also raised concerns about the uncertainty of a solution for Thornham.
* Donnington Parish Council raised concerns about sites draining to Apuldram.
* Wisborough Green Parish Council were supportive but with concerns about water supply, Southern Water delivery, capacity calculations and the water neutrality strategy.
* Fishbourne Parish Council supported but sought additional wording.
* Kirdford Parish Council consider the policy is not justified or effective.
* The Bosham Association, Mayday! Action Group and other residents also sought a moratorium on development until sewage infrastructure upgrades are in place.
* Manhope raised concerns about the location of Sidlesham WwTW, use of tankering and sought a mortarium.
* Fishbourne Meadows Residents Association queried the achievability of the policy measures.
* Bosham Parish Council, a resident, Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and Wisborough Green Parish Council sought clarity about the Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) in relation to the plan making process, queried the efficiency of the policy and sought additional detail on upgrades.
* Chichester Harbour Trust criticised the wastewater system generally.
* Natural England were supportive but sought minor wording changes around the 110lppd figure.
* Horsham District Council supported the policy.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust sought additional reference to commercial and horticultural water use.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy supported but sought clarification of major and minor development.
* Environment Agency support the 110 litres pppd and suggested a wording change relating to sewer connection.
* Portsmouth Water queried evidence required of a water supply and would have preferred a target of 100 litres pppd.
* Southern Water support but requested minor edits to the supporting text and the policy.
* Developers raised issues relating to capacity at Thornham, the requirement to demonstrate no adverse impact, the use of Position Statements and highlighted the right to connect.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the policy is sound. The policy as drafted, requires that development is phased to align with delivery of wastewater treatment infrastructure where this is needed, and that water quality is protected.

The modifications proposed provide clarity over the DWMP process, highlight the ambition of Portsmouth Water to achieve 100 litres pppd, and address clarification points required by the Environment Agency and Southern Water.

Proposed modifications:

Paragraph 4.98, add at the end of the paragraph: “**The Waterwise UK Water Efficiency Strategy to 2030 provides additional guidance on delivering water efficiency in the UK by 2030**.”

Para 4.100 - Insert “**(WRZ)**” after **“Zone”** in the second line. Change the second **~~“Zone”~~ to** “**WRZ**”

Para 4.103 - Replace paragraph to read: **“Southern Water’s Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) for the Arun and Western Streams is a 25 year plan that looks holistically at a range of issues in the catchment and strategic options for addressing them; such as pollution, combined sewer overflow performance, growth, water quality improvements, maintenance requirements, infiltration and sewer flooding. Chichester District Council officers have been fully engaged in the preparation of the DWMP which was published in June 2023, to ensure that proposals emerging in the Local Plan were taken into account. The DWMP feeds into OFWAT’s Price Review process (PR24) which informs investment for the 2025-30 Asset Management Plan period (AMP8). DWMPs, which are now statutory, will be reviewed every 5 years to inform water company business plans for future AMP periods, allowing an iterative approach to planning for growth. More information is available on Southern Water’s** [**DWMP**](https://www.southernwater.co.uk/dwmp) **webpages”.**

Para 4.105 - Insert after 110lppd - **“Portsmouth Water currently offer an incentive of a 50% discount on the infrastructure charge where developments demonstrate achieving high standards of water efficiency of no more than 100lppd. Portsmouth Water will be installing smart metres from 2025 onwards, whilst Southern Water’s roll out of smart metres has already begun.”** and delete last sentence **“ ~~Policy NE19 ( Nutrient Neutrality) covers the need for nutrient neutrality in parts of the plan area”.~~**

In the Policy, amend last sentence of the paragraph under the heading “Water Efficiency”: “A tighter target applies to development in ~~the~~ **~~Sussex North Water Resource Zone~~** **Southern Water’s Water Resource Zone Sussex North**...” and under Water Efficiency (b) correct "Southern Water's Supply Zone North" to "Southern Water's **~~Supply~~ Water Resource** Zone **Sussex** North".

Criterion d) - Insert **“and operation”** after “delivery”.

At the end of the section headed Water Quality and Wastewater add new criterion (h) after g) **- “Development shall connect to a public main sewer as the first option, and if that is not possible, provide justification for this and why a different solution is needed”.**

[**Water Neutrality**](#_Toc125988921)

[**Policy NE17 Water Neutrality**](#_Toc125988922)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **28** | **Support:** | **15** | **Object:** | **13** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Support for joint local planning authority approach and policy from Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, South Downs National Park Authority, Environment Agency, Portsmouth Water, RSPB, and Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council.
* Kirdford Parish Council and Wisborough Green Parish Council raised issues of uncertainty over enforcement of water efficiency; monitoring from LPAs, effectiveness of measures, and understanding of strategy which is an unproven model.
* Policy should allow flexibility for the type of non-domestic buildings and other off- setting opportunities.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust is supportive of policy but question if a guarantee for the lifetime of the development will be required as part of the water neutrality statement.
* Developers consider policy sets out onerous restriction on water use per person per household per day, potentially achievable but restrictive, and not attractive to future residents. Accordingly, its introduction without flexibility, may limit desirability of future properties. Policy should allow house builder flexibility to allow high water usage, set against greater off-site water saving measures. Knock on effect could be an increase in housing values for existing stock. Need for strategic mitigation to be provided alongside the Plan.
* Natural England is satisfied policy requirements are sufficient to rule out adverse effects on integrity of the Plan on the Arun Valley designated sites.
* Natural England also identify some amendments to wording of supporting text and policy criterion 4 to require that where an alternative water supply is provided, that deliverability of that water supply is certain for the lifetime of the development.

The council is satisfied that subject to modifications proposed by Natural England, the Policy is sound. The issue of water neutrality across the Sussex North Water Resource Zone was considered as part of the examination of the Crawley Borough Local Plan in November. Further subsequent changes will need to be made to the council’s policy and text to ensure a consistent joint approach to the issue across the affected local planning authorities.

Amendments identified by Natural England are considered beneficial to the overall text and policy and therefore, the following modifications are proposed:

Amend text of paragraphs 4.108 - 4.113 as shown below:

* 1. Part of the Chichester plan area in the northeast of the district lies within the [Sussex North Water Resource Zone](https://westsussex.statmap.co.uk/map/Earthlight.html?map=)3HdAuPumDN9c63AHs6oyWGuJdVKVXP0NNll24WaKslzqYXMSol8UB%2FsYaqhLrbUXkTboZbvjKhGkRh1ugI8FbA%3D%3D&login=)xTTmj%2Bk%2FXZKhkhsu%2BorBwOAQZimXKxU7pHYb7pZBlMs%3D&password=)DopPKPV8QR6xiVkRgKTioW2Zfwl3tL%2FjRi6LJRmUBNQ%3D) (WRZ). This WRZ is supplied by the Pulborough groundwater abstraction site **abstracting from the Folkestone beds of the Lower greensand/ Wealden greensand semi-confined aquifer**. As well as covering part of the Chichester plan area, the WRZ includes areas within Crawley Borough, Horsham District and the South Downs National Park. Within the WRZ, water is mains-distributed by Southern Water.
  2. The abstraction site is located on the River Arun close to a group of nature conservation sites, known as the Arun Valley Sites, that are nationally or internationally designated as Special Areas of Conservation, a Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site for their rare and protected habitats. On 14 September 2021, local planning authorities covered by the WRZ received a position statement from Natural England. This explained it could not be concluded that extraction was not having an impact on the Arun Valley Sites and that development must not add to this impact. Given the high level of regulatory protection afforded to the Arun Valley Sites as a result of their designation, this requires local planning authorities to demonstrate that development plan documents and planning decisions will not have an adverse effect on the sites. **The most feasible method t~~T~~o** achieve this, **is to require that** development must be water neutral (i.e. not increase the demand for water above current rates of abstraction)
  3. In order to ensure that water supplies can be maintained and the environment protected, the affected local authorities have worked with consultants, Natural England, Southern Water, the Environment Agency and others to produce a Water Neutrality Strategy. To deliver new development, the Strategy outlines why and how all new development must be highly water efficient to contribute to achieving water neutrality. This means that all development will need to be designed to achieve water efficiency standards above the requirements set by the optional requirements in Building Regulations – new residential development will be required to use no more than 85 litres per day and non-residential buildings required to achieve 3 credits within the BREEAM water issue category. **Achieving these higher levels of efficiency will enable the strategy to provide necessary offsetting more effectively, thereby reducing offsetting costs and ensuring viability for development within the WRZ.** This may include incorporating a range of measures, such as greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting into the design of new development, and fitting water saving fixtures such as flow regulators, low flush toilets, low volume bath, aerated taps and water efficient appliances (in particular, washing machines and dishwashers).
  4. The Water Neutrality Strategy shows that water efficient design will not be sufficient alone to achieve water neutrality, as new development would still increase the demand for water above existing levels. As a consequence, this additional demand will need to be offset against existing supplies. It is envisaged this will be achieved through demand management savings identified in Southern Water’s Water Resource Management Plan, together with measures to be identified in a joint local **~~planning~~** authority **and South Downs National Park Authority**-led Offsetting Implementation Scheme (OIS) being prepared. **Achieving high levels of water efficiency will enable the OIS to provide necessary offsetting more effectively, thereby reducing offsetting costs and ensuring viability for all development within the WRZ.** Those using the OIS to offset water, will ‘buy in’ to the scheme at a level to ensure their development achieves water neutrality. **Offsetting is expected to be provided prior to the occupation of new developments and this shall be secured through the development management process.**
  5. The Water Neutrality Strategy provides evidence that the amount of development proposed in the affected area in this Local Plan, and in Local Plans of the other affected authorities, would not increase abstraction at Pulborough and, thus, would not negatively impact on the Arun Valley Sites. Recognising that the capacity of water offsetting the OIS can provide may be limited at particular points in time during the plan period, the authorities will have to monitor use across the WRZ and manage access to the OIS to ensure sufficient water capacity exists to ensure water neutrality is achieved when permissions are granted**. Offsetting capacity in the OIS is not limitless and access will be managed by the local authorities and the SDNPA to ensure there is sufficient capacity in the OIS to demonstrate water neutrality in schemes that are approved. The authorities will publish, and keep regularly updated, a Scheme Access Prioritisation Protocol (SAPP) to show how access to the offsetting in the OIS will be managed. Infrastructure necessary to support planned growth, such as schools, will be prioritised in the SAPP.**
  6. Applicants will have to demonstrate their scheme is water neutral within a water neutrality statement submitted as part of any application within the WRZ. Should applicants not seek to utilise the OIS, **certainty of delivery of alternative offsetting will need to be demonstrated. The Water Neutrality Statement ~~applications~~**should also provide full details of the offsetting scheme that their development would rely upon. **Similarly, certainty of alternative supply will need to be demonstrated in the Water Neutrality Statement. For connection to an alternative water company, this could be achieved by confirming that the alternative water company has sufficient capacity and will take on supply to the development. For a private supply borehole or other source of supply, this will require evidence that sufficient water supply is available to meet demand arising from the proposed development, and demonstrating with certainty that the alternative supply source does not impact upon the Arun Valley sites. To provide the necessary certainty, measures to deliver water neutrality will need to be secured through the development management process.** The council will seek to provide additional guidance to further assist applicants with water neutrality statements. Offsetting schemes can occur in any part of the WRZ, with the exception of the Bramber/Upper Beeding area in Horsham District identified on the [WRZ Map](https://westsussex.statmap.co.uk/map/Earthlight.html?map=)3HdAuPumDN9c63AHs6oyWGuJdVKVXP0NNll24WaKslzqYXMSol8UB%2FsYaqhLrbUXkTboZbvjKhGkRh1ugI8FbA%3D%3D&login=)xTTmj%2Bk%2FXZKhkhsu%2BorBwOAQZimXKxU7pHYb7pZBlMs%3D&password=)DopPKPV8QR6xiVkRgKTioW2Zfwl3tL%2FjRi6LJRmUBNQ%3D) – unless the development is also proposed in that area. This is on the basis water in this part of the WRZ is usually provided by a water source other than the Pulborough abstraction site.

Amend Policy NE17 as shown below, including new criterion after current 1c (moved from criterion 5), and current criterion 3 split:

1. All development within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone (WRZ) will need to demonstrate water neutrality through water efficient design and offsetting of any net additional water use of the development. This is to be achieved by ensuring that:

**Water Efficient Design**

* 1. New residential development is designed to utilise no more than 85 litres of mains supplied water per person per day;
  2. New non-domestic buildings to achieve a score of 3 credits within the water (WAT01 Water Consumption) issue category for the BREEAM Standard or an equivalent standard set out in any future update;

And

**Offsetting Water Use**

* 1. Development proposals must demonstrate that having achieved water efficient design, any remaining mains-supplied water use from the development is offset such that there is no net increase in mains-supplied water use within the WRZ compared with pre-development levels.

**Water Neutrality Statement**

1. **A water neutrality statement will be required to demonstrate how policy requirements have been met in relation to water supply, water efficient design and offsetting. The statement shall provide, as a minimum, the following:**
   * 1. **baseline information relating to existing water use within a development site;**
     2. **full calculations relating to expected water use within a proposed development; and**
     3. **full details of how any remaining water use will be offset.**

**Offsetting Schemes**

1. A local **~~planning~~** authority **and South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)**-led water offsetting scheme will be introduced to bring forward development **and infrastructure** supported by Local and Neighbourhood Plans. The authorities will manage access to the offsetting scheme to ensure that sufficient water capacity exists to accommodate planned growth within the plan period.
2. Development proposals are not required to utilise the local **~~planning~~** authority **and SDNPA**-led offsetting scheme and may bring forward their own offsetting schemes. **Any such development proposals will need to have regard to the local authority and SDNPA-led offsetting scheme and associated documents**.
3. Offsetting schemes can be located within any part of the WRZ, with the exception that offsetting will not be accepted within the Bramber/Upper Beeding area identified on the [WRZ map](https://westsussex.statmap.co.uk/map/Earthlight.html?map=)3HdAuPumDN9c63AHs6oyWGuJdVKVXP0NNll24WaKslzqYXMSol8UB%2FsYaqhLrbUXkTboZbvjKhGkRh1ugI8FbA%3D%3D&login=)xTTmj%2Bk%2FXZKhkhsu%2BorBwOAQZimXKxU7pHYb7pZBlMs%3D&password=)DopPKPV8QR6xiVkRgKTioW2Zfwl3tL%2FjRi6LJRmUBNQ%3D), unless the application site is located within the Bramber/Upper Beeding area.

**Alternative Water Supply**

6. Where an alternative water supply is to be provided, the **Water Neutrality** **S~~s~~**tatement will need to demonstrate that no water is utilised from sources that supply the Sussex North WRZ. The **wider** acceptability **and uncertainty of delivery for** **~~of~~**alternative water supplies will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

5. [text moved to new criterion 2]

**Area of Serious Water Stress**

7. **Should the need to demonstrate water neutrality no longer be required, new residential development must be designed to utilise no more than 110 litres of mains supplied water per person per day, as per the Building Regulations optional requirement for tighter water efficiency. For non-domestic buildings, the minimum standards for BREEAM ‘Excellent’ within the Water category will apply. Should tighter national standards be introduced during the Local Plan period applicable for areas of serious water stress, they will be applied.**

[**Source Protection Zones**](#_Toc125988923)

[**Policy NE18 Source Protection Zones**](#_Toc125988924)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **4** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Portsmouth Water and the Environment Agency support the policy.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council note that any issues are likely to be agricultural.
* A developer commented that they note the policy.

The council is satisfied that no modifications are necessary for this policy to be sound.

[**Nutrient Neutrality in Chichester Harbour**](#_Toc125988925)

[**Policy NE19 Nutrient Neutrality**](#_Toc125988926)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **18** | **Support:** | **6** | **Object:** | **12** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Bosham Association and Bosham Parish Council both want A11 removed from the Plan saying it has no agreed nutrient mitigation.
* A local resident felt Pagham Harbour should have the same protection.
* A developer felt the policy should promote suitable schemes.
* Chichester Harbour Trust support the policy.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy suggests clarification that mitigation measures must be in the context of Chichester Harbour.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council note that agricultural practices are a key issue and ask about strategies to minimise use of pesticides and fertilisers.
* Natural England support the policy but suggest additional wording to refer to other uses and additional guidance. They and Sussex Wildlife Trust (who also support the principle) both suggest information requirements should be set out.
* A resident supports the policy.
* A residents’ group comment on the need for infrastructure before housing;
* Premier Marinas support the principle although mitigation should be proportionate and only required where it doesn’t affect viability.
* The RSPB want additional information about current mitigation schemes and collaborative working.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

Information requirements will be added to the Local List rather than the policy as this can be more readily updated to reflect changing requirements. Other changes are not considered necessary as the appropriate mitigation will be considered and agreed at application stage, and agricultural practices are managed by nutrient reduction programmes that are outside the planning regime. Information about current schemes and collaborative working is set out in the Habitats Regulations Assessment. If the status of Pagham Harbour changes in future, this requirement can be addressed by policy NE16. Further detail on the latest nutrient budget is set out in the Nutrient Budget Background Paper.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

In paragraph 4.121 insert after “overnight stay”: “**Where other types of development have an impact on water quality this can be considered under policy NE16**.” After “other information” insert “**and guidance”**. After “to accompany applications,” insert “**and Natural England’s Framework Approach for Responding to Wetland Mitigation Proposals**”.

In policy NE19 insert a second paragraph “**Where wetlands are used as mitigation they should be designed using the Framework Approach for Responding to Wetland Mitigation Proposals**.”

[**Pollution**](#_Toc125988927)

[**Policy NE20 Pollution**](#_Toc125988928)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **9** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **5** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Natural England support Policy NE20.
* Portsmouth Water sought additional wording requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for developments that are located within Source Protection Zones (SPZ) and next to rivers.
* Environment Agency also sought additional wording to prevent pollution from construction activities.
* Stagecoach South objected to the lack of acknowledgement of the effects of transport.
* 2 parish councils and one action group objected to the policy on the basis that new housing should be reduced and that there should not be mitigation required.
* A parish council supported the policy.

The council is satisfied that subject to the following modification, Policy NE20 (which works alongside a suite of pollution control policies) is sufficient to protect amenity and the environment from pollution.

New paragraph 4 in policy: **“During construction activities, pollution prevention measures should be taken on a development site including but not limited to: appropriate storage of hazardous substances; suitable management of surface water to prevent pollutants reaching watercourses and provision of equipment for containing spills.”**

[**Lighting**](#_Toc125988929)

[**Policy NE21 Lighting**](#_Toc125988930)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **13** | **Support:** | **9** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Policy NE21 raised some support and some objections from parishes who sought further measures to reduce light pollution, including in urban areas.
* Concerns about lighting for pedestrian, cycle and road safety was also raised.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy sought an amendment to make it clear that the Dark Sky Discovery Sites are not designations.
* Natural England supported the Policy.

The council is satisfied that subject to the Policy being modified as follows, that the Policy will ensure that lighting is appropriate and will protect dark night skies.

Modify Policy NE21**;** second para “…to areas **~~with~~ defined as** Dark Skies Discovery Sites **~~designation~~**…”; and supporting para 4.128 “The plan area includes three ‘Dark Sky Discovery Site**s’ ~~designations~~**, all located within the Chichester Harbour AONB; …”

[**Air Quality**](#_Toc125988931)

[**Policy NE22 Air Quality**](#_Toc125988932)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **8** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Policy NE22 is supported by Natural England and the Environment Agency.
* Stagecoach have sought an amendment to ensure that public transport routes are included in criterion 1 of the policy.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and Mayday! Action Group objected to the impact of new housing on air quality.

The council is satisfied that Policy NE22 is sufficient to address the impact of development on air quality and that the impact of housing development and the associated traffic generated has been considered through the Air Quality Assessment that accompanies the Chichester Transport Study January 2023. However, this will be updated in the final version to reflect the further work on the Air Quality Assessment as a result of Natural England's comments on the HRA. A reference to public transport has been added to criterion 1 which partially addressed the objection from Stagecoach.

Amend criterion 1: “Development is located and designed to minimise traffic generation and congestion through access to sustainable transport modes, including maximising **access to public transport routes and** provision of pedestrian and cycle networks.”

Criterion 4 has also been strengthened following feedback from the council’s Environment Team as follows: “Where development is likely to have a negative impact on an Air Quality Management Area, or other areas of poor air quality **and /or has the potential to cause an AQMA or poor air quality**, then an air quality assessment will be required...”

[**Noise**](#_Toc125988933)

[**Policy NE23 Noise**](#_Toc125988934)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **9** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Natural England support Policy NE23;
* National Highways commented that sites close to the Strategic Road Network would require appropriate mitigation measures and masterplanning.
* Goodwood Estate were supportive but also sought changes to include reference to the ‘agent of change’ principle, clarification on evidence requirements and additional reference to leisure uses in para 4.134.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council supported but raised concerns about the noise impact from additional traffic.
* Countryside Properties sought less ambiguous wording in criteria 1 and 2 to align with Noise PPG paragraph 004.

The council is satisfied that subject to the following modifications to the Policy and supporting text, that Policy NE23 will provide protection from noise exposure.

Para 4.133 - Change hyperlink for Planning Noise Advice Document for Sussex and reference in footnote as document revised and accessed in new location.

Para 4.134 to read: “…. located in close proximity to noise sources, including transport, **leisure,** commercial and industrial operations,…..”

Policy NE23 criterion 1 to be amended:“Where noise sensitive development is proposed, a high-quality living environment is provided with acceptable levels of amenity for future occupiers by seeking to **avoid noise that gives rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life ~~achieve an absence of significant noise disturbance of or annoyance~~** as well as no significant adverse impact on the operation of nearby noise generating uses….”

[**Contaminated Land**](#_Toc125988935)

[**Policy NE24 Contaminated Land**](#_Toc125988936)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **6** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **2** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Environment Agency, Portsmouth Water, Wisborough Green Parish Council support Policy NE24.
* Mayday! Action Group are seeking the active promotion of contaminated land to allow its re-use.

The council is satisfied that Policy NE24 will ensure that contaminated land is addressed appropriately to allow development to come forward. No modifications are proposed.

# [Chapter 5: Housing](#_Toc125988937)

[**Meeting Housing Needs**](#_Toc125988938)

[**Policy H1 Meeting Housing Needs**](#_Toc125988939)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **105** | **Support:** | **9** | **Object:** | **96** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* National Highways commented/objected on a number of issues related to the strategic road network, including the impact on the A27 and how mitigation would be funded and delivered if unmet need cannot be dealt with by neighbouring authorities and evidence on the consideration of locations away from the A27.
* Mayday! Action Group objected to the 535dpa due to the impact on Chichester Harbour AONB and South Downs National Park, as well as impact on environment and quality of life for existing residents in East-West corridor.
* Respondents (including Bosham Association, Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council, Chichester Harbour Trust, Fishbourne Meadows Residents’ Association) objected to the amount of development in the east-west corridor on grounds including nitrate neutrality, wastewater pollution, road congestion, air pollution, lack of infrastructure, biodiversity impacts, loss of agricultural land, impact on character of settlements in corridor.
* Several respondents commented that the A27 could not be considered either a permanent or exceptional constraint.
* Developers/site promoters and the Home Builders Federation objected to the Local Plan not making provision to meet the housing needs of the district in full (and impacts of not meeting need) in principle, and on the basis that the Transport Study sensitivity analysis supported higher growth of 700dpa. Several respondents referenced the needs of specific groups not being met as a consequence.
* Site promoters objected that there was no flexibility in the housing requirement figure, suggesting a buffer of 15% would be appropriate.
* One respondent (site promoter) objected to the lack of reference to how the Transport Study was covered in Duty to Cooperate discussions.
* Various alternative sites were promoted including at Fishbourne, Southbourne, Boxgrove, Chichester city, Hunston, Loxwood and Wisborough Green.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish objected to the housing number being too high.
* Kirdford Parish Council objected to the lack of explanation for increase in the amount of housing proposed in the north and decrease in the south, compared to the Preferred Approach.
* A site promoter objected to the lack of any strategic allocations being made on the Manhood Peninsula.
* The scale of development proposed for the northern part of the plan area and the individual parishes was generally opposed by residents and parish councils, with the converse view expressed by site promoters who considered that a higher dwelling number was appropriate.
* A couple of site promoters expressed concern over the amount of housing that was reliant on delivery from strategic allocations, rather than being delivered via small/medium size sites.
* A site promoter objected to the Southbourne broad location approach rather than the making of a site allocation.
* The Home Builders Federation queried if the NPPF requirement to provide at least 10% homes on small sites had been met. They also commented that sites in the AONB should not be discounted in the HELAA without further assessment.
* Horsham District Council acknowledged the challenges in meeting the housing requirement but sought further justification to support this.
* Arun District Council objected that the Policy did not account for cross boundary infrastructure contributions and the phasing of development related to infrastructure to address unmet need.
* Donnington and Bosham Parish Councils objected on the grounds that the Local Plan failed to mitigate the impact of additional growth with particular reference to transport impacts.
* One respondent suggested that the housing requirement figure should take account of replacement housing lost to coastal retreat.

The council’s response to the majority representations on H1 are covered by a series of Background Papers setting out the updated transport evidence and justification for the constrained housing requirement. These are supported by the Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate and Statements of Common Ground.

In response to representations suggesting that 575dpa is too high and there is no justification or evidence to support a housing requirement figure below the 575dpa which is already a constrained number, the Housing Distribution Background Paper explains the background to the distribution of the housing numbers and spatial strategy which will include the justification for the scale of development in the north-east of the plan area. The Housing Need Background Paper sets out the background on the housing requirement figure. The Housing Supply Background Paper sets out the evidence which supports the updated housing trajectory and subsequent update to Policy H1 detailed below. The housing Background Papers should be read in conjunction with the Transport Background Paper.

The promotion of omission sites to the council has been noted. Duty to cooperate discussions with Arun and Horsham councils are ongoing and Statements of Common Ground will be concluded when the council’s position has been finalised. Modifications proposed are as follows:

Paragraph 5.1: The Preferred Approach consultation on the Local Plan was based on meeting the identified **~~objectively assessed~~** **local** housing need**~~s~~ ~~of~~** **for** the plan area of 638 dwellings per annum[[8]](#footnote-8) (dpa) plus an allowance for accommodating unmet need arising from the Chichester District part of the South Downs National Park.

Paragraph 5.2: “However, constraints **~~particularly~~ to** the capacity of the A27 **~~has~~ have** led to the council planning for a housing requirement below the need derived from the standard method, **~~of~~** 535 dpa in the southern plan area and a further 40 dpa in the northern plan area, a total **~~supply~~ requirement** of 10,350 dwellings…..”

Paragraph 5.3 Updated position on Duty to Cooperate: “In order to meet the requirements of the duty to cooperate the council **~~have~~** approached neighbouring and other authorities to see whether they may be able to meet any of Chichester’s unmet needs. **~~Most of t~~T**he neighbouring authorities are faced with similar constraints and are unable to assist **at this time**. The latest position **~~will be~~is** set out in the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance.”

Paragraph 5.5, additional sentence at end of paragraph: "**The number of completions above the housing requirement, since the base date of the plan, will be taken in to account when calculating the council’s 5 year housing land supply position.**”

Policy H1 – Revised tables to be inserted as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category |  | Number of dwellings | |
| Housing requirement for the full Plan Period (1 April 2021 to 31 March 2039) | | **10,350** | |
| Housing supply  (1 April 2021 to 31 March 2039) | a. Completions 1 April 2021 - 31st March 202~~2~~3 | **~~712~~ 1616** | |
| b. Known commitments *(comprising)* | **~~5,674~~ 5,772** | |
| *Outstanding 2015 Local Plan [[9]](#footnote-9) and Site Allocation DPD 2014 – 2029 allocations[[10]](#footnote-10) without planning permission* | *2,210* |  |
| *Outstanding 'made' Neighbourhood Plan allocations without planning permission* | *~~100~~*  *94* |  |
|  | *Planning permissions as of 31 March 2024[[11]](#footnote-11)* | *~~3,364~~*  *3,468* |  |
|  |  | | |
|  | New Strategic Locations/Broad Location for Development and Allocations | *3,210* |  |
|  | c. *Remaining figure without planning permission* | ***~~3,056~~ 2,396*** | |
|  | Non-strategic Parish Housing Requirements | *310* |  |
|  | d. *Remaining figure without planning permission* | ***~~260~~ 248*** | |
|  | e. Windfall **~~(small site allowance)~~** | ***~~657~~ 720*** | |
| **Total supply for the full Plan period** (1 April 2021 to 31 March 2039) (=a+b+c+d+e) | | ***~~10,359~~ 10,752*** | |

The broad spatial distribution of this supply of housing across the different plan areas is indicated in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-Area** | **Housing provision 2021-2039** |
| East-West Corridor | **~~8,717~~ 8414** |
| Manhood Peninsula | **~~963~~ 1013** |
| North of Plan Area | **~~679~~ 605** |
| **Total excluding windfall** | **10,032** |
| **Plan Area Total** | **~~10,359~~ 10,752** |

Paragraph 5.6 Additional sentence at the end of the paragraph to clarify approach to speculative permissions within parishes with a strategic location: “**Paragraph 5.10 also applies to parishes with a strategic location”.**

[**Policy H2 Strategic Locations/ Allocations 2021 - 2039**](#_Toc125988940)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **80** | **Support:** | **12** | **Object:** | **68** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Site promoters supported carrying forward strategic allocations from the adopted Local Plan.
* Thames Water Utilities Ltd did not raise an objection as none of the strategic allocations were located within the Thames Water region.
* Stagecoach South supported the identification of the strategic allocations and opportunity to make use of sustainable transport modes.
* Bosham – local residents objected on grounds of wastewater capacity.
* Chichester city – a site promoter objected that there was greater capacity for development and additional allocations should be made surrounding the city.
* Loxwood – local residents objected on grounds of lack of availability/capacity of local facilities, water neutrality, flooding, amount of housing already given planning permission, greenfield development, Neighbourhood Plan should not be overridden, scale of development disproportionate when compared to strategic allocations in other areas i.e. Chichester city, unsuitable road network, lack of public transport.
* A site promoter objected that the strategic allocation in Loxwood should be increased to 300 dwellings and that the allocation should be made in the Local Plan rather than the Neighbourhood Plan.
* Site promoters objected that strategic allocations should be made in Kirdford, East Wittering, Selsey, Westbourne, Hunston and Boxgrove.
* One respondent indicated that the housing figure for Hambrook and Nutbourne should be increased to 500 dwellings.
* Bosham Association, Mayday! Action Group, Chichester Harbour Trust, Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and Chichester Harbour Conservancy objected to the amount of development on grounds including wastewater capacity, capacity of road infrastructure and no certainty of mitigation, development of greenfield sites when brownfield sites are available; not sustainable, coalescence, traffic congestion, air pollution, impacts on the landscape, AONB and environment.
* One respondent (Chichester and District Cycle Forum) objected that transport and wastewater infrastructure should be committed prior to the release of any housing sites.
* South Downs National Park Authority commented that development of sites that may be in the setting of the National Park would need to address the requirements of NPPF paragraph 176 (now paragraphs 182/183).
* One respondent (site promoter) suggested that to provide some flexibility in the quantum of development on strategic allocations, the Policy wording should be amended so it reflected the assessed actual capacity and effective use of land.
* Bosham Parish Council objected to the making of allocations outside of settlement boundaries.
* National Highways commented that dispersing development along the east-west corridor would place traffic impacts on multiple A27 junctions rather than just one or two locations.
* A site promoter objected to the lack of any strategic allocations on the Manhood Peninsula.
* Westhampnett Parish Council objected that changes since the Preferred Approach had not been subject to further public consultation under Regulation 18.
* Several respondents queried the timing of delivery from the strategic allocations as set out in the housing trajectory.
* One respondent (site promoter) objected to the increased allocation at Highgrove Farm suggesting that some of the housing number should be accommodated on an alternative site.
* One respondent (site promoter) objected that strategic allocations should be made through the Local Plan rather than left to Neighbourhood Plans.

No changes are proposed in response to the representations. The council’s approach to the spatial distribution of the housing numbers between settlements is based on locating the majority of development in locations which have access to a range of services and facilities, informed by the settlement hierarchy evidence, which is set out in the updated Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper. The strategy has also been influenced by site availability and suitability, environmental and other constraints and informed by the Sustainability Appraisal. The Housing Distribution Background Paper sets out the stages which informed the distribution of numbers to each parish, including the testing applied to the options in the north-east of the plan area to demonstrate that ‘no stone is left unturned’ in finding additional supply. Concerns raised in representations in relation to infrastructure delivery are addressed through Policy I1 ‘Infrastructure Provision’ and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that accompanies the Plan.

The housing trajectory has been amended which will address some of the responses relating to delivery timescales.

[**Policy H3 Non-Strategic Parish Housing Requirements 2021 - 2039**](#_Toc125988941)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **94** | **Support:** | **13** | **Object:** | **81** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Wisborough Green Parish Council were supportive of the identification of sites for small scale housing being undertaken at parish level.
* Hunston Parish Council supported the removal of a strategic housing allocation for Hunston/Manhood Peninsula.
* Westbourne Parish Council supported the parish housing figure for Westbourne.
* Boxgrove Parish Council objected to the Boxgrove parish housing figure.
* Objection that scale of growth proposed for parishes in north of the Plan Area was not compatible with statement in the Local Plan that housing would generally be directed to larger settlements, insufficient infrastructure to support this growth and environmental constraints/impacts.
* One respondent (site promoter) sought clarification on how unimplemented commitments impacted on non-strategic allocation numbers.
* Site promoters objected to the lack of at least some growth within all parishes and specifically the absence of non-strategic allocations at Birdham, Hunston, Lavant, Sidlesham, Selsey, East and West Wittering.
* Site promoters objected that some parishes (Boxgrove, Plaistow and Ifold, Fishbourne, North Mundham, Wisborough Green, Westbourne, Tangmere) could accommodate a higher housing figure.
* Several respondents sought clarification of what would happen in the event that Neighbourhood Plans did not progress, suggesting that either clear timescales were needed or flexibility built into the policy to enable sites to come forward via planning applications.
* There was objection from a site promoter that allocations should be made through the Local Plan and not left to Neighbourhood Plans.
* Clarification of the policy wording to define ‘small scale’ was sought.
* Chidham and Hambrook, Kirdford and Wisborough Green Parish Councils expressed the view that developments of any size (not just 6+) should count towards the parish housing requirement.
* One respondent objected that the Local Plan did not include a policy regarding the identification of a new settlement and suggested that the wording of paragraph 5.14 could form the basis for a policy.

The council’s response to representations on H3 are largely the same as for Policy H1. Where representations have criticised the reliance on neighbourhood plans, there is no evidence to suggest that the successful track record of allocations successfully being made through neighbourhood plans would not continue.

The housing trajectory has been amended which will address some of the responses relating to delivery timescales.

The following changes are proposed to the supporting text for clarity:

Paragraph 5.9 “Housing sites for Chichester city will be allocated through the preparation of **a neighbourhood plan or ~~the~~ a subsequent** development plan document and, **if the latter is the case, this** may include sites adjoining the Chichester city settlement boundary in neighbouring parishes (including sites separated from the settlement boundary by the A27)”.

Paragraph 5.10 Text should say “**5** or more” not 6, and “less than **5**” not 6 to reflect PPG update in 2019.

[**Affordable Housing**](#_Toc125988942)

[**Policy H4 Affordable Housing**](#_Toc125988943)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **29** | **Support:** | **8** | **Object:** | **21** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* A planning consultant on behalf of various developers highlighted the under-provision of affordable housing and argued that this means that the council’s housing requirement needs to be significantly increased above standard method (and hence well above 575) in order to ensure that the level of affordable need is met.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council raised concerns about the lack of sufficient provision of affordable housing, and the large amount of unmet need that would remain. They also object to the higher affordable housing threshold in the northern plan area, which they feel does not reflect the high level of need in the southern plan area.
* Mayday! Action Group were also critical of the long-standing lack of sufficient provision of affordable housing, which will only continue based on the proposed approach.
* Various local residents raise similar points in terms of the lack of sufficient provision of affordable housing and the need for a more extensive approach to provision.
* A consultant representing a developer has argued that the policy does not respond appropriately to the evidence set out in the HEDNA concerning the tenure mix.
* Various developers stress the need for the policy to incorporate flexibility so that the level and tenure of affordable housing provision can be adapted on a site-by-site basis with respect to viability considerations.
* One developer raised concerns about providing certain combinations of tenures on sites.
* Churchill Retirement Living argued that older persons housing should be exempt from needing to provide affordable housing, at least on brownfield sites in the southern plan area. McCarthy and Stone were also concerned about the ability of older persons housing schemes to provide the required level of affordable housing while still remaining viable.
* Kirdford Parish Council criticised the policy for lack of reference to the evidence base and lack of clarity regarding commuted sum payments.
* Westbourne Parish Council raised concerns that the policy as currently drafted, in relation to thresholds for when commuted sums are required, would prevent contributions being collected in Westbourne.

The council disagree with the comment that the policy does not respond to the HEDNA evidence in relation to the tenure mix, and in any case, the tenure mix is largely driven by the approach taken by the Local Housing Authority.

In response to the comments regarding the need for flexibility, in order to respond to viability constraints the policy already includes such flexibility, and such provisions are a well-established element of any such policy and reflective of national policy.

The point raised about certain combinations of tenures on sites is considered to be valid, but it is not considered that this gives rise to a need to change the policy, rather, it is a point to be considered when the policy is implemented.

In response to Churchill Retirement Living, no evidence has been submitted to substantiate this request and hence it is not considered to be a justified amendment. McCarthy and Stone raise similar concerns about the viability of older persons housing in terms of the scope for including the required level of affordable housing provision. Nevertheless, this issue has been considered in the Council’s viability appraisal which underpins the new Local Plan.

The points raised by Kirdford Parish Council are not considered to be soundness issues. The issue raised by Westbourne Parish Council in relation to thresholds for commuted sums is understood, however, the problem flows from national policy and cannot be avoided.

Ultimately, while it is acknowledged that it would be highly desirable to increase the amount of affordable housing provision, the reality is that there are insurmountable constraints in this regard which render it impossible to fully meet the level of need. The council consider that the plan is as positive as it reasonably can be in terms of tackling the need for affordable housing, and there are no amendments which can be proposed in order to ensure that the full need is met.

The following changes are proposed to Policy H4 for clarity:

Delete reference to Appendix I in criterion 3.

Add reference to **‘equivalent’** financial contribution to criteria 2 and 3.

[**Housing Mix**](#_Toc125988944)

[**Policy H5 Housing Mix**](#_Toc125988945)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **19** | **Support:** | **9** | **Object:** | **10** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* A few residents objected to the proposed housing mix, stating that the number of larger properties should be reduced in favour of an increase to 1/2 bed properties.
* Developers raised whether criterion 3 of the policy was flexible enough to support applications where a site may be more suitable for higher density, smaller units or where viability may impact achieving the proposed housing mix.
* Kirdford Parish Council raised an objection in relation to needing reference to the ability of Neighbourhood Plans to be supported by their own Housing Needs Assessment.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound.

The housing mix is based on the latest evidence set out in the HEDNA 2022. Consequently, the indicative percentages are considered to be appropriate.

The policy is considered flexible where required. Criterion 3 sets out that where a different need can be evidenced, an application can be granted. Additionally, paragraph 5.26 supports a different housing mix where appropriate, with regard to the nature of the development site and character of the area.

The policy includes a footnote to state that a specific local housing need study can be used, to reflect where additional/or updated studies have been done to inform both applications and neighbourhood plans.

[**Self Build and Custom Homes**](#_Toc125988946)

[**Policy H6 Custom and/or Self Build Homes**](#_Toc125988947)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **13** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **10** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* A general concern raised is that the current register has not been fit for purpose in terms of: the way it has been administered; the lack of publicity; and barriers to entry, and hence the level of need/demand it demonstrates is inaccurate. This is argued to be reflective of a general lack of positivity in terms of the approach taken to this issue by CDC.
* Chapman Lily Planning on behalf of Bellway Homes raise concerns about the clarity of the policy provisions which seek to secure a proportion of self/custom build units on large mainstream housing sites. They, along with other developers, also raised concerns about the appropriateness and practicality of the whole approach to securing provision via this mechanism.
* The Home Builders Federation (HBF) also object to the approach of providing self/custom build units on mainstream housing sites, as they argue that windfall sites provide adequate opportunities to meet the level of need/demand.
* National Highways have raised concerns regarding how construction traffic in relation to self/custom builders will be managed.

The council acknowledges that the administration of the register could be improved and has taken steps to do so, including a publicity campaign in the autumn of 2023, which has culminated in an updated register and hence a refreshed level of need/demand. The council has also procured additional data in relation to the level of self/custom build need in the plan area.

The council consider that requiring a proportion of self/custom build on mainstream housing sites is not uncommon, and it would make it very difficult to meet needs if this approach cannot be utilised. The approach set out by the HBF conflicts with national policy.

The council agree that the issue of construction traffic would need to be addressed and propose that planning conditions would provide an appropriate mechanism for doing so, by requiring the establishment of suitable construction management plans for relevant sites.

The self/custom build register was updated in 2023 in order to ensure it complied with the legislative and policy requirements. The council has also procured additional data from the right to build register in order to augment the understanding of the level of demand for plots in the plan area. Both these sources illustrate that there is a strong demand for self/custom building within the plan area. Consequently, amendments to relevant policies are required to increase the level of custom and self build provision.

Policy H6: Amend percentage requirement for self/custom build on strategic sites.

“In all other instances **~~2%~~5%** of market units provided on strategic scale housing sites should be self/custom build.”

This has also been reflected in the relevant site-specific allocation policies, A8 (Land East of Chichester), A10 (Land at Maudlin Farm), A11 (Highgrove Farm) and A13 (Southbourne Broad Location for Development).

[**Affordable Housing on Exception Sites**](#_Toc125988948)

[**Policy H7 Rural and First Homes Exception Sites**](#_Toc125988949)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **9** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **6** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Developer objections regarding limit to amount of development that can be delivered due to site size and location in proximity to settlement boundary.
* Developers raised objections for no allowance for market housing on rural exception sites.
* Developer raised an objection that the proportion of market housing on first homes exception sites is limited to demonstrating the need through viability assessment.
* Objection raised by Kirdford Parish Council in regard to definition of local, what is considered a local connection, the justification for 30 dwellings, and that sites should be required to be adjacent to the settlement boundary.
* National Highways requested more information on how such sites would be included in any monitor/manage policy.
* Goodwood Estate raised an objection regarding possible future provision of staff accommodation for workers that may not be covered by Policy H9.
* Objection raised by landowner that wording of criterion 1 was limiting the number of sites coming forward as ‘future’ affordable housing provision may not come forward and deliver current need.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound. The supporting text has been updated to include links to the relevant local connection tests. The policy criteria has now been split between rural and first homes sites due to the differences in connection tests, requirements and planning policy guidance. Further consideration has been given to the site size threshold for first homes and additional guidance suggested for the supporting text to help with the interpretation of ‘proportionate’

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Para 5.31. “… For the purposes of **rural exception sites ~~this policy~~** a 'local connection' is set out in the rural allocations policy contained in the council's allocations scheme**[[12]](#footnote-12)**. **For first homes exceptions sites, ‘local eligibility criteria’ is set out in First Homes guidance[[13]](#footnote-13)**.”

Para 5.34. “…National policy sets out that First homes exception sites **~~only~~** need tobe 'primarily' for First homes and hence can include a small market housing component, **where it can be demonstrated it is necessary to ensure overall viability. ~~However, tT~~**he inclusion of a market housing component will need to be robustly justified, taking into account the requirements set out in this regard in national policy and guidance.”

Para 5.37. “…Proposals for affordable housing exception sites will not be permitted in scattered or isolated locations.**~~, or, large scale development of over 30 homes.~~**”

Para 5.38. “The scale of the development should be **~~appropriate~~ proportionate** to the size of the settlement.**Proportionate should be determined with regard to the form, scale and established pattern of the settlement. However, sites will be unlikely to be considered proportionate in size if they would lead to an increase in the number of homes in a settlement by more than 5%, or if they would have an area exceeding 1ha**.**~~, defined in the NPPF as not larger than one hectare, or exceeding 5% of the size of the existing settlement.~~** …”

Policy H7

Criteria 1 “There is an identified local housing need which cannot be met by existing**, allocated** or **~~future~~ permitted** affordable housing provision;”

Delete Criterion 2: “**~~Proposals for rural exception sites are for up to 30 dwellings;”~~**

Criteria 4 “Occupiers can demonstrate a local connection; **~~to the parish in the first instance, and the immediately surrounding parishes in the second instance;~~**”

Second part of the policy: “**~~In addition to the requirements above,~~ ~~p~~P**roposals for first homes exception sites, except in designated rural areas, will be supported where all of the following criteria are met:

1. **a)** The site delivers primarily first homes;
2. **b)** There is a need for first homes which is not being met elsewhere in the plan area;
3. **c)** The homes will remain first homes in perpetuity;
4. **d)** The first homes provided are occupied by first-time buyers who meet the local connection test;
5. **e) The site is located adjacent or as close as possible to the existing settlement boundary and does not result in scattered or isolated development in rural areas; and**
6. **f)** The **scale of the proposal ~~size of the site~~** is proportionate to the size of the existing settlement to which it is adjacent, reflects the landscape character of the area and would be well related to the settlement…”

Applications for **~~first homes~~** exception sites that propose the inclusion of a small proportion of market housing will be expected to provide robust evidence that the site would be unviable without such housing being included.”

[**Specialist accommodation for older people and those with specialised needs**](#_Toc125988950)

[**Policy H8 Specialist accommodation for older people and those with specialised needs**](#_Toc125988951)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **20** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **15** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* General support received from residents.
* National Highways raised concerns about demonstrating funding for public transport services that may be needed for specialist accommodation, how the transport needs of the older demographic in the plan area will be managed, what locations have been considered and how trip generation would be assessed.
* Objection raised by developer that the policy should be amended to include ‘where appropriate and viable’ as some sites may not be suitable for specialist accommodation.
* A number of objections were raised from developers and planning agents that the quantum of units to be delivered is not specified in either Policy H8 or individual site allocation policies, and therefore there is no certainty that the need for different accommodations will be met.
* A developer raised an objection that specialist housing should not just be focused on large scale housing schemes as sites of over 200 dwellings will not be suitable in some locations.
* McCarthy Stone raised an objection that the supporting text should include sheltered and retirement housing as sources of housing for older people, and that applications should not need to demonstrate need given that substantial need in the plan area has already been identified.
* West Sussex County Council suggested some amendments to policy wording to support extra care housing coming forward for all age groups, as the policy as drafted, incorrectly has this listed only under housing for older people.

The council is satisfied that the policy is sound, subject to modifications set out below:

Amend title of section and Policy H8 to ‘Specialist **Housing ~~accommodation for older people and those with specialised needs~~**’

Add subheading after para 5.42 ‘**Extra Care Housing**’

Amend para 5.43 ‘**To help provide accommodation for those of different ages and with different support needs,** West Sussex County Council supports the provision of extra-care housing rather than traditional care homes.’

[**Accommodation for Agricultural, Horticultural and other Rural Workers**](#_Toc125988952)

[**Policy H9 Accommodation for Agricultural, Horticultural and other Rural Workers**](#_Toc125988953)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **4** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **1** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Policy H9 is largely supported, including by the West Sussex Growers’ Association who noted that it would help accommodate workers. The CDC Housing Team are also supportive of the Policy.
* One respondent objected as they considered the Policy failed to deal with new businesses.

The council is satisfied that the Policy and Appendix C do not preclude new businesses. No changes are required to Policy H9 or the supporting text.

[**Accessible and Adaptable Homes**](#_Toc125988954)

[**Policy H10 Accessible and Adaptable Homes**](#_Toc125988955)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **10** | **Support:** | **2** | **Object:** | **8** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Most objections received were from developers stating that the requirement for M4(2) dwellings would become a duplication of building regulations, as the Government is likely to introduce this as a mandatory standard following a consultation on Part M in 2020.
* Developers also raised that were this not to become a mandatory standard, that it would be too onerous, and only a percentage of dwellings should be required to meet the requirements.
* McCarthy Stone suggested a wording change to clarify that wheelchair accessibility standards can only be required where the council have nomination rights.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound. For the other matters raised, the M4(2) standard remains in the policy, as the proposed update to building regulations has not yet taken place. The policy has been drafted to reflect the needs of the local population and has been viability tested alongside all other policy requirements.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Point a) of Policy to be updated to: “a) 5% of affordable housing must meet wheelchair accessibility standards M4(3)((2)(b)) where there is an identified need on the Housing Register **and the council will have nomination rights**.”

[**Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople’s Needs**](#_Toc125988956)

[**Policy H11 Meeting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeoples’ Needs**](#_Toc125988957)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **9** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **6** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Two neighbouring authorities were supportive of the policy and general approach to this issue, namely the South Downs National Park and Horsham District Council.
* National Highways raised concerns regarding whether the policy needed to consider a wider array of temporary forms of accommodation, and the impact of digital nomads in relation to the Strategic Road Network.
* Southbourne Parish Council have objected on the basis of lack of consultation regarding the pitches assigned to Southbourne, the number of pitches which are now proposed in the parish, and in relation to the intensification of the Sunrise site.
* Several site promoters/prospective developers for sites within the new Local Plan have objected to the proposal to provide pitches on those allocations, this is for a variety of reasons, including lack of evidence that those locations would be acceptable to the traveller community and the difficulty with designing developments which could accommodate the size of vehicles associated with traveller pitches.
* One developer considered that the principle of incorporating pitches into housing sites is acceptable but considered that they should have separate accesses.
* It was also argued that the council is over-providing pitches owing to seeking to meet the needs of non-travellers.

In response to National Highways comments, the council considers that the scope of the policy is consistent with the requirements of PPTS and is reflective of the GTAA.

The issues raised by Southbourne Parish Council are addressed in the background paper published alongside the Reg.19 consultation. The background paper has been updated to reflect the latest position.

The approach of assigning pitches to strategic allocations is becoming increasingly common and is considered to be an entirely valid approach.

The need for separate accesses would appear to be discriminatory, as that would not be an appropriate requirement for any other form of housing.

In relation to the concern about over-provision of pitches, this is addressed by the proposed amendments to the plan which revise the need requirement in order to accord with the amended definition of travellers within PPTS 2023.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Representations have referred to the suitability of the proposed locations for pitches, and while that is not considered valid in relation to the proposed housing allocations, it is considered to be pertinent in a general sense, as there is essentially no need for pitches in the northern plan area, and hence pitch provision should be steered towards the southern plan area, in order to address the identified needs. Consequently, the following amendment has been proposed:

Paragraph 6 of Policy H11:“In addition to the site allocations within the Local Plan, in the event of any non-allocated housing sites coming forward for development **in the southern plan area**…”

The following amendment is also proposed for clarification in response to a representation by Natural England:

New paragraph at end of policy:“**In all cases, proposals for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople’s accommodation are expected to contribute to relevant access management strategies to mitigate recreational disturbance to SPAs in accordance with Policy NE6 (Chichester’s Internationally and Nationally Designated Habitats), and Policy NE7 (Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester, Langstone and Pagham Harbours and Solent and Dorset Coast SPAs, and Medmerry Compensatory Habitat).**”

In addition to the changes above, the following changes are necessary in response to the updated PPTS 2023:

Paragraph 5.60: “The Government’s Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS 20**23~~15~~**)requires councils to assess and meet gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople’s accommodation needs. Meeting this need has the same level of importance as every other housing need within the plan area. PPTS **~~2015~~ was** updated **in 2023, to the effect that** the definition of travellers for planning purposes **now includes again~~to no longer include~~** those **gypsies and travellers** who have ceased to travel permanently. **~~However, the needs of all travellers still have to be met in an appropriate manner.~~**

Additional sentence at the end of paragraph 5.61: “**The latest GTAA is based on the definition of travellers as set out within PPTS 2015, as that was the relevant version at the time the GTAA 2022 was completed, however, the consultants who prepared it have subsequently updated the need figures to reflect the amendments made to PPTS in 2023.**”.

Update references to PPTS in Table 5.1 and Table 5.2 to **‘PPTS 2023’**

Change Table 5.1 and link footnote as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2024 - 29[[14]](#footnote-14) | 2029 – 34 | 2034 – 2039 | Total |
| Households who meet the PPTS **2023** definition[[15]](#footnote-15) | 9**5~~0~~** | 17 | 1**8~~7~~** | 1**30~~24~~** |
| Households whose status is unknown but may meet the PPTS **2023** definition | **2~~3~~** | 1 | **1~~2~~** | **4~~6~~** |
| People living in caravans but established in the GTAA as not meeting the **PPTS 2023** definition. | **16~~20~~** | 4 | 4 | 2**4~~8~~** |

Delete final sentence at the end of paragraph 5.62 due to proposed changes to plan making system not allowing ‘part 2’ plans to be submitted post 30 June 2025: **~~The council will also consider allocating additional pitches via the forthcoming Allocations DPD.~~**

Amendments to Policy H11:

First bullet point add: “1**30~~24~~** additional permanent residential gypsy and traveller pitches(for those who meet the **PPTS 2023** definition) of which 9**5~~0~~** pitches are required before 2029;”

Second bullet point, delete: “**~~34 additional pitches will be needed for those who donidn’t meet the PPTS 2015 definition; and~~**”

Amend third paragraph: “All gypsy and traveller **and travelling showpeople** pitches**/plots** provided must comply with the site design policy (Policy H14).”

Amend sixth paragraph: “…accommodation for Gypsies and travellers **(that ~~whether they~~** meet the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites **2023** definition **~~or not~~)** should be provided…”

Delete first sentence from seventh paragraph: “**~~Where there is a shortfall in provision, sites will be allocated within a Site Allocation DPD.~~**”

[**Policy H12 Intensification sites**](#_Toc125988958)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **6** | **Support:** | **2** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The South Downs National Park were supportive of the policy, as were the Environment Agency.
* Southbourne Parish Council objected to the policy on the grounds of lack of consultation, and, objected to the inclusion of the Sunrise site, they also appear to suggest that unauthorised development appears to have taken place subsequent to the drafting of the policy.
* Westbourne Parish Council objected to the intensification of sites within their parish, owing to the high concentration of sites already within the area.
* A local resident criticised the policy for being overly restrictive (particularly in relation to flood risk) and inconsistent in terms of the approach to flood risk with respect to the sites near East Wittering.

In response to Southbourne Parish Council, the council considers that the policy is appropriate vis-à-vis the position at the time the evidence and policy were produced but has suggested an amendment in order to tackle any subsequent changes in circumstances pertaining to the sites listed.

In response to Westbourne Parish Council the council can understand the point raised, however, the council have taken a very measured approach to the intensification of sites, and pitch provision must respond to where the need is being generated, and that is essentially driven by existing sites, and hence there needs to be some scope for those sites to be intensified where there is capacity.

It is considered that generally the restrictions within the policy are appropriate, but an amendment is proposed to improve consistency.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Concerning the point raised above regarding the flood risk restrictions pertaining to the sites near the Witterings, the following amendments are proposed in order to provide greater consistency and also, another option for how to address the flood risk concerns:

Amend bullet point 6: “The Stables on Bracklesham Lane, 1 additional pitch **(temporary or personal consents owing to future flood risk)**”

Amend bullet 7: “Five Paddocks Farm, Bracklesham, 2 additional travelling showpeople plots (temporary or **personal consents** owing to future flood risk).”

The following amendment is proposed in relation to the point raised by Southbourne Parish Council.

Amend last sentence of first paragraph: “The number of additional pitches specified is in addition to the number of pitches on the site which **~~have~~had** been granted planning permission at the **~~time of the adoption of the Local Plan~~ time of the Pitch Deliverability Capacity Assessment in December 2022.**”

**Policy H13 Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **6** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The South Downs National Park and Environment Agency support the policy. Natural England have also set out support for the policy, although have asked for some additional clarification to be incorporated.
* Westbourne Parish Council objected to the intensification of sites within their parish, owing to the high concentration of sites already within the area.
* A local resident has raised concerns regarding the clarity of the proposed wording.

In response to Westbourne Parish Council the council can understand the point raised, however, this policy does not seek to direct additional pitches to Westbourne but needs to provide flexibility for provision to respond to the particular need characteristics of the plan area.

The council considers that the wording reflects that in the adopted Local Plan and national policy and is hence appropriate.

As has been referred to in relation to policy H11, the council is happy to include the wording proposed by Natural England, which clarifies the applicability of policies NE6 and NE7 to the provision of additional pitches, but considers that it would be best applied to the overarching policy (H11), as the clarification they have requested should apply to all pitch provision, not just that which comes forward on non-allocated sites.

[**Policy H14 Gypsy and Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople site design policy**](#_Toc125988960)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **2** | **Support:** | **1** | **Object:** | **1** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* A local resident, while supporting the policy, also objected on the grounds that further restrictions should be added to the policy, specifically in relation to preventing business related activities on sites which would be provided on the strategic allocation sites.

The council is not convinced that such an amendment would be necessary to make the policy sound. It would be overly restrictive to prevent any ancillary uses within traveller sites, and the plan already provides a suitable framework for ensuring that ancillary employment related aspects of traveller sites are properly considered.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound. An amendment has however been proposed to the supporting text in order to provide greater clarity regarding the storage requirements associated with travelling showpeople sites, this is in response to a representation received in relation to policy A20 (Land South of Bognor Road), which queries how such provision should be addressed. The proposed additional supporting text is as follows:

**“Travelling showpeople sites entail all of the amenity considerations associated with other traveller sites, however, they also require large areas for the storage and repair of equipment. These areas can vary considerably in terms of size. Analysis of the size of plots is set out** **in the Council’s** [**Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople background paper**](https://www.chichester.gov.uk/media/37688/Draft-Gypsy-and-Traveller-and-Travelling-Showpeople-Background-Paper-2023/pdf/Gypsy_and_Traveller_Background_Paper_-_draft.pdf?m=1673951956653)**. This sets out that the average travelling showpeople plot size in the plan area is 1500 sq.m and consequently this provides an indication of the area which should be planned for when providing travelling showpeople plots. Sites will need to include suitable areas of hardstanding for the storage and repair of fairground equipment. Clearly, such large storage and maintenance areas have implications in terms of residential amenity and landscape impact, which will require very careful consideration** **when devising site layouts and assessing relevant applications.”**

# [Chapter 6: Place-making, Health and Well-being](#_Toc125988961)

[**Design**](#_Toc125988962)

[**Policy P1 Design Principles**](#_Toc125988963)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **33** | **Support:** | **16** | **Object:** | **17** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Residents have objected on the grounds that development should be required to meet rigorous energy efficiency standards, such as the Future Homes Standard, in order to achieve net zero, and that the Local Plan policy should set requirements over those stated in Building Regulations. Hunston Parish Council raised concerns that the policy does not require PassiveHaus standards, or an equivalent, and that renewable energy is not considered.
* The Home Builders Federation, developers and their representatives including Bellway Homes, Thakeham Homes, Countryside Properties, Metis Homes, Miller Homes and Vistry Group consider the policy to be overly prescriptive, inappropriately detailed and inflexible, especially in relation to the use of materials. Bellway Homes challenged the proportionality of requiring sustainability statements for all proposals.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and Mayday! Action Group support the policy in principle but have respective concerns regarding the resources required to uphold the ambitious principles and the achievability of associated monitoring requirements.
* Kirdford Parish Council and Goodwood Estate propose the prioritisation of local design codes, involving local communities, to clarify detailed expectations of design quality. Chichester City Council propose that references are made to neighbourhood plans as a key means of addressing of thematic principles. Kirdford Parish Council and a resident propose greater policy emphasis on masterplanning to ensure effective design.
* National Grid and National Gas Transmission object to the policy on the grounds that references to existing site constraints, such as overhead power cables and underground pipelines, should be considered. National Highways objected as the policy does not explicitly recognise the safety aspects of roadside signage. Stagecoach South objected as they do not consider the policy to sufficiently focus on safe and efficient access, or sustainable transport modes.
* The Environment Agency proposed that all references to green infrastructure should be amended to green/blue infrastructure to ensure the water environment is not marginalised or ignored.
* Natural England, Wisborough Green Parish Council and several residents are supportive of the policy intent.
* A resident objected to the policy and considered that its intent for a high-quality environment is contradicted by the proposed strategic allocation at Loxwood.

The Council is very sympathetic to the representations which have been made that advocate setting much more ambitious sustainability requirements in relation to new buildings. However, the government made it very clear in December 2023 that Council’s should not seek to do that through their Local Plan and that this issue should be left to the process which is underway to update the buildings regulations in this regard. Consequently, the Council consider that the policy is already as ambitious as it reasonably can be in relation to sustainable design.

In terms of the representations concerning the perceived rigidity in relation to building materials, an amendment is proposed in order to provide some more flexibility in this regard. Similarly, an amendment is proposed to make the requirements in relation to when sustainability statements are required less onerous.

With regard to the comments concerning the need to emphasise the importance of design codes, particularly in relation to the neighbourhood plan level. The Council fully appreciate the importance of local communities in relation to raising design standards and consider that it is appropriate to emphasise that in the policy and an amendment to that effect is proposed. The other concerns raised are not considered to be soundness issues.

The amendments referred to above are as follows:

An amendment is proposed to the first paragraph of Policy P1 to clarify that adherence to the National Design Guide is required: “All development shall achieve a high quality design, **~~consistent with the ten characteristics set out in the National Design Guide (or any subsequent amendment)~~** **which accords with the** **National Design Guide (as amended or replaced with any subsequent version). The ten key characteristics of the National Guide can be summarised as follows**:”

This change also needs to be reflected in bullet point 2. Under “Consistency must also be achieved with the following:”: “All Design and Access statements submitted in support of applications shall clearly explain how the proposed development **~~delivers all of the above principles~~****complies with all relevant sections of the National Design Guide**,...”

Recommend new paragraph within P1 as follows: “**The Council will progress a design code(s) for the plan area following the adoption of the Local Plan and is supportive of the production of area based, neighbourhood or site specific design codes.**”

Recommend modification in relation to when sustainability statements are required**: “~~All development~~ ~~proposals~~ Proposals for new residential and commercial development, including replacement dwellings…**”.

Within point A regarding sustainable design add the words “**wherever possible**” after “including” in order to provide a degree of flexibility concerning the imposition of this requirement.

[**Local Character and Distinctiveness**](#_Toc125988964)

[**Policy P2 Local Character and Distinctiveness**](#_Toc125988965)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **13** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **8** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The Chichester Harbour Trust objects to the policy on the grounds that it is contravened by proposed housing allocations A11, A12 and A14. A resident has objected as they consider proposed development at Loxwood to be incompatible with the protection and enhancement of local character.
* Natural England, Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council, Wisborough Green Parish Council and residents are supportive of the policy intent.
* The Goodwood Estate proposes that the protection of local character and distinctiveness is achieved through the identification of character areas; Kirdford Parish Council proposes community preparation of local design codes through neighbourhood plans, and challenges lack of clarity surrounding masterplanning requirements.
* Bellway Homes propose the removal of references to building typologies and silhouettes, the removal of policy wording replicated in other polices, and the altering of wording regarding retention of boundary treatments and views.
* Thakeham Homes object to the ambiguity of supporting text regarding the provision of ‘too may identical house types’ within larger developments.
* Mayday! Action Group challenges the enforceability of policy criteria, especially in relation to respecting natural features and the retention of views.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound without modifications required. Objections raised regarding the incompatibility of P2 with proposed strategic allocations are addressed separately in relation to the more relevant policies. Proposals relating to the development of local character area and local design codes are considered within P1 Design Principles. Proposed changes to remove references to building typologies are not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the plan. The council is sympathetic to enforcement concerns but considers the issue separately to the development of planning policy.

[**Density**](#_Toc125988966)

[**Policy P3 Density**](#_Toc125988967)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **13** | **Support:** | **7** | **Object:** | **6** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Wisborough Parish Council, Miller Homes and Vistry Group support the policy intent.
* The Church Commissioners for England support the efficient use of land but suggest reference is made to density varying according to site specific circumstances.
* A resident supports the policy on the grounds the minimum density target of 35dph is achievable and not unrealistically high; Mayday! Action Group objects, considering the target to be inappropriate in a semi-rural area, with biodiversity insufficiently considered, and expectations of alternatives to car travel unrealistic.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council object to the policy on the grounds that biodiversity should be specifically considered by the policy, and that it needs to relate to different areas.
* Bellway Homes support the policy in principle, but propose integration with P2 to rationalise policies.
* A resident objects on the grounds the density target is not explained and conflicts with policies P1 and P2; Thakeham Homes seek clarity on the policy wording as well as how lower density schemes could be accommodated at constrained sites.
* Kingsbridge and Landlink developers object as they consider density would need to increase within Runcton HDA.
* National Highways support the policy to make most efficient use of land, but seek further understanding of associated constraints such as traffic generation and transport network capacity.

Recognising that policies to optimise land use will be robustly scrutinised at examination, as set out in the NPPF, the council has undertaken further work to review housing densities within the plan area. This provides evidence that efficient use of land is currently being achieved. The study has also explored existing densities in relation to the most sustainable and accessible areas.

Modifications to the policy in response to representations are not considered necessary, following completion of the density study. Furthermore, the council considers matters of biodiversity to be appropriately addressed by NE5.

[**Layout and Access**](#_Toc125988968)

[**Policy P4 Layout and Access**](#_Toc125988969)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **12** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **8** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council supported the policy but sought road adoption and queried parking calculations.
* Wisborough Green Parish Council supported the policy.
* Residents raised objections: seeking more cul-de-sacs and impact on Loxwood.
* Developers sought a less prescriptive policy.
* Mayday! Action Group considered the policy unsound and unrealistic.
* Stagecoach South sought reference to need for buses to access and circulate within large-scale development.
* National Highways queried how new active travel links will integrate with the wider network (including A27 pedestrian and cycle footbridges) and be funded, monitored and maintained; and sought clarity on how severance will be addressed.

The council is satisfied that the policy is sound. The points made by National Highways and Stagecoach are addressed through responses to Chapter 8, Transport. The criteria within the policy are not overly rigid but provide a clear steer on layout and access design principles to ensure high quality development.

[**Spaces and Landscaping**](#_Toc125988970)

[**Policy P5 Spaces and Landscaping**](#_Toc125988971)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **18** | **Support:** | **8** | **Object:** | **10** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* A resident sought additional wording on dark skies, climate change adaptation and protecting existing trees and hedges.
* The Woodland Trust and Wisborough Green Parish Council support the policy.
* Developers objected to the level of detail in the policy (too prescriptive) and one sought clarification on the wording in para 6.20 on boundary treatment. Barratt David Wilson Homes objected to criterion 7 (seeking permeable paving) on the basis that it was inconsistent with the drainage hierarchy.
* Chichester Tree Wardens support the policy and suggested minor amendments to the supporting text to highlight cooling benefits of trees.
* Natural England were supportive.
* Environment Agency proposed an additional reference to blue infrastructure.

The council considers the policy to be sound, subject to amendments below:

Modification to paragraph 6.20, last sentence as follows: “Where boundaries are exposed to the public realm or shared open space, such as communal gardens or parking, the use of timber close board fences will be resisted in place of higher quality, **~~and~~** more durable **or natural** approaches**, such as planting, railing or masonry.**

Modification to paragraph 6.23: “Development proposals including public realm must be proactively designed to anticipate and respond to these changes **by seeking and** maximising opportunities for **mitigations and adaptations ~~sustainable drainage and biodiversity functions~~**.Within external spaces and landscaping this could include, for example, **~~seeking and optimising opportunities for shade and~~** green infrastructure **such as trees to provide solar shading and cooling via transpiration, or ~~and~~** sustainable drainage systems. **~~that w~~W**hilst being functional**, these features** are designed **to be attractive and** contribute **~~an attractive and~~ a recreational function to the scheme**.” to clarify benefits and avoid confusion with P14.

Modification of criteria 2: “Will not leave or result in the creation of undefined **or** poorly integrated **~~or poorly lit~~** areas with no clear function;” to improve clarity.

Removal of criteria 7: “**~~Uses permeable materials for proposed and replacement hard surfacing or ensures surfacing can drain to sufficient adjoining permeable land within the site~~**;” to avoid inconsistency with Policy NE15 and national guidance.

Modification of criteria 8: “Will deliver well-considered planting schemes that are appropriate for the local context, promote biodiversity and prioritise the use of locally native species and the retention of existing trees **and hedgerows** (unless there is sound justification for removal);” to ensure comprehensiveness.

Modification of criteria 9: “Proposals should contribute positively to **~~connecting existing~~** green infrastructure **networks, connecting existing green and blue infrastructure assets and spaces ~~corridors~~** and seek**ing** to create new ones;” to recognise blue infrastructure and ensure alignment with P14.

Modification of criteria 10: “Exploit opportunities for appropriate new tree planting, including street trees, which enhance the public realm and where possible are positioned to provide additional **~~solar shading~~** benefits**, such as solar shading and cooling,** to both external and internal spaces;”to recognise cooling as well as shading benefits.

[**Amenity**](#_Toc125988972)

[**Policy P6 Amenity**](#_Toc125988973)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **12** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **8** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Developers and their representatives, as well as residents, objected to the absence of justification for the proposed adoption of space standards; Bellway Homes additionally raised the potential viability implications of meeting Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) in combination with the M4(2) accessibility regulations.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council supported the principle of the policy but proposed for Parish Council and local residents to be consulted at pre-application stage, and sought further definition of amenity.
* Developers sought flexibility within the policy in relation to the integration of technologies such as air source heat pumps, as well as separation distances. Residents also sought clarity on the separation distance requirements.
* Residents proposed additional policy references to protection of biodiversity, views and heritage assets but also commented on replication with policies relating to noise and lighting.
* Wisborough Green, Bellway Homes and residents supported the policy intent.

The council is satisfied that, subject to the modifications proposed below, the Policy is sound. The modifications reflect the compilation and intended publication of evidence to justify the adoption of the NDSS, which also provides assessment of compatibility with accessibility standards and consequential viability impacts. The council otherwise considers the policy to be sufficiently flexible, including in relation to separation distances, and wishes to avoid unnecessary duplication of matters concerning biodiversity, landscape and heritage addressed elsewhere.

Policy proposed to be modified as follows to improve clarity:

“**Housing Space Standards**

~~In the following case, the gross internal floor area of all~~ **All** new dwellings (excluding purpose built student accommodation, hotels, residential institutions) shall meet as a minimum the nationally described space standards (or any subsequent standards) **including:**

1. All dwellings in new build developments, regardless of tenure.
2. Where practicable, having regard to the physical constraints of the existing building, changes of use and conversions.

**~~Built in internal storage areas are included within the overall minimum gross internal areas. Garages, balconies, detached ancillary buildings and communal areas shared with other dwellings will not be considered to contribute towards meeting the minimum space standards~~.”**

Proposed modification to policy P6 in relation to separation distances:

Development shall maintain suitable separating distances between the windows of habitable rooms in dwellings (principal living rooms, principal dining areas, bedrooms and kitchens where there is not **a** separate dining room) and the windows and walls of other properties to ensure that an appropriate level of amenity is provided and retained for all residential occupiers.

**~~It will generally be expected that no less than 21 metres is proposed between facing principal windows of habitable residential rooms and windows of other uses that could result in significant overlooking. Appropriate distances will be considered on an individual site and design basis considering aspects such as density, scale, height differences and site levels.~~**

**~~In circumstances where land levels vary or the difference in building heights is greater than one storey longer distances may be required. Shorter distances will be permitted where they are necessary to secure the positive reuse of a historic building or are consistent with the character of the local area subject to it being demonstrated that an appropriate level of amenity for existing and future occupiers would be achieved.~~**

Relocation and rearrangement of deleted policy text to supporting text between current paragraphs 6.31 and 6.32 as follows:

**Appropriate separation distances between dwellings will be agreed on an individual site and design basis, allowing a range of scenarios including front-to-front, front-to-side and back-to-back to be considered, as well as aspects such as density, scale, height differences and site levels. It will generally be expected that, within a back-to-back scenario, no less than 21 metres is proposed between facing principal windows of habitable residential rooms and windows of other uses that could result in significant overlooking. In circumstances where land levels vary or the difference in building heights is greater than one storey longer distances may be required. Shorter distances will be permitted where they are necessary to secure the positive reuse of a historic building or are consistent with the character of the local area subject to it being demonstrated that an appropriate level of amenity for existing and future occupiers would be achieved.**

[**Alterations and Extensions**](#_Toc125988974)

[**Policy P7 Alterations and Extensions**](#_Toc125988975)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **5** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **1** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chidham and Hambrook, and Wisborough Green Parish Councils, Rolls Royce Motor Cars and residents are supportive of the policy;
* Chichester Tree Wardens propose amendments to the policy to require street tree planting.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound. It is considered unreasonable to further require development, which may be modest in scope, to provide additional tree planting beyond the criteria specified within Policy NE8.

[**Materials and Detailing**](#_Toc125988976)

[**Policy P8 Materials and Detailing**](#_Toc125988977)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **8** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chidham and Hambrook, and Wisborough Green Parish Councils as well as residents support the intent of the policy.
* Developers and their representatives including Bellway Homes, Countryside Properties, Thakeham Homes, Miller Homes and Vistry Group object to the overly prescriptive nature of the policy, especially in relation to the discouragement of non-timber cladding, uPVC and value engineering approaches.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound. The Council note the concerns that have been raised, but consider that high quality materials and detailing are vital for raising design and sustainability standards. The policy is considered to be important for clearly setting out how materials and detailing will help achieve high quality design, but also provides a degree of flexibility which recognises the practical aspects the design and construction process.

[**Historic Environment**](#_Toc125988978)

[**Policy P9 The Historic Environment**](#_Toc125988979)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **10** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **6** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Resident groups objected to the effectiveness of policy implementation and enforcement in relation to the protection of conservation and residential areas and proposed the zoning of functional areas within Chichester City.
* Goodwood Estate objected on the grounds the policy should recognise and assess the contribution of a heritage asset to the local economy.
* Chichester Tree Wardens objected on the grounds of the policy failing to connect trees with the historic environment.
* Bellway Homes commented that the policy is repetitive of national policy and should be consolidated into a single heritage policy with P10 and P11.
* Historic England welcome the inclusion of the P9-P13 heritage policy collection.
* Wisborough Green Parish Council and residents support the policy.

For P9, amendments include the following proposed modification:

Paragraph 6.52: “There are a high number of non-designated heritage assets which comprise much-cherished local elements of the area ranging from historic street furniture to locally important historic buildings **and trees**…”

Modifications don’t include references to the protection of residential areas, considered to be a separate matter to heritage considerations, or to require the assessment of the economic contribution of heritage assets on grounds of inconsistency with national policy as this may be disproportionate to the asset’s significance.

[**Listed Buildings**](#_Toc125988980)

[**Policy P10 Listed Buildings**](#_Toc125988981)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **6** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **2** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* A residents group objected to the effectiveness of policy implementation and enforcement in relation to the protection of conservation and residential areas and proposed the zoning of functional areas within Chichester City as well as restrictions on the use of Listed Buildings as amplified music venues.
* Wisborough Green and residents support the policy.
* Bellway Homes object on the grounds that the policy repeats large tracts of national policy and could be consolidated into a single heritage policy.
* Historic England welcome the inclusion of the P9-P13 heritage policy collection.

There are no changes proposed in response to the representations.

[**Conservation Areas**](#_Toc125988982)

[**Policy P11 Conservation Areas**](#_Toc125988983)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **8** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* A residents group objected to the effectiveness of policy implementation and enforcement in relation to the protection of conservation and residential areas and proposed the zoning of functional areas within Chichester City.
* Wisborough Green and residents support the policy; a resident commented that Chichester courts and bus stations should be preserved and the Southern Gateway enhanced as a public space.
* Bellway Homes objected on the grounds that policy criteria A2 is not positively prepared and proposed alternative wording.
* Residents objected to the policy on the grounds of inconsistency with proposed development at Tangmere.
* Historic England welcome the inclusion of the P9-P13 heritage policy collection.

For P11, amendments include the following proposed modification:

Amend criterion A.2: “Protecting **or enhancing** the setting (including views into and out of the area)” to ensure the policy is positively prepared and consistent with the NPPF and national guidance**.**

Modifications don’t include references to the protection of residential areas, considered to be a separate matter to heritage considerations, or to require specific protection of the assets within Chichester Conservation Area and recognised by local listing or the relevant character appraisals. Representations relating to the Southern Gateway and Tangmere strategic allocations are considered within those policies.

[**Non-designated heritage assets**](#_Toc125988984)

[**Policy P12 Non-Designated Heritage Assets**](#_Toc125988985)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **3** | **Support:** | **2** | **Object:** | **1** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Historic England welcome the inclusion of the P9-P13 heritage policy collection.
* Wisborough Green Parish Council support the policy.
* Bellway Homes object to the policy on the grounds criteria 2 c) implies non-designated heritage assets could be identified on the sole basis of contribution to surroundings, not heritage. They also challenged the application of criteria 4 a)-c) to all development involving ground works.

For P12, amendments will clarify identification criteria to ensure focus on heritage significance, and to ensure requirements relating to ground works in archaeological priority areas are appropriate.

Amend paragraph 6.74:

“The identification of non-designated heritage assets **~~throughout the plan area~~** will be **justified by consistent assessment against selection criteria to determine heritage significance ~~subject to change over time as more assets are identified~~.** Proposals affecting **non-designated heritage assets ~~buildings and structures~~** will be permitted where their **identified** architectural**, archaeological or ~~interest,~~**historic interest, **positive contribution to their rural or** townscape **setting, and/or external appearance~~value and rarity~~** are sustained or enhanced in accordance with established conservation best practice.

Amend Policy P12:

“2. **~~In order to be considered~~ The identification of** non-designated heritage assets**~~,~~ ~~buildings, historic areas, street furniture and designated landscapes~~** will **require ~~be~~** assess**ment~~ed~~** against **criteria within** the following **~~criteria~~ broad categories:**

1. **~~Buildings of high-quality traditional design, detailing and appearance which make good use of historic materials;~~**
2. **~~Buildings which are good examples of vernacular or traditional types;~~**
3. **~~Buildings which contribute towards their surroundings or street scene or have important local, historical or social associations~~.**
4. **Historic interest;**
5. **Architectural or artistic interest;**
6. **Archaeological interest;**
7. **Contribution to setting;**
8. **External appearance.**

**4.** The council will require applicants for **development** proposals **~~which involve excavation or ground works~~** on sites **which include or have the potential to include heritage assets with ~~of~~** archaeological **interest~~potential~~** to:

a) Submit an archaeological assessment **~~and evaluation of the site~~**, including the impact of the proposed development**, and, should it be indicated that significant remains may be present, an evaluation of the site;**

b) Preserve, protect, safeguard and enhance archaeological monuments, remains and their settings in development, and seek **~~a~~** public **~~display and~~**interpretation where appropriate;

c) Undertake proper investigation and recording of archaeological remains as an integral part of a development programme, and publication and archiving of results to **preserve significance and** advance understanding.

[**Registered Parks and Gardens**](#_Toc125988986)

[**Policy P13 Registered Parks and Gardens**](#_Toc125988987)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **5** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **2** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Goodwood Estate support the policy but propose modifications to its supporting text to emphasise the value of the Estate to the district.
* A resident supports the policy.
* Bellway Homes object to the policy on the grounds it is not positively prepared in relation to requirements to preserve the setting of registered parks and gardens.
* Historic England welcome the inclusion of the P9-P13 heritage policy collection.

The council is satisfied that, subject to the modifications below, the Policy is sound.

Amend criterion 4 “Preserve **or enhance** the setting (including views in and out) **whenever possible**; and”.

Modifications to this heritage-focused policy are unlikely to specifically refer to the broad value of individual estates, recognised elsewhere within the Local Plan.

[**Green Infrastructure**](#_Toc125988988)

[**Policy P14 Green Infrastructure**](#_Toc125988989)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **16** | **Support:** | **8** | **Object:** | **8** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Natural England, Sussex Wildlife Trust, Wisborough Green Parish Council and residents support the policy.
* Woodland Trust support to policy but propose strengthening it to reference the emerging statutory requirements regarding Local Nature Recovery Strategies.
* Rolls Royce Motor Cars support the policy in principle but propose that it or its supporting text should acknowledge that GI may require rerouting or re-provision to facilitate development.
* Miller Homes are broadly supportive but propose increased flexibility to take account of site-specific circumstances; Countryside Properties consider the wording of criterion 2 to be ambiguous in relation to expectations beyond site boundaries.
* The Environment Agency propose the amendment of references to GI and green/blue infrastructure.
* WSCC and National Highways propose a more proactive approach, seeking enhancements of the PROW network, and the maximising of active travel routes to achieve transport modal shift.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council comment that proposed housing development in the East/West corridor will reduce GI and decrease access to it.

The council is satisfied that, subject to the modifications below, the Policy is sound:

First paragraph of policy: “Proposals for **all** new **~~residential~~** development (excluding householder applications **~~and replacement dwellings~~**) will be expected to contribute to the provision of additional green **and blue** infrastructure, and the protection and enhancement of existing green **and blue** infrastructure.” to ensure clarity and recognition of blue infrastructure.

Amend criterion 2: “Where appropriate, the proposals create new green infrastructure which is ~~appropriate~~**proportionate** to the **scale,** type and **wider** context of the development proposal, and is integrated into the development design **~~and meets the needs of the communities within and beyond the site boundaries~~.**” to ensure the policy requirements are proportionate.

Amend criterion 4: “The proposals maximise opportunities to **enhance and** link to **active travel~~cycling and walking~~** routes, including **existing public rights of way as well as** multi-user routes.”to increase the proactivity of the policy requirements in relation to active travel as a means of achieving modal shift.

Amend criterion 5: “The proposals maximise opportunities to link to nature recovery networks, **including in accordance with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy**.” to ensure recognition of emerging statutory requirements.

Final paragraph: “Proposals for development that will otherwise harm **~~the~~ existing** green infrastructure **~~network~~ assets** will only be granted if they ~~can~~ incorporate **sufficient mitigation measures ~~that sufficiently~~ ~~mitigateits effects~~ ~~through~~ to benefit the GI network’s functions, connectivity, quality and/or extent**.” to clarify mitigation expectations and offer flexibility in relation to harm to individual GI assets.

The modifications are unlikely to address concerns relating to proposed strategic allocation, reflected elsewhere within the Local Plan.

[**Open Space Sport and Recreation**](#_Toc125988990)

[**Policy P15 Open Space, Sport and Recreation**](#_Toc125988991)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **18** | **Support:** | **8** | **Object:** | **10** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Developers and the Home Builders Federation queried the lack of clarity in P15 and supporting table 6.4 on the requirement for new indoor sports facilities, as table 6.1 does not include a threshold for when built sports and recreation facilities would be required. In relation to this, the age of the Open Space, Sports Facilities and Recreation Study (2018) was also questioned.
* The Woodland Trust welcomed the inclusion of natural greenspace but raised that it fell short of the Natural England Accessible Natural Green Space standard introduced in January 2023 and their Woodland Access Standard.
* Natural England, Sussex Wildlife Trust, parishes and residents generally supported the policy.
* A developer felt that existing open space is ill-defined in the final part of draft Policy P15.

The council is satisfied that the standards in the Local Plan reflect the evidence base as set out in the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study including the Indoor Sports Facilities and Playing Pitch Strategy 2018. However, the study has now reached its five year expiry date.

Due to the age of the evidence base the council has updated the Open Space Study, Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor and Built Sport and Leisure Facilities Needs Assessment.

The following amendments will be made to address objectors’ concerns in order to improve the clarity and accuracy of the Local Plan and to reflect the latest evidence:

Table 6.1 will be amended to show a threshold for indoor facilities and footnote 2 will be added as shown below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Threshold requirement for providing on-site open space, sport & recreation facilities to be secured by S106** | | | | |
| Type of provision | 1-19 dwellings | 20-49 dwellings | 50-99 dwellings | 100+ dwellings |
| Allotments | Not required | Not required | Not required | Must be provided |
| Amenity and Natural Green Space | Not required | Must be provided | Must be provided | Must be provided |
| Parks, Sport and Recreation Grounds (1) | Not required | Not required | Not required | Must be provided |
| Equipped Play Space (Children) | Not required | Not required | Must be provided | Must be provided |
| Equipped Play Space (Youth) | Not required | Not required | Not required | Must be provided |
| **Small community and sports halls (2)** | **Not required** | **Not required** | **Not required** | **May be required** |

1. For sports pitches, facilities need to be provided according to the need identified in the most up to date Playing Pitch Strategy.

**2. Provision depends upon average household size (table 6.2); local circumstances and quantity and access standard (table 6.4)**

Table 6.3 – Minimum Open Space Quantity and Access Standards to be amended:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Typology** | **Minimum quantity standards in hectares per 1000 population** | **Access standard in metres or by straight line walk time** |
| Allotments | 0.30 ha | 600 metres or 12-13 minutes |
| Amenity ~~and Natural~~ Green Space (3) | ~~1.0~~ **0.65** ha | 600 metres or 12-13 minutes |
| Parks**, Sport** and Recreation Grounds (1) | 1.2 ha | 600 metres or 12-13 minutes ~~to local facilities, but by a 10 minute drive time for larger multifunctional facilities~~ |
| Equipped Play Space (Children) (2) | ~~0.05~~ **0.075** ha | 480 metres or 10 minutes |
| Equipped Play Space (Youth) (2) | ~~0.05~~ **0.075** ha | 720 metres or 15 minutes |
| **Accessible Natural Green Space** | **1.2 ha** | **720 metres or 15 minutes and Natural England’s Accessible Natural Green Space standards and Woodland Trust’s Woodland Access standard** |
| Total for new provision | ~~2.6~~ **3.5** ha per 1000 population |  |

1. In addition to this standard, playing fields & pitches should be accompanied by small built facilities as a minimum to accommodate toilets, showers & changing rooms, parking and storage and associated parking and access commensurate with the scale of development proposed
2. Please note that this standard does not include any buffers, landscape design or informal play. However, equipped play space should be provided in accordance with Play England's 'Design for Play' Guidance which recommends designed landscape and buffers around play equipment which will be required in addition to the standard above.
3. SuDS and landscape screens and buffers can be potentially provided within the open space if they are both functionally appropriate and form an integral part of the design of the type of open space being provided.”

The wording in the introduction to Table 6.4 needs to be corrected by removing the reference to hectares. The sentence should end after the word “facilities”.

A footnote will be added to table 6.4 to make it clear that Sports halls and Health and Fitness facilities can be provided in small community halls as local needs determine – so applied flexibly.

Table 6.4 – Built Sport and Recreation Facilities Quantity and Access Standards

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indoor Facility | Quantity Standardper 1000 population | Access Standard Drive-time or walking in urban areas |
| ~~Swimming Pools - Based on 4 lane x 25m pool unit\*~~ | ~~10.05 sqm; or 0.042 pools~~ | ~~Within 15 to 20 minutes~~ |
| ~~Sports Halls - Based on 4 x badminton court hall unit~~ | ~~0.26 courts; or 0.065 halls~~ | ~~Within 15 to 20 minutes~~ |
| ~~Health & Fitness - Based on individual stations (pay and play access)~~ | ~~5 stations, subject to viability~~ | ~~Within 20 minutes~~ |
| **Indoor sports facilities** | **See the Indoor and Built Sport and Leisure Facility Needs Assessment** | **No standard set** |
| Small community halls\* | **New housing developments generating 500 or more people will be assessed by the council to determine what facilities are required proportionate to the scale of development proposed.**~~1 venue for each settlement of 500 people. 1 further venue for each additional 2,500 people but with flexibility of interpretation.~~  **The standard will be applied flexibly to best meet local circumstances. The aim should not be (for example) to create a proliferation of small community venues in areas of growth where fewer larger venues would be more appropriate. Contributions arising from this standard may also be used towards the enlargement/improvement of existing venues (whether on-site or nearby off-site) where appropriate.**  A small community hall will be required to provide:  A main hall to be used for a variety of recreation and social activities, of at least 18m x 10m; a small meeting/committee room; kitchen; storage; toilets; provision for disabled access and use; car parking.  Overall a total net floor space of 300 sqm will be used as a minimum guide for the building.  **A larger hall will be needed where an identified need for badminton or other sports and health and fitness facilities as local needs determine**.  ~~The standard will be applied flexibly in liaison with the council to best meet local circumstances. The aim should not be (for example) to create a proliferation of small community venues in areas of growth where fewer larger venues would be more appropriate.~~  ~~Contributions arising from this standard may also be used towards the enlargement/improvement of existing venues (whether on-site or nearby off-site) where appropriate.~~ | 600 metres or 15 minutes straight line walk time, but 15 minutes drive-time might be acceptable in rural areas. |

**~~\*To be funded through CIL~~**

**\* Sports Halls and Health and Fitness facilities can be provided in small community halls as local needs determine – so applied flexibly.**

In Policy P15 a cross-reference will be made to paragraph 6.84 to clarify what is included within the definition of open space.

[**Health and Well-being**](#_Toc125988992)

[**Policy P16 Health and Well-being**](#_Toc125988993)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **13** | **Support:** | **8** | **Object:** | **5** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Support from Natural England, National Highways and Chichester Harbour Conservancy.
* Support and objections received from Wisborough Green Parish Council. General support for policy, however concerns raised about ability to apply policy to northern parishes and that the IDP is Chichester centric.
* Developer objection to criteria 1, stating that requirements to provide land for healthcare provision should be justified on a case-by-case basis.
* Developer objection to the threshold of 50 dwellings and above to be accompanied by a Health Impact Assessment, stating that this should be in line with other polices, for example 100 dwellings for open space and recreation.

The council is satisfied that the policy is sound, subject to the modifications below:

Criteria 1 of the Policy is to be removed due to overlap with Policy I1 Infrastructure Provision: ‘**~~For new housing, the provision of land or financial contributions from new development, where appropriate and viable, towards new or enhanced healthcare facilities where new housing results in a shortfall or worsening of provision; For new housing developments, the provision of land will be secured via S106 agreements. CIL contributions will be used to fund improvements to healthcare facilities as set out in the council’s Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP).~~**

Delete number ~~‘~~**~~6’~~** as threshold is not part of list of requirements. Amend threshold to include floorspace: ‘Development proposals for over 50 dwellings **or 1,000sqm**, along with development proposals that may have an impact on health will require submission of a Health Impact Assessment.’

[**Local and Community Facilities**](#_Toc125988994)

[**Policy P17 New and Existing Local and Community Facilities including Local Shops**](#_Toc125988995)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **5** | **Support:** | **2** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* National Highways commented that further information was sought to assess how new or improved community facilities will demonstrate no adverse traffic generation effects.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound. The matters raised by National Highways are covered by Policy T2 Transport and Development.

# [Chapter 7: Employment and Economy](#_Toc125988996)

[**Meeting Business and Employment Needs**](#_Toc125988997)

[**Policy E1 Meeting Employment Land Needs**](#_Toc125988998)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **13** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **8** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Developers of Land West of Chichester want the policy to give a site area rather than a floorspace for their site.
* The horticultural industry considers the amount of industrial land proposed is insufficient to meet needs related to horticulture.
* Site promoters of alternative sites object, saying their site is more deliverable and that the council are not allocating enough.
* One individual objects to an allocation of Land South of Chichester (when read with other reps this appears to refer to the site South West of Chichester which was removed from the plan after Reg 18).

The floorspace for Land West of Chichester was taken from a planning application. The council proposes a minor modification to bring the way floorspace is calculated for Land West of Chichester in line with other figures that have been calculated on a plot ratio (where specific figures were not available). A floorspace figure is required for calculations. The council does not agree that insufficient land is proposed for employment across the plan period – the approach is based on the HEDNA 2022 which includes a flexibility uplift and allowance for replacement of losses. The other changes requested in relation horticulture relate to the horticultural policies. Further detail on the council’s approach to employment is set out in the Employment Background Paper.

The council is satisfied that the policy is sound with the following modifications, which also take account of recent data on employment completions and permissions up to April 2023 and some corrections:

Paragraph 7.1 Replace “**~~County Economic Strategy~~**” with “**Economy Plan**” – correction.

Paragraph 7.5: **~~22,000~~** should be replaced with **20,800.**

Paragraph 7.8:“In addition, provision is made **for flexible employment/leisure space within the neighbourhood centre at ~~within some of~~** the new strategic site allocation**~~s (Chidham and Hambrook and~~** Land East of Chichester **(A8) ~~for flexible working space to be provided within local centres/community hub buildings~~** and local provision will also be made through neighbourhood plans, and at the Southbourne Broad Location for Development.” – change to correctly reflect the allocations.

Table in policy E1:

After “Employment floorspace completions” amend date: (1 April 2021 to 31 March 202**~~2~~3**) and amend floorspace figure: **~~3,695~~****7106**.

After “Floorspace supply”, amend date**:** (1 April 2021 to 31 March 202**~~2~~3**).

Amend permissions figure: **~~53,655~~** **53,190**.

After “Land west of Chichester" replace **~~22,000~~** with **20,800**.

Amend total supply from **~~114,652~~ to** **116,388.**

[**Existing Employment Sites**](#_Toc125988999)

[**New Employment Sites**](#_Toc125989000)

[**Policy E2 Employment Development**](#_Toc125989001)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **13** | **Support:** | **6** | **Object:** | **7** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Policy E2 is generally supported by businesses, including the Goodwood Estate, Premier Marinas and Rolls Royce.
* Issues raised included more clarity required about when development would be supported outside settlement boundaries and in rural areas, and ensuring flexibility for new and flexible working practices.

The Local Plan is clear on employment in the countryside and Policy NE10 would also apply. There is sufficient scope within Policy E2 to allow for new and flexible working practices. The council proposes one minor change to criterion 5 to clarify that it applies to office developments.

Amend criterion 5: “For **office developments ~~class E(g)~~**, that the sequential test set out in national policy has been met, unless the proposal is for small-scale rural development.”

The council is satisfied that subject to the proposed modification, that the Policy is sound.

[**Addressing Horticultural Needs**](#_Toc125989002)

[**Policy E3 Addressing Horticultural Needs**](#_Toc125989003)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **11** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Representations from individual respondents concerned viticulture and the predicted unmet demand within the HDAs.
* The WSGA did support the policy although sought more flexibility in the types of horticultural development that could be supported by the policy.
* The RSPB requested acknowledgment of the Strategic Wildlife Corridors.
* The main horticultural developer within Runcton HDA requested major changes to the policy to support the developer, particularly in relation to the activities that might be permitted as horticultural development. Support was received from another developer.
* West Sussex County Council requested land owned by them be removed from the Tangmere HDA whilst the Church Commissioners for England promoted several landholdings across the local plan area to meet the predicted horticultural land need over the plan period.
* Natural England and Sussex Wildlife Trust were concerned in relation to how the proposed extension would interact with the Strategic Wildlife Corridors and sought prioritisation of the corridor over future development.

Changes to wording are proposed to address the points raised by Natural England and other environmental organisations in relation to the interaction of the Strategic Wildlife Corridor and future horticultural development, including the proposed extension to the Runcton HDA.

An amendment is also proposed to the definition of activities associated with horticultural development to address the objections from the horticultural industry, and further clarity is also provided in respect of the predicted horticultural need. The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound. Further detail on the council’s approach to the HDA is set out in the Horticultural Development Area Background Paper.

The reduced size of the proposed extension of the HDA as well as adjustments to the Strategic Wildlife Corridor so that no part of the proposed extension overlaps with the Corridor, satisfies Natural England’s concerns regarding prioritising the Strategic Wildlife Corridor.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Paragraph 7.22 – Amend as follows: “…. Approximately, 67 hectares is identified as necessary to meet the future horticultural land need within HDAs over the plan period **based on past trends.** However, given the historical pattern of horticultural development outside of HDAs, an additional 137 hectares of horticultural land is also forecast to be required outside of HDAs to meet future need.”

Paragraph 7.24 (ii) – “There is however, insufficient availability within HDAs to cover the forecast horticultural and **~~ancillary~~ functionally-linked** development need. Land at the Runcton HDA is almost at capacity and the Runcton HDA boundary has therefore been reviewed. The HDA will be extended at its southern boundary to include a further **~~30~~21** hectares of land promoted by the horticultural industry for horticultural **and functionally-linked** development **(as defined in Policy E4). The extension to the Runcton HDA is** **~~as~~** shown on the policies map.”

Paragraph 7.25 - “Horticultural and **functionally-linked ~~ancillary~~** development proposed outside of the HDAs will need to provide clear justification as to why the development cannot be accommodated within the HDAs.”

Policy E3 – change references to “ancillary development” to “**functionally-linked development**” throughout.

Second paragraph to refer to **21** hectares of land instead of **~~30~~** hectares of land as a planned extension at the southern boundary of Runcton HDA.

[**Horticultural Development**](#_Toc125989004)

[**Policy E4 Horticultural Development**](#_Toc125989005)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **11** | **Support:** | **8** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Horticultural organisations and developers both supported and objected to the policy. Policy objections questioned whether the current definition of horticultural development included sufficient flexibility for the industry to thrive, as well as contending there was a need for acknowledgment of horticultural land need outside of HDAs, a sequential approach and acknowledgment that there would be landscape impacts.
* The Environment Agency, RSPB, National Highways and the Church Commissioners for England were all in support of the policy.
* Natural England supported the policy with suggested amendments in relation to a requirement for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments to echo the provisions of the Natural Landscape policy, as well as a strengthening of the wording in relation to the Strategic Wildlife Corridors.

Changes to wording are proposed to address the point raised by Natural England, as well as an amendment to the definition of activities associated with horticultural development, and the reference to landscape impacts to address the objections from the horticultural industry. The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Paragraph 7.29 –Delete last two sentences: **“~~The council considers that the HDAs should remain available for growing and packing horticultural products and other processes directly related to their production. These other processes are classed as “ancillary development~~”.**

Insert new paragraph between 7.29 and 7.30 as follows: “**The council is committed to ensuring that planning policies assist the national and international competitiveness of the district’s horticultural industry during the local plan period. It is recognised that there is a demonstrable business need to deliver development that is functionally-linked to the growing of produce within HDAs in order to support the vitality and viability of the industry. Functionally-linked developments are likely to include, but are not limited to, storage and distribution facilities, food processing and packaging, research and development and the production of renewable energy/provision of energy hubs. The council considers it important to ensure that new developments within HDAs are retained for horticulture, or purposes functionally-linked to horticulture, in order to ensure the competitiveness of the industry is maintained. The council will use planning conditions and/or planning obligations where appropriate to achieve this aim. In order for a proposal to be considered as functionally-linked development, the planning application will need to demonstrate considerable benefits of co-location within the HDA (i.e. the contribution to local synergies and/or the reduction in food miles and in carbon emissions).”**

Paragraph 7.30 – amend first sentence: “Smaller scale horticultural development will **continue to** be focused within the existing HDAs at Sidlesham and Almodington.”

Paragraph 7.36 – amend last sentence: The Arun and Western Streams Abstraction Licensing Strategy **(~~March 2019~~June 2022**) sets out the current situation within the Chichester District.

Policy E4, second paragraph –change to read: **“**Within designated HDAs, as shown on the policies map, planning permission will be granted for new horticultural and **functionally-linked ~~ancillary~~** development where it can be demonstrated that **~~the following criteria (1-10) have been met~~**:”.

Policy E4, insert new criterion 1 and 2 as follows:

1. **The development will be used solely for horticulture and/or purposes functionally-linked to horticulture. Functionally-linked development may include:** 
   1. **Propagation and growing of horticultural produce within or outside buildings;**
   2. **the processing and packaging of food items,**
   3. **the storage and distribution of produce, processed foods and associated packaging;**
   4. **research and development and office functions which relate to horticulture and/or horticultural food production;**
   5. **renewable energy production where the primary recipient/user of the energy produced are located within or adjacent to the HDA.**
2. **If the proposal is for functionally linked development, the proposal demonstrates considerable benefits of co-location (i.e. the contribution to local synergies and/or the reduction in food miles and in carbon emissions);**

Policy E4, current criterion 5 – change as follows: “…does not **have a significant adverse effect upon ~~damage~~** the character or appearance of the surrounding countryside, **landscape or setting of the SDNP** and mitigation measures…”

Policy E4, criterion 9 - “…The proposal **enhances and protects the Strategic Wildlife Corridors and** ensures….”

Policy E4, Outside HDAs, first paragraph – change to read**:** “…Where no suitable land within HDAs is available, development proposals for horticultural and **~~ancillary~~functionally-linked** development on land adjacent to HDAs is preferred followed by land elsewhere in the plan area. All development proposals on land outside HDAs will need to address the criteria above (1-**~~8~~12)** as well as the additional criteria (**~~9-~~**1**~~2~~-3-16)** below:”

Policy E4 final paragraph – change: **“**Planning applications for horticultural and **functionally-linked~~ancillary~~** development will need to consider the policies concerning biodiversity; wildlife; **strategic wildlife corridors;** the natural landscape; and pollution….”

[**Retail Strategy and New Development**](#_Toc125989006)

[**Policy E5 Retail Strategy and New Development**](#_Toc125989007)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **5** | **Support:** | **1** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* National Highways support the provision of retail development within existing areas and the re-occupation of vacant floorspace.
* Concerns over loss of city centre shops versus increase in out of town development.
* Concern over traffic generation.
* Brookhouse Group object to de-allocation of Land at Barnfield Drive.
* Bellway Homes support delivery of housing to support economic development.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound. It is not considered necessary to make modifications to the policy. The policy as written is intended to protect the city centre. Traffic impacts will be assessed through the development management process. The council remains supportive of development on Land at Barnfield Drive. De-allocating the site allows for a variety of development proposals to come forward as an alternative to strictly retail. Further detail on the council’s approach is set out in the Retail Background Paper.

[**Chichester City Centre**](#_Toc125989008)

[**Policy E6 Chichester City Centre**](#_Toc125989009)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **5** | **Support:** | **1** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Comments relating to updating references to the Chichester Vision (2017).
* Bellway Homes support delivery of housing to support economic development.
* Object to lack of strategy to enhance night-time economy.
* Suggest zoning of city centre for different uses.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound. It is not considered necessary to make modifications to the policy. The Chichester Vision (2017) remains the current version therefore reference should continue to be made. The Vision considers ways to boost night-time economy. Zoning of the city centre is not considered justified due to the impact on historic significance of the area.

[**Local and Village Centres**](#_Toc125989010)

[**Policy E7 Local Centres**](#_Toc125989011)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **1** | **Support:** | **1** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Bellway Homes support delivery of housing to support economic development.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound. No issues of soundness or objections were raised.

[**Tourism**](#_Toc125989012)

[**Policy E8 Built Tourist and Leisure Development**](#_Toc125989013)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **5** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Representations, including from Natural England, were supportive of Policy E8.

The council is satisfied that subject to the proposed modification below, that the Policy is sound.

A minor amendment is proposed to criterion 2 of Policy E8 to include reference to internationally designated areas: “It is located so as not compromise the essential features of **internationally designated areas and** nationally designated areas of landscape,…”

[**Caravan and Camping Sites**](#_Toc125989014)

[**Policy E9 Caravan and Camping Sites**](#_Toc125989015)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **7** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **2** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Comments on Policy E9 are generally supportive, including support from the Environment Agency and National Highways.
* Objections related to a desire for the winter storage of touring caravans/units to be year-round as well as visual obtrusions applying to areas within the Chichester AONB only.
* Natural England sought an amendment to the policy to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites.

The council is satisfied that subject to the proposed modifications, that the Policy is sound.

The following wording will be inserted between criterion 5 and criterion 6 of Policy E9: **“They are located so as not compromise the essential features of internationally and nationally designated areas of landscape, historic environment or nature conservation protection, including impacts from visitors or users of the facilities, particularly in relation to the potential for increased recreational pressures on Chichester Harbour, Pagham Harbour, Medmerry Compensatory Habitat and other designated sites;”.**

For consistency with criterion 6 and since the SFRA evidence, the current criterion 8 is amended as follows:“Whether the accommodation is within an area at risk of flooding **~~as defined by the Environment Agency~~**;”

[**Equestrian Development**](#_Toc125989016)

[**Policy E10 Equestrian Development**](#_Toc125989017)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **3** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* No objections were raised to the policy.
* Natural England supported the inclusion of an additional policy requirement in relation to biodiversity impacts and provision of biodiversity net gain, following advice sent in 2021.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound.

# [Chapter 8: Transport and Accessibility](#_Toc125989018)

[**Transport Infrastructure**](#_Toc125989019)

[**Policy T1: Transport Infrastructure**](#_Toc125989020)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **141** | **Support:** | **18** | **Object:** | **123** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* National Highways welcomed the collaborative work with the council to date, but suggested several changes, including addressing the potential need for Compulsory Purchase powers to be used and more detail provided on proposed sustainable transport initiatives and the ‘Monitor and Manage’ approach which was not yet considered robust.
* National Highways suggested that the Planning Obligations & Affordable Housing SPD should be revised to align with the proposed approach to collecting contributions, including allowing for the collection of contributions from smaller developments.
* National Highways and some individuals questioned how the Transport Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG) would be constituted and what the terms of reference would be.
* Natural England, Network Rail and some individuals and developers welcomed references in Policy T1 to reductions in car use, increased provision of sustainable transport choices and opportunities for active travel.
* West Sussex County Council questioned the evidence to demonstrate that key infrastructure proposals (related to the A27) were deliverable and thought that other parts of the evidence base needed to be updated or revised.
* West Sussex County Council commented that more technical work and detail was required on the ‘Monitor and Manage’ approach and on the proposed funding mechanisms as these were not yet robust.
* West Sussex County Council commented that opportunities to enhance Public Rights of Way should not be limited to those identified in the documents referred to in Policy T1.
* Hampshire County Council raised concerns about the evidence used to support Policy T1 and the lack of detail on the impact of proposals on specific routes and junctions in Hampshire and the mitigation required to address these impacts.
* Surrey County Council was supportive of Policy T1.
* South Downs National Park Authority was concerned at potential impacts of additional development on routes within the Park that would not be mitigated through Policy T1.
* Arun District Council suggested that Policy T1 should account for the cross-boundary mitigation contributions to ensure there are no adverse implications for delivering committed developments in Arun.
* Lavant Parish Council, Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and other individuals and groups considered that more work was needed to find alternative funding sources and that it should not be up to the Local Plan/developer contributions to fund improvements to the Strategic Road Network.
* Donnington Parish Council and others, including developers, commented that the CATM model used to test the impact of planned traffic growth was out of date, with some arguing that this would result in an overestimate of traffic generation and others suggesting that it would lead to an underestimate.
* Donnington Parish Council, Fishbourne Parish Council and some individuals were concerned about the Stockbridge Link Road being proposed as mitigation for the A27 as this was considered to have a range of adverse impacts. However, other individuals offered support for this proposal.
* Havant Parish Council, Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and other individuals were concerned that congestion on the A27 would lead to an increase in ‘rat-running’ around towns and villages near to the route.
* The Bosham Association, Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and other individuals were concerned that the A27 was already over capacity with congestion an everyday occurrence meaning that new homes will exacerbate existing problems. Some of these responses suggested that no more homes should be permitted until this is resolved.
* Wisborough Green Parish Council questioned how Policy T1 could be applied to the north of the district and considered the policy to be ‘Chichester-centric’ as many residents in the northern area have no option other than to rely upon private cars.
* GoVia Thameslink Railway, Stagecoach South as well as other groups and individuals argued that developer funding secured should be used to improve active and sustainable travel infrastructure rather than junction improvements on the A27 and that improving road capacity would result in the generation of additional traffic over time.
* GoVia Thameslink Railway and Network Rail argued that the focus should be on ensuring that new development links directly and effectively to existing and new sustainable travel routes.
* GoVia Thameslink Railway and Stagecoach South argued that using funding for active and sustainable travel infrastructure would be significantly more cost effective compared to funding junction improvements.
* GoVia Thameslink Railway as well as some groups and individuals considered that the proposals were not consistent with the council’s declared Climate Emergency and other carbon reduction obligations.
* Stagecoach South commented that the evidence base does not provide for a holistic and integrated approach to transport mitigation and were concerned that they had not been involved in any discussion about the evidence or appropriate responses.
* The Chichester Society and the Chichester and District Cycle Forum commented that there was no evidence that Statements of Common Ground had been concluded between the council and neighbouring authorities and key statutory undertakers, which undermined the validity and efficacy of the proposals.
* Some developers were concerned that the evidence does not justify the planned level of housing growth and that reliance on ‘Monitor and Manage’ demonstrated a failure to plan to address infrastructure or housing needs, with some seeking a ‘Vision and Validate’ approach instead.
* Some developers and landowners sought clarification on the proposed developer contributions and others argued that these would not comply with the CIL Regulations and/or that contributions should be sought from other forms of development (such as retail) or that viability could be improved if the housing target was increased to reduce the ‘per dwelling’ cost impact.
* Some developers suggested minor modifications to the text of Policy T1 for clarity purposes and some of these will be taken forward.
* Some individuals and developers commented that the problem was being caused mainly by through-traffic rather than local residents and that local development should not be used to fund improvements for the benefit of strategic/background traffic growth which was the responsibility of National Highways.
* Some individuals argued that since infrastructure funding was not sufficient to deliver the full A27 mitigation, the proposed housing target should be significantly reduced.
* Some individuals suggested that additional sustainable travel options would be needed at Tangmere in particular, including the re-opening of the former rail halt.
* A number of route/road specific comments or concerns were raised, and these will be forwarded to WSCC Highways for consideration.

The council recognises in light of the representations made and further work undertaken since the Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation that a number of modifications are required to Policy T1 and its supporting text. The changes, alongside further work on the monitor and manage approach and setting up of the Transport Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG), seek to address many of the concerns of the highway authorities including increased evidence of deliverability, a greater emphasis of mitigation through sustainable and active travel modes and a more nuanced approach to the collection of developer contributions from development. Changes to the policy are set out in Appendix 9 of the ‘Council’s suggested modifications schedule’ and the council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed that the Policy is sound.

[**Transport and development**](#_Toc125989021)

[**Policy T2 Transport and Development**](#_Toc125989022)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **23** | **Support:** | **8** | **Object:** | **15** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* National Highways recommended that the proximity to the A27 justified a requirement for all developments to submit a site-specific Travel Plan and a number of management measures were suggested.
* Natural England expressed support for Policy T2.
* Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council and another group were concerned that significant traffic problems on both the A27 and local road network would arise before any improvements can be made.
* Wisborough Green Parish Council and another individual questioned how Policy T2 could be applied to the north of the district and considered the policy to be ‘Chichester-centric’ as many residents in the northern area have no option other than to rely upon private cars.
* Network Rail supported Policy T2 but suggested that it should refer to 15–20-minute neighbourhoods that provide a range of services within this walk time. They also requested improvements to cycle parking at Southbourne and Fishbourne stations.
* GoVia Thameslink Railway support much of Policy T2 but consider that it should go further since active travel infrastructure should be the core of access requirements within developments and not just ‘incorporated’.
* Stagecoach South commented that Policy T2 was not effective as it does not require measures to make bus services more reliable and more efficient, by insulating them from chronic congestion as far as possible.
* Some developers and individuals supported Policy T2.
* One developer proposed specific Main and Minor Modifications to improve clarity, flexibility and effectiveness of Policy T2 and some of these will be taken forward.
* One landowner supported the Policy but recommended that it should go further to ensure that applicants comply with the requirements and to include an assessment of the practicality and suitability of all new active travel routes.
* One individual commented that there needs to be a specific plan for provision of clearly defined cycle routes and suggested a number of route-specific recommendations.

The council has considered the representations and is satisfied that, with the inclusion of the following Main Modifications, Policy T2 would be ‘sound’.

In criterion i), change as follows: “Ensure that where new **~~accessing~~deliver access** or servicing is required….”

In criterion 1 j) “Provide **or contribute towards** site-specific transport mitigation…”

Add new sub-criterion to 3: “**3. d) appoint a Travel Plan Co-ordinator whose role will be to oversee the implementation of the Travel Plan and use the outcome of monitoring to review its targets to ensure continued relevance.**”

To be consistent with NPPF para 113, revise criterion 2 and 3 of Policy T2 as follows: Criterion 2: **“**Proposals for development which are likely to result in significant transport impacts must be supported by a Transport Assessment **~~and Travel Plan~~**.” Criterion 3: “**A Travel Plan will be required from all proposals for development which generate significant amounts of movement.** Travel Plans should encourage sustainable travel choices…”

[**Active Travel - Walking and Cycling**](#_Toc125989023)

[**Policy T3 Active Travel - Walking and Cycling Provision**](#_Toc125989024)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **16** | **Support:** | **6** | **Object:** | **10** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Objections from individuals and organisations related to concerns over whether the policy was informed by national guidance as well as raising issues already covered within the policy or other policies within the local plan and requests for finer details such as specific walking and cycling routes to be identified within the policy.
* National Highways queried the funding, monitoring and maintenance of new facilities whilst Network Rail and Govia Thameslink sought references to public transport.
* West Sussex County Council sought specific mention of the Public Rights of Way network.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

To address the objection by West Sussex County Council, the following sentence is proposed to be added to paragraph 8.24 of the supporting text:

“…demands on public transport and road networks. **The Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network provides extensive walking and cycling opportunities and important links between places in the local plan area.**”

[**Parking Provision**](#_Toc125989025)

[**Policy T4 Parking Provision**](#_Toc125989026)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **6** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Some support received with few objections relating to requests in the policy for flexibility according to individual application circumstances, inclusion of car park provision as well as seeking a provision on parking space pricing.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound.

# [Chapter 9: Infrastructure](#_Toc125989027)

[**Infrastructure Provision**](#_Toc125989028)

[**Policy I1 Infrastructure Provision**](#_Toc125989029)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **38** | **Support:** | **10** | **Object:** | **28** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The majority of the representations from residents, residents’ groups and parishes relate to concerns about the timely delivery of infrastructure to serve new development, with particular concerns about wastewater disposal capacity and calls for infrastructure to be provided in advance of or in tandem with development.
* Developers and the Home Builders Federation have queried the feasibility and viability of gigabit capable broadband. Developers also objected to the use of ‘in-perpetuity’ in criteria (iv) of the policy and queried what would be required and how it would be secured (e.g., through commuted sums). An objection was also made to criterion (iv) that future proofing of infrastructure can only be secured through the application of reasonable allowances rather than treated as an absolute.
* The Environment Agency commented and are supportive of the policy wording incorporating reference to flood defences and SuDs infrastructure.
* National Highways commented on the IDP strategy for collecting developer contributions, their governance and how developers will be charged if additional contributions are required.
* Stagecoach have objected to the lack of realistic assessment of costs to deliver schemes and a lack of assurance on their technical deliverability.
* The Goodwood Estate wants the plan to require developers to provide contributions for infrastructure relating to existing deficits.

The council is satisfied that Policy I1 provides robust criteria combined with sufficient information in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to ensure that the right infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner to support development.

In response to the concern that criterion (iv) should be amended to include ‘appropriate allowances’ for future proofing development to take account of climate change, Policy wording (iv) has been amended to add the words: **‘Appropriate mitigation and adaptation measures should be made following a risk assessment to build in resilience for infrastructure over its lifetime to take account of the impacts of climate change ~~Future proof infrastructure provision to take account of the impacts of climate change~~** such as…**’** at the beginning of the criterion.

In response to developer’s objections to the use of ‘in-perpetuity’ in criterion (v), the intention is to ensure that infrastructure is managed and maintained – for example through the provision of a management company for on-site infrastructure.

Additional wording is suggested to clarify criterion (v): “…and maintenance. **The ongoing costs of infrastructure management and maintenance that is the responsibility of statutory providers and utility companies will continue to be met by those businesses**;”

Regarding the objections to new development having gigabit-capable broadband at first occupation is proposed to modify criterion (vii) to read “Ensure new development benefits from gigabit-capable broadband infrastructure **(where such facilities are locally available)** at the point of occupation”.

# [Chapter 10: Strategic and Area Based Policies](#_Toc125989030)

[**Chichester City**](#_Toc125989031)

[**Policy A1 Chichester City Development Principles**](#_Toc125989032)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **16** | **Support:** | **6** | **Object:** | **10** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Chichester City Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group requested that references be included throughout to the Chichester Neighbourhood Plan.
* RADAR suggests zoning of the city centre and Mayday! Action Group suggests that the policy should be more ambitious and make use of brownfield sites for redevelopment.
* GoVia Thameslink Railway and Stagecoach South both make suggestions to increase public transport access, whilst Stagecoach also objects to the removal of the bus station.
* The Environment Agency, Sussex Wildlife Trust, National Highways and Bellway Homes support the policy.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound. The points raised by objectors are covered through the provision of policy criteria, and Policy A2 Chichester City – Strategic Housing Location provides the mechanism for a Chichester Neighbourhood Plan to deliver development. Zoning of the city centre is not considered to be justified due to the impact on the historic significance of the area.

[**Chichester City – Housing**](#_Toc125989033)

[**Policy A2 Chichester City – Strategic housing location**](#_Toc125989034)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **13** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **8** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The Woodland Trust suggests that any future allocation will require a site survey for ancient woodland and that appropriate buffers should be applied.
* Landacre (Chichester) Limited suggest that the allocation should be a minimum figure and that flexibility should be given to allow a mix of sites to come forward.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust request that the policy should make reference to delivery of strategic green infrastructure.
* West Sussex County Council require a change to the reference to safeguarding minerals and waste infrastructure.
* Mayday! Action Group object that the city is the primary area of focus when the allocation number is low; The Chichester Society suggest that the density should be higher and that unneighbourly uses should be encouraged to relocate to the edge of the city.
* Chichester City Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group request references be made to the Chichester Neighbourhood Plan.
* GoVia Thameslink Railway suggest changes to the criteria to focus on public transport modes.
* The Environment Agency, National Highways and Bellway Homes support the policy.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

To address the objection made by Landacre (Chichester) Limited, the policy is proposed to be modified as follows:

“Land will be allocated for development in the Chichester Neighbourhood Plan for **~~a minimum of~~ approximately** 270 dwellings and supporting facilities and infrastructure.”

To address the objection made by West Sussex County Council, the policy is proposed to be modified as follows:

“12. **~~Proposals for development within a Minerals Safeguarding Area will need to accord with Policy M9: Safeguarding Minerals of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (or updated version). A Mineral Resource Assessment may be required prior to any development being consented, which addresses the relevant requirements set out in the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan~~ Consider (if within the Minerals Safeguarding Area) the implication of development on safeguarded minerals in line with the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Policy M9) and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, to assess whether the land contains economically viable minerals that would require extraction prior to development to avoid permanent sterilisation.”**

A new criterion is also proposed to be added (and subsequent criterion renumbered) as follows:

New criteria:

“**14. Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals and waste infrastructure in the vicinity to ensure development does not prevent or preclude any waste management uses, as required by Policies W2 and W10 of the West Sussex Local Plan or the operation of minerals infrastructure as required by Policy M10 of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance.**”

To address the objection made by Sussex Wildlife Trust, the policy is proposed to be modified as follows:

New criteria:

“**Ensure that green infrastructure provision is well related to the overall layout and character of the development and how it relates to its surroundings, as well as providing opportunities to connect to the existing green infrastructure network;”**

[**Southern Gateway Regeneration Area**](#_Toc125989035)

[**Policy A3 Southern Gateway Development Principles**](#_Toc125989036)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **23** | **Support:** | **10** | **Object:** | **13** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Comments on the introductory text (which also relates to policies A4 and A5) object to the loss of the bus station and want to see a new bus station or integrated transport hub next to the rail station.
* Several respondents proposed alternatives to the masterplan, want a more ambitious scheme encompassing a wider area and additional facilities such as a music venue/conference facilities.
* A resident supports but considers it is not deliverable.
* Stagecoach raise concerns about the relocation of the bus depot.
* National Highways, Govia Thameslink and a housing developer support the policy.
* Several residents and a parish council want to see more emphasis on housing and a green, car free area.
* The Environment Agency support the references to ensuring flood risk is addressed.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust suggest additional wording on green infrastructure and BNG.

The council as landowner, has been in discussion with local representatives of Stagecoach throughout the promotion of this site to ensure that the bus depot can be relocated.

Modifications are proposed to the supporting text to clarify the nature of the transport hub approach and to clarify the requirements in respect of minerals and waste.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

* 1. Relocation of the existing bus depot ~~is likely to~~ **will** be required with the bus station being replaced by new bus stops **as part of the transport hub approach set out in the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) Bus Improvement Plan. A transport hub is defined as “railway station, bus stops, toilets, electric vehicle charging points (EVCP), bike racks, café and car parking in close proximity.”**

10.16 Delete second sentence.

In the policy, reword the 5th bullet point to include additional wording suggested by Stagecoach.

* Be designed to encourage and facilitate **increased use of** active travel **and public transport to, from and through the city centre.**

And insert 2 additional bullets to cover Minerals and Waste (on request of WSCC):

* **Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals in line with the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Policy M9) and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, to assess whether the land contains economically viable minerals that would require extraction prior to development to avoid permanent sterilisation.**
* **Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals infrastructure in the vicinity to ensure development does not prevent or prejudice the operation of minerals infrastructure as required by Policy M10 of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance.**

[**Policy A4 Southern Gateway – Bus Station, Bus Depot and Basin Road Car Park**](#_Toc125989037)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **16** | **Support:** | **3** | **Object:** | **13** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Several residents and a parish council want to see more emphasis on housing and a green, car free area.
* A resident suggests alternative proposals such as using the site for a public sector office hub, with the depot as a music venue and another says a more ambitious masterplan is needed.
* Residents and Parish councils object to the loss of the bus station without an integrated transport hub at the rail station. One objects due to increase in traffic.
* Stagecoach raise concerns about the relocation of the bus depot and the location of the proposed bus stops.
* Govia Thameslink support but suggest additional/ revised wording.
* The Environment Agency supports the policy.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust suggest additional wording on green infrastructure and BNG.
* Southern Water suggest a wording clarification.

Stagecoach have been fully involved in the discussions on this site locally – the respondent is understood to be from a different part of the company.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

Policy A5 amendment to first paragraph: “**approximately 110 dwellings”**

In point 3, update reference to Route 88 which is now National Cycle Route **288**.

In point 9, replace **~~treatment~~** with **disposal** as requested by Southern Water.

Amend point 13: **~~the most recent~~** Infrastructure Delivery Plan **as updated by the Infrastructure Business Plan**;

Replace point 15 with 2 new points as requested by WSCC:

1. **Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals in line with the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Policy M9) and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, to assess whether the land contains economically viable minerals that would require extraction prior to development to avoid permanent sterilisation; and**

**16 Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals infrastructure in the vicinity to ensure development does not prejudice the operation of minerals infrastructure as required by Policy M10 of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance**

[**Policy A5 Southern Gateway – Police Field, Kingsham Road**](#_Toc125989038)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **11** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **7** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The site promoter supports the policy but raises queries about the River Lavant Flood Alleviation scheme, headroom at Apuldram WwTW, the need for replacement of the former playing field and wants the figure to be a minimum.
* Residents want a more ambitious masterplan, including a wider area and incorporating adjacent WSCC land.
* Environment Agency supports.
* Govia Thameslink support but suggest additional wording.
* Southern Water suggest a minor wording change for clarity.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust support points 5-9.

The status of the former playing field is being explored to confirm if a replacement should be required. There is not currently evidence that a more ambitious masterplan would be deliverable.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

Insert “**approximately**” before “70” in the first line of the policy for consistency.

Change “Route 88” to “Route **2**88” in point 11.

In point 13 replace “~~treatment~~” with “**disposal”** as requested by Southern Water.

Amend point 14: **~~the most recent~~** Infrastructure Delivery Plan **as updated by the Infrastructure Business Plan**

Replace point 15 with 2 new points as requested by WSCC:

1. **Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals in line with the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Policy M9) and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, to assess whether the land contains economically viable minerals that would require extraction prior to development to avoid permanent sterilisation; and**

**16 Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals infrastructure in the vicinity to ensure development does not prejudice the operation of minerals infrastructure as required by Policy M10 of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance.**

[**Policy A6 Land West of Chichester**](#_Toc125989040)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **14** | **Support:** | **2** | **Object:** | **12** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Residents, a Residents Association, Chichester Society and Mayday! Action Group were concerned over the impacts on the A259; wastewater infrastructure being in place before delivery of development; protection of land to the north of the development site and environmental impacts such as light pollution.
* The Woodland Trust sought specific buffer provision in relation to ancient woodland.
* The Site Developer was supportive of the policy although also made suggestions and sought clarification in revisions to the policy text concerning the development provided in phase 1 and surface water and wastewater.
* The Environment Agency objected to the policy as they believed additional wording was necessary in relation to the impacts of culverts.
* The Sussex Wildlife Trust queried whether sufficient opportunities had been taken to protect the features of the Strategic Wildlife Corridor.
* The West Sussex County Council proposed amendments in relation to the education provision and queried whether the infrastructure criterion in other allocations should be included.
* National Highways sought clarification on the list of measures for transport assessments as well as the mitigation fund for potential off-site traffic impacts whilst Stagecoach South sought finer details in relation to the bus service provision. Govia Thameslink sought additional wording regarding active travel and sustainable modes of transport.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound. Some factual corrections have been made in respect of Phase 2 of the development as detailed at paragraph 10.20; bullet point 10 should reflect criterion 13. A new paragraph will be inserted into the site considerations and then carried through to policy criterion 12 to address the Environment Agency’s objection in relation to impact from culverts. Corrections in relation to the education provision have been made to address WSCC’s objection and the wording in relation to minerals and wastewater infrastructure has been changed to be consistent with the other allocation policies. There is additional text at criterion 11 to correct an omission as well as reflect the provision of on-site SANG in both phases of the development.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Paragraph 10.19 – Add “**with nursery and SEND provision**” after “teaching accommodation”.

Paragraph 10.20 – Change as follows: “Phase two would extend development on to the south-western part of the site. The **~~agreed~~** framework for phase two provides for up to 850 dwellings, informal and formal open space (including a further area of country park), expansion of the primary school for the further one form entry (1FE) of teaching accommodation **with nursery and SEND provision**, playing pitches **~~and pavilion~~**, extension of community building and play area, allotments, new southern access linking the site to Westgate and the remainder of the 6 hectares of employment space.

Paragraph 10.21 – Insert new bullet point after bullet point 9: “**Any new additional culverts are kept to an absolute minimum and designed in such a way so as to limit their impact on the watercourse;**”

Paragraph 10.21 bullet point 10 – Change to reflect criterion 13: “Increasing capacity to attenuate surface water on site, thereby reducing the discharge flows off the site **to reflect greenfield rates ~~below current rates, and reducing the risk of flooding to residential areas downstream~~**;”Policy A6 third bullet point – Add “**to include nursery and SEND provision**” after “primary school”.

Policy A6 Criterion 6 – for consistency, delete **~~in accordance with NE5 (Biodiversity and Biodiversity Net Gain),~~** and amend “…..Brand**y** Hole Copse Local Nature Reserve….”.

Policy A6 Criterion 11 – insert at end of sentence “**issues and the provision of on-site SANG land**;”

Policy A6 Criterion 12b – Add “**Ensure new additional culverts are kept to an absolute minimum and designed so as to limit their impact on the watercourse;**”

Policy A6 Criterion 13 – Delete the word “**and”**.

Policy A6 Criterion 14 – Change to read: “**~~Demonstrate capacity of sewer network to accommodate the conveyance and treatment of wastewater (to strict environment standards) from the proposed development.~~ Development will be dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards;**

Policy A6 Criterion 15 – Delete: "**~~Occupation of the development will be phased to align with the delivery of wastewater infrastructure”~~** and insert the word **“and”** at the end of the criterion.

Policy A6 Criterion 16- Change to read:“Proposals **~~for the development~~** should have regard to the West Sussex **~~County Council~~** Minerals **Plan ~~Safeguarding Area~~** and associated guidance.”

In addition to the responses to representations, Policy A6 second bullet point - Insert “**E(g)(iii) Business use”** to correct an omission to align with the use classes allowed in the current Adopted Local Plan policy.

[**Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)**](#_Toc125989041)

[**Policy A7 Land at Shopwyke (Oving Parish)**](#_Toc125989042)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **8** | **Support:** | **1** | **Object:** | **7** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Support was received from the Environment Agency.
* The Sussex Wildlife Trust raised concerns regarding the site’s interaction with the Strategic Wildlife Corridor.
* West Sussex County Council requested specific wording in relation to the consideration of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the site’s location within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area.
* National Highways sought detailed information on the mitigation and active travel provision, Stagecoach South commented that the bus service had failed to be delivered and Govia Thameslink requested site specific considerations relating to sustainable travel.
* The Forestry Commission also sought site specific considerations in relation to trees, hedgerows and woodland.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modification proposed by West Sussex County council that the Policy is sound.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Paragraph 10.26, last bullet point – **“**Taking account of the West Sussex **Joint** Minerals **Local** Plan, **Waste Local Plan**, and associated guidance, in relation to the site being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area **and in close proximity to safeguarded waste infrastructure.**

A7 Criterion 12 – change to read **“**Proposals for the development should have regard to the West Sussex County Council Minerals Safeguarding Area, **safeguarded waste infrastructure** and associated guidance.”

[**Land East of Chichester**](#_Toc125989043)

[**Policy A8 Land East of Chichester**](#_Toc125989044)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **26** | **Support:** | **6** | **Object:** | **20** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Natural England, Sussex Wildlife Trust, the RSPB, Sussex Ornithological Society, Mayday! Action Group and other representors wished to see the justification for the change to the Westhampnett-Pagham Strategic Wildlife Corridor, as well the corridor being widened to the version consulted upon in the Technical Consultation 2021.
* Comments from interested parties include removing the requirement to provide gypsy and traveller accommodation; suggestions to look at transport impacts in further detail.
* West Sussex County Council objected to the education requirements and suggested modifications.
* The agents on behalf of the two site developers wish to see the housing figure as a minimum and suggest amendments to some of the policy criteria wording.
* Stagecoach South and GoVia Thameslink Railway suggest changes to the wording to shift the focus onto more sustainable modes of transport.
* National Highways, the Environment Agency, and the Forestry Commission support the policy.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

For consistency purposes and to reflect increase in custom and self-build need, criterion 1 is proposed to be amended as follows: “Development to include **approximately** 680 dwellings, including **34~~ten~~** suitable serviced plots to provide self/custom build housing;”

To address the objection made by the site developer, criterion 4 is proposed to be amended as follows: “4. Conserve **~~and enhance~~** the historical significant of the listed Shopwyke Grange and the cluster of buildings associated with the grade II\* listed Shopwyke House should be analysed at an early stage of the masterplan;”

To address the objection made by West Sussex County Council, bullet point 2 of para 10.35 is proposed to be amended as follows:

* “Making provision for a primary school, neighbourhood centre and other economic and social infrastructure. **Land for the primary school must meet the minimum recommended education space requirements for a two-form entry primary school;**”

To address the objection made by the site developer, criterion 6 is proposed to be amended as follows: “6. Provide for appropriate hard and soft landscaping, including street trees, **~~a substantial and effective~~ an appropriate** buffer with significant planting the strategic wildlife corridor on the eastern boundary of the site…”

To address objections made in relation to sustainable travel modes, criteria 7 and 12 are proposed to be amended as follows:

“7. Ensure that green infrastructure provision is well related to the overall layout and character of the development and how it relates to its surroundings. This will include creating linkages throughout the site to the wider countryside, Tangmere**, Oving** and development at Shopwyke Lakes;”

“12. Provide for sustainable travel modes and new improved cycle and pedestrian routes, including linkages with Chichester**, Westhampnett, Tangmere and Oving**;”

Amend criterion 18 for consistency: “Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals in line with the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Policy M9) and **Minerals and Waste** Safeguarding Guidance.”

[**Westhampnett/North East Chichester**](#_Toc125989045)

[**Policy A9 Land at Westhampnett/North East Chichester**](#_Toc125989046)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **11** | **Support:** | **6** | **Object:** | **5** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Representations from individuals and the Mayday! Action Group related to environmental and planning constraints as well as access to the strategic development site.
* Whilst Goodwood Estates supported the policy, they also expressed concern regarding the impact on the development from the existing operations at Goodwood.
* The Environment Agency, Sussex Wildlife Trust, South Downs National Park Authority and National Highways all supported the policy.
* Stagecoach South’s objection related to the bus service provision being ineffective and a lack of up-to-date transport evidence whereas GoVia Thameslink Railway sought changes to the policy in relation to off-site traffic impacts and public transport.

The considerations raised in objections would have been determined at the planning application stage for this strategic site allocation and the council is therefore satisfied that subject to the minor modifications proposed below, the Policy is sound.

Paragraph 10.36– Change: “Rolls Royce” to “**Rolls-Royce**”

A9 Criterion 12 – change to read**: “Proposals ~~for the development~~** should have regard to the West Sussex **~~County Council~~** Minerals **Plan ~~Safeguarding Area~~** and associated guidance.”

[**Land at Maudlin Farm**](#_Toc125989047)

[**Policy A10 Land at Maudlin Farm**](#_Toc125989048)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **13** | **Support:** | **9** | **Object:** | **4** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The Environment Agency and Southern Water both sought inclusion of additional policy criterion relating to wastewater disposal.
* Representations seeking inclusion within the Maudlin Farm allocation of adjoining HELAA site (HWH0005a) were made by both the landowner of that site and promoter of the Maudlin Farm site.
* Amendments to the wording of various policy criteria were sought including reference to Biodiversity Net Gain (Sussex Wildlife Trust) and measures to secure modal shift (Stagecoach South and Govia Thameslink Railway).
* The promoter of the site objected to policy requirements regarding specialist accommodation for older people, gypsy and traveller pitches and secondary access.
* Objection to allocation on grounds of impacts on visual amenity and landscape between the South Downs and Chichester Harbour AONB; local infrastructure should be in place before development.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below, the Policy is sound.

Amendment to first bullet within Policy, for consistency and to reflect increase in custom and self-build need: “**Approximately** 265 dwellings, including **13 ~~4~~** serviced self/custom build plots;”

To address the comments from Stagecoach South and Govia Thameslink Railway regarding modal shift it is proposed to amend Policy criterion 5:

In second sentence of criterion 5 delete the word ‘highway’ so it reads: ‘… requisite contributions for off-site **~~highway~~** improvements in conformity …’

To address the representation from the promoter of the site regarding a secondary vehicle access, it is proposed to amend Policy criterion 5 to remove this requirement:

In the first sentence of Policy criterion 5 amend it to read: ‘Provide safe and suitable access points for all users, including a main vehicle access from Old Arundel Road **~~and, subject to further assessment, a secondary vehicle access from Dairy Lane~~**.

To address the comments on wastewater disposal from the Environment Agency and Southern Water, an additional Policy criterion is proposed:

After criterion 12 add new criterion and renumber subsequent criteria. New criterion to read: **‘The development will need to be phased in such a manner to ensure that sufficient wastewater disposal capacity is available to accommodate the requirements resulting from this development’.**

Amend criterion 13 for consistency: “the **~~most recent~~** Infrastructure Delivery Plan **as updated by the Infrastructure Business Plan**.”

Replace criterion 14 with **“Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals in line with the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Policy M9) and Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, to assess whether the land contains economically viable minerals that would require extraction prior to development to avoid permanent sterilisation[[16]](#footnote-16)”** for consistency with other policies.

Paragraph 10.40– minor correction: “Rolls Royce” to “**Rolls-Royce**”

Paragraph 10.41 – Delete and replace with “**Account taken of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan and associated Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, in relation to the site being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area.”**  for consistency with other policies.

[**Bosham**](#_Toc125989049)

[**Policy A11 Highgrove Farm, Bosham**](#_Toc125989050)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **32** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **27** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Bosham Parish Council, the Bosham Association, Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council, Mayday! Action Group and a number of interested parties object on a range of varying grounds, including public transport availability, lack of capacity at the primary school and GP, lack of shopping facilities, local opposition to the site, conflict with plan policies, impact on landscape, lack of infrastructure, loss of agricultural land, impact on the road network, risk of flooding, risk of coalescence of settlements, and lack of capacity at wastewater treatment centres.
* A developer suggests splitting the allocation figure and allocating Land at Willowfield in addition to Highgrove Farm.
* Chichester Harbour Conservancy objects due to the impact on the Chichester Harbour AONB and suggests deleting the allocation, and the Chichester Harbour Trust suggests the allocation conflicts with the policies on natural environment.
* Barratt David Wilson Homes support the principle of the allocation, however considers it inappropriate to include gypsy and traveller pitches on the allocation, and requests further consideration of the requirements for older persons accommodation.
* The Environment Agency supports the requirement for phasing to ensure capacity for wastewater treatment, and National Highways supports the allocation and sets out that masterplanning provides the opportunity to develop an appropriate transport strategy.
* The Forestry Commission comments to suggest that planting on the west of the site should be bolstered. The Sussex Wildlife Trust suggests that the policy should provide more clarity regarding levels of biodiversity net gain.
* GoVia Thameslink Railway suggests that no development should take place in Bosham until a maximum figure has been achieved at Southbourne. Stagecoach South supports the identification of the site and the consolidation of development on an existing high quality public transport route, however suggests the policy is not clear on boosting active travel modes.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

For consistency purposes and to reflect increase in custom and self-build need, the first bullet point is proposed to be amended as follows: “**~~A minimum of~~ Approximately** 245 dwellings including **~~4~~ 12** suitable serviced plots to provide self/custom build housing;”

To address the comment made by the Forestry Commission, the policy is proposed to be modified as follows:

Amend criterion 4:

“4. Provide for appropriate hard and soft landscaping, including street trees and buffer planting to the north, south, **west** and east of the site, in order to ensure that the development is well integrated with its surroundings and successfully mitigates the impacts on the wider landscape character;”

Amend criterion 13 for consistency: **“**the **~~most recent~~** Infrastructure Delivery Plan **as updated by the Infrastructure Business Plan**.”

[**Chidham and Hambrook**](#_Toc125989051)

[**Policy A12 Chidham and Hambrook**](#_Toc125989052)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **23** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **18** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Residents and local organisations (including the Chichester Harbour Trust,) object to the allocation and seek its removal from the plan on the basis of:

1. Nitrate neutrality
2. Wastewater pollution and treatment
3. Congestion and inadequate road network
4. Lack of safe walking and cycling routes
5. Air pollution
6. Loss of agricultural land
7. Lack of infrastructure
8. Impact on the views between the Harbour and South Downs National Park

* Chichester Harbour Conservancy and Sussex Wildlife Trust consider insufficient detail on location to consider mitigation on AONB and biodiversity. Forestry Commission note details will emerge through neighbourhood plan; area contains parcels of ancient woodland; seeking strengthening of development to contribute to enhancement of SWC, expansion and connectivity for GI.
* Developers support the allocation and/or consider it should be a higher figure of 500 as no justification for the reduction to 300 dwellings considered at the preferred approach stage of the Local Plan. Figures should be minimum.
* Environment Agency support policy requirements relating to flooding and phasing of development relating to wastewater.
* National Highways support policy reinforcing master planning, offers opportunity for Council to consider traffic, viable alternatives to the car, future infrastructure requirements, mitigation measures and travel plan monitoring through phased development.
* Natural England advise wording to be strengthened to reflect mitigation hierarchy for consistency with other policies.
* Govia Thameslink do not consider proposed numbers sufficient to increase current train service, Southbourne more suitable location.
* Stagecoach South consider insufficiently clear on traffic mitigations and means of securing modal shift. Transport strategy requires updating.

The council is generally satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below, the Policy is sound.

Amend first paragraph of policy for consistency: “…**~~a minimum of~~ approximately** 300 dwellings…”

The advice to include further text in Policy A12 (Chidham and Hambrook) to better reflect the mitigation hierarchy will be included in the next iteration of the plan and therefore the following modification is proposed:

Amend the wording of Policy criterion 6 to read: **“~~Successfully mitigate potential impacts~~Avoid, and if necessary, mitigate any adverse effects** on the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar, including contributing to any strategic access management issues (including on-site mitigation where required as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment), and potential for loss of functionally linked supporting habitat”.

Amend supporting text 8th bullet point to read: **“**Account taken of the West Sussex **Joint** Minerals Local Plan and associated **Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance ~~guidance~~,** in relation to the sites within the parish being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area.”

Amend supporting text 9th bullet point to read: “Account taken of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan and associated **Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance ~~guidance~~** in relation to the safeguarding policy W2.”

Amend criterion 12: “**~~the most recent~~** Infrastructure Delivery Plan **as updated by the Infrastructure Business Plan**.”

Replace Policy A12 criterion 13 to read**: If a site is within the Minerals Safeguarding Area consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals in line with the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Policy M9) and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, to assess whether the land contains economically viable minerals that would require extraction prior to development to avoid permanent sterilisation.**

Add new criterion 14 to Policy A12 to read: **Consider the implication of development on safeguarded waste management sites in the vicinity, to ensure development of the site does not prevent or prejudice any waste management uses, as required by Policy W2 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance.**

[**Southbourne**](#_Toc125989053)

[**Policy A13 Southbourne Broad Location for Development**](#_Toc125989054)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **52** | **Support:** | **36** | **Object:** | **16** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Whilst supportive in principle of the BLD and a number of the Policy criteria, Southbourne Parish Council also sought clarification to the wording of the reasoned justification and a number of the policy criteria. They also sought the extension of the Ham Brook Strategic Wildlife Corridor to cover the area proposed in the Southbourne Modified Neighbourhood Plan.
* A number of respondents (including the Chichester Society, Bosham Association, Mayday! Action Group, Bosham Parish Council, Chichester Harbour Trust, Chichester Harbour Conservancy) objected to the level of housing proposed on grounds of inadequate supporting infrastructure, impact on setting of the Chichester Harbour AONB, impact on character of local area and maintaining gaps between settlements.
* Representations were made from those promoting sites that the council should be seeking to deliver a higher number of dwellings at Southbourne and/or that their specific site should be the subject of an allocation, the approach should allow for the early delivery of small/medium size sites, and sites within the AONB should have been considered.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust sought an amendment to Policy criterion 9 to reference biodiversity net gain and Natural England, an amendment to Policy criterion 10 to better reflect the mitigation hierarchy.
* Stagecoach South sought more specific reference to measures to secure modal shift.
* Site promoters objected to the policy requirement regarding the provision of gypsy and traveller pitches and travelling showpeople plots or sought amendments to a number of the Policy criteria. One site promoter suggested that development should be CIL exempt.
* West Sussex County Council made a representation that the evidence available at Regulation 19 did not provide sufficient assurance that the scale of development proposed could be accommodated on the local road network, in particular the capacity of the level crossing to accommodate additional traffic flows.
* Hampshire County Council made a representation that the evidence available at Regulation 19 did not provide an adequate consideration of the impact on the local highway network in Hampshire and specifically the A259.
* The potential for a significant upturn in the use of public footpath level crossings and the risk factors associated with that was raised by Network Rail.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below, the Policy is sound. The published Southbourne BLD Background Paper has been updated following the Regulation 19 consultation.

To address the comments from Southbourne Parish Council regarding reference to the ChEm route and local evidence of demand for self-build plots, the following modifications are proposed:

Amend paragraph 10.56, third bullet point to read: ‘…cycling and pedestrian routes **including linking to the National Cycle Network Route 2 along the A259 and proposed enhancements as part of the Chichester to Emsworth Cycle Path (ChEm Route)**;

Amend criterion 1 to read: “…provide **approximately** 1,050 dwellings”

Amend number of self/custom build units required on the site at criterion 1:

“Provide an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet evidenced local need including affordable housing and specific provision to meet specialised housing needs including **~~16~~ 53** serviced self/custom build plots, accommodation for older people and accessible and adaptable homes in accordance with relevant Plan policies;”

Amend criterion 6 for consistency: “**~~the most recent~~** Infrastructure Delivery Plan **as updated by the Infrastructure Business Plan**.”

Modifications to criteria 9 and 10 are proposed to address the comments from Sussex Wildlife Trust regarding delivering biodiversity net gain and Natural England regarding the mitigation hierarchy:

At end of Policy criterion 9 add: **and facilitates the achievement of biodiversity net gain and the creation of high levels of habitat connectivity within the site, the wider green infrastructure network and identified strategic wildlife corridors**;

Amend wording of Policy criterion 10 to read**: ‘~~Provide mitigation to ensure the avoidance of~~ Avoid, and if necessary, mitigate any** adverse effects on the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Chichester Harbour …. ‘.

Replace criterion 16 with**: “If a site is within the Minerals Safeguarding Area consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals in line with the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Policy M9) and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, to assess whether the land contains economically viable minerals that would require extraction prior to development to avoid permanent sterilisation.”**

After criterion 16 add new criterion to read: **“Consider the implication of development on safeguarded waste management sites in the vicinity, to ensure development of the site does not prevent or prejudice any waste management uses, as required by Policy W2 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance.”**

[**Land West of Tangmere**](#_Toc125989055)

[**Policy A14 Land West of Tangmere**](#_Toc125989056)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **63** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **58** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Comments from residents and Mayday! Action Group suggested that the housing figure should be reduced, that the infrastructure (including the highway network and sewage capacity) and facilities are not capable of accommodating the new development, the density should be reduced, there should be increased separation between the development and Saxon Meadow, consideration should be given to the Tangmere Conservation Area, the sports pavilion should be relocated, the cycle path along the access road to Saxon Meadow should be rerouted, and objected to the loss of agricultural farmland.
* Suggestions from residents and a developer to relocate the development to Tangmere Airfield.
* Comments from residents relating to the council’s resolution to use compulsory purchase powers to acquire the site.
* Objections to the inclusion of the meadow owned by Saxon Meadow in the development site, and suggestions to relocate proposed community orchard.
* The Woodland Trust, the Forestry Commission and Sussex Wildlife Trust request that wording is included requiring biodiversity net gain and the protection of trees and hedgerows.
* Countryside Properties support the allocation and suggest changes to the policy criteria.
* Rolls Royce Motor Cars Limited, the Environment Agency, National Highways, and the Church Commissioners support the allocation.
* Stagecoach South and GoVia Thameslink Railway request insertion of wording relating to shifting of modes of transport to sustainable travel.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

To address the comments made by Countryside Properties, the following amendments are proposed to the Policy.

“3. **Expanding and enhancing the existing local centre ~~Incorporate new or expanded community facilities, including transforming the existing village centre into a new local centre~~** providing new village centre amenities;”

“10. Conserve or enhance the heritage and archaeological interest of the site, the historic village and its setting (particularly that of the Conservation Area)**~~and the World War II airfield~~**, including making provision for the relocation of existing allotment space to facilitate the potential expansion or relocation of the Tangmere Military Aviation Museum;”

To address a number of objections made by residents, and for consistency purposes, the boundary of the allocation on the policy map will be amended to reflect the outline planning permission. This is shown in Appendix 3 of the ‘Council’s suggested modifications schedule’.

[**Policy A15 Loxwood**](#_Toc125989057)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **86** | **Support:** | **No data in system** | **Object:** | **No data in system** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Loxwood Parish Council objected and sought the removal of the policy and a lower number (125 homes). They also raised issues about sustainability, water neutrality, sewage capacity, traffic and safety.
* Objections from residents included: that the number should be 125 houses in line with the Neighbourhood Plan; that the actual housing number will be 311 (220 + 91 dwellings permitted before the base date); account should be taken of the 17 dwellings in the made Neighbourhood Plan; that brownfield sites should be found; development should be elsewhere (amount disproportionate) and should not have a strategic number; already overdevelopment; no mention of Crouchlands development proposal; no employment (mainly in Horsham and Guildford); existing social housing unsold; other locations are more sustainable without the environmental consequences and climate emergency; should consider Petworth as alternative.
* Residents also objected to the lack of services and facilities (shops, doctors, school capacity) and infrastructure (wastewater treatment, current sewage issues, power supply, street lighting) and stronger policy wording to ensure that infrastructure improvements are made in advance of development.
* Residents also objected for environmental concerns (impact of water usage which will damage nature reserves, surface water management, flooding, air pollution from traffic, wildlife impacts, green space protection, loss of habitat, loss of ancient woodland and veteran trees, loss of species, loss of BMV agricultural land, loss of footpaths and PROW).
* Residents also objected to the location being unsustainable with poor public transport and raised congestion, traffic, and lack of cycle routes.
* Residents also objected to the scale of development and impact on character and built heritage, design (unsuitability for large scale housing) and didn’t want development to the west of main road through village.
* Residents also objected to the impact on local amenity and social impact of growth.
* Developers/site promoters objected on the basis that: there should be an increase in the number to 300 based on the Sustainability Appraisal findings; that the numbers should be allocated by CDC and not left to the Neighbourhood Plan; that it was sequentially less preferable than sites in the south.
* Developers/site promoters objected on the basis that the site west of Loxwood can provide at least 825 homes - number should be at least 825 homes - through allocation or in an SPD.
* Clarification to confirm that 220 figure is fixed as a minimum figure and will not be affected by pending applications and appeals for the post Jan 2023 period. Wording should be amended to include reference to minimum.
* GoVia commented that there is a need to provide sustainable transport links to larger communities and railway station and a conflict with CDC Climate Emergency.
* Horsham District Council require clear evidence that cumulative impacts on settlement in HDC have been considered as part of the proposed allocations – to ensure that additional pressures on HDC infrastructure is addressed.
* Environment Agency raised that they are due to complete a property level resilience scheme for Loxwood in late 2023 as Loxwood has suffered from property flooding several times in the last 20 years. Policy requirement 8 is important. Supportive of policy for phasing. Suggested amendment to policy wording.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust were unable to give effective feedback without site details.
* WSCC raised that references to safeguarding minerals were inconsistent and suggested alternative wording. Also include references to safeguarding minerals and waste infrastructure. Within clay MSA.

The council is generally satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below, which address representations from WSCC and the Environment Agency, the Policy is sound.

Duty to cooperate discussions with Horsham council is ongoing and a Statement of Common Ground will be concluded when the council’s position has been finalised.

Amend first paragraph to read: “…**~~a minimum of~~ approximately** 220 dwellings”

Amend criterion 10 for consistency: “the **~~most recent~~** Infrastructure Delivery Plan **as updated by the Infrastructure Business Plan.”**

Additional bullet point to para 10.70 **“Account taken of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan, and associated Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, in relation to the sites within the parish being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area for clay.”**

Additional bullet point to para 10.70 “**Development should not increase flood risk elsewhere, taking into account risks from all sources of flooding in accordance with Policy NE15;”**

Additional criterion 11: **“If a site is within the Minerals Safeguarding Area consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals in line with the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Policy M9) and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, to assess whether the land contains economically viable minerals that would require extraction prior to development to avoid permanent sterilisation.”**

[**Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield**](#_Toc125989058)

[**Policy A16 Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield**](#_Toc125989059)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **10** | **Support:** | **4** | **Object:** | **6** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Goodwood Estate supports the approach but provides updated information about the estate’s economic contribution to ensure this is fully reflected.
* Goodwood Estate raise concerns about the impact of developments on nearby land on their interests and would like to see safeguarding of runways and operations mentioned.
* Residents are concerned about noise pollution.
* Govia Thamelink support but want to see more sustainable travel measures.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust note the location is close to a Strategic Wildlife Corridor and suggest additional wording.

Revised wording of the supporting text has been agreed in discussion with the Goodwood Estate to address concerns and improve clarity, with some edits to the policy wording. Criterion 4 of the policy requires a Travel Plan which should address Govia Thameslink’s point, and other policies cover the points from the Sussex Wildlife Trust. This is not an allocation policy.

The council is satisfied that the policy is sound subject to the modifications proposed below

Paragraph 10.71: “**The Goodwood Estate lies to the immediate north of Chichester and is known worldwide as a global brand. The Estate through its range of businesses provide very significant economic, environmental and cultural benefits to a wide area, not just to Chichester District, but also regionally and nationally. The contributions made are well documented, with the Estate, together with its tenant, Rolls-Royce, delivering very significant sums annually to these economies.**

**According to an independent study by the London School of Economics during 2022[[17]](#footnote-17) the Goodwood Estate generated an estimated economic contribution of £444m into the national economy, including £133m in tax contributions, and of which, £323m was of benefit to the local economy directly (including £108m in tax contributions). Since 2003, Rolls Royce has contributed more than £4 billion to the UK economy and annually the contribution exceeds £500m[[18]](#footnote-18). Both** Goodwood **and Rolls Royce are major local employers, directly and in the supply chain~~. Motor Circuit and Airfield represent significant leisure and tourism destinations within the plan area, particularly on occasions such as the Goodwood Revival and The Festival of Speed, where a significant number of visitors are attracted to the sites. The economic and cultural benefits afforded to the wiser area from such events are well documented with research from the University of Brighton showing that the 2014 Festival of Speed brought in over £25 million to the area as well as a further £35.5 million turnover for the national economy.~~**

Paragraph 10.72: “The council remains supportive of the ongoing operation of the site as a motor circuit and airfield, **recognising that these are central to the revenue stream of the Estate. These operations are** subject to **~~the existing legal~~** agreements**, permissions and other arrangements that ensure activities can operate in a manner that is not harmful to material considerations such as noise, traffic and environmental concerns. ~~secured which impose noise control restrictions~~** For example, the motor circuit has to adhere to trackside decibel levels and activity is limited through category days, while at the airfield measures such as Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) and restrictions on the number of annual flights (both fixed wind and rotary) are imposed. **Continued beneficial operation is encouraged and the council recognises the need for an effective, yet flexible, range of controls (including planning permissions and legal agreements) that are responsive to change and which bring about an enhancement to the offer of the Circuit and Airfield, as well as continued control over environmental issues.**

Paraggraph 10.73: “Opportunities to replace, **add to** and improve the facilities within the site **and its use** will be supported, subject to the considerations set out in the following policy.”

Policy A16 –

1st paragraph:“The council is supportive of the role that Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield plays in the plan area's economy and in attracting visitors to the area. The council will permit proposals for outdoor sport, recreation, **~~and~~** leisure **and business** activities in connection with or ancillary to the existing use at Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield. **This may include changes to existing permissions and agreements where flexibility is appropriate,** provided the proposal does not conflict with other policies of the Plan.”

In criterion 2:“The character of the **site and its environs ~~area~~** should be **conserved ~~retained~~** and reinforced;”

In criterion 3: “**~~The~~** **Any** proposed..”

At the end of point b: **~~and~~**

At the end of point c**: and**

Add new point d **“it will allow the airfield to operate in compliance with the Government’s General Aviation Handbook.”**

Delete final paragraph beginning **“~~Any development proposals within the vicinity~~……”** because development within the vicinity is covered by the next Policy A17.

[**Development within the vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield**](#_Toc125989060)

[**Policy A17 Development within the vicinity of Goodwood Motor Circuit and Airfield**](#_Toc125989061)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **11** | **Support:** | **2** | **Object:** | **9** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Goodwood estates consider the 400m buffer too simplistic and that something more is needed to keep land that may be needed for emergency landings free of development. Land around the circuit and aerodrome should be kept open.
* A developer/site promoter objects to the presumption against development in the 400m buffer.
* Another site promoter objects to the way their site was treated in the HELAA.
* Another site promoter objects to criterion 2 of the policy (which requires good amenity levels without compromising design quality).
* Sussex Wildlife Trust suggest additional wording about wildlife, habitats and biodiversity.
* Forestry Commission suggest additional wording.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound. Wildlife, biodiversity and woodland are covered by other policies.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

In paragraph 10.74: “… allowing residential **or noise sensitive**” in the last line.

In paragraph 10.75 “….noise emanating from the site **and does not otherwise compromise any provision of Policy A16**.”

Split the rest of the text into a new paragraph at this point to start “The **400m should not be interpreted as a distinct policy boundary as the**" and insert “**detailed and focussed**” before “noise impact assessment” later in the same paragraph.

Insert an additional paragraph: “**As set out in the NPPF, existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. This will be a consideration when any development in the vicinity is proposed.** “

In Policy A17 at the end of the initial paragraph “…. noise impact assessment clearly **and demonstrably”**

In criterion 3 insert after “Airfield” “**nor place unreasonable restrictions on such operation,**”

Insert an additional criterion 4 “**Development will be resisted where it will compromise the ability of the airfield to operate in compliance with the Government’s General Aviation Handbook.”**

[**Thorney Island**](#_Toc125989062)

[**Policy A18 Thorney Island**](#_Toc125989063)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **5** | **Support:** | **2** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* The Environment Agency, Sussex Wildlife Trust and Mayday! Action Group all raised concerns regarding habitat creation schemes/managed retreat.
* The policy was supported by the Chichester Harbour Conservancy and Govia Thameslink Railway.

To address the concerns raised regarding references to habitat creation schemes and managed retreat, the council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

Paragraph 10.78 – Change to read as follows: “…Solent Waders and Brent Goose ecological network. **The Environment Agency are also developing a habitat creation scheme in partnership with the Ministry of Defence and Chichester Harbour Conservancy through managed realignment of the coast at the south-western edge of Thorney Island barracks. In addition, ~~D~~**development would **~~also~~**need to be compatible with the Chichester Harbour AONB….”

Third paragraph of Policy – Change to read: **“**All development proposals should seek to enhance the overall character of the Island as well as support opportunities for habitat creation **whilst avoiding adverse impacts on existing habitat creation schemes.** Proposals must **also** mitigate any adverse impacts on local infrastructure and ecology…**”** “.….Chichester Harbour AONB/SAC/SPA and Ramsar designations and comply with Policy NE13 (Chichester Harbour AONB) and associated **~~AONB~~ Chichester Harbour** Management Plan and **Joint Chichester Harbour AONB** SPD…..”

[**Tangmere Strategic Employment Land**](#_Toc125989064)

[**Policy A19 Land at Chichester Business Park, Tangmere**](#_Toc125989065)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **3** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* National Highways raised concerns regarding traffic generation from B8 uses.
* GoVia Thameslink Railway raised that development must be dependent on provision of walking and cycling routes through to the Tangmere SDL, along with providing a bus for employees.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust raised concerns about not having information to support development in the location in relation to biodiversity impacts.

The council is satisfied that the Policy is sound. The policy is carried forward from the adopted plan and the site is under construction with individual plots already in use. Site suitability was assessed at the Local Plan examination and further through the development management process with planning applications on site.

[**Land south of Bognor Road**](#_Toc125989066)

[**Policy A20 Land South of Bognor Road**](#_Toc125989067)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **6** | **Support:** | **1** | **Object:** | **5** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* A site promoter proposes their site as an alternative.
* National Highways note that delivery is dependent on realignment of Vinnetrow Road and works to Bognor roundabout.
* Govia Thamelink suggest additional/revised wording requiring active travel links to the rail station and residential areas, including a bridge and bus lanes.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust suggest a correction to the description of Chichester Gravel Pits and Leythorne Meadows.
* WSCC want more flexibility about the delivery of travelling showpeople’s plots.

In response to the representations – Policies T1 and T2 require measures to avoid and reduce need to travel by car. The detailed suggestions from Govia are beyond the scope of the Local Plan and for the county council as highway authority. The policy already refers to the realignment of Vinnetrow Road and a bus lane.

Changes to wording in relation to Minerals and Waste which have been agreed with WSCC are proposed for consistency.

Supporting text and policy proposed to be modified as follows:

In para 10.83 – replace “~~SNCI~~” with “**Local Wildlife Site (LWS)**.”

Replace the last bullet of para 10.87 with:

* **Account should be taken of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan and associated Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance, in relation to the site being within a defined Minerals Safeguarding Area.**
* **Account should be taken of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan and associated guidance in relation to the safeguarding policy W2.**

Amend the first paragraph of the policy to read:

A 19.5ha site is allocated for:

* employment uses, to accommodate at least 28,000sqm of employment floorspace, and
* 5 plots for travelling showpeople **(if there remains a need for plots at the time of the determination of the planning application)** with **adequate**~~1ha of~~ ancillary storage ~~requirements~~.

In criterion 7 of the policy, replace “~~Local Nature Reserve~~” with **“Local Wildlife Site**”.

Replace criterion 12 of the policy with: **Consider the implication of development on safeguarded minerals and waste infrastructure in the vicinity to ensure development does not prevent or prejudice any waste management uses, as required by Policies W2 and W10 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan or the operation of minerals infrastructure as required by Policy M10 of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan and the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance.**

[**Land East of Rolls Royce**](#_Toc125989068)

[**Policy A21 Land east of Rolls Royce**](#_Toc125989069)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **8** | **Support:** | **5** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Rolls Royce would like the site to be formally allocated rather than safeguarded.
* Govia Thameslink want additional wording relating to walking and cycling routes and an expansion of the staff bus scheme.
* National Highways support and note a Travel Plan would be required.
* Forestry Commission want additional wording about trees and hedgerows and Sussex Wildlife Trust want additional wording about protecting habitats, species and biodiversity net gain.
* WSCC ask for reference to minerals and waste safeguarding guidance.

At the time the plan was being drafted, there was insufficient certainty about the timing of any expansion plans for an allocation and whether it would be within the plan period, so a safeguarding policy was proposed.

The council considers that access to the site by non car means is required by other policies – T1, T2 and P1 and by the requirement for a Travel Plan.

Policy NE8 covers the concerns about trees and hedgerows and Policy NE5 covers biodiversity but some wording will be added in line with site allocation policies. Reference to the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance will also be added.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound:

* 1. This policy provides a framework to support the **proposed extension to the home of Rolls-Royce, which is crucial to its long term viability ~~continued expansion and long term viability of Rolls Royce Motor Cars~~**. The future shape of low-volume, high-value automotive production is dynamic and the industry must **be able to respond to evolving requirements~~remain responsive to known, unpredicted needs~~** and economic conditions, **both known and unknown**. The policy is essential to provide Rolls-Royce with certainty that the manufacturing plant could continue to expand production from the current 6,000 units per year. **This necessitates~~will require~~** an increase in manufacturing space, associated logistics operations and space for other uses. **Because of uncertainty around the timing of growth when preparing this Local Plan,~~The requirements cannot be precisely specified at the current time so~~** the policy is based on safeguarding the land for future needs.
  2. Since the site first became operational, Rolls-Royce has seen strong sales growth worldwide. Employee numbers and the scale of vehicle production on the site have grown **significantly**. The number of vehicles produced has increased from **~~an output of~~**less than 1,000 to around **~~5~~6**,000 vehicles per annum, in response to increased demand and expanding export markets. More than 90% of the vehicles produced are exported.
  3. Some **2,500~~2,000~~** people are employed on site, including Rolls-Royce employees, contractors, agency workers, interns and students. Around 75% live within 15 miles of the plant. In partnership with several local colleges in the Higher Education sector in West Sussex, Rolls-Royce has established a highly successful Apprenticeship Programme. Since the launch of the programme in September 2006, **the volume of apprentices~~numbers~~** joining the scheme has steadily increased. **Rolls-Royce Motor Cars (RRMC) seeks to nurture future talent by offering almost 100 students from across the globe a 13-month paid internship across all areas of the business, including assembly, interior surface, interior trim, quality management, commercial and administrative roles. There are around 100 active apprentices at RRMC at any given time, who are offered full time roles in the company upon successful completion of the programme. ~~The apprenticeship lasts for up to four years and around 100 people have joined the company as a result; a number of former apprentices have subsequently progressed into leadership roles.~~**
  4. It is clear that potential further **growth~~expansion~~** of production at Rolls**-**Royce Motor Cars will be constrained without the availability and certainty of long-term strategic expansion land.
  5. The proposed **extension~~expansion~~** land is **~~located in~~**close**~~proximity~~** to the South Downs National Park and it is important that the proposed development conserves and enhances its setting by taking a landscape-led approach to the design of the new buildings. Furthermore, a footpath currently crosses the site and it is important that this footpath is diverted around the site so that walkers can continue to access the National Park on foot.
  6. I**t~~s~~** should be noted that as this site is safeguarded to address a specific need, the land is not counted towards the overall Local Plan employment land requirement.

Site Specific Considerations

* 1. The proposed **extension~~expansion~~**land is close to the South Downs National Park and it is important that the proposed development conserves and enhances its setting by taking a landscape-led approach to the design of the new buildings.
  2. **The site lies within a Minerals Safeguarding Area, as defined by the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan.**
  3. A footpath currently crosses the **proposed** site and it is important that this footpath is diverted around **this area~~the site~~** so that walkers can continue to access the National Park on foot.

In the policy ‘**~~at~~**~~’~~ is replaced with ‘**in’** before Westhampnett.

An additional criterion 7 is inserted:

**Car parking will be managed in the shift changeover periods to minimise delay on the local highway network. This will be supported by a Car Parking Strategy.**

New criterion 8: "**Proposals have regard to the West Sussex County Council Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance.**”

Consequently, “and” is deleted from the end of point 5 and inserted at the end of point 7.

Throughout, Rolls Royce should be hyphenated.

# [Appendices](#_Toc125989070)

[**Appendix A: Plan Area sub-area maps**](#_Toc125989071)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **0** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* There were no representations received to Appendix A.

Officer noted change: Maps are dated 2013 and Map A3 shows Parish of Plaistow and Ifold as “Plaistow CP”. Current maps will therefore be generated and the Plaistow and Ifold correction made. This change is shown in Appendix 4 of the ‘Council’s suggested modifications schedule’.

[**Appendix B: Map of designated rural areas**](#_Toc125989072)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **0** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* There were no representations received to Appendix B.

Officer noted change: Ifold should be added to Plaistow entry, this is shown in Appendix 5 of the ‘Council’s suggested modifications schedule’.

[**Appendix C: Additional Guidance**](#_Toc125989073)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **1** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **1** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Church Commissioners contend that there is nothing in the NPPF that requires demonstrating previous uses are unviable before converting buildings in the countryside to residential. Therefore, they seek deletion of the reference to NE10.

The criterion in Policy 10 and its reference in the Appendix is carried forward from the adopted Local Plan and Regulation 18 Preferred Approach Local Plan. The council maintains that reference to the countryside policy, which is as a result of its requirement that economic and community uses are considered before residential, reflects the aims of paragraph 84 in the NPPF “Supporting the rural economy”. The council is satisfied that Appendix C is sound.

[**Appendix D: Shopping frontages**](#_Toc125989074)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **0** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* There were no representations received to Appendix G.

[**Appendix E: Housing trajectory**](#_Toc125989075)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **2** | **Support:** | **1** | **Object:** | **1** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Support from developer in allocating new sites to ensure delivery of housing and relieve pressure from delayed sites.
* Developer raised an objection that the supply position will change by examination and the 5YHLS will be dependent on the housing requirement determined at examination. Objection that trajectories for sites are different to the published 5YHLS and inclusion of sites which gained planning permission after the base date.

The council has updated the housing trajectory following receipt of the latest completions and commitments data from WSCC and any updates on site progress following discussion with development management officers and developers, as well as anticipated completions and new supply for the current monitoring year. In addition to the trajectory, the council has drafted the necessary evidence for inclusion of sites in supply and estimated phasing. A revised trajectory has been produced which is set out in the Housing Supply Background Paper and shown in Appendix 6 of the ‘Council’s suggested modifications schedule’.

[**Appendix F: Monitoring framework**](#_Toc125989076)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **3** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **3** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* National Highways requested more detail in relation to the monitoring of the Infrastructure Policy.
* Sussex Wildlife Trust and Kirdford PC both contended that the layout was unclear whilst SWT also sought greater detail for the biodiversity policy as well as a minor change in respect of the responsible partners listed for that policy. Kirdford PC also wanted reference to a key strategy as well as objecting to the indicators defined for the Water Resource Zone.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the monitoring framework is sound. The modifications proposed include additional supporting text and a new early review policy (Policy M1) in response to work undertaken on transport issues to address representations from National Highways and West Sussex County Council. As a result of the addition of a new policy, it is suggested that Appendix F becomes a new Chapter 11 to the Plan.

Amend heading “**~~Appendix F:~~ Chapter 11: Monitoring**” and insert introduction before framework as follows:

**11.1 This Appendix shows how the implementation of policies in the Local Plan will be monitored.**

**11.2 The purpose of monitoring is to access whether the policies of the Local Plan are achieving the objectives and intended policy outcomes, whether they are having any unintended consequences and whether they require a review.**

**11.3** **To ensure that the plan continues to be up to date, the plan will be monitored and an early review undertaken if monitoring shows it to be necessary. This review process will enable the findings of the updated transport model and the ongoing ‘monitor and manage’ process to be taken into account and whether this results in any consequent changes to key aspects of the plan. Further detail transport monitoring detail is set out in paragraph 8.28.**

**Policy M1: Review of the Local Plan**

**An early review of the Local Plan (i.e. before the five-year period expiring) could be triggered by the outcomes of the updated transport modelling or the ongoing transport monitor and manage process. The Transport Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG) will set the programme for updating the transport model and agree triggers for the early review of the Local Plan, based on the outcomes of the new model and monitor and manage process.**

**11.4 Monitoring proposed by the Sustainability Appraisals to check the predicted effects of the Local Plan policies has informed the monitoring framework.**

**11.5 The Monitoring Framework is set out in relation to the Local Plan chapters with those policies with identified targets listed together with their relevant monitoring indicators.**

**11.6 The effectiveness of policies is assessed, where possible, against measurable targets. However, some policies aim to deliver a qualitative rather than a quantitative outcome. In such instances, it is appropriate to monitor whether the policy is delivering the intended trend or direction of travel. For some policies, measurable targets may be set through subsequent Development Plan Documents or Supplementary Planning Documents.**

**11.7 The indicators have been selected based on their appropriateness for gauging the effectiveness of the Local Plan policies. The choice of specific indicators is dependent upon the availability of data and in this respect, it is possible these could change over time. The specific indicators used will therefore be reviewed on a regular basis and where the availability of data changes, then some indicators may need to be removed whilst others could potentially be added.**

**11.8 The indicators will be monitored annually through the Authority’s Monitoring Report (AMR). The AMR will contain information on the implementation of the Local Plan policies and an assessment of their effectiveness whilst indicating whether any changes need to be considered if a policy is not working or if the targets are not being met. The AMR is published on the council’s website.**

Chapter 4 Delivery column – insert: “**Sussex North Water Neutrality Mitigation Strategy**”.

Chapter 4 Responsible agency/partner column – change: Sussex **~~Wildlife Trust~~ Biodiversity Record Centre.**

Chapter 5 Target to be achieved column – add: **If previous years cumulative housing delivery exceeds past cumulative housing targets as set out in Policy H1, any oversupply will be factored into the most recent 5 Year Housing Land Supply assessment.**

Chapter 8 Add reference to Monitor and Manage process as follows: In ‘Target to be achieved’ column, add “**Apply monitor and manage approach by monitoring demand on local transport networks across Local Plan area to identify sustainable transport initiatives and highway improvement schemes**”. In the ‘Delivery’ column, add: “**TIMG (Transport Infrastructure Management Group)**” and in ‘Monitoring indicators’ column, add “**Travel patterns across Local Plan area/forecasts of future transport needs**”.

Change ‘Highways England’ to ‘**National Highways’**

Chapter 9 Monitoring indicators column – add: “Record of infrastructure projects committed or completed **as recorded in the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) and Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS)**”.

[**Appendix G: Local Plan strategic policies**](#_Toc125989077)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **0** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* There were no representations received to Appendix G.

[**Appendix H: List of saved and deleted Local Plan 2014 – 2029 and Site Allocation DPD 2014 – 2029 policies**](#_Toc125989078)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **0** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* There were no representations received to Appendix H.

[**Appendix I: Gypsy and traveller site intensification plans (policy H12)**](#_Toc125989079)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **0** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* There were no representations received to Appendix I.

[**Appendix J: Glossary**](#_Toc125989080)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **0** | **Support:** | **0** | **Object:** | **0** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* There were no representations received to Appendix J.

For clarification to reflect the updated definition contained in ‘Planning Policy for Traveller sites’ (2023), amend the definition of Gypsies and Travellers as follows:

‘Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family’s or dependants’ educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily **or permanently**, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such. **~~Following an update to DCLG Planning policy for traveller sites (2015), those that have ceased to travel permanently no longer meet the definition for planning purposes.~~’**

# Sustainability Appraisal

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **27** | **Support:** | **n/a** | **Object:** | **n/a** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Several respondents made comments which were not directly related to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) but rather reiterated the representations they had made to specific elements of the Local Plan.
* A number of respondents sought clarification of why certain scenarios considered in the SA had been discounted. In particular, reference was made to the growth scenarios for Wisborough Green, Kirdford and Crouchlands Farm.
* The majority of respondents felt that the assessment of reasonable alternatives was flawed being based on a housing requirement figure below the assessed local housing need.
* One respondent thought that more than one growth scenario should have been considered for Boxgrove.
* One respondent commented that more reasonable alternatives should have been considered for Southbourne, in particular, considering sites in the Chichester Harbour AONB.
* Several respondents commented that the SA did not go far enough in testing the implications of climate change on the spatial strategy e.g. coastal retreat on the Manhood Peninsula.

A housing requirement figure significantly above the local housing need (LHN) figure has previously been considered (as set out in the SA report published at the time of the Preferred Approach Local Plan) but it was concluded that there would be significant negative effects. The infrastructure constraints that have constrained the ability of the Local Plan to deliver in full the LHN figure are acknowledged in the SA, and it is on this basis that the SA references it as being ‘unreasonable’ to consider an above LHN figure.

The comments regarding the number of reasonable alternatives are noted.  However, this process should be manageable, not all conceivable reasonable alternatives need to be appraised through the SA.

# Habitats Regulations Assessment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **3** | **Support:** | **n/a** | **Object:** | **n/a** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Bellway Homes (Wessex) Ltd raise concerns relating to data as full weight cannot be given to Reg 18 Local Plans. Bellway’s interest lies in relation to proposals for Southern Gateway (Policies A4 and 5) where HRA recognises through Policy H2, there is potential for likely significant effects regarding air quality; HRA goes on to conclude plan contains positive measures to mitigate or avoid such effects (through Policies NE21, T2, T3 and NE1) to help reduce atmospheric pollution.
* Kirdford Parish Council raise concerns in relation to Ebernoe SAC (disturbance of bat flight lines, atmospheric pollution) and The Mens SAC (suggesting Policy NE8 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands, does not provide sufficient protection to the SAC and no consideration of recreational pressure arising from development). The PC also identifies the need for issues relating to HRA to be dealt with at the Local Plan level rather than being left to neighbourhood plans. Issues raised in relation to water neutrality where HRA concludes no likely significant effect. Concerns include the use of 85lpd enforceability and monitoring; need for certainty in relation to mitigation; operation and detail of off-setting mitigation strategy; phasing of development.
* Natural England is largely satisfied with the conclusions of the HRA but has raised concerns relating to atmospheric pollution for various sites including Ebernoe Common SAC, The Mens SAC, Butser Hill, SAC, Kingley Vale SAC, Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC. At Reg 19 stage looking for other evidence to support HRA conclusions of no adverse effect on integrity.
* Natural England is satisfied with approach to mitigation relating to nutrient mitigation concerning water quality but happy to continue the conversation. Identify evidence for Pagham Harbour still developing, at that point in time Plan allocated limited development (if any) discharging to Pagham Harbour and general protection from Policies NE6 and NE16 may be sufficient to conclude no adverse effect on integrity.
* Natural England identify that where new areas for development potentially overlap with Solent functionally-linked land (the Solent Wader and Brent Geese Strategy) (where there are no detailed sites yet identified) general protection is provided by Policies NE5, NE6 and NE7 but advise wording in Broad Location for Development and policies A13 (Southbourne) and A12 (Chidham and Hambrook) be strengthened to reflect mitigation strategy.

Natural England has provided additional help through discussions and meetings to provide further advice since the consultation period ended on how to resolve issues concerning atmospheric pollution in the northern part of the plan area. This work remains on-going. Further discussions are being held between the transport consultants and AECOM to examine the air quality data in more detail with a view to establishing a clearer position on potential impacts of proposed development. This will then enable consideration of any such impacts and further deliberations around identifying potential necessary mitigation that will then require discussion with Natural England.

The advice to include further text in Policies A12 (Chidham and Hambrook) and A13 (Southbourne) to better reflect the mitigation hierarchy will be included in the next iteration of the plan and therefore the following modification is proposed:

Amend Policies A12 (Chidham and Hambrook) and A13 (Southbourne) to better reflect the mitigation hierarchy.

# Schedule of Changes to the Policies Map

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of comments received** | | | | | |
| **Total:** | **16** | **Support:** | **1** | **Object:** | **15** |

**Comments and CDC response**

* Representations related to requests for sites/areas to be included/changed on the Policies Map and explanations were duly provided as to why these proposed sites/areas were not featured or changes made.

The council is satisfied that subject to the modifications proposed below that the Policy is sound. These modifications relate to an omission identified by the council; a change to the Horticultural Development Area extension and strategic wildlife corridor; and approved changes in an outline planning permission to the boundaries of A14.

Schedule of proposed changes to the Policies map to be modified as follows:

**Chapter 4: Climate Change and the Natural Environment:**

Add “**Policy NE6 Chichester’s Internationally and Nationally Designated Habitats - SAC – Key and Wider Conservation Areas ranges referred to in d) to be added**.”

Change map NE4b East of City Corridors map to reflect adjustment to wildlife corridor around Runcton Horticultural Development Area extension.

**Chapter 7: Employment and Economy:**

Extension to be changed on Runcton Horticultural Development Area Map E3a.

**Chapter 8: Transport:**

Detail of Charging sectors by Ward for purposes of Policy T1 to be added.

**Chapter 10: Strategic and Area Based Policies**

Change map A14a to reflect changes approved in the outline planning permission.

1. In stages prior to Proposed Submission referred to as Local Plan Review. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.chichester.gov.uk/strategicwildlifecorridors> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://chichester.oc2.uk/> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-improvement-plan) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. **https://ecsa.international/reach/restoring-meadow-marsh-and-reef-rememare** [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. [Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-improvement-plan) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. [National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping (arcgis.com)](https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9cef4a084bbb4954b970cd35b099d94c&marker=636394.9963403749%2C332466.006489025%2C27700%2C%2C%2C&markertemplate=%7B%22title%22%3A%22%22%2C%22x%22%3A636394.9963403749%2C%22y%22%3A332466.006489025%2C%22wkid%22%3A27700%2C%22isIncludeShareUrl%22%3Atrue%7D&level=16) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (April 2022) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Carried forward in this Local Plan (see Policy H2 Strategic Locations/ Allocations 2021 – 2039) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Carried forward in this Local Plan (see Policy H2 Strategic Locations/ Allocations 2021 – 2039) Site Allocations DPD 2014-2029) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <https://www.chichester.gov.uk/applyhousingregister> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. This includes the figure from the base date of the GTAA, which is 2022, so this period is effectively a 7 year period. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. This category includes a proportion of the undetermined need (**68~~30~~**%), as per the methodology used by the consultants who produced the GTAA. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Guidance on the application of the Joint Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan safeguarding policies is available in the [West Sussex County Council Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance](https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/about-the-council/policies-and-reports/environment-planning-and-waste-policy-and-reports/minerals-and-waste-policy/joint-minerals-local-plan/) [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The Goodwood Estate – Socioeconomic Contribution: 2022’ by Dr Alexander Grous, London School of Economics (published July 2023 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Rolls-Royce Motor Cars Pressclub article 27.04.2023 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)