
Chichester Local Plan 2021-2039

Hearing Statement on behalf of: West Sussex County Council (Representor No. 5640)

Relating to Matter 6:

Area Policies and Allocations – Policy A20 Land south of Bognor Road

Issue: Are the proposed policies and allocations justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Policy A20 land South of Bognor Road

Q.266 Are the site-specific development requirements as set out in the Policy justified, and will they be effective in achieving sustainable development on the site?

Response:

1. As a starting point, we support the allocation of the site, but some of the policy requirements are quite generic and covered by other policies elsewhere in the plan. Some further consideration, in the form of main Modifications, should be considered for the following site-specific criteria.

2. Criteria 2 – it would assist if there were specifics in relation to what ‘good’ access comprises and the expectations of the site in terms of what our client can control and deliver. The site is well placed adjacent to the A259, which includes nearby bus stops, crossing points for pedestrians so you can travel east and west from the site along the A259 and beyond. This section of the A259 also includes a pedestrian cycle route adjoining the site boundary, which links to a bridge over the A27, therefore overcoming this as a key barrier for sustainable transport routes into the town. The site can connect directly to these routes as part of any detailed design, which may address the criteria, but this should be clarified if a site-specific criteria on access is sought.
3. Criteria 6 – this would be an expectation any development and is covered elsewhere. This policy doesn’t cause difficulties for the appellant, but it is not site specific.
4. Criteria 8 – the first part suggests that the requirements may not have to provide the access as prescribed, should a site specific transport assessment be undertaken. However, it is not entirely clear and if this point of access is essential to the Council’s consideration of sustainability, it should make that clear.
5. Criteria 9 – similar to our comments relating to criteria 2, it is not clear what is expected from our client in this regard. Some clarification as to what comprises regular bus services and whether that should be a site specific requirement, or more a strategic matter for the wider Local Plan strategy and infrastructure delivery. That said, it is an important matter and the Council’s strategy for sustainable transport is not clear.
6. Criteria 10 – this is a generic policy covered elsewhere under Policy NE15 – Flood Risk and Water Management.
7. Criteria 12 - this is covered by the adopted Minerals & Waste Local Plan, which covers the Site and wider District. Whilst this does impact the site, a specific criterion is not considered necessary for soundness.

Q.267 Are the suggested MMs necessary for soundness?

Response

8. We agree to the proposed MM CM191 to ensure flexibility regarding the requirement for Travelling Showpeople plots, as this will depend on needs at the point of the application preparation and determination.

9. In terms of CM363 – we do not believe this policy criteria is required at all and the amendments are not necessary for the purposes of soundness.