

Examination of the Chichester Local Plan 2021-2039

Further Statement in Respect of

Matter 4A: Transport

Submitted on behalf of:

Beechcroft Developments Limited

September 2024

Document Management

Project	Version	Date	Author	Checked/ Approved by	Reason for Revision
23027	Matter 4A	04/09/2024	JF	KM	

Matter 4A: Transport

Issue: Would the Plan be effective in ensuring that any significant impacts from the development proposed on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree?

Issue: Are the individual transport policies clear, justified and consistent with national policy and will they be effective?

Policy T1 Transport Infrastructure

Q.29 Policy T1 includes that ‘Developer contributions from new development will also be sought from all new housing development that is not yet subject to planning permission, in accordance with the per dwelling contribution as set out in paragraphs 8.20 and 8.21’?

Given that the approach to A27 mitigation contributions is set out in explanatory text and not the strategic policy, is the Plan clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals in this regard?

1. The above wording of this policy is not clear. It suggests the Developer contributions will be sought from all new development i.e. other forms new development including housing development. The amended wording to paragraph 8.27 (previously 8.21) and Table 8.2 in the **Council’s suggested modifications schedule - Appendix 9 - Chapter 8. Policy T1 and supporting text** (SD10 04) does not reflect this. The wording in paragraph 8.27 only refers to housing development and Table 8.2 sets out an example for a housing development proposal in Oving.
2. As set out in para 3.15 of Appendix 2 of Beechcroft Development’s representations to the Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Plan which comprises a *Statement of Representations - A27 Mitigation Contributions* by Bellamy Roberts LLP it is not just housing developments that generate traffic movements. Other types of development such as industrial, retail, leisure, education etc all generate traffic movements during the network peak hour but there is no evidence to suggest that developer contributions should be sought from these other types of development.
3. The way Policy T1 is currently worded is not clear and the omission of contribution figures from ‘other forms of development’ is flawed. This Policy should be made clearer and the supporting text should include a Table that sets out contribution figures (based on Apportionment and Averaging Factors) for other forms of development such as industrial, retail, leisure, education etc.