

7th February 2019

Dear Sir,

Reference: Chichester Local Plan Review 2016-2015.

Dear Sir,

I have been unable to download your representation form so I am advised an email / letter to you will suffice.

I have read much of the lengthy document and consider the following to be my main areas to record as being my personal response.

Housing.

The Chichester District Council seem unable to resist the demands of central government regarding the quantity of residential properties required to be built. There appears a complete lack of understanding of the pressure caused by being squeezed between the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour as an area of outstanding natural beauty. This is the impression I have.

The Southern Gateway project includes a significant number of new residential properties and there needs to be a better indication of the work all these people will be doing. There does not appear to be any solid indication of new employment possibilities. Rolls Royce can only take on so many new staff and the WSCC, as a local employer, is declining everyday. The right type of accommodation must be required from any developer – not just low cost provision. The majority of people who wish to live in Chichester are older and do not want the same accommodation as a young family with two cars. The disaster at the Graylingwell development in recent years is an example of how NOT to permit a new estate to be developed – a fire engine cannot get to many of the streets owing to the appalling lack of parking space.

I am deeply worried about the local planning authority's ability to rigorously discern what constitutes a quality development owing to past experience and the evidence around us. The City Gates development originally stated fine words of its intended aim:

“The proposed design will provide a high quality development that formalises a historic gateway into and out of Chichester....the development creates a strong and lasting impression as visitors travel along Stockbridge Road.”

Design Concept – “The development design echoes the story of Chichester’s earliest history...High quality materials and allusions to modern nautical detail signal a gateway connection between the City and its harbour.....a designed architectural statement that elevates the quality of Chichester’s southern gateway.”

Chichester Gate is a reminder of CDC’s failure to deliver its aspirations stated in the Design Statement and Concept.*Planning committee must stick to their aspirations and not be cowed by developers/builders. Strengthen scrutiny process at all stages.

*Design Statement Chichester Gate –

What guarantees are there that the developer will not pick out the profit making bits of the project and leave the less attractive elements to linger for years? This project has caused the Ministry of Justice to imagine that it will achieve funding from the sale of the law courts and I am certain it influenced their decision to close the courts in Chichester instead of Horsham. This closure will have a catastrophic effect on the ambience of the city. The need for firms of lawyers and other related employment to be based in Chichester has now gone.

I hear echoes in the wording for the Southern Gateway Project. CDC say ‘The Local Plan has an important role in creating a district we can all be proud of’ (Local Plan Review pull-out guide). This development risks not meeting CDC’s flagship project.

I am advised that the Southern Gateway developers/builders costs will be high and margins tight, resulting in potentially lower quality building material and inappropriate accommodation. This will potentially force people working in Chichester to live outside the city and for them to have to rely on poor/absent public transport and a total lack of safe routes for cyclists. Good design and use of good materials doesn’t have to imply high cost.

Chichester Gate with its unused piazza and tawdry, empty premises is the template of how not to do it. It is just as well that it is largely out of view. The Southern Gateway project will be very visible to all, residents and visitors.

The CDC should appoint/co-opt a Design Champion for this project – perhaps an architect who is able to represent good practice, design etc, not someone motivated by profit.

Continued/

Roads

The proposed alterations/mitigations to the A27 focus on the E-W-E through flow of traffic and will make local traffic journeys longer/use unsuitable narrow residential City centre roads.

For example:

- No right turns from the A27 at the Stockbridge and Whyke junctions on to the A286 and B2145 north mean westbound traffic would have to leave the A27 at the Bognor Road roundabout and use Quarry Lane, Kingsham Ave and Kingsham Road, both narrow residential roads with schools, residents parking, speed bumps, making these roads dangerous. Up-to-date and realistic understanding of effects on local journeys must be used.
- No right turns from Terminus Road south on to the A286 reduce access to John Rennie Road, South Bank and Kings Avenue and increase traffic on the A27. Right turns should be reinstated.
- The Systra BABA27 work has not been taken into account. This work showed a priority issue is separating A27 through traffic from local traffic. The Plan ignores this. Systra's identification of key issues must be used.
- The full mitigated costs of the A27 junctions have not been calculated and therefore no-one knows whether the funding will be forthcoming. The costs in the Plan are clear underestimates. Yet the new housing has already started at several sites close to the A27 and on the Manhood peninsula. Vehicles to and from these will impact the area soon.
- Increase in air pollution arising from increased congestion at junction traffic lights and construction has not been dealt with.
- An increase in noise pollution is acknowledged, but the additional costs of mitigating noise have not been identified.
- No cost-benefit analysis is available to determine whether the A27 junction alterations are worth it. A cost-benefit analyses must be done.
- The construction timetable for the A27 junctions is not available and therefore the integration of new dwelling traffic with junctions is unknown and will result in increased congestion. We need the dwelling development and road construction timetables.
- Sustainable and integrated transport must be separately identified as cycling, walking, buses, trains. Each mode has different needs which must be properly included in transport planning from the outset and not inadequately added as an afterthought. We desperately need dedicated cycle paths planned from the outset.

*The transport study states that 'mitigation is not required to solve existing issues of queues and delays, but only provide a scheme that addresses....the increase in flow generated by the developments for the Local Plan period'. Thus congestion will continue. "...the junction improvements.....may not provide any additional capacity

beyond the Local Plan period (ie to 2035) and as such a new/improved scheme would be required to support future capacity issues” (PBA report para 1.3.2).

I should be grateful if these comments are taken into account in your review of the consultation exercise.

Yours Sincerely,

Martin Tomlinson MBE

(Resident since September 1989)