

RESPONSE TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT FOR CHIDHAM AND HAMBROOK (POLICY AL10 AND PREAMBLE).

- 1) Chidham and Hambrook is designated as a 'Service Village' with no explanation as to what, this is. What exactly are we, as residents, servicing? Most residents, I am sure, regard the village as their home and where they build their lives, not as simply a dormitory which they inhabit in order to 'service' local employment opportunities. As such, what happens to the place where they have chosen to live their lives is of some importance to them.
- 2) i) The reference to possible relocation and expansion of Chidham Primary School is simply wrong. The relocation of Bosham Primary School will make it completely infeasible for any replacement school in Chidham and children will have to make their way along the A259 to Bosham. The proposed development of a *minimum* 500 homes in the revised Neighbourhood Plan will, therefore, *not* include a two form entry primary school
ii) The number of houses allocated to the designated sites is in excess of CDC's own guidelines on houses per hectare, and seems to unquestionably accept what developers would like to build – i.e. as many as they can squeeze onto the given sites.
iii) There is no specific mention of social housing in the types of residential accommodation cited. The reliance on what private developers want to build will mean yet more cramped estates of largely three and four bedroom houses that will not meet the needs of the full range of those desperately needing affordable housing.
- 3) The "provision of high quality development as a sustainable extension of the existing settlements" gives little indication of what 'sustainable' means other than "sustainable forms of transport" with no further explanation. There is a reference in point 3 to 'off-site improvements (including highways)' again to "promote sustainable transport options". It would seem, from this, that 'sustainability' is taken to mean nothing more than the use of private cars. The A259 is already a heavily used transport route for all types of conveyance, including large numbers of heavy lorries and commercial vehicles. Another 500 plus houses (not to mention the 1,250 intended for Southbourne) will, of course, dramatically increase this already congested route since there is no nearby access to the A27. The local train service from Nutbourne is infrequent and unreliable, and the bus service, whilst frequent and fairly reliable, is prohibitively expensive for commuters and, especially, families. There appear to be no plans to address the obvious need for proper integrated public transport systems, including safe cycle routes. In fact, in relation to both housing development and transport, 'sustainability', whilst stated more than once, is, in practice, ignored. This myopic view of 'sustainability' will seriously diminish the quality of life in this area.
- 4) There is absolutely no doubt that the building of 500 houses in Chidham, in addition to the 1,750 houses earmarked for Bosham, Fishbourne and Southbourne, will have an irreparably damaging impact on all aspects of the Chichester Harbour AONB. Views of, and from, the water to the South Downs will be irretrievably lost. The water quality will be diminished, threatening the SSSI status of the Harbour, and the distinctive nature of the villages of Bosham, Chidham and Southbourne will be destroyed.
- 5) The infrastructure of the whole area is already under enormous strain, and there are no serious proposals to mitigate the damaging effects of this excessive and poorly planned development. The whole process appears to be driven by both government diktat and CDC's uncritical acceptance of developer's requirements. The need for more housing is

clear. But such development must be focused on the needs of the most vulnerable as well as the financially advantaged. Most importantly, it must be genuinely sustainable in terms of infrastructure, the environment and the special status of areas bordering AONB's and SSSI's. The proposed development fails these needs in every respect.

Tim Towers