

the Centurion way. The main negative impacts are on loss of trees and hedges and landscape impacts of these greenfield sites.

Option 2 (land north of Marchwood)

This option is more prominent in the landscape than the option above and there is good evidence of a range of protected species using the site, so the biodiversity impact is more severe. Access to facilities is also less good than options 1, 3 and 4. Overall the negatives outweigh the positives.

Option 5 (Shopwyke Lakes) [submitted option]

Unusually for the Chichester options this is a site already with planning permission and also a brownfield site. This option is effectively a small extension of an existing permission. The main drawback is the separation from the rest of Chichester due to the A27, but this is mitigated by the access improvements generated by the larger strategic location on the site. Provided that the potential contamination of the brownfield site can be dealt with then there are few negative impacts.

Option 6 (Land north of Stockbridge)

This large open site is separated from the City by the A27, which makes walking and cycling links difficult despite the proximity. The major negative impacts are on the protected wildlife of the Harbour and the landscape impacts on the Harbour AONB. Overall this site has the most negative impacts and the fewest positive of all the Chichester options.

2.2.4 Hunston Housing Options

There are multiple options at Hunston – for a relatively small amount of housing to meet a local housing need. Several of the sites are directly adjacent or are close enough to form a recognisable group with similar impacts due to their location relative to the village.

Options 1 (Land south of Meadow Close) and 8 (Land at corner of Church Lane)

Generally these options have few significant impacts. They are positive for housing and economy. Option 8 being close to the main road is the better location and is more self-contained.

Options 2 (Land south of Carmelite Convent) and 10 (land at Chrislee)

These two options are clearly separated from the existing village with negative impact on urban forms and landscape as a result. They are also further in terms of walking into the facilities of the village.

Options 3 (Land east of Foxbridge Drive) and 7 (Land east of Southover Way)

These adjacent sites to the east of the settlement are more sustainably located than Options 2 and 10 but have greater landscape and biodiversity impacts than either Options 1 and 8 or options 4 and 9.

Option 2 (Land south of the A27)

Extending Chichester to the south of the A27 has negative impacts on landscape (getting closer to the Harbour AONB) and on biodiversity (closer to the Harbour SPA/SAC). The A27 also acts a barrier to pedestrian access but good road access make the site attractive from an economic standpoint.

Option 3 (land to the rear of 69 Fishbourne Road)

The direct proximity to the SNCI and possible knock on effects on the Harbour are the main issues with this site. Good local accessibility and provision for local jobs needs are the main positive impacts.

Option 4 (Site 3 Tangmere City Fields)

This option does not directly compare with the others in this section, due to the location and therefore potentially meeting different economic needs. However this site could meet some of Chichester's need for employment sites. The relative remoteness of the site and lack of cycling/walking/train links militate against this. As a local employment site it has few drawbacks. To meet district wide needs it is more questionable, good access to the A27 is its main positive in that regard.

2.3.3 North Mundham and Runcton Employment sites

Option 1 (land south of Bognor Road)

This large site can accommodate a range of uses, meeting wider than just parish needs. Closer to transport links than the other option. The site has the potential to affect biodiversity and water quality negatively, but delivers well on the economic objectives.

Option 2 (Walnut Tree Field)

The site is more remote and would be more attractive to horticultural uses than office development. Accessibility is not as good as option 1, but this could be mitigated through the type of employment use on the site. This option is less sensitive than Option 1 for wildlife and water quality.

2.3.4 Oving Employment sites

Option 1 (land west of Sherwood Nursery)

For this site, negative impacts outnumbered the positive ones, with biodiversity loss and poor access to facilities and transport links being the primary issues.

Option 2 (land north of Fuel Depot)

This site has similar drawbacks to Option 1, but with the addition of concerns over contaminated land. The main positive for options and 1nd 2 is the large amount of space that they could provide for development.