



Harbour Villages Ward - Liberal Democrats Campaign Team Chichester Local plan Review 2035 Submissions

Our Observations

We wish to be called at the time of the Planning Inspection.

This plan appears to have been created in a short time and therefore lacks cohesion. Information used in one area is different to that elsewhere.

Points made for: Apuldram/Donnington/Bosham/Chidham/Hambrook/Fishbourne make it appear that they have been written in silos. Can you please look at each one and try and line the reasoning up.

Our fear is that this document needs significant change for it to be fit and proper and presentable to the Inspector.

3.1 to 3.2

It is our view that an opportunity has been missed to:

1. Look at new opportunities to develop away from existing settlements
2. Look at innovative solution to develop new dwellings. There is no provision for
 - a. Kit built small homes
 - b. Eco style properties built in a rural environment
3. Choose CDC identified sites rather than be lead by developers

3.4

The plan does insufficient to encourage students or young people to come to Chichester or for them to remain to develop careers. In the report "Know your Place" by BBC Chichester scored very badly. Going out and sports facilities scored zero. Busses scored one.

3.5

We do not accept that the wider plan has taken into account the wider range of environmental aspirations. The size and scope of planned development along the East West corridor damages the environment and fails to enhance the social aspirations of the communities.

3.6

Haphazard development as proposed does not conserve and enhance the local distinctiveness of the area.

3.7

Any significant development, as planned, between the Chichester Harbour and the South Downs will seriously damage the area.

3.10

The growth proposed will damage the villages and remove essential farmland. The villages do not need to grow to thrive. Schools, facilities and roads are already over loaded.

4.1

This plan has no provision for the building of eco communities. There are sites in the rural areas or just outside the SPA (Bosham for example) that could be used to develop high quality eco villages.

If we wish to build sustainable developments then as a Council we need to look and embrace new modern techniques to create eco friendly developments. There are opportunities in the area that this plan flatly ignores.



In terms of high quality building with standards that embrace an environmental future it is lamentable in its lack of a positive approach.

4.2

We support the need for sustainable development. This plan currently is prescriptive and does not allow local people to shape the future.

4.8/4.9

This plan does not enhance or maintain the vitality of some of the rural communities. More development in Fishbourne, Donnington, Chidham, Hambrook and Bosham will damage the communities. Other more rural communities do need more housing to ensure the shops and schools survive. Funtington and East and West Ashling are good examples.

4.18

Service villages are not sufficiently defined. Comparing Fishbourne with Westbourne or Westhamnett with Wisborough Green fails to distinguish them. They are different.

4.22

Are we meeting housing needs or delivering a government policy that we have no control over? Is this demand led? Do we need this level of housing here? Not proven. We accept we need more housing especially for our young but this policy fails to create a coherent plan that will satisfy local people.

4.34

Affordable housing is not defined in this document. Typically "affordable Housing" in this Council areas is unaffordable to many people.

Policy S6

A 30% provision is unacceptably low. We recommend a minimum of 35%.

4.52

We support the need for business and employment. This must though be well paid high quality jobs. Developing land for warehousing is not acceptable.

4.6

We do need to retain and expand our retail offering. This needs to be flexible as people's requirements change. Young people now wish to live, work and play in Cities. Chichester currently does not offer this as a serious opportunity. This plan does little to address this.

4.62

We do not support the development of retail warehouse parks. This does damage to our city centre. We need to encourage the iconic stores into the City.

4.63

We support the enhancement of the local centres in Selsey, Wittering and Tangmere

4.75

Our view is that we could be doing more in this area. More thought is probably needed to help develop the area at a business level.

We believe there is scope for innovative horticulture especially in the Sidlesham and Almodington area.



4.8

No mention is made of supporting the Marine Industry within the confines of Chichester Harbour. This is essential and a new paragraph must be added. There is pressure on Northshore, Dell Quay and other smaller sites. The old Burnes site is left in ruin. This could be run as a successful business maybe with a few week-end retreats to help fund. All sites can thrive with clear policies by CDC. We must retain and encourage our marine industry. We lost Coombes many years ago due to CDC inability to support local business.

4.86

This is not acceptable as a clause. Infrastructure is critical. We cannot build if the roads, water or mains drainage is insufficient.

4.88

The decision to develop along the East West corridor is short sighted and damaging to the area and will not enhance the villages. The infrastructure is not present. It will develop land too close to the AONB and create a housing corridor.

4.92

This area must be fully redeveloped with Hotel, Multi use centre for exhibitions, concerts and conferences with a site for community use. An area must also be created for young business leaders with gigabyte connectivity. Space should also be found for the University to incubate businesses. Housing should focus on young people wishing to live in the city.

4.98

We have read the Transport Study. The costings appear to be incorrect. We do not accept this study.

4.108 to 4.11

Policy S15/S16

This area should be used for additional commercial development. It is close to Rolls Royce and the roads can be improved to accommodate new high grade businesses. The building can be built to avoid concern over noise from the airfield and motor circuit.

This site could take some if not all of the proposed building from the site at AL6

4.111 to 4.113

See our comments later. We are opposed to the over development in this area.

5.15

The plan provides insufficient detail for the provision of cycle routes on all new developments. Cycle routes should be part of the agreed outline and not set down later. All new developments MUST have dedicated cycle routes that link in with existing routes on the highways.

5.19

We believe the level of housing proposed along the A259 will cause major holdups at the Fishbourne roundabout. This will be damaging to business, tourism and the local population.

Rat running is a serious issue on roads off the A259. This will get worse.

5.34 to 5.43

Countryside gaps need to be defined urgently and guaranteed to be in place for at least 25 years. If not they will be valid for only till the next 5 year Review.....



5.53

Most of the land proposed for development along the A259 corridor is Grade 1, 2 or 3a land. It is required for growing food and keeping livestock.

Policy S27

Any development South of A27 at Donnington/Apuldram/Fishbourne is at risk of flooding. It is on the Lavant flood plain

5.64

We support strategic wildlife corridors. However the one in Fishbourne has already been desecrated by Whitehouse Farm and development on Clay Lane. We propose a new one running from Chichester Harbour through Beth wins Farm to the South Downs. This will require planting and developing.

5.72

We support this. We do not support on site systems. We are opposed to any new connections to the Apuldram Waterworks.

6.37 to 6.43 and AL5

We support this but feel it needs to be extended to include the railway and other buildings. It requires an extension to the station with an additional platform and line for a Metro service.

There needs to be a multi use building for concerts, conferences, exhibitions and community activity.

All waste water must be pumped to TANGMERE.

We need to include suitable housing for young people. Employment sites for entrepreneurs. A link to the gigabyte project.

6.44 to 6.49 Policy AL6

NOTE This is Apuldram/Donnington AND Fishbourne

Fishbourne Parish boundary is Lavant River

We oppose this. No development should be undertaken in this area. It is in the Lavant flood plain.

No additional housing

No Commercial sites

We object to the relief road.

All employment land MUST be relocated to the Goodwood Aerodrome site.

This site is too close to the AONB on a flood plain and the relief road would affect the landscape and views.

An additional road onto the Fishbourne Roundabout will add to the traffic being projected onto the roundabout with development in Southbourne, Chidham/Hambrook, Bosham and Fishbourne.

6.50 to 6.56 Policy AL7

This is a sensitive site close to the harbour and exposed. Any development must be supported by planting and screening.

If this site is developed we support the relocating of the school with sufficient parking.

Any development must include cycle routes and recreational space. We also recommend a new cricket pitch.

Out of choice we would not develop this site.



6.62 to 6.65 Policy AL9

Fishbourne has had significant development in recent years. An additional 250 houses need to find a sustainable location. The area on Clay lane has now potentially been removed by the sudden imposition of a Wildlife Corridor. We support Wildlife Corridors but this one is in an area where development has already taken place and was being proposed by CDC.

Development on Bethwins Farm is hugely damaging to the village and encroaches on Bosham. It is not supported by the village. It removed important farm land and separates the Harbour from the South Downs. No other land has been identified as deliverable.

We propose that this 250 houses is reduced to a more manageable level in consultation with the Parish Council

6.66 to 6.70 AL10

We support the moving of the primary School to a location in the north of Hambrook. 500 houses is too much on this location and the numbers need to be reduced in consultation with the Parish Council. An allocation of 250 is more acceptable. No more development should be undertaken on the land west of Broad Road.

7.7

We support housing for older people but recommend this is in units in villages as well as in cities. Some people wish to stay in their communities.

7.100 to 7.104 Policy DM16

The standard set out here in terms of sustainable design is not high enough. All new developments, all new houses should be built to a zero carbon standard. This may not be popular with developers but it is essential for the long term good.

7.105

We strongly support all forms of renewable energy. All new properties should be built with solar panels. Renewable should be encouraged as part of the planning process.

7.118

We strongly support the retention of the AONB. Limited development should be allowed on existing sites. Marine businesses must be retained and sites not used for development of housing.

7.134 to 7.140 DM22

This plan has no provision for the building of eco communities. There are sites in the rural areas or just outside the SPA (Bosham for example) that could be used to develop high quality eco villages.

7.144

We support the need to continue increased air quality monitoring. CDC does have in its powers to affect this by careful planning of houses, parking and commercial development. The proposed new relief road exiting onto the Fishbourne roundabout is unlikely to improve air quality.

7.154

WE are concerned that insufficient care is taken with preserving the historic environment whilst understanding that careful redevelopment needs to take place. We support retain the fabric of old buildings but allowing design to move the sites forward.

Ends