



Representation Form

Local Plan Review: Preferred Approach Consultation

The consultation on the Local Plan Review: Preferred Approach will run from 13 December 2018 to 7 February 2019. The document and more information on the consultation can be viewed on our website www.chichester.gov.uk/localplanreview

All comments must be received by 11.59 pm on Thursday 7 February 2019.

There are a number of ways to make your comments:

- Comment on the document on the internet using our online consultation website www.chichester.gov.uk/localplanreview (**Recommended**)
- Complete this form on your computer and email it to us at planningpolicy@chichester.gov.uk
- Print this form and post it to us at: Planning Policy Team, Chichester District Council, East Pallant House, 1 East Pallant, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 1TY

How to use this form

Please complete Part A in full. Please note anonymous comments cannot be accepted, a full address including postcode must be provided.

Please complete Part B overleaf, using a new form for each separate policy or paragraph that you wish to comment on. Please identify which paragraph your comment relates to by completing the appropriate box.

For more information, or if you need assistance completing this form, please contact the Planning Policy Team by email at planningpolicy@chichester.gov.uk or telephone 01243 785166.

| PART A | Your Details | Agent's Details (if applicable ¹) |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Full Name | | Hywel James |
| Address | c/o Agent | 5th Floor, Thames Tower, Reading |
| Postcode | | RG1 1LX |
| Telephone | | 01182 149340 |
| Email | | h.james@nexusplanning.co.uk |
| Organisation (if applicable) | CEG | Nexus Planning |
| Position (if applicable) | | Senior Planner |

Is this the official view of the organisation named above? Yes No

¹ Where provided, we will use Agent's details as the primary contact.

PART B

Please use a new form for each representation that you wish to make. Please note anonymous comments cannot be accepted. Any personal information provided will be processed by Chichester District Council in line with the General Data Protection Regulations 2018. More information is available at:

<http://www.chichester.gov.uk/dataprotectionandfreedomofinformation>.

To which part of the document does your representation relate?

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------|----|
| Page/ Paragraph Number: | | Policy Reference: | S4 |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------|----|

Do you support, object, or wish to comment on this policy or paragraph?
(Please tick one answer)

Support

Object

Have Comments

Enter your full representation here giving details of your reasons for support/objection:

Please see separate sheets below

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

What improvements or changes would you suggest?

Please see separate sheets below

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

Declaration

I understand that any comments submitted will be considered by Chichester District Council in line with this consultation and will be made publicly available on their website www.chichester.gov.uk and may be identifiable by my name or organisation, if provided.

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Name (<i>print</i>): | Hywel James |
| Date: | 05/02/2019 |

Chichester Local Plan Review - Regulation 18 Preferred Options Consultation

Policy S4 - Meeting Housing Needs

1. We fundamentally object to Policy S4 which does not meet (or seek to meet) the actual need for housing in the District, has no flexibility and lacks clarity, all contrary to the provisions of the NPPF. We address these matters in turn below.

The Housing Requirement Figure

2. As identified in our representations to paragraph 4.22 Policy S4, in proposing to provide for at least 12,350 dwellings in the period 2016-2035 (650dpa), takes forward the standard methodology figure for Chichester District of 609dpa and adds to that provision of 41dpa of unmet need from the South Down National Park Authority. However, as made clear in the HEDNA, the 609dpa figure for Chichester District is capped at a level 40% above the current adopted Local Plan requirement figure of 435dpa. Accordingly, it is evident that the actual level of housing need for the District (the uncapped figure) is actually 775dpa. As such the Local Plan Review is failing to provide for 166dpa, or a total of 3,154 homes over the Plan period. This is very significant.
3. Whilst we accept that the standard methodology does allow for the application of a cap in circumstances such a Chichester's (to help ensure that the local housing need figure is as deliverable as possible), it is important to note that the cap does not of course eliminate the additional clearly identified need. The PPG is clear (ID 2a-007) that:

"The cap reduces the minimum number generated by the standard method, but does not reduce housing need itself. Therefore strategic policies adopted with a cap applied may require an early review and updating to ensure that any housing need above the capped level is planned for as soon as is reasonably possible."
4. As such by applying the cap, apparently without question or consideration of whether a higher figure could be delivered, the Council is effectively advancing the case that it is not at this time possible to deliver its full housing requirement and, therefore, that there is justification for delaying the delivery of much-needed housing to a subsequent plan.
5. We are not aware of any evidence to justify this position.

6. Furthermore, the Council's approach of course means that the Local Plan Review will itself need to be reviewed almost immediately following adoption, to ensure that the 3,154 homes of identified need for Chichester, that sits above this cap, are provided for as soon as possible, in accordance with the provisions of the PPG.
7. Against this background we consider that the Council's simple adoption of the capped standard methodology figure, without consideration of whether it is necessary to use the cap on deliverability grounds, is flawed and unnecessarily delays the delivery of much-needed housing. As set out elsewhere in our representations, there are demonstrably available and sustainable sites (that should in fact have been allocated in the emerging Local Plan Review in any event) that could certainly be allocated and delivered in this plan period, in addition to those already proposed, to allow the Council to get closer to meeting its actual level of housing need as quickly as possible, consistent with government policy.

Lack of Flexibility

8. NPPF paragraph 11 states that local plans must be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change.
9. As referenced above, the standard methodology capped annual requirement for Chichester is 609 dpa i.e. a total of 11,571 homes. In addition to that the Council is taking on board unmet needs from the South Downs National Park Authority of 41 dpa. This results in Policy S4 indicating that housing provision will be for 'at least' 12,350 dwellings (650dpa).
10. The first table within Policy S4 confirms that to meet this requirement, the Council is relying upon existing commitments, strategic allocations, parish housing requirements and a windfall allowance which would, combined, deliver a total of 12,378 homes.
11. This proposed housing provision is just 28 dwellings above the identified minimum housing need over a 19-year Plan period and provides flexibility that equates to just 0.2% - or no flexibility.
12. As a consequence there is no flexibility in the event that, for example, assumed delivery from windfall sites is lower than expected, or any proposed allocation comes forward more slowly than expected, or any neighbourhood plan allocation comes forward more slowly than expected or for a lower number than expected. These are all very real risks that this Local Plan Review must consider and address.
13. Given that it is inevitable that sites will not come forward exactly as predicted by the Council, it is normal practice, to ensure appropriate flexibility, to over-allocate housing to an extent. This allows a plan to be flexible and respond to inevitable change.
14. By way of context / contrast the emerging Guildford Local Plan, which identified an OAN of 654dpa over a 19-year Plan period (a total of 12,426 homes) proposes to allocate at least 14,191 homes – 14% in excess of the requirement to ensure flexibility. Similarly, the Arun Local Plan

(adopted in July 2018) identifies an OAN of 919dpa over a 20 year period i.e. a total of 18,380 homes but in fact allocates 20,768 homes - 13% in excess of its requirement.

15. It is clear that the Local Plan Review provides no flexibility in terms of housing provision and as such, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, there is significant potential for its capped housing figure, which already fails to provide for its actual housing needs, to be undershot.
16. Accordingly it is necessary and appropriate, in order to provide for a sound plan, for Policy S4 to be amended to increase its housing allocations such that they exceed its requirement by 10-20% - to provide the flexibility required by the NPPF. Arguably even greater flexibility should be provided given the significant deliverability concerns associated with a number of its proposed strategic allocations (see below and elsewhere in our representations).

Deliverability

17. Due to the lack of any flexibility as referenced above, the Council is reliant on all of its commitments, windfalls, neighbourhood plans and strategic allocations coming forward in a timely manner. Any delay or failure of any one element of this supply will result in the Council failing to meet even its capped housing requirement figure (which already fails to provide for its identified needs).
18. This concern is exacerbated by the fact that, as set out elsewhere in our representations, there are significant questions relevant to the deliverability of a number of the proposed strategic allocations (which we address elsewhere in our representations), most notably:
 - AL5 - Southern Gateway;
 - AL6 - Land South-West of Chichester;
 - AL7 - Highgrove Farm - Bosham;
 - AL8 - East Wittering Parish;
 - AL9 - Fishbourne Parish;
 - AL10 - Chidham and Hambrook Parish;
 - AL11 - Hunston Parish;
 - AL13 - Southbourne Parish;
 - AL14 - Land West of Tangmere.

Ambiguity

19. NPPF paragraph 16 is clear that local plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous. Policy S4 has no such clarity.
20. By way of example, there is no information within the Local Plan Review document, or the supporting evidence, to clarify / establish which sites contribute to the 'Known commitments' figure (6,344 homes) set out in Policy S4. By way of example, we are aware that planning permission has already been granted on a number of the sites which seem to be identified as new 'allocations' in the Local Plan Review including:
 - AL1: Land west of Chichester - 750 dwellings granted outline permission in April 2018 (planning permission ref. 14/04301/OUT);
 - AL2: Land at Shopwyke - 500 dwellings granted outline permission in March 2015 (planning permission ref. 14/03560/OUT); and an extra 85 dwellings granted outline permission in November 2016 (planning permission ref. 15/03720/OUT);
 - AL4: Westhampnett/ North East Chichester - 300 dwellings granted outline permission in June 2016 (planning permission ref. 15/03524/OUT); and 200 dwellings granted outline permission in November 2018 (planning permission ref. 16/03791).
21. The lack of clarity in Policy S4 means that it is not possible to determine whether these units are included in the 'Known commitments' (as they presumably should be) or within the new 'Strategic Locations/Allocations' which they seems to be presented as later in the Plan.
22. It is critical that clarity is provided in this regard so that all respondents can determine the extent to which there is, or is not, any double-counting. We reserve the right to re-visit this when the relevant information is made available.

Housing Trajectory

23. There is no housing trajectory included as part of Policy S4, and neither is a trajectory included as an appendix to the Plan (or, to the best of our knowledge, in the supporting evidence).
24. Paragraph 73 of the NPPF is clear that strategic policies in a local plan (which Policy S4 demonstrably is):

"...should include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period."
25. The absence of such a trajectory is contrary to the provisions of the NPPF. As a result it is impossible to determine when the Council expects various sites to come forward, and at what rate and over what period they are assumed to deliver housing. It is also impossible to determine

whether the Local Plan Review would deliver a 5 year supply of housing as required by the NPPF. This is a fundamental failing of the Plan as drafted which must be rectified.

Sub-Area Spatial Distribution

26. Notwithstanding the fundamental concerns identified above, the second table within Policy S4 identifies how the identified supply (12,378 homes) in the first table is distributed across the different plan Sub-Areas. Of the 12,378 homes it confirms that 9,956 homes would be in the East-West Corridor (80%), 1,933 homes on the Manhood Peninsula (16%) and 489 homes (4%) in the North of Plan Area.
27. We generally support this spatial distribution which, consistent with Policies S2 and S3, focusses the majority of development within the East-West Corridor. However, we note that the adopted Local Plan provided a higher proportion in the East-West Corridor (83%) and a consequently lower proportion (12%) in the more constrained and less sustainable Manhood Peninsula.
28. As set out in further detail in our representation to Policy AL4, there is additional available and sustainable land immediately adjacent to Chichester City which could (and should) be allocated in preference initially to other less sustainable locations within the East-West Corridor, and ahead of the less sustainable locations on the Manhood Peninsula or the northern part of the District, to ensure a sustainable distribution of development and consistency with the Council's own strategy as set out in Policies S2 and S3.

Proposed Changes

29. In the light of the above, Policy S4 needs to be fundamentally amended to:
 - consider to what extent the Local Plan Review can provide for the District's actual level of housing need indicated by the standard methodology (as opposed to the significantly lower capped figure)
 - allocate additional housing to provide meaningful flexibility of supply
 - provide clarity as to the elements of the constituent parts of the proposed housing supply
 - include a housing trajectory