|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Scenario 1 (West)** | **Scenario 2 (East)** | **Scenario 3 (Mixed)** |
| **Integrated, well-serviced community** | | | |
| **Land allocation for new educational facilities and community facilities.** | **Strong**  Overstated as provision relies on public sector funding which is not guaranteed. | **Strong**  Overstated as provision relies on public sector funding which is not guaranteed. | **Strong**  Overstated as provision relies on public sector funding which is not guaranteed. |
| **Reduce the barrier effect of rail tracks.** | **Reasonable**  Overstated as vehicular bridge would be reliant on funding which is not guaranteed. Cycle and pedestrian bridge would not reduce Stein Road congestion. Stein Road improvements could be achieved with any development | **Reasonable**  Issues on funding and also additional restraints on access roads need solutions too. Stein Road improvements could be achieved with any development | **Poor**  No improvement on congestion in Stein Road. Funding issues still exist here too. |
| **Support delivery of a community hub - a 'Heart for Southbourne'.** | **Poor**  Overstated as creates a separate hub from existing facilities. So doesn’t create a joined up hub in the village. | **Poor**  Overstated as creates a separate hub from existing facilities. So doesn’t create a joined up hub in the village. | **Poor**  Overstated as creates a separate hub from existing facilities. So doesn’t create a joined up hub in the village. |
| **Support delivery of improved connectivity within the village as a whole with good integration between new and existing community.** | **Poor**  The educational land creates a barrier to movement and integration between new development and existing village, potentially mitigated through improved connectivity via pedestrian/cycle bridge. | **Reasonable**  Overstated as doesn’t integrate the village | **Poor**  This doesn’t guarantee any improvements and the green ring lost within the development is not what was envisaged in the neighbourhood plan. |
| **Promote access to nature and open space.** | **Poor**  Overstated as creates a separate hub from existing facilities. So doesn’t create a joined up hub in the village. Open space disappears on the west side with this proposal. | **Poor**  Overstated as creates a separate hub from existing facilities. So doesn’t create a joined up hub in the village. | **Poor**  Overstated as creates a separate hub from existing facilities. So doesn’t create a joined up hub in the village. Removes all open space surrounding the whole village. |
| **Support local employment opportunities** | **Poor**  No detail of how this will be achieved in the proposed document. | **Poor**  No detail of how this will be achieved in the proposed document. | **Poor**  No detail of how this will be achieved in the proposed document. |
| **Asessment Criteria** | **Scenario 1 (West)** | **Scenario 2 (East)** | **Scenario 3 (Mixed)** |
| **Housing for all** | | | |
| **Utilities pipeline impact on-site capacity.** | **Reasonable**  Greater percentage of area including space for access road is covered by consultation zone, potentially pushing development to the west.  **No comment** | **Reasonable**  A smaller area north of site is impacted by consultation zone.  **No comment** | **Reasonable**  Greater percentage of area north including space for access road is covered by consultation zone.  **No comment** |
| **Site capacity to meet 800 homes delivery requirement.** | **Poor**  Overstated as vehicular access as not guaranteed. | **Reasonable**  Better solution on road/railway but constraints with narrow lanes needs detailed solutions. | **Poor**  Problems with north south railway movement not addressed under this option. |
| **Potential to deliver mix of housing types and tenures, including G&T provision** | **Strong**  Potential to deliver the objective.  Overstated  Need for G&T not justified nor has the location specified. | **Strong**  Potential to deliver the objective.  Overstated  Need for G&T not justified nor has the location specified. | **Strong**  Potential to deliver the objective.  Overstated  Need for G&T not justified nor has the location specified. |
| **Potential to meet local housing need (Housing Need Survey Report NP)**  **• Younger households**  **• Affordable rented tenure**  **• 1-bed houses/flats**  **• 2-bed houses**  **• First time buyers**  **• 2/3-bed houses**  **• Downsizing accommodation**  **• Affordable rented tenure**  **• 1/2-bed bungalows**  **• Private market housing**  **• 2/3-bed houses.**  **• G&T Provision** | **Reasonable**  Potential to deliver the objective.  Overstated as detailed above and still subject to developer(s) delivering this so not guaranteed | **Reasonable**  Potential to deliver the objective.  Overstated as detailed above and still subject to developer(s) delivering this so not guaranteed | **Reasonable**  Potential to deliver the objective.  Overstated as detailed above and still subject to developer(s) delivering this so not guaranteed |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Scenario 1 (West)** | **Scenario 2 (East)** | **Scenario 3 (Mixed)** |
| **Transport and sustainable travel** | | | |
| **Providing active travel connectivity.** | **Reasonable**  All options overstatedas improvements could be achieved with existing infrastructure and S106/CIL funds available. | **Reasonable**  All options overstatedas improvements could be achieved with existing infrastructure and S106/CIL funds available. | **Reasonable**  All options overstatedas improvements could be achieved with existing infrastructure and S106/CIL funds available. |
| **Potential for a bridge crossing the railway for pedestrians and cyclists.** | **Reasonable**  All options overstatedas improvements could be achieved with existing infrastructure and S106/CIL funds available. | **Reasonable**  All options overstatedas improvements could be achieved with existing infrastructure and S106/CIL funds available. | **Reasonable**  All options overstatedas improvements could be achieved with existing infrastructure and S106/CIL funds available. |
| **Potential for a bridge crossing the railway for vehicles.** | **Reasonable**  Assessment overstated. Since complications of a potential land swap may be required to facilitate bridge footing and access to the north. Plus depending on route opposition by new estates impacted by this. | **Poor**  Reduce assessment to poor from very poor. | **Very Poor**  No vehicular bridge.  No comment. |
| **Influence of vehicular bridge on traffic congestion.** | **Reasonable**  Overstated and reduced to reasonable as congestion will be exacerbated around the college and leisure facilities under this option | **Strong**  Provides vehicular bridge so would help alleviate traffic congestion at the rail crossing. | **Very Poor**  It does not provide vehicular bridge so would not alleviate traffic congestion at the rail crossing. |
| **Development within 400m of a bus stop.** | **Strong**  Approximately 50% of development within 400m of existing bus stop. (Note:40 % considered positive contribution).  No comment | **Reasonable**  Approximately 10% of development within 400m of existing bus stop. (Note:10-40% considered neutral).  No comment | **Reasonable**  Approximately 30% of development within 400m of existing bus stop. (Note:10-40% considered neutral).  No comment |
| **Improvements in pedestrian / cycle access to the train station.** | **Reasonable**  Limited opportunity to improve pedestrian / cycle access to and from train station.  No comment | **Strong**  Opportunity to improve access for wider community through provision of land for a new pedestrian/cycle bridge adjacent to the station.  No comment | **Strong**  Opportunity to improve access for wider community through provision of land for a new pedestrian/cycle bridge adjacent to the station.  No comment |
| **Development located within 15 walking distance from station (Note: reference slide 20- Area of Search).** | **Strong**  All sites meet this requirement. | **Strong**  All sites meet this requirement. | **Strong**  All sites meet this requirement. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Scenario 1 (West)** | **Scenario 2 (East)** | **Scenario 3 (Mixed)** |
| **Climate change, move towards net zero carbon living** | | | |
| **Potential to create buildings to high environmental performance and meet Future Homes Standard.** | **Poor**  All sites meet this requirement.  Disagree with this as developers in control here and so how will this be enforced by the Council & NHBC? Rating as poor as CDC as little influence/control | **Poor**  All sites meet this requirement.  Disagree with this as developers in control here and so how will this be enforced by the Council & NHBC? Rating as poor as CDC as little influence/control | **Strong**  All sites meet this requirement. |
| **Support a mix of uses and facilities minimising the need to travel.** | **Poor**  Disagree as only providing housing, employment opportunities are lacking so travel is not minimised. | **Poor**  Disagree as only providing housing, employment opportunities are lacking so travel is not minimised. | **Poor**  Disagree as only providing housing, employment opportunities are lacking so travel is not minimised. |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Scenario 1 (West)** | **Scenario 2 (East)** | **Scenario 3 (Mixed)** |
| **Environment** | | | |
| **Provide the Green Ring for both people and wildlife.** | **Poor**  Downgrade assessment as poor for all elements and options as impact on loss of open space and existing wildlife has been under estimated.  The solution or objectives do not overcome these issues.  Any achievement is all subjective and based on developers doing work which is not guaranteed. | **Poor**  Downgrade assessment as poor for all elements and options as impact on loss of open space and existing wildlife has been under estimated.  The solution or objectives do not overcome these issues.  Any achievement is all subjective and based on developers doing work which is not guaranteed. | **Poor**  Downgrade assessment as poor for all elements and options as impact on loss of open space and existing wildlife has been under estimated.  The solution or objectives do not overcome these issues.  Any achievement is all subjective and based on developers doing work which is not guaranteed. |
| **Mitigate impact on the Chichester Harbour SPA from recreational disturbance by creating accessible natural greenspace.** | See above  Should be poor | See above  Should be poor | See above  Should be poor |
| **Preserve wildlife corridors.** | See above  Should be poor | See above  Should be poor | See above  Should be poor |
| **Development sites to provide sufficient open greenspace (in line with policy).** | See above  Should be poor | See above  Should be poor | See above  Should poor. |
| **Protect and / or mitigate existing wildlife and biodiversity.** | **Very poor**  This site would result in significant loss of land of Brent Geese Secondary Support area, with potential area of mitigation north of the A27. Existing ecological constraints could be mitigated through design.  **No Comment/changes** | **Reasonable**  Impact on existing hedgerows and orchards could be integrated and mitigated through  h design. Existing ecological constraints could be mitigated through design.  **No comment/changes** | **Poor**  This site would result in some loss of land of Brent Geese Secondary Support area. Existing ecological constraints could be mitigated through design.  **No comment/changes** |
| **Impacts to agricultural land.** | **Very Poor**  Understated as loss of grade 1 & 2 not any grade 3 land.  The majority of development is located on Grade 1 agricultural land and would result in the loss of agricultural land Grades 1 and 2. | **Poor**  The majority of development is located on Grade 1 agricultural land and would result in the loss of Grades 1, 2 and potentially 3. | **Poor**  The majority of development is located on Grade 1 agricultural land and would result in the loss of Grades 1, 2 and potentially 3. |
| **Development location within Flood Zones.** | **Poor**  Would result in development being constructed on flood zone 1.  Surface water flooding north of the railway and to the south of the railway line along the potential access road is located in the area for critical infrastructure (rail bridge) and needs mitigation through design.  Groundwater impacts will require further consideration. | **Poor**  Would result in the vast majority of the site development being within flood zone 1.  Surface water flooding north of the railway is located in the potential area for critical infrastructure (rail bridge) and needs mitigation through design. Future flood zones (Tidal - Climate Change) is located in the access location on the A259. | **Poor**  Can’t see this can be anything other than poor assessment taking into account it’s just option 1 & 2 combined. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Scenario 1 (West)** | **Scenario 2 (East)** | **Scenario 3 (Mixed)** |
| **Character** | | | |
| **Impact on views to and from Chichester Harbour National Landscape (CHNL)and South Downs National Park (SDNP).** | **Poor**  Understated all options should be poor. Impact on west side robs those residents any view if fields developed. | **Poor**  Understated all options should be poor. Impact on east side robs those residents any view if fields developed. | **Poor**  Understated all options should be poor. Impact on both east and west sides robs those residents any view if fields developed. |
| **Retention of landscape gaps between villages/settlements.** | **Very Poor**  Development site located within identified landscape gap within proximity to Hermitage. A landscape gap of at least 100m has been retained to mitigate impact. Further a design-led approach to mitigation is required. | **Poor**  A small section of the development site located within identified landscape gap within proximity to Hambrook. A landscape gap of at least 250m has been retained to mitigate impact. Further a design-led approach to mitigation is required. | **Poor**  A small section of the development site located within identified landscape gap within proximity to Hambrook and Hermitage. A landscape gap of at least 250m has been retained to Hambrook and min 100m to Hermitage to mitigate impact. Further a design-led approach to mitigation is required. |
| **Potential to retain and enhance existing landscape features to create character.** | **Poor**  All options put these at risk and doesn’t enhance them but reduces their impact. Especially the memorial trees. | **Poor**  All options put these at risk and doesn’t enhance them but reduces their impact.. | **Poor**  All options put these at risk and doesn’t enhance them but reduces their impact. Especially the memorial trees. |
| **Growth of the village sympathetically to its existing form and structure.** | **Poor**  Development leads to one sided growth of the village, unbalanced with its original form and structure. | **Poor**  Development leads to one sided growth of the village, unbalanced with its original form and structure. | **Poor**  Disagree should be poor as massive impact on size of village and the infrastructure and public service growth need not guaranteed especially as potential of 1000 homes at various stages of the current planning approved by the District Council. This documents does not take account of this position which is inexcusable. |
| **Sympathetically to existing heritage features.** | **Strong**  No heritage asset within the development area.  No change | **Poor**  The two designated heritage assets located within the development area.  No change | **Poor**  The two designated heritage assets located within the development area.  No chnage |

Deliverability Assessment

5.1. The below table considers the deliverability of each scenario in relation to key matters of land ownership/assembly complexities and challenges surrounding cost and delivery of different bridge options which may be necessary.

5.2. Each of the scenarios have potential deliverability challenges that would need to be carefully addressed with the landowners and/or site promoters through requirements set in the site allocation DPD and forthcoming Section 106 Agreements linked to planning applications.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Scenario 1 (West)** | **Scenario 2 (East)** | **Scenario 3 (Mixed)** |
| **Deliverability (land) considerations.** | **Reasonable**  Majority landowner to the north of the railway can facilitate the majority of the development and there is safeguarded land for a future multimodal bridge to the south side of the railway and a connection to the A259. The exact alignment of the bridge will need to be tested in detail at later stages. | **Poor**  Requires land assembly due to multiple landowners. Newly submitted planning application with no safeguarded land to south of railway indicates high-risk delivery of bridge. | **Poor**  Requires land assembly due to multiple landowners which will require equalisation across allocation and pooling of infrastructure. |
| **Deliverability (viability) considerations** | **Poor**  There remains a high viability risk due to the uncertainty of the costs for the vehicular bridge. A S106 contribution framework will be required to ensure all landowners contribute to the infrastructure costs. | **Poor**  There remains a high viability risk due to the uncertainty of the costs for the vehicular bridge. Equalisation and a S106 contribution framework will be required to ensure all landowners contribute to the infrastructure costs. | **Poor**  Equalisation and a S106 contribution framework will be required to ensure all landowners contribute to the infrastructure costs. |
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