

**EBRA's suggested response
to the
Housing Numbers
and
Locations
Consultations Document**

5 . Questionnaire - Housing Numbers

**Q1(a) What factors should be given the greatest weight in deciding the overall housing target for Chichester District (excluding the National Park)?
(please tick one answer for each question)**

	Highest Priority	Very Important	Quite Important	Not Important
Preserving the existing character and environment of the District	✓			
Providing a good choice of housing for all local people			✓	
Providing affordable housing to meet all local needs				✓
Providing affordable housing to meet the highest priority needs		✓		
Providing enough housing to maintain current levels of economic growth				✓
Providing enough housing to support further economic growth in line with national expectations				✓

Q1(b) Are there any other factors that you consider important? (Please list)

- The basis of dividing the housing target between the South Downs National Park (SDNP) and the rest of Chichester District would appear to be arbitrary. The former has 67% of the land and yet has only 26% of the target. There are sizeable settlements in the National Park and if greenfields are to be used for housing in the rest of the District the same should apply to the SDNP which should be allocated a much larger share of the total.

- There is an insatiable demand for housing within the District and the more houses that are built, the more migration from London and elsewhere will be experienced. New house building must be kept at the essential minimum in order to protect the character of the District, especially the City, which we consider is incapable of absorbing any more large developments without risking the destruction of its historic fabric and essence as an important old market town and sustainable community. A further influx of large numbers of people and vehicles would bring gridlock to the City.
- The numbers on the housing register do not equate to housing need: by the Council's own definition those in Band D do not meet the need criteria and many in the other bands do not have a genuine connection with the District.
- The case for more housing to sustain economic growth is weak; Chichester, particularly the City, does not have the capacity to attract large scale employment so building more houses will just mean more people travelling long distances to work.

Q2(a) What housing target should be set for the South of the District? (please tick one answer only)

Target A 305 homes per year	
Target B 330 homes per year	
Target C 355 homes per year (equivalent to the South East Plan requirement)	
Target D 380 homes per year	
Target E 415 homes per year	

Q2(b) If you favour another housing target for the South of the District other than the one set out in the South East Plan, please briefly explain why

- We believe the housing target should be significantly less than 305 pa.
- It is wrong to look at housing targets in isolation from the impact that the extra housing will have on the District. It is already close to capacity in many areas, especially the City. If the SDNP and the Chichester Harbour AONB, which together account for 75% of the District's land mass, are to be given protection from development, it is wholly unrealistic to expect the remainder of the District to suffer the burden of the bulk of the development for the whole District.

- If the District is not able to meet the absolutely essential need for affordable housing then the District should increase the ratio of affordable homes that developers are required to provide (currently 40%). Furthermore CDC should use its own land to provide 100% affordable housing (e.g. at the Portfield site).

Q3(a) What housing target should be set for the North of the District (excluding the National Park)?

(please tick one answer)

Target A 12 homes per year	
Target B 16 homes per year	
Target C 20 homes per year	

Q3(b) If you favour another housing target for the North of the District (excluding the National Park) other than the ones set out above, please briefly explain why

A housing target of 100 homes per year

If more housing is absolutely necessary, consideration should be given to providing a major development in this area (possibly in the Wisborough Green area) as a hub, given that it is close to areas in Horsham District that have been expanded. We consider that such a development would enable the North of the District to meet a target of 100 houses per annum. This would enable this area in the North to catch-up with the rate of development that has occurred in the South of the District.

7 Questionnaire - Housing Locations

Please give your general views on the best approach for locating new housing

Q4 What factors should be given most weight in determining where new housing should be located?

	Highest Priority	Very Important	Quite Important	Not Important
Preserving the existing character and environment of the District	✓			
Providing a good choice of housing for all local people			✓	
Providing affordable housing to meet all local needs				✓

Providing affordable housing to meet the highest priority needs			✓	
Providing enough housing to maintain current levels of economic growth				✓
Providing enough housing to support further economic growth in line with national expectations				✓

Q5(a) Which of the Options for locating housing should be given priority? Please refer to Maps 1-5 for details.

(please tick one answer)

Option 1: Development Focus on Chichester City and Tangmere	
Option 2: Dispersed Development with Focus on Chichester City	
Option 3: Dispersed Development with Focus on Tangmere	
Option 4 : Combination of Development Options 1-3	
Option 5: Maximise Housing in all Identified Locations	

Q5(b) If you favour another option for housing distribution, please give details.

- We support the suggestion that the District Council should enter into discussions with Arun District Council to develop a new large settlement hub at Ford. It is ideally situated between the A27 and A259 and already has good railway connections including a main line station. With appropriate infrastructure, it could be developed into a thriving town. Joint working between the authorities in this way could help to address the housing needs of both authorities, or
- Tangmere and Southbourne should have significant developments of around 1500 dwellings at each with some dispersed development, unless the Army vacate all or part of Thorney.
- Discussions should take place with the Ministry of Defence to identify the likelihood of part, or the whole, of the military base at Thorney Island coming on to the market during the foreseeable future and thereby releasing land suitable for housing.

Major Housing Development

Please give your views on whether the following locations are suitable for development.

The Core Strategy will identify sites or broad locations for major housing developments of at least 500 dwellings in any single location.

Tangmere

Q6(a) Do you consider Tangmere is a suitable location for major development?

YES POSSIBLY NO

Q6(b) Please provide any comments on your choice above and what key issues will need to be considered in planning development in this location?

While we consider that Tangmere is a suitable location for a significant expansion by 1500 dwellings we would reinforce the need to provide the necessary infrastructure, as is usual as part of the Planning Agreement, to support the increased population which would bring benefit to the existing residents.

Portfield/Shopwhyke

Q7(a) Do you consider Portfield/Shopwhyke is a suitable location for major development?

YES POSSIBLY NO

Q7(b) Please provide any comments on your choice above and what key issues will need to be considered in planning development in this location?

- This development would exacerbate the existing traffic problems coming into the City. These traffic problems exist not just because of the A27 but also because the City roads cannot cope with the volume of traffic. Solving the A27 bottlenecks will just make the City roads even more congested.
- This development could not exist as a separate community so it would just result in a significant expansion of the existing built-up area (Settlement Policy Area) beyond the A27.

It would irreversibly and adversely change the character of Chichester City, given the massive development already underway in other areas.

North-East of Chichester City

Q8(a) Do you consider north-east of Chichester City is a suitable location for major development?

YES

POSSIBLY

NO



Q8(b) Please provide any comments on your choice above and what key issues will need to be considered in planning development in this location?

- This development would exacerbate the existing traffic problems coming into the City. These traffic problems exist not just because of the A27 but also because the City roads cannot cope with the volume of traffic. Solving the A27 bottlenecks will just make the City roads even more congested.
- This development could not exist as a separate community so it would just result in a significant expansion of the existing built-up area (SPA)
- It would irreversibly change the character of Chichester City, given the massive development already underway in other areas.

Please give your views on whether the following locations are suitable for development
Medium and Small Scale Housing

These would be locations for housing developments, ranging from 10-15 dwellings up to around 300-400 dwellings on any one site.

East Wittering/Bracklesham

Q9(a) Do you consider East Wittering/Bracklesham is a suitable location for development

YES

POSSIBLY

NO



Q9(b) Please provide any comments on your choice above and what key issues will need to be considered in planning development in this location?

- This would require significant improvements to the road networks, especially the A27 junctions.

Selsey

Q10(a) Do you consider Selsey is a suitable location for development?

YES

POSSIBLY

NO



Q10(b) Please provide any comments on your choice above and what key issues will need to be considered in planning development in this location?

If more housing is absolutely necessary, consideration should be given to providing a major development in this area (possibly in the Wisborough Green area) as a hub, given that it is close to areas in Horsham District which have been expanded. This would enable this area in the North to catch-up with the rate of development that has occurred in the South of the District.

Q14 Do you have any other comments or suggestions on planning for housing development?

- We are resolute in the belief that Chichester City has reached its maximum viable size and, indeed, may already be in danger of exceeding this with the completion of the Graylingwell and the Barracks sites over the next decade. It is absolutely essential that the City stays within the existing built-up area (SPA) to protect its unique character including the wildlife habitat that surrounds the City (one area of which is already recognised as a Local Nature Reserve (Brandy Hole Copse)).
- It is essential that all development in or around the City, preserves the views of the Cathedral by incorporating only low rise building which does not challenge the Cathedral's dominance of the skyline.
- This is a flawed consultation due to ...
 - the lack of public presentations by the Council and open debate, and
 - the Council's insistence that it will accept only online responses thereby denying many people their democratic right to participate in the consultation.

It is essential that the Council addresses and remedies these issues for future consultations.