



Chichester City Council

PLANNING ADVISER'S REPORT FOR THE PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING ON 22 JUNE 2023 AT 4PM

Week 20

No committee items.

Week 21

CC/23/00533/FUL - Case Officer: Eleanor Midlane-Ward
Southgate Car Park Deanery Close Chichester West Sussex
Construction of a pitched tiled roof on an existing open storage area.

<https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RQUCM5ER12N00>

Key issues:

- The existing site is an open-air storage area, enclosed to a height of approximately 2m by timber fencing atop a low wall.
- The proposal is to erect a pitched roof over the existing structure to provide covered storage. The materials proposed are clay tiles to the roof slopes and timber cladding to the gable ends to reflect the materials on the surrounding buildings.
- The site is within the conservation area wherein development is required to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. The resultant building would be more attractive than the existing and would enhance the character of the area.
- The site is within a car park and there would be no significant impact from the development on the surrounding land uses.

Recommendation: No objection.

Week 22

CC/23/00454/FUL - Case Officer: Sascha Haigh
Harry's Fish And Chips 105A Victoria Road Chichester West Sussex
Demolition of single storey fish and chip shop and ancillary buildings, construction of 2 no. semi detached dwellings and 1 no. detached dwelling, including parking provision to 3 no. new dwellings and to retained existing dwelling.

<https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RQFTYDERJ8000>

Key issues:

- The proposal is to demolish the Fish & Chip shop building and erect 3 dwellings.
- The site is within the settlement policy boundary wherein sustainable development is acceptable in principle.
- The applicant submits that the shop is no longer viable commercially and is unlikely to be re-used as a commercial premises. The change of use would be acceptable, as the shop is unlikely to constitute an "employment site" under Policy 26 (retention of employment sites), as the policy is not aimed at shops, nor at small, isolated premises in residential areas.
- Plot 2 is oriented away from Victoria Road so that a 2m fence can be erected abutting the pavement around the corner of the plot from the frontage along Victoria Road around into Leatherbottle Lane until the proposed access. Further 2m fencing would be erected at the frontage of plot 3. There is insufficient space for a back garden at the rear of plot 2.

This design solution impacts the openness of the space and prevents any interaction or natural surveillance on this part of the street and would harm the character and appearance of the area.

- 1.3 (or 1-2) parking spaces are required per dwelling. 2 spaces are provided for plots 1 and 3. 1 space is provided for plot 2. This is a corner plot in an area where parking is limited and a minimum of two parking spaces per plot should be provided.

Recommendation: Objection. The 2m fencing around the frontage of the plot, and the orientation of plot 2 with the rear garden along the street frontages of Victoria Road and Leatherbottle Lane unacceptably affects the openness of this street corner, prevents interaction and natural surveillance, and would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Plot 2 offers insufficient parking for a corner plot in this area of limited parking. The dwelling at plot 2 and any fencing over 1m in height adjacent to the highway should be omitted from the scheme in order to achieve an acceptable development.

CC/23/00953/FUL - Case Officer: Vicki Baker

Muchos Nachos At The Crown 140 Whyke Road Chichester West Sussex

Retrospective outdoor play area within the grounds/landscape of Muchos Nachos.

<https://publicaccess.chichester.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RTM125ERK6W00>

Key issues:

- Grade II listed C17/18th pub/restaurant with large pub garden to the rear, fenced off behind the car park to the front of the site.
- The proposal is for children's play equipment (a swing/slide set up) within the pub garden.
- Due to the nature, scale and position of the play equipment within the pub garden, it would not harm the character and appearance of the listed building.
- There is a dwelling to the north, screened by a 2m fence and mature vegetation. It does not directly overlook the equipment and there is an intervening outbuilding between the dwelling and the play area. It is unlikely that the proposal would result in a significant increase in noise and disturbance, given that this is an existing pub garden, and the equipment is for children only. The impact upon residential amenity would therefore be acceptable.

Recommendation: No objection.

Week 23

No committee items.



Chichester City Council

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE REPORT JUNE 2023

Summary

The Neighbourhood Plan has been in production since 2019. Although much work has taken place and £68,786.25 has been invested, the NP remains at a very early stage of the process. The potential financial returns have significantly diminished and will continue to do so with each planning permission granted before a NP is adopted. Estimated “ballpark” figures would be that Members initiating the NP work expected to see about £2,000,000 return on their financial investment in the NP, whereas currently this is likely to be around £700,000. The prospect of any financial return at all may be removed by the government with the replacement of CIL with IL as recently consulted on. Significant work remains to produce the NP.

Options

Option 1: Discontinue funding and work on the Neighbourhood Plan at this time

Option 2: Continue work on the Neighbourhood Plan

Recommendation: It is recommended that all work relating to the Neighbourhood Plan cease at present, and that the responsibility for housing site allocations be returned to the Local Planning Authority.

Introduction

Neighbourhood Plans were introduced through the 2011 Localism Act as a vehicle for local people to exert influence over development taking place in their local area. A Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is produced by a local community group, often organised and funded by the Parish Council, but this is not a necessity. The purpose of a NP is to give local communities more influence over the development in their area by producing a NP themselves. A NP is a planning policy document which contains a suite of planning policies, which the Planning Authority must have regard to when determining planning applications in that area. A NP may also include a “Vision” for the area and objectives, which the planning policies aim to achieve. It can also include aspirations for the area, such as tree planting or other physical changes, which the NP cannot itself bring into implementation, but which are statements of public support for an idea which could encourage the relevant landowners or other interested parties to look into the practicalities of implementing such ideas.

There are strict legal limitations on the content of NPs, and policies must accord with the Local Plan (LP), otherwise the NP would not be legally sound and would fail at its examination. NP policies therefore are not a replacement for Local Plan policies, but sit under or alongside those policies and provide more specific detail or address specific areas.

There is a correct legal process for producing NPs which must be followed, this includes a number of formal consultations and an examination by a planning inspector. If these formal requirements are met, a referendum is then held where residents within the NP area vote yes or no to adopting the Plan. After a vote count, if 50% or more of the votes are yes votes, the Plan is adopted.

As well as the benefit of having a set of locally produced and supported planning policies, against which the LPA will determine planning applications for the area, the adoption of a Neighbourhood Plan would result in an increase in CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) receipts. CIL is payable by developers for each new dwelling, or other development over a certain size, to the Local Planning Authority to improve the infrastructure required to support that development. Without a Neighbourhood Plan, 15% of CIL payments are passed to the Parish Council for very local infrastructure, community projects and upkeep of public buildings

and war memorials. Upon adoption of a Neighbourhood Plan, which can include community projects suggested and supported by local residents, this increases to 25%.

Neighbourhood Plan status and work undertaken

On 15th July 2019, Chichester City Council undertook to commence work on a Neighbourhood Plan. NPs usually take between 2-5 years; it was envisaged at the time that adoption would take place by the end of 2021.

The launch of the Neighbourhood Plan took place and a well-received public consultation in early 2020 attracted over 1,660 survey responses from individual residents, the Steering Group feel this is now too old to be of use. Over 600 residents signed up to an email list for updates on the NP, this has not been used in well over a year. A Chichester NP Facebook group was set up with over 700 active members to discuss NP topics, however the group has become less and less active and the last comments relevant to the NP are now several months ago.

In addition to the consultation work, a number of specific reports were commissioned to inform the NP work and to evidence the policies which would later be developed. These included a study on trees and green spaces, a carbon output and reduction report and a feasibility study relating to highways.

A Steering Group was formed (the membership and chairmanship of which has changed over time).

Work commenced on PLACE assessments; this is a project of in-depth public engagement with residents, creating a planning-related assessment for the residential areas of Chichester.

The Neighbourhood Plan work, as set out above, had the benefit of the Planning Advisor’s involvement until approximately October 2020. A planning consultancy, Feria Urbanism, was then asked to continue supporting the work on the NP by guiding the Steering Group through the necessary processes and providing planning advice when necessary, in order that a legally sound NP could be produced and adopted.

The Planning and Conservation Committee has been updated at least every two months on NP progress by a member of the Steering Group, most recently this has been Ash Pal, Steering Group Chairman. Updates have confirmed that the PLACE assessment work has been continuing however the last PLACE work uploaded to the website is dated September 2021 at which point approximately 33% of the City had a completed PLACE assessment. Ash Pal advises that this now stands at approximately 50% however, the summary and presentation of the PLACE work since September 2021 has not yet been completed ready for uploading to the website, but this is expected to take place shortly with the assistance of Feria Urbanism.

Permission has been requested to send a letter from the City Council, written by the Steering Group, to the Local Planning Authority offering further comment on the content of the Local Plan and offering assistance in producing it. The consultation period for comments on the Local Plan is closed and the Local Plan Review is at or very close to completion already, and is shortly to be submitted for examination.

Following the appointment of a new Town Clerk and the election of a new administration, an update and overview of the Neighbourhood Plan current status and work to date was requested of the Planning Adviser. The following actions were taken in order to inform the following update and the outcome is correct at the time of writing the report:

- Tuesday 6th June: Planning Advisor met with the NP Steering Committee Chairman, Ash Pal.
- Tuesday 6th June in person, Weds 7th June by email, Mon 12th by email, Mon 12th in person and Wednesday 14th by email: Planning Advisor requested access to the NP working documents, project plan and any work produced since the last website update in May 2022. Ash Pal advised this would be provided but no access to these documents has been provided.

AGENDA ITEM 6

- Wednesday 7th June, the Planning Advisor requested an update by email from Planning Consultants, Feria Urbanism, no response was received.
- Monday 12th June: Planning Advisor attended a meeting of the NP Steering Committee.
- Thursday 15th June: Planning Advisor discussed NP with Chichester District Council's NP Principal Policy Officer, Valerie Dobson.

From the available information, the current Chichester NP status is advised as follows:

- There is not yet any draft "Issues and Options" document which starts to define possible policy directions for the NP, drawing on previous consultation. Once an Issues and Options document is drafted, a formal consultation on it should take place. The Steering Group feels it is too early in the process to start drawing up such a document or putting any such thoughts together; they feel that an updated fresh initial consultation should take place first.
- There is not yet a draft plan, which would be drawn up following an Issues and Options consultation.
- The Steering Group feel that the 1,660 resident response survey is now too old to draw on for an issues and option document, and that consultation should effectively start all over again from the beginning.
- PLACE assessments have been carried out on approximately 50% of the Parish Area. Some areas are not covered by a PLACE assessment as they are not residential (e.g. Terminus Road, Quarry Lane). The new Minerva area is yet to carry out a PLACE assessment but may do so.
- A summary of the PLACE work since the last published update of September 2021 is due to be provided shortly by Feria Urbanism.
- A Community Collaboration Day took place, inviting residents, particularly those who took part in the PLACE work, to review the PLACE outcomes for their area.
- A new public consultation is to take place at the Gala event in July as a standalone one-off event in the form of a table at the Gala with visual displays. The exact nature of the consultation and content of the displays is still under discussion. The Steering Group has been advised against taking undeliverable "What if" scenarios to residents discussed at the Steering Group meeting. These included moving the football club and the Quarry Lane industrial area. The Steering Group were advised that a consultation relating to the PLACE work would be appropriate.
- No updates to the website have been made since March 2022.
- Not all of the Steering Group appear to fully accept the fundamental legal requirement that the NP must accord with the Local Plan.
- Some of the Steering Group are minded to continue the search for "big ideas" at this stage, however this includes continued discussions of radical re-structuring of the City which cannot be achieved through the NP process.
- At this time, the Plan is very close to the start of the NP process, and significant progress is required in order to achieve adoption.

Financial implications

The previous administration envisaged that a NP would be adopted by late 2021, prior to the submission of a planning application for 850 homes on the West of Chichester major development allocation site. Producing a NP would therefore have been an investment opportunity due to the increase in CIL from these new homes.

In financial terms, at a 2023 CIL rate for this area of £157.20/sqm (token ballpark "average" used here for demonstration purposes, £15,700 per dwelling), the 850 dwellings proposed on White House Farm/Minerva area phase 2 would be expected to raise a total of £13,345,000 in CIL. The City Council's proportion of this at 15% would amount to £2,001,750. If a NP was adopted before outline permission was granted, the proportion would be 25% which amounts to £3,336,250.

Having a NP adopted prior to the phase 2 development being granted outline permission would therefore have meant an additional £1,334,500 for the Parish to allocate to local projects and infrastructure needs within the City, rather than for the District Council to use it for wider

AGENDA ITEM 6

infrastructure needs. This was a financial incentive to produce the Plan within a reasonably short time frame.

The situation is now different, four years on, because the outline application for Phase 2 has been submitted and under consideration for approximately 9 months and is very likely to be approved much sooner than a NP could be produced and adopted. The City Council has therefore likely missed the opportunity to benefit from the uplifted CIL amount in respect of these 850 homes, and the expenditure on a NP is an entirely different prospect in terms of the likely financial return on the investment.

The remaining housing allocation for the City is 180 homes within the Southern Gateway area (Police Field, Bus Depot and Station, Basin Road Car Park) and a general requirement of 270 homes within the City between 2021-2039. This would mean an estimated approximately £7,065,000 in CIL of which the City Council would receive 15%, approximately £1,059,750. If a NP is adopted before any of these are granted planning permission, the City Council would stand to receive 25%, £1,766,250, an increase of £706,500.

However, it remains the case that, there is no guarantee of any financial return on the cost of the Plan. It remains possible that a Plan may not be adopted. Unless and until a NP is actually adopted, there is no financial return at all. The possible future return on the NP costs is now significantly less than was envisaged when the decision was taken to commence work on the Plan at approximately £700,000 rather than approximately £2,000,000.

The government recently consulted on replacing CIL altogether, with a new, more streamlined Infrastructure Levy "IL". It is not yet confirmed whether CIL will be replaced, but one of the consultation questions related to possible changes to the Parish proportion. It is therefore important to be aware of possible future changes being considered which may mean that, even if a NP is now adopted within a reasonable time frame, the City Council may not receive the financial returns expected under CIL in the long term, as the system may be replaced. More information on the IL consultation is available here:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/technical-consultation-on-the-infrastructure-levy>.

Expenditure to date

The expenditure to date is a total of £68,786.25, as follows:

2019-2020:	£13,793.86
2020-2021:	£36,187.73
• Carbon footprint report	£1,875
• Summersdale character study	£2,830.95*
*It appears this was paid to Feria but not completed, Feria opined it unnecessary.	
• Stantec (Highways)	£7,800
• Ethos (Trees & Green Spaces Study)	£9,275
• Groundwork Grant to cover the above study	-£9,275
• Feria Planning Consultants	£1,145.50
• Motion (Highways)	£1,500
• Staff	£20,286.78
• Survey Monkey (Consultation)	£750
2021-2022:	£7,400
• Feria Urbanism (Planning Consultant)	£7,400
2022-2023:	£4,864.66
• Feria Urbanism	£364.66
• Craft Pegg Concept Design	£4,500
2023-2024:	£6539.50
• Feria Urbanism	£6539.50
Total	£68,786.25

Conclusion

Work commenced on the Neighbourhood Plan in 2019, at which time the project was envisaged to be completed within 2-3 years, with a Plan adopted by the end of 2021. At this time, the City Council stood to gain an additional £2,000,000 (estimated “ballpark” figure) from CIL if a Plan was adopted in that timeframe.

After four years of work and an investment of £68,786.25 in the project, the NP remains at a very early stage of the process.

The potential financial returns have significantly diminished since the decision was taken to start work on the Plan. The potential financial return for a Plan adopted now has reduced to around £700,000. Potential financial returns on the Plan continue to diminish with each planning permission granted before a NP is adopted and the Plan is not yet near adoption stage. The prospect of any financial return at all may be removed by the government with the replacement of CIL with IL as recently consulted on.

The Plan will take a significant amount of time and work before it can be adopted and is still at the beginning stages of the Plan making process. Although a lot of work has been undertaken, the Plan does not yet have any “issues and options” identified, which is the stage before a draft plan can be produced.

Significant additional work, time and expense still remains in order to produce the NP. It is open to the newly elected administration to determine whether such an investment should be undertaken at this time. The options and their associated risks and benefits are therefore set out below.

Options

Option 1: Discontinue funding and work on the Neighbourhood Plan.

Option 2: Continue work on the Neighbourhood Plan

Option 1: Discontinue funding and work on the Neighbourhood Plan.

Benefits:

- This would enable the City Council to avoid any future costs and risks associated with the Neighbourhood Plan work.
- The Parish area would remain a designated NP area and the City Council would remain a qualifying body, so work could recommence on the NP should the circumstances become clearer or more favourable in future.
- In respect of housing site allocations, discontinuing with the Plan at this time would mean that the formal process of housing site allocations for the 270 dwellings within Chichester City over the Plan period to 2039 would be completed by the Local Planning Authority. The LPA are likely to complete site allocations in a reasonable timeframe and in accordance with the required allocations procedures as a result of their resources, experience, and expertise. This would save work, time and expenses and would deliver certainty for residents sooner. It is likely that the LPA would have taken back site allocations from the NP in any case due to timescales and because members of the Steering Group have indicated that they do not agree with the necessary site allocations procedure.

Risks:

- Residents who spent time taking part in consultations are likely to be disappointed.
- Planning applications in the parish area will continue to be determined on the basis of Local Plan policies, without additional NP policies to influence planning decisions.
- The City Council would not stand to benefit from the possible increased CIL amount, which may be in the region of £700,000. However, the amount available to benefit from, and the likelihood of eventually benefitting from any CIL increase, is significantly lower than when work on the Plan commenced and continues to diminish with time; there is no guarantee that a NP would eventually be adopted in any case.

Option 2: Continue work on the Neighbourhood Plan

Benefits:

- If adopted, a NP would mean that planning policies shaped by local people to be used to determine planning applications in their area.
- If adopted, the City Council would benefit from an increased percentage of CIL which could be in the region of £700,000. However, the sum the City Council would benefit from reduces with every planning application permitted before the adoption of the Plan and the Plan is still at a very early stage. This sum has already reduced from an originally envisaged possible return of £2,000,000 due to the time the process has already taken. In addition, the government may replace the CIL system, in line with their recent IL consultation, with the possibility that any potential financial benefit from having an adopted NP may be reduced further or lost altogether.

Risks:

- A very significant amount of work, with commensurate cost implications, remains to be done on the Plan. At best, adoption is likely to be at least 18 months away, but it may be significantly longer and may not happen at all. Continuing with the Plan would mean significant additional expenditure with no guaranteed outcome. Progress so far has been much slower than expected and the Plan remains at a very early stage after 4 years of work. There is a significant possibility at this stage that, even if work and funding continue, an adopted NP will not be achieved.
- It is necessary to have the support and agreement of the Steering Group on the general scope and content in order that a NP can be achieved. In order to achieve a Plan within a reasonable time period, it would likely be necessary to produce a Plan much smaller in scope than the Steering Group feel committed to producing at this time. In order to achieve any NP, the Steering Group must be committed to producing a NP which accords with the Local Plan and other limitations of NPs, this is not necessarily the case at present. Such agreement and support has not yet been achieved and may not be possible.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that all work relating to the Neighbourhood Plan cease at present, and that the responsibility for housing site allocations be returned to the Local Planning Authority.

It remains open to Members to consider re-commencing work on the Neighbourhood Plan at any time in the future, for example, if further clarity on the proposed IL and its financial implications becomes available.

AGENDA ITEM 7

From:
Sarah Quail - s.quail@chichestercity.gov.uk

To:
Andrew Frost - afrost@chichester.gov.uk
Jane Hotchkiss - jhotchkiss@chichester.gov.uk
Tony Whitty - twhitty@chichester.gov.uk

CC:
Cllr Craig Gershater – c.gershater@chichestercity.gov.uk (CCC Council Leader, Mayor)
Cllr Adrian Moss - amos@chichester.gov.uk (CDC Leader)
Cllr Bill Brisbane - bbr Brisbane@chichester.gov.uk (CDC Cabinet Member for Planning)
Cllr Harsha Desai – hdesai@chichester.gov.uk (CDC Cabinet Member for Growth and Place)
Sam Tate - s.tate@chichestercity.gov.uk (CCC Clerk)
John Pegg - jpegg@craftpegg.com (Chichester Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group member and Advisor)
Richard Eastham - richard@feria-urbanism.com (Feria Urbanism, Chichester Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Advisor)
Anna Whitty – a.whitty@chichestercity.gov.uk (CCC Planning Advisor)
Ash Pal – [REDACTED] (CCC Chichester Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Chair)

LETTER BEGINS

Mr. Andrew Frost
Head of Planning Services
Chichester District Council
East Pallant House
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1TY

BY EMAIL ONLY

SUBJECT: City and District Council Local and Neighbourhood Plan Collaboration – Follow-Up to Our Meeting on February 27th 2023

Dear Andrew,

As requested by the District Council at our meeting on February 27th, 2023, the City Council now writes to describe its desired role to strengthen the Chichester Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) and enhance the Chichester Local Plan (CLP) and our suggested next steps to advance the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan work.

ALIGNMENT AND PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE PLANS

The purpose of the February meeting was to brief the District Council on the progress of the CNP, to share some of the emerging ideas from the plan research, and to see how the best possible alignment between the two plans can be achieved.

The City Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group subsequently provided a Regulation 19 submission on the Local Plan draft. This is attached for reference.

As mentioned in the submission *"we are looking for a stronger partnership between CDC and CCC over the respective roles of the two statutory planning documents, namely the Local Plan and the Chichester Neighbourhood Plan."*

SOUNDNESS AND POSITIVE PREPARATION TO CREATE STRONGER LOCAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS

On the question of CLP soundness, the City Council believes the need for "positive preparation" requires further work between the councils. We consider the CLP could exhibit greater levels of positive preparation if it contains stronger links with Neighbourhood Plans and that is what our regulation submission focused upon.

For example, it is anticipated that the broad CNP team will be able to address the gaps and outdated aspects of the current Chichester Vision document upon which the CLP relies for parts of the planning policy for Chichester (specifically draft policies A1 and A2.) Most of what is put forward in the Chichester Vision is tactically focused or relates to initiatives which have yet to be realized which could be seen as unsound. Specifically,

1. It does not address anything other than the commercial characteristics of the core Chichester area. It does not address the needs and aspirations of the whole city area, which is also the boundary of the CNP.
2. It does not address significant areas of change or areas outside of the commercial core.

3. The document lacks specificity. For example:
 - *“The Vision will serve as a template against which to test new projects, policies and proposals emerging for the City Centre”* – yet the document is too incomplete and subjective to fulfil this purpose.
 - *“Provide clear objectives to guide investment into the City Centre, so that all current and future development proposals, policies, strategies, ideas and opportunities have due regard as to how they might relate to each other, to the wider City and to adjoining areas.”* – yet there are no clear objectives, and we cannot find the criteria to measure achievement of objectives.
 - It does not contain specific plans, while there are aspirations, there is a lack of detail of what the “vision” is in terms of land use nor how the vision will be delivered in three-dimensional terms. No plans or massing studies have been included in the final document.
4. The current “vision” is based on older (2017) incomplete research. The “City Centre Audit” on which the Vision is based is primarily a study of street furniture and signage rather than the necessary broader audit of character and function for the whole parish area. (*City Centre Audit – BroomeJenkins – June 2016*)
5. The comparator towns and cities used in the Chichester Vision are too large. Most of the city comparators used (Guildford, Exeter, Winchester, and York) are a different scale to Chichester and need to be reconsidered. Better city comparators might be Lincoln, St Albans, and Chester based on size, geographic area, heritage, and their Roman origin. International comparators such as Basel and Speyer (Speyer is twinned with us) based on cultural similarity and spatial footprint are accessible to us. These comparators can help position Chichester alongside a more representative and aspirational peer group.
6. The Chichester Vision document predates CDC’s announcement of a climate emergency in July 2019, when “the council announced its commitment to taking urgent action and asking others - residents, businesses, partner organisations, and the Government - to help and support us. We developed a Climate Emergency Action Plan, in which we set a target of a 10% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions year-on-year until 2025.” There is interest to explore how active travel can change the City Public realm in what is a relatively compact geographic civil parish area with a lower, possibly even zero emissions aspiration to support CDC’s Climate Emergency goals. The CDC LP repeats climate aspirations to do this but could benefit from greater specificity about stated actions to achieve it. For example, the CDC LCWIP (Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan) has many excellent schemes which will benefit the CNP plan area but there is no specific mention in the CDC Local Plan nor policies protecting, prioritising, safeguarding and funding the LCWIP.

7. The greatest weakness of the 2017 Chichester Vision based on the CNP's research so far, is that it lacks real public recognition and buy-in. One of the requirements of the CNP is to *"consult as widely and thoroughly as is possible to ensure that the draft and final neighbourhood plan is representative of the views of residents."* We anticipate that the CNP will help to smooth and ground some of the ideas in the Chichester Vision work, bring it up to date, make it specific and enable deep Chichester public input. Examples of our engagement work with Chichester stakeholders includes the recent Chichester Community Collaboration Forum, Business Forum, and other engagement events.

CREATING A DESIGN-LED VISION FOR CHICHESTER

As the land within the boundary of the Chichester neighbourhood plan is more than 95% built-out from a development perspective, the role of brownfield redevelopment becomes ever more vital to directing future development. As we outlined when we met in February, our research identifies significant opportunities to create new value from CDC land assets in Chichester that we believe are worth further joint investigation. This research has identified opportunities for CDC to achieve "highest and best use"—in terms of amenity and value to Chichester people but also to identify development sites that allow it to deliver its future housing allocations much more easily than has formerly been possible. We would like to explore these opportunities jointly with the District.

We believe there are numerous, publicly acceptable, potential development sites which will both improve the quality of the built environment in Chichester (e.g., improving its gateways) and unlock economic potential for the district.

The City Council is keen to run a series of design-led engagement events with the District Council – all involving the public, stakeholders, landowners, and other interested parties, as appropriate – to develop a spatial 3-D vision for a series of opportunity sites in Chichester that are likely to be subject to change over the coming years. This work might include several District strategic development sites which have not significantly progressed, in part because of the pandemic, the economic slowdown, and lack of community buy-in and offer an opportunity for a reset.

Our suggestion would be to have these be facilitated by Feria Urbanism which acts as our plan advisor and is vastly experienced in delivering this type of engagement and alignment.

IMPACT TO TIMESCALE AND GENERAL CONFORMITY

We fully anticipate that these suggestions will maintain general conformity with the CDC Local Plan, as set out in the legal provisions that allocate strategic matters to the Local Plan and non-strategic matters to a Neighbourhood Plan. The CNP work timescale continues to be adjusted to ensure it aligns with the LP timescale.

NEXT STEPS

We are looking for a stronger partnership between CDC and CCC over the respective roles of the two statutory planning documents, namely the Chichester Local Plan and the Chichester Neighbourhood Plan. As a next step, we would suggest that a small working group be convened to prepare a terms of reference document and scope of work.

Yours faithfully,

Councillor Sarah Quail
Chairman, Planning & Conservation Committee
Chichester City Council

Wide-Area 20mph Update

The Wide-Area 20mph default scheme for Chichester is now a project with 20 months of history. It began as a response to residents' of Chichester North's main issue on the doorstep at the by-election in Nov 2021.

There is an indisputable, international and very large evidence base for the benefits of implementing 20mph urban default schemes, which I will be glad to share with anyone interested. It convinced Wales to go live with a Country-wide Urban 20mph default in September to join over 600 other such schemes across British Cities, towns and villages. Sadly, like climate change denial, the myths about 20mph linger. Below is a myth-busting sheet for those still sceptical of the reality.

Chichester has a partial 20mph residential scheme which does not afford the same benefits as Wide-Area implementations. These schemes include A, and other main roads where people mix with vehicles. This 'Zonal default' configuration makes the most difference to collision rates, fuel use, air pollution, noise pollution, quality of life, active travel improvements and perceptions of safer roads.

Early in 2022, Chichester City Council, and Chichester District Council, unanimously voted for their separate motions to call on West Sussex County council to implement a Wide-Area 20mph default to all of Chichester's roads where people live, work, study or play. Only WSCC Highways can do this. WSCC took almost all of 2022 to amend their policy to enable communities that wanted 20mph schemes to apply for them. Previously this was not possible. However, the policy amendment necessary was ratified at the end of last year and at CCC it was agreed that the Planning Officer would write the Traffic Regulation Order required to request such a scheme, newly available for Chichester. A Working Group was called for to draw up a plan to gather and provide WSCC with the evidence they require to complete a TRO.

A change of Town Clerk and the local elections with their pre-election restrictions have halted the work meaning the deadline for submitting CCC's TRO at the end of July now looks unrealistic. This is a big disappointment in that submission dates only come around once per year, and, since there is no guarantee that any scheme will be chosen by WSCC Highways, the pool of applications next year will undoubtedly be much larger and our chances of success lessened.

On the plus side, the delay will now afford CCC the time required to draw up a comprehensive, City-Wide street plan, covering all wards, and to include a 20mph default amongst a wider plan for making all Chichester's Roads safer, with more crossings, and SIDs for example. Those that live, work, play or study alongside our dangerous, polluting roads deserve to feel the benefit of cleaner air, better quality of life, less noise, and fewer accidents.

With this wider brief, this project will need

- members to form a working group
- quotes to perform the work of offering Chichester's online and paper surveys
- quotes for expert facilitation at one Council House, and one web-based community engagement event to support the members in promoting the scheme
- quotes for advertising the benefits of 20mph on local social and other media
- quotes from traffic planning experts for developing and drawing up a road plan of the chosen desired scheme.

Cllr Maureen Corfield
June 2023

AGENDA ITEM 8

Myths about City or Town driving at 20mph

#01 *'Journeys take too long'*

Wales compared average times-taken for 100s of journeys with urban sections limited first to 30mph then to 20mph.

Cardiff to Llandudno by car	192 miles	4 hrs	extra 5 mins
Border to Aberystwith by car	46.7 miles	1hr.10mins	extra 30 secs
132 Bus (Maerdy to Cardiff)	25 miles		extra 5 mins
12 Bus (Rhyl to Llandudno)	18 miles		extra 2 mins

From Sept this year, Wales will be the first country to default all its urban roads to 20mph - the benefits are big but the journey times hardly change. See why on this demonstration on a Bristol Road [20mph vs. 30mph on Whiteladies Road - YouTube](#)

#02 *'If drivers won't stick to 30mph, they won't comply with 20mph'*

Not true. There will always be some that break the rules - at 30mph or 20mph. Yet, most drivers in **Wide-Area schemes** do respect slower speeds if 20mph limits include A and Trunk roads. Drivers do learn. New norms can be set, Edinburgh is a good example. We normalized Seat Belts.

#03 *The Police can't enforce a 20mph speed limit*

Not true. The Police can act on all speeding infringements. Community Speed Watch groups regularly monitor and re-educate on 20mph roads.

#04 *Driving at 20mph is more polluting*

The opposite is true. Driving in URBAN areas means more accelerating and decelerating. Consequently, a small hatchback spues out 22% more CO2 at 30mph than at 20mph in towns and cities.

And there is 36% more from diesel fuelled SUVs

NOx was found to be 40% greater for a Ford Focus at 30mph than 20mph

Lots of research shows 30mph in urban areas is 1/4 - 1/3 more polluting and x2 as noisy

[Urban Traffic Research – Future Transport London](#)

#05 *Driving at 20mph instead of 30mph uses more fuel*

Not in towns and cities. On motorways or rural roads maybe- but - energy use for stop-start URBAN driving is higher. In this research, a Ford Focus gets 36mpg at 20mph, but only 30mpg at 30mph

[Urban Traffic Research – Future Transport London](#)

#06 *My car isn't made to go that slow*

It can feel odd, at first, to drive consistently at 20mph, but habits form in less time than you think. Cars are made to drive at whatever speed the road requires.

#07 *It's just as safe to drive at 30mph as 20mph*

Not true. Stopping takes longer, visibility is narrower at 30mph. You can see more of what's in front of you and it takes less time to stop at 20mph

#08 *'I'm safe at 30mph'*

For yourself, inside the bubble of your vehicle, this is probably **true**.

Outside it, for others, on the pavements or on a bike, this is definitely **not true**.

A child is 3 times more likely to die if hit at 30mph than at 20mph.

#09 *Speeding is not the main cause of deaths on the roads*

Commander Kyle Gordon told the Times last year that new police research says 50% of road deaths were now known to be due to speeding. Previously, reporting was from the roadside before inquiry results were known. Now, collisions reports include all the data. Speeding causes 3 times as many road deaths as previously thought.

[Speeding causes three times as many road deaths as previously thought | News | The Sunday Times \(thetimes.co.uk\)](#)

#10 *It will cost too much to make the changes*

20mph urban defaults are a big saving to the public purse.

Bristol (population 450K) spent £2.3 million on city-wide 20mph.

Annual estimated savings = £15.2 million, on reduced casualties alone.