

Issues and Options: Analysis

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Objectives

Relevant Question Numbers: Question 1

Q1 Do you agree with the objectives?

Objective 1: Protecting and Enhancing the Environment: Balancing the need to protect the environment, with the need for new development

Statistical Data:

	Mean*	No reply	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Protecting and Enhancing the Environment: Balancing the need to protect the environment, with the need for new development	1.35	8.7%	46.7%	37.9%	1.5%	2.1%	3.1%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Of those returning a questionnaire, the greatest amount (nearly 47%) “strongly agreed” with objective 1, and a further 38% (approx) “agreed”.
- Only 5.2% either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Objective description:

- Enhancement of the environment should be stressed. Reference should also be made to enhancing biodiversity and land. (Countryside Agency)
- Objective one should be revised to read “ensuring new development protects and enhances the environment”. It should be made clearer that development can actually bring an environment benefit.
- There are opportunities for bio-diversity gains within new development rather than mitigating damage.
- Bio-diversity and semi-natural habitats are not the focus of Eco homes and BREEAM standards.
- Developers should be looking to provide small-scale ‘green’ energy generation within development.
- It is important to look at each part of the district and individual developments before deciding on the most appropriate method of energy generation.
- It requires expert knowledge and asking non-experts without providing any information is misguided and will distort the outcome of consultation on an extremely important issue.
- English Nature is concerned that the objective does not adequately reflect the legislative or policy requirements for biodiversity. Specifically; Designated areas and protected species International nature conservation designations - the document needs to make reference to internationally designated sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites) and indicate that development affecting them

will be subject to special legal procedures under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations.

- The objective would be strengthened if there were clear links to the community strategy and high level action plan.
- Objective too vague and should indicate ADC priority

The Objective should not restrict development:

- This objective should not be interpreted as meaning “no development in order to protect the environment”. It is possible to meet the strategic housing requirement whilst preserving the Countryside. Not all land outside the built up areas has the same environmental quality. It is appropriate to identify the least sensitive of these areas, in sustainable locations, for the purpose of housing and employment growth that cannot be accommodated on previously used land.
- Disagree. The objective should be reworded to change emphasis “balancing the need for development with the need to protect the environment”.
- Will the ‘need’ for new development always override the need to protect the environment. Against what criteria will ‘need’ be assessed?

Flooding:

- Specific policies should be drafted to reflect the Shoreline Management Plan, to ensure risks from coastal erosion, instability and flooding are minimised and to require mitigation measures as appropriate. Policies should not preclude new development per se, provided that specific coastal management criteria can be met.

Gaps:

- Developing strategic and local gaps will undermine all previous policies to prevent coalescence and urban sprawl and could lead to habitat loss and further fragmentation.

Biomass etc:

- Supports use of biomass and wind power in principle. Provision and location of these must be done strategically and avoid direct adverse impacts on priority habitats and nationally or internationally important sites. Growth of biomass crops can conflict with maintenance/restoration of BAP habitats. Key Principles 4 and 5 of PPS9 are relevant. Location of biomass crops must be carefully considered.
- Support in principle the expansion of wind power, providing that developments themselves do not have a detrimental impact or pose a threat to sites of existing conservation value including designated sites and priority habitats.

- All development should be built to the Eco home and BREEAM excellent standard at the very least.

Conservation designations:

- National nature conservation designations - the document needs to indicate that development likely to adversely affect the interest features of Sites of Special Scientific Interest will not be permitted, without including caveats or exceptions.
- Regional and local nature conservation designations - the document needs to indicate that development likely to have a significant adverse effect on regionally or locally designated sites including County Wildlife Sites, SINCs and Regionally Important Geological Sites will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.
- Protected species (wherever they may occur) - the document needs to include a policy to protect species especially protected by law, distinguishing European protected species from others. Explain that permission will not be given until adequate surveys have been undertaken to establish the potential effects on the species and determine the effectiveness of the mitigation. English Nature supports the caveat that, with regard to development, compensatory habitats should only be acceptable as a last resort, and that habitats/species should be protected and enhanced in-situ where ever possible.

Other:

- No comments/Agree.
- Objective 1 is discussed in relation to a future development proposal.
- Objective 1 essential for successful maintenance/Enhancement of tourism activities/ facilities.
- The levels of development proposed in the South East are not sustainable in terms of water resources. Low river flows are stressing ecosystems.
- It was highlighted by several respondent that no environmental information or statements were included in the 'Vision' or 'Snapshot' sections of the Core Strategy.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Objective description	7
Not restrict development/protect the environment	3
Flooding	1
Gaps	1
Alternative energy generation techniques	3
Bio-diversity	3
Conservation designations	3
Other	6

Implications for Preferred Options

The Objective should be re-written to take into account the comments of the Countryside agency and English Nature.

Environmental information should be included in the Vision and District summary.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Objectives

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q1 Do you agree with the objectives?

Objective 2: Housing for all, and Working well: Ensuring new housing and employment development meets local needs.

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	Mean*	No reply	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree
2. Housing for all, & working well: Ensuring new housing & employment development meets local needs	1.22	9.7%	35.9%	46.2%	2.6%	3.6%	2.1%

* (mean score ranging from +2 = strongly agree, to -2 strongly disagree)

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 82.1% of the respondents who completed a questionnaire either agree or strongly agree with the objective.
- Only 5.7% either disagree or strongly disagree.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Agree:

- I agree with the objectives. I do not think that the proposal meets them fully.
- Some development is necessary and inevitable.
- The number of new houses proposed is simply too great not to change the character of rural communities in a negative way.
- Agree with objective 2 that aims to provide new employment accommodation to meet existing and local need. However, it should look longer term and be flexible enough to meet future demand and emphasis in changing sectors.

This could also mean encouraging new industries in to the area. Residential development will then be needed to balance the employment.

Disagree:

- Strongly disagree because Arun is part of the South East region and must assist in meeting its share of regional development needs, not just its own local needs.
- I disagree with the statement to provide “Housing for all”. Arun is being asked to build too much housing – for one thing there are clearly insufficient water resources to sustain the current population and housing stock – do all of us have to expect more water shortages.

Location

- Housing should only be placed where there is already a good road/railway network in place as government seem reluctant to invest in these.
- Housing should not be on greenfield land. Drains, roads and schools are not adequate. The environment will be threatened,
- Affordable housing should not be used as a tool to develop unsustainable sites, particular greenfield land.
- It is important to ensure that the provision of new housing and employment development is only relevant where it doesn't alter the basic character of the local area. There is a risk that a blanket response to this objective might allow that to happen.

Affordability

- Housing should be affordable to live in, sustainable housing means less expensive to run. Inappropriate and dated construction methods will not be affordable in terms of natural resources, systems and the wider community.

Other:

- The housing requirement figures should reflect the most up to date position as at 1st April 2004.
- Objective 2 will conflict with objective 1 if development levels are set at an unsustainable level.
- It is unfortunate that the need for a bypass around Arundel is proposed but no alternative solutions.
- Objective 2 is discussed in relation to a future development proposal.
- The document does not provide sufficient development strategy options, in that it would appear that the Council has already agreed its preferred option for a new settlement and other small scale development to meet the housing requirement.
- It is essential that the needs of pockets of disadvantage are addressed when completing an overarching plan. The two wards of social deprivation in Littlehampton highlight the need for joined up economic, social and community regeneration.

- Affordable housing should be for Key Workers and less well off people who have no anti-social behaviour problems.
- How will clear and reasonable intention of meeting local needs be influenced by overriding Government imposed strategies.
- Support is given to achieving sustainable development; an adequate supply of housing, with a choice of sites, is fundamental to this.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Agree	3
Disagree	2
Employment	1
Housing in relation to transport	2
Affordable construction techniques	1
Affordable locations/site	1
Housing figures	1
Location character	1
Other	8

Conclusions and Implications for Preferred Options

The majority of comments raised with regards to this section relate to the content of the actual objective rather than its description. In particular the numbers of houses that the Council have to plan for are considered too high, cover sustainable development or Affordable housing.

The only relevant comment relating to the objective is “Arun is part of the South East region and must assist in meeting its share of regional development needs, not just its own local needs”.

However, 82.1% of respondents who completed the questionnaire either agree or strongly agree with the objective description itself.

In conclusion, the objective could be reworded.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Objectives

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q 1 Do you agree with the objectives?

Objective 3 – Creating Quality Places: Providing an attractive living and working environment.

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	Mean*	No reply	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree
3. Creating Quality Places: Providing an attractive living and working environment	1.39	8.7%	46.2%	39.0%	3.6%	0.5%	2.1%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 85.2% of respondents either strongly agree or agree.
- 2.6% either disagree or strongly disagree.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Density of development should be appropriate to specific locations and availability of natural resources.
- Higher densities should encourage a more creative approach to the provision of green space. Smaller gardens (if any) and more community space for recreation, leisure, education, food production and biodiversity to improve neighbourhoods, safety health and therefore quality of life in the district.
- Design should encourage the use of local materials and skills and incorporate innovative technology that will deliver affordability through the lifetime of a building.
- If the needs of the ageing population are met, this may reduce the need for some types of development by freeing up dwellings that are more suited to other age groups.
- Out of town retail parks encourage car use, unsustainable. Improving sustainable transport access and increasing pedestrian areas will improve town centres. Increasing exchange space and decreasing movement space has been shown to re-vitalise city-centres in many countries.
- It is important to support the rural community; facilities in rural areas should be protected to reduce the need to travel.
- The quality of the environment is unfortunately seen as a constraint in this document, offers an opportunity to promote sustainable tourism and contribute to the economy in a sustainable way. There needs to be a network of open spaces, which is interconnected to allow species movement (wildlife corridors) as well as sustainable links for people. There should be provision of accessible community allotments. Improve access to facilities, do not encourage the car.
- Strongly agree with objective 3, but Core Strategy should seek enhancements, which is fundamental to creating quality places.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Agree. 1
Strongly agree 2

Other 1

Implications for Preferred Options

85.2% of respondents either strongly agree or agree with objective 3

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Objectives

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q1 Do you agree with the Objectives?

Objective 4: Social and Community Infrastructure: Meeting social needs.

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	Mean*	No reply	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree
4. Social and Community Infrastructure: Meeting social needs	1.40	8.7%	45.6%	39.0%	5.1%	0.5%	1.0%

* (mean score ranging from +2 = strongly agree, to -2 strongly disagree)

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 84.6% of respondents who filled in the questionnaire either strongly agree or agree with the objective.
- 1.5% who either disagree or strongly disagree.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- A healthy environment contributes to both mental and physical health and therefore quality of life. It is important the environment is considered when considering the provision of facilities.
- The objective is so vaguely worded that I cannot agree/disagree.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Quality of life 1
Objective wording 1
Agree/No comments 2
Other 1

Implications for Preferred Options

The wording of the objective could be re-written so that it is less “vague”.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Objective 5

Relevant Question Numbers: Question 1

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	Mean*	No reply	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5. Transport and Movement	1.12	24.1%	31.8%	29.2%	9.2%	3.6%	2.1%

* (mean score ranging from +2 = strongly agree, to -2 strongly disagree)

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 61% of the respondents who filled in the questionnaire either strongly agree or agree with the objective.
- 5.7% who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the objective.
- Should note that 24.1% of all respondents who filled in a questionnaire did not reply.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Comments related to Objective 5 generally:

- Objective 5 is not and objective
- Objective 5 is meaningless
- What is the objective? What about Transport and Movement? Transport and Movement is not an objective in itself.
- There is not description of the Transport and Movement objective, unlike the other objectives. Suggest ‘Reducing the need to travel’ and ‘Promoting Sustainable travel, particularly alternatives to the private car’ (Highways Agency)
- Objective 5 does not pose a question; merely says Transport and Movement.
- So vaguely worded cannot agree/disagree.
- Clearly we need transport and movement, but it is not an objective. We suggest, in line with the County Transport Plan, the objective should be “Improved Accessibility”.
- Transport and movement, in what context?
- This is not an objective and is rather a statement. The Council need to set out clearly their objective for Transport and Movement

Parking:

- There is no mention of parking policy in the document. Suggest linking parking policy in the District to higher level policy such as WSCC parking strategy.

Roads:

- There is a local traffic issue plus access from the east (Worthing, Arundel etc.) is poor.
- The use of cars must be discouraged as much as possible says suggested include: absolute bans on residential street parking, so that inhabitants of congested spaces in towns would have to give up cars and use public transport which must be improved
- A27 – Blocks up at Poling – Lyminster roundabout
- A29/A27 Fontwell junction blocks and could easily be helped by a firm of division of traffic coming west after the Slindon A29 roundabout.
- Improvement to the A29 needed.
- New by-passes for Chichester, Arundel and Worthing. Existing roads totally inadequate.
- Motor bridges over A27 to take place of roundabouts
- A27 improvements important but not if the consequences of these bring major housing developments to the surrounding area – the increased traffic that these would bring would negate the benefits of improvements.
- All new roads and road improvements should include cycle lanes, of similar quality to the road they accompany.

Public Transport:

- Access to rail stations and bus interchange by integrated timetable systems and good parking facilities at these locations for commuters – public transport connections.
- Inadequate public transport.
- Public transport should be encouraged.
- The roads are congested, parking is a nightmare, public transport is bad and rail services have been cut.

General Comments:

- I can never see this Country having a good public transport system until we stop thinking with existing networks. We are pouring more good money after bad all the time. I would support the plan if I was confident it would be carried out and be efficient.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Objective 5 is not an objective	11
Poor public transport	2
Public Transport	2
Parking	1
Roads: A27	3
A29	2
Roads in relation to housing	1
Cycling	1
Support	2

Implications for Preferred Options

This objective requires rewording, as it stands the objective fails to provide a description. Several suggestions have been received from the respondents, including one from the Highways Agency whose suggestion is '**Reducing the need to travel**' and '**Promoting Sustainable travel, particularly alternatives to the private car**'. Further work is also required in relation to parking issues and Transport Assessments. The impact of these assessments depends upon the department's meetings with the County Council Highways department in January.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Renewable Energy

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q2 Do you agree that we should ask for all new homes to be built to the Eco-Homes 'Very Good' standard as a minimum requirement?

Q3 Do you agree that we should ask for adoption of the BREEAM 'very good' standard in all new commercial developments?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	Mean*	No reply	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Need more information
Do you agree that we should ask that all new homes be built to the 'Eco-Homes' 'very good' standard as a minimum requirement?	1.37	7.7%	42.1%	36.9%	3.6%	2.1%	1.0%	6.7%

* (mean score ranging from +2 = strongly agree, to -2 strongly disagree)

	Mean*	No reply	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Need more information
Do you agree that we should ask for adoption of the BREEAM 'very good' standard in all new commercial developments?	1.28	9.2%	38.5%	28.7%	8.7%	1.5%	1.5%	11.8%

* (mean score ranging from +2 = strongly agree, to -2 strongly disagree)

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

N/A

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Many of the comments received did not distinguish between BREEM or Eco-homes or confused the two schemes in making comments.
- Suggest an excellent as minimum standard.
- Standard should apply to redeveloped as well as newly developed homes.
- Possible to get Eco-homes high environmental rating without implementing water efficiency measures. Encourage standard of at least 4 out 6 water credits in new homes. (Southern Water)
- Replace Eco Homes standard with a suitable Sustainable Building Code. (Portsmouth Water)
- BREEAM very good standard conforms to Policy EN1 in draft SE Plan.
- Disagree that issue should be a policy requirement. These matters should be considered through negotiations in respect of significant planning applications.
- Disagree; building regulations are the appropriate mechanism for reducing resource consumption in buildings.
- The cost of eco-homes should not affect the viability of the development.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

- Excellent standard: 4
- Eco Homes does not adequately address water efficiency: 2
- Eco homes not a policy requirement: 2

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for Preferred Options

- Preferred Options needs to explain the difference between BREEAM and Eco Homes.
- Preferred Options should explicitly address the failure of Eco-homes to adequately address water efficiency.
- Examine implications of relevant SE Plan amendments.
- Examine implications of the Sustainable Building Code.
- Assess which option (Sustainable Building Code and Eco-Homes) would work best in Arun. (*Response to Southern and Portsmouth Water comments*).

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Renewable Energy

Relevant Question Numbers:

- Q4 Should we ask developers to demonstrate how they have taken 'passive' energy into account in their designs?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q4 Should we ask developers to demonstrate how they have taken 'passive' energy into account in their designs?	11.8%	64.6%	2.6%	6.7%	14.4%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

N/A

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- General agreement that developers should demonstrate (through a supporting planning statement) how passive energy has been taken into account in the layout and design of development.
- Highlighted that passive energy should only be one consideration. It may conflict with other layout and design issues (e.g. highways), should be balanced against these considerations.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

- Support demonstration of passive energy in new development: 5
- Balanced against other considerations: 3

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for Preferred Options

- We will consider asking developers to demonstrate how they have taken passive energy into account.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Renewable Energy

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q5 Should we ask for renewable energy technologies in new developments?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q5 Should we ask for renewable energy technologies in new developments?	11.3%	64.6%	8.7%	3.1%	12.3%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

N/A

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Support a policy requiring larger developments to produce a specified percentage of energy-on sites from renewable sources as proposed in Policy EN1 in draft SE Plan.
- Renewable energies technologies should be requested in retrofit properties.
- Inclusion of renewable energies technologies should not compromise viability. Should be appropriate to scale of development and subject to negotiations.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

N/A

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for Preferred Options:

- Preferred Options should require renewable energies technology in new developments.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Renewable Energy

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q6 Which renewable energies technology do you believe to be most appropriate to Arun?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Large wind turbines	Small wind turbines attached to individual properties	Solar panels	Photovoltaic panels	Biomass Plant	Other sources - please specify below
Q6 Which renewable energies technologies do you believe to be most appropriate to Arun?	19.5%	12.8%	32.8%	74.9%	47.7%	36.9%	20.5%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- There is a high level of support for solar panels and photovoltaic panels (probably reflecting Arun's climate).

Comments Analysis Part 1 & Part 2:

Comments:

- A range of different technologies should be used in the district (4)
- Technologies must be appropriate (2)
- Requiring renewable energies technology in all new development might affect viability. (1)
- Not enough information provided
- Too complex an issue for a questionnaire.
- Specific renewable energy technology considerations:
 - Wind turbines: location, scale, noise pollution (1)
 - Biomass: location (1)
- Technologies highlighted as appropriate for Arun:
 - Small wind turbines (2)
 - Solar (2)
 - Large wind turbines (1)
- 'Other' technologies:
 - Wave / Tidal / River / Hydro (33)
 - Waste/Sewage – methane gas (3)
 - Nuclear (3)
 - Combined Heat and Power (4)
 - Ground source heat pumps (6)
 - Neighbourhood heating systems (1)
- Technologies respondent opposed to:
 - Large wind turbines (1)

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for Preferred Options:

- The comments made highlight, as the statistical analysis does, a range of different renewable technologies with varying levels of support.
- The comments do not provide any particular rationale for a particular renewable technology.
- The Preferred Options should probably support all renewable technologies where appropriate and where viable.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Renewable Energy

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q7 Are there any locations in Arun that you think should be allocated specifically for the production of renewable energy? If so, where, and what types?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q7 Are there any locations in Arun that you think should be allocated specifically for the production of renewable energy? If so, where, and what types?	14.9%	25.1%	7.2%	22.6%	30.3%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- The majority of people who responded to this question did not feel that they had the necessary information to effectively respond to this question. This may reflect the fact that the production of renewable energy is considered a technical question.

Comments Analysis Part 1 & 2:

- Wind Turbines:
 - Coastal plain between Middleton and Littlehampton (2)
 - Coastal (4)
 - Off-shore (6)

- Ford Airfield (4)
 - High ground (1)
 - South Downs (1)
- Photovoltaic:
 - Public buildings (1)
 - Housing association buildings (1)
- River / Tidal:
 - River Arun (between Arundel and Littlehampton) (18)
 - Where appropriate (1)
- Bio-mass plant
 - Industrial estates (1)
 - Ford Airfield (2)
 - Aldingbourne Landfill Site (1)
- General:
 - Brownfield sites (2)
 - Rear of Bognor (1)
 - Felpham (1)
 - 5 Villages (1)
 - Where appropriate (1)
 - Ford (3)
 - Flood plain (1)
 - Throughout the district (1)
- “The agency recommends that the District undertakes a renewable energy strategy for the Arun District.” **(Environment Agency)**

Implications for Preferred Options:

- A variety of locations for different types of technology. No consensus.
- The Preferred Options should draw upon a renewable energy strategy for the district.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Climate change & flood risk

Relevant Question Numbers:

- 8 Are there parts of the District where detailed studies need to be undertaken to address flood risk issues?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q8 Are there parts of the District where detailed studies need to be undertaken to address flood risk issues?	13.8%	44.1%	5.1%	17.4%	19.5%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis: Comments Analysis Part 1 & 2:

Flood Risk:

- Rapid Surface water run-off can cause flooding. Adequate provision should be required for surface water drainage in development. (Southern Water).
- Core Strategy should stress there may be flood risk constraints/dangers which are not shown on EA maps. (EA) (2)
- Flood Risk Assessments will be required for search areas, site allocations and applications. (EA) (2)
- CFMP identifies flood risk areas. (2)

Development and flood risk mitigation:

- Development should be directed away from flood risk areas. (EA, suggested policy wording).
- Consideration would be given to redevelopment in urban areas if acceptable flood mitigation/defence works are provided. (EA)
- Support inclusion of SUDS in development. (EA, suggested policy wording)
- Requirements for SUDS will have land take. (EA)
- Opportunity to upgrade flood defences should be taken advantage of.
- Flood defence are critical to development of Littlehampton harbour (EA)

Locations for detailed flood risk studies:

- Areas already identified as high/ significant risk / Previously flooded areas (5)
- Whole area (5)
- All low lying areas (3)
- Any area that will be subject to development
- South of A27 to coastline (3)
- Coastal areas (14)
- Flood Plain (5)
- Arun Valley (9)
- Barnham, Westergate and Eastergate (7)
 - *Specifically mentioned: Lake Lane*
- Shripney (1)
- Ferring area including Rife (2)
- Angmering (1)
- Aldingbourne area including Rife (13)
 - *Specifically mentioned: from Northfields Lane to Hook Lane / Pack Lane*
- Lidsey area including rife (9)

- Pagham area including Rife (5)
- Middleton and Elmer (3)
 - *Specifically mentioned: South end of Sea Lane Middleton-on-Sea*
- Climping (1)
- Littlehampton (4)
- Ford station (1)
- Felpham (3)
- Black ditch (1)
- Bersted (3)
- Arundel (1)
- Bognor (2)

Climate change:

- Core strategy should identify the consequences climate change for the district and how these may be managed (e.g. reduction of emissions). (EA)

Implications Preferred Options:

- Flood risk assessments will be required for search areas, site allocations and applications as suggested by the EA.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Water Resources

Relevant Question Numbers: 9

What measures can we introduce to ensure more efficient water use in development?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Water harvesting	Grey water systems	Low water usage appliances	Other measures - please specify below
Q9 What measures can we introduce to ensure more efficient water use in new developments?	22.1%	51.8%	45.1%	66.2%	18.5%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

N/A

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Other suggested technologies:

Demand Side

- Water meters (New build, retrofit) (9)
- Water butts/ rainwater storage measures (6)
- SUDS (link with water harvesting) (3)
- Do not permit increasingly wasteful uses (1)
- Address water efficiency in existing stock. Require in retrofit. (1)
- Require water efficiency measures in new development. (4)

Supply Side

- Use treated waste water (1)
- Use sea water / desalination (2)
- Water companies address leakage in systems (5)
- Increased publicity / education (3)
- More reservoirs (winter run off water storage) – new housing should contribute to reservoir capacity – see Policies NRM1 NRM2 of the South East Plan re: Havant Thicket Reservoir (Portsmouth Water) (4)
- Introduce a 'national grid for water supplies. (3)

Other comments

- Less development (5)
- More information required (1)
- Incorporation of water efficient technologies should be appropriate to the scale of development to maintain viability. (1)
- Rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling technologies; realistic technologies options ?(Portsmouth Water & Southern Water) (1)
- Eco homes does not require water efficiency measures. New sustainable building code is not compulsory. Core Strategy should therefore have a specific policy on water efficiency. Planning policy may not be the correct tool for water efficiency measures (Portsmouth Water). (1)

Infrastructure

- Policy should be included regarding development adjacent to sewage works and the protection of residents amenity. (Southern Water) (1)
- The cumulative effect of development upon water and waste water infrastructure (Environment Agency) (1)
- Whole site approach to delivery of infrastructure should be required (Southern Water) (1)

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

- There are a variety of supply and demand side methods available to conserve and more efficiently use water resources. These methods have varying levels of support.
- There should be work carried out to consider the scope for using planning policy as a tool to require demand side water efficiency technologies.

Application of planning policy to retro-fit? Systems for the integration of planning policy with Building control?

- Consideration of impacts upon viability and balancing requirements for different types of infrastructure.
- There should be research carried out into the viable and non-viable technologies.
- There should be work carried out in to the practice of requiring infrastructure contributions, perhaps the use of standard charges to co-ordination between different developments to mitigate cumulative impact. Work with infrastructure stakeholders.

Implications for Preferred Options:

- The issue of water efficiency will be looked at in conjunction with Eco-homes standards and BREEAM and a practical policy will be formed around this issue.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Water Quality

Relevant Question Numbers:

- 10 What other measures can we ask for to reduce the adverse effects of pollution upon water quality?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

N/A

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

N/A

Comments Analysis Part 1 & 2:

- No mention of ground water quality. Protection of water resources should be considered in more generic terms. (1)
- **Protection of Source Protection Zones should be ensured – development should be directed away from SPZ1, maps available on EA website. (Environment Agency) (3)**
- **Contaminated land remediation methods should be sought. (EA) (1)**
- **Promotion of pollution conclusion should be sought. (EA) (1)**
- **Future Management of SUDS should be ensured (EA) (1)**
- Increase/improve/invest in sewage treatment (8)
- Organic water treatment (3)
- Reduction in use of agricultural chemicals (9)
- Better enforcement of existing standards (4)
- Raise agricultural, commercial and industrial standards (3)

- Better monitoring (8)
- Specialist area requiring specialist information (9)
- No more development (1)
- Require SUDS in all new development where appropriate. (3)
- Stricter control of location of commercial and industrial premises (1)
- Reduction in domestic chemical use. (5)
- Reduction in commercial chemical use. (5)
- Planning conditions to control run off. (2)
- Raise awareness (5)
- Ensure new development contributes to sewage infrastructure. (2)
- Waste water meters (1)
- Use of recycled water where applicable (2)
- Control run off more effectively (3)

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

- Analysis EA Source Protection Zones
- Consider explaining the limits of planning in addressing the issue of water quality.

Implications for Preferred Options

- EA source protection zones will be mapped – Development will be directed away from SPZ1.
- Contaminated Land remediation methods will be sought.
- Promoting of SUDS will be continued.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Natural Environment

Relevant Question Numbers:

- Q11 Which of these options in respect of strategic and local gaps do you prefer?
- Retain Strategic and Local Gaps but with policies which allow for development on the edges of settlements, where justified and essential, without giving rise to visual or perceived coalescence.
 - Abandon the principle of strategic or local gaps on general countryside protection policies.
 - Retain Strategic and Local Gaps essentially restricting non-agricultural development within them.

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

		No reply	Retain Strategic and Local Gaps but with policies which allow for development on the edges...	Abandon the principle of Strategic or Local Gaps and rely on general countryside protection policies	Retain Strategic and Local Gaps essentially restricting non-agricultural development within them
Q11	Which of these options in respect of strategic and local gaps do you prefer?	11.8%	25.1%	9.7%	53.3%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 53.3% of respondents who completed a questionnaire think that the Council should retain the Strategic and Local Gaps as they stand, essentially restricting non-agricultural development within them.
- 25.1% think that the gaps should be retained whilst allowing for development on the edge of settlements where justified and essential without giving rise to visual or perceived coalescence.
- 9.7% think we should abandon the principal of Strategic or Local Gaps.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Retain Gaps:

- No local gaps should be developed in any way
- Development in gaps should be the provision of playing fields and similar community facilities only.
- Strategic gaps should not be compromised or debased by weak policy which might be exploited by persistent “nibbling”. The 3 options are vaguely worded. Policy wording should include former strictures that “need” should be both “compelling” and “demonstrable”.
- Ferring: Retain strategic and Local Gaps essentially restricting non-agricultural development within them.

Development on the edge of settlements:

- Several comments received supporting this option, one of which is directly related to the promotion of a site.

Abandon:

Several comments received suggesting that strategic and local designations are not necessary for the protection of the countryside

- Rely on criteria based policies.
- Rely on assessment on a site by site basis.

- Rely on general countryside protection policies.

Review Gaps

- Follow guidance in PPS7, para 24.
- Should review strategic and local gap
- Strategic and Local Gaps can serve a useful function but they should only be imposed in the most sensitive locations where encroachment and coalescence is a genuine threat.
- These gaps need to be radically overhauled in Arun District to reflect what already exists on the ground.
- There are sites on the northern edge of the of Littlehampton, currently within the Strategic Gap, which the South East Plan directs for consideration as sustainable extensions to the built up area.

Other:

There are more creative ways of managing greenspace in urban areas.

None of these option protect the "natural environment and landscape" satisfactorily.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Retain Gaps:	4
Development on the edge of settlements:	1
Abandon:	3
Review Gaps	2
Other:	2

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options

53.3% of respondents who completed a questionnaire think that the Council should retain the Strategic and Local Gaps as they stand, essentially restricting non-agricultural development within them. Whilst 25.1% think that the gaps should be retained whilst allowing for development on the edge of settlements where justified and essential without giving rise to visual or perceived coalescence. A further 9.7% think we should abandon the principal of Strategic or Local Gaps altogether. These figures indicate that the majority of respondents favour protecting the gaps as they exist. However, the Council have received a number of other comments regarding this issue (listed above).

The final decision that the Council make regarding this topic will depend upon the results of the Urban Potential Study, the Landscape study and the emerging South East Plan.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Housing Locations

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q12 Which of the following do you think is the best approach to providing large-scale greenfield housing up to 2026? (please tick one option only)

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	A single new settlement which can be carefully planned to grow?	One new settlement up to 2017, plus a second new settlement somewhere else in the district?
Q12 Which of the following do you think is the best approach to providing large-scale greenfield housing up to 2026?	31.3%	39.0%	29.7%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Answers to this question were fairly evenly split. Nearly 40% favoured a single new settlement planned to grow beyond 2016, whilst nearly 30% favoured a second new settlement after 2016. Just over 30% provided no reply.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

There were 4 main categories of further comments relating to Q12.

Comments opposing new settlements altogether

- A number of respondents stated that they supported neither option. In addition, some stated that they opposed any greenfield development.

Comments favouring other options not listed

- Several respondents felt that the question as phrased was too restrictive, as there were other development options which were not being considered, for example urban extensions or development dispersed between several settlements.

Comments considering that the question is premature as further work is required

- This category of respondents felt that the question was premature, as the scale, form and location of development should follow from analysis of sustainability considerations and analysis of infrastructure.
- Some respondents felt that the option of urban extensions should be looked at before new settlements and others felt that further urban capacity studies were needed before the need for greenfield development was proven.

Comments supporting new settlement(s)

- Most of those who supported the principle of new settlements favoured the option of one large new settlement, with reasons given including economies of scale and greater potential to fund community infrastructure.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Oppose new settlements

Support neither option	8
Oppose any greenfield housing	3
Regeneration should be given priority	1
More housing should be provided on brownfield land	1

Favour other options

Question is too restricted/simplistic	7
Prefer urban extension (location not specified)	3
Prefer urban extension north of Littlehampton	2
Support one new settlement & smaller greenfield sites	1
Prefer several medium sized developments	1

Consider question premature

Depends on location/form of development, sustainability, infrastructure	6
Requirement for new settlement not proven	2
Urban capacity study needed	2

Further comments on options provided

Support for one new settlement	3
Support one major settlement – economies of scale/ community infrastructure	3
Specific comment on infrastructure	1

Locational Comments Analysis:

Not applicable as this question does not specify locations.

Implications for Preferred Options:

Further work will be undertaken to look at different development options in terms of settlement sustainability, landscape impacts, transport and other infrastructure requirements etc. A number of parallel background studies to consider these issues are now being undertaken as part of the development of Preferred Options.

One key outcome of the consultation on housing locations is that the Council needs to reconsider the option of providing additional housing through extensions to existing urban areas, as well as the possibility of new settlements.

There is also a need to provide up-to-date evidence on the amount of housing which could be provided on brownfield sites within existing settlements. This is being addressed through the Urban Housing Potential Study.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Infrastructure

Relevant Question Numbers:

- 13 What type of infrastructure do you think would most benefit the wider Arun Community?
Please prioritise by numbering options 1 the highest 14 the lowest.

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	Community facilities	Leisure	Educational facilities	Libraries	Employment land	Open space	Health facilities
Mean	5.33	6.85	4.14	8.81	6.58	4.43	3.34
Ranking by mean score	7	11	2	12	10	4	1

	Rail	Road - Bus	Road - Cars	Cycle facilities	Pedestrian facilities	Retail	Other
Mean	5.20	4.31	4.76	6.19	6.50	9.69	9.04
Ranking by mean score	6	3	5	8	9	14	13

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- The statistical results highlight the greatest concern for health and education infrastructure.
- Open space and transport infrastructure are also highlighted as important to the community.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Comments relating to *what type of infrastructure* that should be provided:

- Sustainable transport systems (different modes suggested).
- More roads to address existing deficiencies in various locations (specifically A27 Arundel bypass).
- Flood defences / flood mitigation.
- Utilities infrastructure (in particular water and waste water both in terms of need and the environment). Policy to specifically support the provision of utilities infrastructure required (Southern Water).
- Recreation facilities (specifically for youth).
- Housing (affordable and quality)
- High quality employment opportunities (Ford enterprise hub suggested)

Comments not relating directly to what type of infrastructure should be provided:

- Location of facilities (different types of facility mentioned, of particular concerns was schools and retail) must be accessible by sustainable transport methods.
- The improvement of existing facilities would increase sustainability.
- More information is required to identify what sort and where infrastructure should be provided.
- Infrastructure should be directly related to the demand created by new development as the first priority. Text should be redressed to reflect sentiment of Planning Obligations Circular 05/2005 (WSSC).
- Development that facilitates/requires infrastructure improvements will have wider benefits for the communities.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

- Sustainable transport (7)
- Road improvements (5)
- Flood defence/mitigation (5)

- Utilities (3)
- Recreation (4)
- Housing (3)
- Employment (2)

- Location of infrastructure (2)
- Improvements to existing infrastructure (1)
- Information (1)
- Delivery of infrastructure through planning obligations (4)

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

The majority of the comments received, specifically those relating to the provision of certain *types of infrastructure*, can be understood as either:

- A suggested type of infrastructure that was not present on the questionnaire list of options on the at all.
- Additional detail (either in terms of a specific need or a specific location) relating to a particular type of infrastructure.

The comments that do not relate to types of infrastructure raised issues that will be addressed through the Preferred Options, potentially requiring background work.

The issues raised and the implications for the Preferred Options are:

- How can the location of infrastructure and housing increase sustainability?

The accessibility (via public transport) of infrastructure needs to be assessed in relation to existing and future residential development. The settlement sustainability study will present this information using the Geographical Information System.

- Improvements in existing infrastructure provide the best opportunity for sustainability.

The sustainability of existing infrastructure needs to be assessed. The capacity/deficits of existing infrastructure needs to be assessed. The potential for expansion of existing infrastructure needs to be assessed. The implications of new built development for infrastructure needs to be modelled (this may relate to planning obligations standard charges work, or possibly existing WSCC guidance).

- Further information is required to make decisions on infrastructure requirements.

The work outlined above should provide the required information to address this concern.

- The legitimacy of using planning obligations to resolve existing infrastructure deficits.

The preferred options will have to ensure that the options it presents are consistent with government guidance. This will have to be addressed through a reassessment of Circular 05/2005 and possibly the consultation PPS3. Other LPA best practice with regard to the use of planning obligations may be useful (see planning obligations briefing notes).

Implications for Preferred Options:

- Each potential housing search area, will have to set out its requirements in terms of essential infrastructure.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Housing Locations

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q14 Bearing in mind the constraints to development discussed in the Core Strategy Issues and Options document, and indicated on the Constraints Map, in which of these general areas do you think a new strategic settlement(s) should be located? (Please place in order of priority with 1 being the highest priority and 9 being the lowest. As a minimum response, please prioritise the top 3).

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	Aldingbourne area	Angmering area	Barnham area	North of Bognor Regis
Which area(s) do you think a new strategic settlement(s) should be located?				
Mean*	5.18	3.51	4.40	3.22
Ranking by mean score	9	4	7	3
First (no. of mentions as top priority)	14	7	7	16
Second (no. of mentions as second top priority)	9	13	6	20
Third (no. of mentions as third top priority)	3	36	13	22
Total number of mentions in 'top 3'	26	56	26	58

(* mean score ranging from 1 = highest priority to 9 = lowest priority)

	Eastergate area	Ford area	North of Littlehampton	Yapton area	Another location ¹
Which area(s) do you think a new strategic settlement(s) should be located?					
Mean*	5.00	1.88	2.60	3.66	3.85
Ranking by mean score	8	1	2	5	6
First (no. of mentions as top priority)	5	88	24	6	7
Second (no. of mentions as second top priority)	8	15	59	19	4
Third (no. of mentions as third top priority)	7	13	26	26	3
Total number of mentions in 'top 3'	20	116	109	51	14

(* mean score ranging from 1 = highest priority to 9 = lowest priority)

Note:

¹ 14 additional locations were mentioned within Arun and 5 outside the District.

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Of the locations listed, the Ford area is the clear favourite, followed by North of Littlehampton, with North of Bognor Regis as the third most popular choice.
- However, geographical analysis of responses indicates that this result has been heavily skewed by the high proportion of comments from Aldingbourne residents (see below).

Comments Analysis Part 1:

A small number of respondents made additional comments relating to this question. Of these, the only issues which were raised by more than one person are as follows.

- Don't accept that a new strategic settlement is needed: 5
- Preference should be given to brownfield sites: 3
- The question conflicts with Q12: 3

The view that this question conflicts with Q12 presumably arises because this question asks respondents to prioritise at least 3 potential locations for development, whereas Q12 asks whether respondents support one or two new strategic settlements. However, this question is merely asking people to rank potential locations in terms of suitability/preference, it makes no assumptions about how many locations will be required.

Locational Comments Analysis:

Aldingbourne residents account for a high proportion of total responses received (92 out of the total of 195 responses) and this has a significant impact on the overall results to this question. Further analysis has therefore been undertaken to assess the responses of Aldingbourne residents in comparison to those living elsewhere. The results of this analysis are set out below.

Aldingbourne residents

	Mean*	Rank	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Top 3 choices
Aldingbourne area	7.74	9	2	0	0	2
Angmering area	3.30	3	2	9	24	35
Barnham area	5.62	7	1	1	2	4
North of Bognor Regis	3.74	5	1	9	16	26
Eastergate area	6.71	8	0	1	1	2
Ford area	1.41	1	72	4	5	81
North of Littlehampton	2.32	2	10	47	18	75
Yapton area	3.33	4	1	13	18	32
Other location	5.06	6	2	2	1	5

Non-Aldingbourne residents

	Mean*	Rank	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Top 3 choices
Aldingbourne area	3.37	5	12	9	3	24
Angmering area	3.82	8	5	4	12	21
Barnham area	3.59	6	6	5	11	22
North of Bognor Regis	2.57	2	15	11	6	32
Eastergate area	3.79	7	5	7	6	18
Ford area	2.78	3	16	11	8	35
North of Littlehampton	3.11	4	14	12	8	34
Yapton area	4.11	9	5	6	8	19
Other location	2.09	1	5	2	2	9

Note: (* mean score ranging from 1 = highest priority to 9 = lowest priority)

- For Aldingbourne residents, the Ford area is the overwhelming first preference with 72 out of the 92 Aldingbourne respondents making this first choice and 81 placing it in their top 3. North of Littlehampton is the clear second favourite, with 75 Aldingbourne respondents placing it in the top 3. Not surprisingly, the Aldingbourne area itself is the least favoured option among this group.
- The pattern of responses given by non-Aldingbourne residents is much more evenly spread. All the locations listed receive some support, with the most popular first choices spread quite evenly between Ford (16 responses), north of Bognor Regis (15), north of Littlehampton (14) and Aldingbourne (12). A fairly similar pattern is apparent in the analysis of top 3 preferences, with the

Ford area, north of Littlehampton and north of Bognor Regis being the most favoured locations. There is also a significant, though lower level of preference, for development at locations in the 'Five Villages' area (Aldingbourne area, Barnham area and Eastergate area).

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

This question asks about potential locations for major strategic development and the results to some extent reflect the locational distribution of respondents answering the question. In particular the very high proportion of Aldingbourne residents has influenced the overall results, as can be seen from the locational analysis of replies shown above.

However, taking account of this locational bias, the overall pattern which emerges is a general preference for three locations – the Ford area, north of Littlehampton and north of Bognor Regis, followed by the 'Five Villages' area (split between Aldingbourne, Barnham and Eastergate).

Implications for Preferred Options:

Before ruling any locations in or out of the Preferred Options further studies will be undertaken to assess the options which perform best in terms of sustainability and which perform best in transport terms.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Housing Locations

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q15 With regard to smaller greenfield locations, which of the following development options should be pursued? (please tick one of the following options)

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Development nearer / adjacent to the urban areas of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton...	Development should be distributed to various settlements across the District	A mixture of both approaches should be considered
Q15 With regard to smaller greenfield locations which of the following development options should be pursued?	13.8%	42.1%	16.9%	27.2%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- There is a general preference for development nearer or adjacent to the Bognor Regis and Littlehampton, with 42% favouring this option.
- About 17% of respondents favour distributing development to various settlements across the District.
- Around 27% favour a mixture of both approaches.

Comments Analysis:

A few additional comments were received, including the following points.

- Development adjacent to urban areas is the most sustainable option, as it would capitalise on existing services and facilities.
- Distribution of development across various settlements would tend to generate more traffic.
- Additional development would risk swallowing up village communities.
- Small scale development if carefully considered could be used to improve support/services.
- A sequential approach should be used which takes account of local context and not simply a settlement hierarchy approach (Countryside Agency).

Locational Comments Analysis:

	No reply	Development nearer / adjacent to the urban areas of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton...	Development should be distributed to various settlements across the District	A mixture of both approaches should be considered
Q15 With regard to smaller greenfield locations which of the following development options should be pursued?				
Aldingbourne residents	10.9%	55.4%	9.8%	23.9%
Residents elsewhere	16.5%	30.1%	23.3%	30.1%
All residents	13.8%	42.1%	16.9%	27.2%

- Not surprisingly, there are some differences in responses when analysed by location. For example, 55% of Aldingbourne residents favour Option 1 - development nearer or adjacent to the urban areas of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton.
- Among residents elsewhere, Option 1 is favoured by only 30%, the same proportion as favour Option 3.

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

The responses to this question tend to reflect some of the answers given to other questions on housing location. Among respondents overall, there is a preference for urban extensions to Bognor Regis and Littlehampton rather than extensions to

villages, although a significant number of people favour a combination of both approaches. However, if the large number of responses from Aldingbourne residents are taken out, the analysis shows a more even split, with equal numbers of people favouring Option 1 and Option 3, and more than 20% supporting Option 2.

Implications for Preferred Options:

Before ruling any locations in or out of the Preferred Options further studies will be undertaken to assess the options which perform best in terms of sustainability and which perform best in transport terms.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Housing Locations

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q16 Bearing in mind the constraints to development discussed in the Core Strategy Issues and Options document, and indicated on the Constraints Map, do you think small scale development should be located at any of the following locations? (Please tick all that apply)

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	South of Arundel	South of Eastergate	North of Elmer	North of Middleton
Q16 Bearing in mind the constraints to development discussed in the Core Strategy Issues and Options document, and indicated on the Constraints Map, do you think small scale development should be located at any of the following locations?	26.2%	21.5%	16.4%	17.9%	27.2%

	North of Pagham	North of Rustington	North of Westergate	Any of the Downland villages *	Another location
Q16 Bearing in mind the constraints to development discussed in the Core Strategy Issues and Options document, and indicated on the Constraints Map, do you think small scale development should be located at any of the following locations?	18.5%	29.7%	14.9%	17.4%	16.9%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- The main point indicated by the answers is that there is limited support for small scale development at any of the locations listed with all the locations listed receiving under 30% support.
- Aside from this, it is difficult to discern any clear pattern of preference. The best supported options were North of Rustington with 30% and Middleton-on-Sea which received 27% support.

Comments Analysis:

A few additional comments were received, including the following points.

- Development adjacent to urban areas is the most sustainable option, as it would capitalise on existing services and facilities.
- Distribution of development across various settlements would tend to generate more traffic.
- Additional development would risk swallowing up village communities.
- Small scale development if carefully considered could be used to improve support/services.
- A sequential approach should be used which takes account of local context and not simply a settlement hierarchy approach (Countryside Agency).

Locational Comments Analysis:

No locational analysis has been undertaken for this question.

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

The responses to this question tend to reflect some of the answers given to other questions on housing location. Among the respondents, there is a preference for urban extensions to Bognor Regis and Littlehampton rather than extensions to villages, although many people would support a combination of both approaches. However, the answers may be skewed by a higher number of responses from people living in the rural parishes, particularly Aldingbourne.

Implications for Preferred Options:

Before ruling any locations in or out of the Preferred Options further studies will be undertaken to assess the options which perform best in terms of sustainability and which perform best in transport terms.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Affordable Housing

Relevant Question Numbers:

- Q17 With regard to the provision of affordable housing, do you think Arun District Council should: (please tick all that apply)
- Consider if smaller sites under the affordable housing threshold can contribute to affordable housing provision in some way – for example through some form of contribution scheme?
 - Lower the threshold at which it negotiates for affordable dwellings to 15 units?
 - Lower the threshold at which it negotiates for affordable dwellings to 10 units?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Consider if smaller sites under the affordable housing threshold...	Lower the threshold at which it negotiates for affordable dwellings to 15 units?	Lower the threshold at which it negotiates for affordable dwellings to 10 units?
With regards to the provision of affordable housing, do you think Arun District Council should:	23.1%	39.0%	23.6%	30.8%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Highest number of respondents to this question indicated that consideration should be given to how small sites under a threshold can contribute to affordable housing provision.
- Of the two options proposing a threshold, a threshold of 10 units was preferred.
- Over 20% of questionnaire respondents did not reply to this question.
- Please note that more than one option could be ticked.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Object to any proposed changes (1)
 - None of these options (1)
 - Reference to South East Plan affordable housing target (1)
 - Need to comply with government guidance (2)
 - Need to ensure viability of any changes to thresholds (2)
 - Basing thresholds on local needs assessment (2)
- Of these above points, respondents tend to be developers.
- Affordable housing for local families/ key workers only (1)
 - Affordable housing should not be occupied by anti-social tenants (1)

- Affordable housing should be decided before considering approach to locations of new development – should be where people work.
- Site specific comments:
 - Pagham PC acknowledges local need for affordable housing (1)
 - Affordable housing needed in Rustington (1)
- Comments relating to use of mobile homes as affordable housing, including outside of BUA, and include this approach as part of an affordable housing strategy. (1)

Comments Analysis Part 2:

- Reference to government guidance (2)
- Reference to Regional Affordable Housing Target (1)
- Use of Housing Needs Assessments (2)
- Role of mobile homes for affordable housing (1)
- Site specific comments (2)
- Reference to viability (2)
- Affordable homes for local people/ key workers/ non anti-social (2)
- Wish to object/ none of these options/ propose another policy (2)

Implications for Preferred Options

- It will be vital to ensure that any threshold chosen ensures that development remains viable.
- A local Housing Needs Assessment has already been undertaken, and is likely to be updated in due course.
- Due to the large number of “small” sites under both existing, and potential thresholds, it will be important to consider how smaller residential developments can contribute to meeting affordable housing need.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Affordable Housing

Relevant Question Numbers:

- Q18 If it is demonstrated to be viable, do you think:
- The percentage of affordable housing sought should be raised?
 - The percentage should only be raised if it includes a specific proportion (say 10%) for Key Worker housing?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	The percentage of affordable housing sought should be raised?	The % should only be raised if it includes a specific proportion (say 10%) for key worker housing
If it is demonstrated to be viable, do you think:	25.1%	20.5%	54.4%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Approximately a quarter of questionnaire respondents did not respond to this question.
- Over half of questionnaire respondents that did, thought that the percentage of affordable housing sought should only be increased if it were to include a specific proportion for key workers.

Comments Analysis Part 1 & 2

- Should be shared equity (1)
- Disagrees with both options (1)
- Affordable housing should be Key Worker (1)
- Over 30% not viable or could prejudice viability (2)
- Strategic settlement and lowering site threshold would provide considerable additional affordable housing anyway (1)
- Percentage should stay same – could include element for key workers (1)
- Only increase for key workers (1)
- Need up to date Housing Needs Survey (2)

Implications for Preferred Options

- Key messages are the need to ensure viability.
- Any change in proportion is based on up to date evidence, and consistent with government guidance.
- Viability work will need to be carried out, in conjunction with consideration of thresholds/ small sites, to ensure a consistent approach.

Q19 Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Affordable Housing

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q19 Should the Council:

- Option A: Consider allocating some land within or adjoining rural villages for affordable need only?
- Option B: Rely only on the “exception sites” approach?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Option A: Consider allocating some land within or adjoining rural villages for affordable need only?	Option B: Rely only on the “exceptions sites” approach?
Should the Council:	30.8%	30.8%	38.5%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Just under one-third of questionnaire respondents did not respond to this question.
- Of those who responded, a majority preferred to rely only on the exceptions site approach, and not allocate for affordable homes in rural areas. However, it should be noted that there was only a 7.7% difference.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

A few respondents have commented upon the options presented in the questions:

- Allocating some land could have sustainability benefits as it allows for a more considered and targeted approach based on needs. (Countryside Agency)
- Land allocated in or adjoining rural areas should always be subject to a comprehensive selection process taking account of environmental, social and economic factors. (Countryside Agency)
- Option A could create “hope value” on sites, which could raise purchase price and make delivery difficult (1)

A small number of comments were received on affordable housing in general:

- Allocating land exclusively for affordable housing is not permitted under PPG3 and Circular 11/98 (1)
- Neither options will work – need mixed tenure to ensure delivery (1)
- Affordable housing should not be forced into developments of higher value (1)

Some respondents made comments of areas where affordable rural housing could or should be located:

- Any/All villages (6)
- No areas at all(2)
- WW2 airfield (1)
- Paghams (1)
- North Eastergate (1)
- Downland villages (2)
- Former glasshouses at Aldingbourne and Eastergate and Barnham (only for sheltered housing) (1)

Several comments were received which suggested criteria or conditions that should be applied to affordable housing in rural areas, these included:

- Only local people with no anti-social problems (1)
- Housing in accordance with Parish Plans (1)
- Housing linked with proven need (1)
- Housing where there are sufficient transport facilities(1)
- Housing in those settlements that perform well as service centres (1)
- Brownfield sites (1)
- within villages, not adjoining (1)

A small number of additional comments were also received:

- Allocations should make provision for gypsy sites (this comment also included in analysis of gypsy and traveller section) (1)
- a health centre at Barnham is required(1)

Implications for Preferred Options

Need to decide, in conjunction with locations strategy, whether allocations for affordable homes will be made, or whether the exceptions sites policy will be relied on to contribute towards meeting rural affordable needs. This will need to be considered in conjunction with Housing Needs Study and the Council’s Housing Waiting List. Issue of allocating for affordable housing is addressed in emerging government guidance.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Housing Section

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q 20 Do you think the council should:

- Try to encourage a range of dwelling sizes in all types development (both private and affordable)?
- Try to encourage a mix of dwelling sizes, but only in larger developments (e.g. 25 dwellings or more)?
- Leave the choice to developers and not try to influence the number of smaller dwellings?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Try to encourage a range of dwelling sizes in all types of devts* (both private and "affordable")?	Try to encourage a mix of dwelling sizes, but only in larger devts* (e.g. 25 dwellings or more)?	Leave the choice to developers, and not try to influence the number of smaller dwellings?
Do you think the Council should:	11.3%	48.2%	30.3%	10.3%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- The majority of respondents to the questionnaire indicated that the Council should try to encourage a mix of dwelling sizes in all types of developments (both private and affordable).
- Approximately 10% felt that the choice of dwellings mix should be left to developers.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- 3 respondents commented that the choice should be left to the developer – option 3. Of these, all were developers. 2 of these relate to the need to provide accommodation according to the market.
- 3 others state a preference for a mix. One states this is important to avoid “ghettoisation” and allow families to remain in a locality as they grow; one states this should be achieved with sensitive architectural style, and one relates dwelling mix to local housing need, and enhancement of local character.
- One respondent states that the last option could be incompatible with government advice. (This option was least supported by respondents who answered this question).

Implications for Preferred Options

The questionnaire results reflect support in influencing residential dwellings mix of private sector development.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Employment Section

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q 21 Should some sites in rural areas be allocated for employment uses?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q21 Should some sites in rural areas be allocated for employment uses?	10.8%	35.4%	17.9%	11.3%	24.6%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 47% of questionnaire respondents either did not respond to this question, required further information or were not sure how to respond/ had no clear view.
- Of those who responded yes or no, the majority were in favour of allocating some sites in rural areas for employment uses.

Comments Analysis

- Meeting rural needs / rural needs only (3)

- Employment areas in the countryside should be appropriate to the rural economy (1)
- Existing rural sites should be fully utilized. (1)
- Need to ensure appropriate businesses not involve high levels of vehicle movement/ create noise/ interfere with residential environments. (2)
- A comprehensive rural development strategy is taken into consideration when preparing Core Strategy policy in relation to rural employment sites. Such sites need to be carefully identified and developed to help support the rural economy and workforce, and any development should respect the landscape and settlement character of rural areas. (Countryside Agency) (1)
- There appears, from the comments/ letters received, to be some feeling that employment land should be made available in rural areas, but also some concern that it is appropriate to the countryside location.

Implications for Preferred Options

Further analysis of the recent Employment Needs Study is required to look at employment requirements of differing types, and in locations across the district. The study includes some suggested criteria relating to employment sites in the countryside, which could be compared with the existing Local Plan policy, and relevant changes proposed if required. It will be important to work closely with the Economic and Cultural Development team in considering these issues.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Employment

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q22 What types of employment facilities should be provided in Arun District?

- Small starter units
- 'Move on' units for growing businesses
- Business parks
- Sites for offices
- Sites for warehouse and distribution facilities
- General industrial / Business areas

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Small starter units (also known as "incubator" units)	"Move on" units for growing businesses	Business Parks	Sites for offices	Sites for warehouse and distribution facilities	General industrial / business areas
Q22 What types of employment facilities should be provided in Arun District?	22.6%	55.4%	45.1%	39.5%	31.8%	18.5%	31.3%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Nearly 23% of questionnaire respondents did not reply to this question.
- Of those who did, small starter units were indicated most frequently, and “move on” units the next.
- Warehouse/ distribution were indicated the least.

(Please note that more than one option could be ticked).

Comments Analysis:

- There are no particularly evident trends, in terms of the comments made.
- Reference to results of Employment Study (1)
- Need for the Core Strategy to ensure existing businesses can relocate within Arun/ Chichester districts (1)
- Need to ensure requirements can be met in terms of location/ variety of employment space. (1)
- Need to consider horticulture, and associated need for water (1)
- Need to encourage working from home to reduce commuting; could include rate reductions on homes used for teleworking and training in use of new technology (1)
- Need to encourage organisations developing and producing new technologies, especially green energy and sustainable building, transport, etc. (1)
- No more development of this type, as regionally there are sufficient facilities (1)
- Existing sites in the area should be redeveloped first, before adding more (1)
- Development of employment facilities should be for the private sector only (1)
- Offices only in attractive areas (1)
- Query: why land used formerly for commercial activities has been redeveloped for residential purposes (1)

Implications for Preferred Options

The recent Employment Needs Study will be of use, in addition to the Issues and Options consultation exercises, to determining the form and location of employment provision. It will be necessary to work closely with the Economic and Cultural Department.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Employment

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q23 Do you think that the Council should consider the allocation of Employment Protection Areas to ensure that existing employment land is not lost to other uses?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Do you think that the Council should consider the allocation of Employment Protection Areas to ensure that existing employment land is not lost to other uses?	15.9%	36.9%	19.0%	15.9%	12.3%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Approximately 44% of questionnaires either did not respond to this question, were not sure, or required more information.
- Of those who indicated either yes or no, the majority were in favour of allocating Employment Protection Areas.

Comments Analysis:

- Need to retain employment land in urban areas (unless no longer needed)(1)
Developer comments:
 - Land should not be protected for employment use “for the sake of it”, and that redevelopment for alternative uses should be permissible, even if it resulted in additional/ replacement employment land elsewhere (1)
 - Reference to the requirement in PPG3 that redundant employment sites be reconsidered for alternative uses, and believes that the proposal could be contrary to government advice, and restrict urban capacity (1)

Implications for Preferred Options:

PPG3 requires a review of non-residential allocations. The recent Employment Needs study has assessed a range of existing employment sites. The study also indicates a need for provision of a variety of types of premises for employment uses, required in locations across the district, and a shortage of employment land. It is therefore likely that a mechanism to ensure the retention of employment land (unless it is demonstrated it is not required) will be addressed through the Core Strategy.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Density

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q24 Which approach do you think the Council should adopt towards housing densities?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Maintain the current approach – a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare...	Increase the minimum to 40 dwellings per hectare	Have a min density of 30 dwlgs p.h., but encourage higher densities in certain areas eg town centres	Encourage higher densities provided that this would not harm the character or townscape of an area	Encourage higher densities in all locations that are well-served by public transport
Which approach do you think the Council should adopt towards housing densities?	13.3%	30.8%	3.1%	30.3%	8.7%	13.8%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 30.8% of respondents to the questionnaire think that the Council should maintain the current approach (a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare unless the character of a specific area might be harmed).
- 30.3% think that the Council should have a density of 30 Dwellings per hectare but encourage densities in certain areas.
- 13.8% think that higher densities should be encouraged in all locations that are well served by public transport

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Higher densities:

- Council should adopt 30 dwellings per hectare as minimum density standard, but encourage densities in excess of 50 dwellings per hectare at places where accessibility to good public transport is available within the settlements identified in the Core Strategy as forming part of the Sub Regional Urban Centre, Principal Towns and Towns subject to design and layout considerations.

- Higher densities should be well served by public transport and encouraged around existing transport modes.
- Encourage higher densities in certain defined areas like town centres.

Character:

- Density per se is a meaningless concept. Policies concerning density need to take into account character of local area and quality of design.

Transport:

- Q24 Favours development in areas with good access to public transport. Network Rail is funded to maintain the existing railway and do not have monies for enhancements. Would welcome support from the Council to improve stations and facilitate minor infrastructure projects to cope with growth. Higher density development, incorporating mixed use activities around stations could directly (where Network Rail estate land is used) or indirectly (through s106 contributions) support station improvement works. Where land in NR ownership is no longer required for operational railway, there is often potential for redevelopment, leading to wider regeneration benefits. It would be reasonable to provide for the pooling of planning contributions that are taken from developments in order to fund significant improvements to transport infrastructure.

Other:

- Consideration should be given to land take implications of SUDS. Core Strategy should also consider the issue of green

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Higher densities	3
Character	1
Transport	1
Other	1

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A.

Implications for the Preferred Options.

Higher densities are welcomed by some individuals but only when supported by public transport or in certain location that would ideally be served by it. This is especially clear in the statistical analysis where 30.3% think that the Council should have a density of 30 Dwellings per hectare but encourage densities in certain areas

and 13.8% think that higher densities should be encouraged in all locations that are well served by public transport. However, it should be noted that 30.8% think we should maintain the current approach. The final result will depend upon the results of the Urban Potential Study and the Landscape study.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Town Centres and Retail Development

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q25 Where do you think new retail development should be located? (please tick)

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	In existing town centres	On the edge of towns	Out of towns
Q25 Where do you think that new retail development should be located?	11.3%	63.1%	30.3%	8.2%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- The strongest preference (63% of those answering) is for new retail development to be located in existing town centres.
- A significant minority of respondents (30%) want new retail development to be located on the edge of towns.
- There is relatively little support (8%) for retail development out of towns.

Note: The percentages add to more than 100% as more than one answer was allowed.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- No retail development needed, as towns already have vacant shops.
- There are already enough out of town sites which are killing town centres.
- Different types of shops are appropriate to different locations.
- The sequential test should be applied, giving priority to town centres, as set out in PPS6.
- Would be concerned about large scale out of town retail development (Highways Agency).
- The question gives the impression that there is an unrestrained choice between town centre, edge of town or out of town locations, whereas planning policy (PPS6) requires a sequential approach to be adopted (West Sussex CC).
- Existing town centres should be supported and enhanced, but local centres may also be needed to support large scale residential development.
- Small scale retail development is appropriate in village centres.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

- A sequential approach should be applied: 3
- Preference should be given to town centres: 6
- Lack of support for out of town development: 3
- Small scale development may be appropriate on edge of towns/village centres: 2
- New retail development is needed to support new residential development: 1

Locational Comments Analysis:

Not applicable.

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

Most respondents clearly feel that town centres should be the priority for new retail development. A substantial minority do support further retail development on edge of town or out of town locations, but there were also a number of comments that further out of centre retail development should be prevented.

The comments received generally support the direction of existing national and Local Plan policy which requires that a sequential approach is adopted in locating new retail development, giving first preference to town centres. This broad policy will be carried forward into the LDF.

A further significant comment is that smaller scale retail development may be desirable in local centres outside the main towns and to support the proposed large scale residential developments.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Town Centres and Retail Development

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q26 Do you agree with the principle of encouraging certain uses in certain parts of town centres?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q26 Do you agree with the principle of encouraging certain uses in certain parts of the town centres?	15.4%	39.0%	12.3%	13.3%	20.0%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- There is moderate support for the principle of encouraging certain uses in certain parts of town centres, with nearly 40% of respondents supporting the idea compared to only 12% who didn't.
- However, nearly 50% of those responding either didn't reply, weren't sure or felt they needed more information.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Comment about Bognor Regis Masterplan – doesn't directly relate to the issue raised in this question.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

No comments made relate directly to this issue.

Locational Comments Analysis:

Not applicable.

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

There was no strong response to this question. Many respondents favour the idea of encouraging different uses in different parts of town centres, but a larger number expressed no view or felt that they needed more information.

The concept of promoting different town centre 'quarters' is set out in the Bognor Regis Masterplan and a similar approach could be adopted in Littlehampton. In practice, such an approach would have to be pursued through detailed area-based planning policies and planning briefs or proposals for specific identified town centre sites, which have need to be linked to clear implementation strategies and funding. It requires a comprehensive 'master planning' approach which it is intended to take forward through the preparation of Area Action Plans for Bognor Regis and Littlehampton town centres at a later stage of the LDF process.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Town Centres and Retail Development

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q27 Should the Council try to further control the mix of uses by designating 'secondary shopping frontages' within the town centres?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

		No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q27	Should the Council try to further control the mix of uses by designating 'secondary shopping frontages' within the town centres?	17.9%	23.1%	13.8%	23.1%	22.1%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- As with the previous question, the answers here seem to indicate that people are unclear about the implications of such a policy. 23% of responses support the idea, whilst 14% oppose it. However over 60% of those responding either didn't reply, weren't sure or felt they needed more information.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

No further comments were received.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

No further comments were received.

Locational Comments Analysis:

Not applicable.

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

Again there was no clear response to this question, probably indicating that respondents are unclear about what such a policy would entail, or what difference it would make.

Implications for Preferred Options:

The designation of 'secondary shopping frontages' would be appropriate on the edge of the larger town centres, particularly Bognor Regis and Littlehampton, where it would enable a degree of planning control to be applied, preventing the wholesale conversion of shopping areas to other uses. It is likely that the principle of designating 'secondary shopping frontages' will be incorporated into policies in the Core Strategy, but the detailed definition of areas where the policy would apply would be included in subsequent Local Development Documents.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Town Centres and Retail Development

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q28 What else can be done to ensure that the towns of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton become more competitive?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

Not applicable as the question was open ended.

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

Not applicable.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

As this was an open ended question, a very wide range of comments was received. The main themes can be summarised under the following headings.

- Range and type of shops. Several respondents feel that the town centres need to attract more High Street stores and larger established chains (such as Marks & Spencer to Bognor Regis). Others consider that a wider choice of shops is needed or that the centres need to attract more high quality/upmarket shops.
- Parking. The largest number of comments concerned parking issues. Of these, the majority are arguing for lower parking charges or free parking, either for short stay parking, at certain times of the day, or all the time. A significant number of additional respondents mention improving parking facilities in general.
- Transport. A number of respondents mention the need to improve transport and accessibility overall. Several comments referred to specific road improvements which would benefit Bognor Regis and Littlehampton and several people mention improvements to public transport.
- Town centre environment. A number of respondents mention improving the general environment of the town centres, both in terms of cleaner streets, less litter etc, and through improvements to the built environment. Some comments also relate to the provision of specific facilities and addressing anti-social behaviour.
- Town centre facilities. A number of respondents refer to improving entertainment, leisure and/or cultural facilities as a way of drawing more people to the town centres.

- Regeneration/development. Several respondents feel that regeneration or 'master planning' would be the best way to revitalise the town centres. There are references to the Bognor Regis Masterplan and specific regeneration proposals such as Bognor seafront and the Littlehampton waterfront.
- Local economy. Quite a few respondents feel that the way to regenerate the town centres is through measures to boost the local economy as a whole. A significant number of responses refer to measures to encourage businesses or create higher quality employment. Some people mention specific incentives such as grants or lower business rates. Several respondents also feel that new residential and/or employment development locally would help boost the town centres and help sustain more shops and facilities.

A detailed breakdown of comments by category is included below.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Comments on range/type of shops

Encourage larger retailers/high street stores	9
Encourage wider range of shops	8
Encourage better quality/upmarket shops	7
Keep/encourage small independent shops	3
Reduce charity shops	1
Encourage local/farm produce	1
Stop 'moving' shops out	1
Limit out of town retail parks	1

Comments on transport/parking

Provide low cost/free parking	23
Improve parking facilities (not specified)	9
Improve transport links/infrastructure (not specified)	7
Improve road access/infrastructure	7
Improve public transport	7
Improve rail links	2
Improve cycle and pedestrian access	2
Provide park and ride services	2
Increase parking space	1

Comments on town centre environment

Cleaner streets/tidy up town centres/environmental improvements	9
Crack down on anti-social behaviour	3
Improve toilets	2
Too much development	1
Tidy up shop frontages	1
Better signage	1
Encourage re-occupation of vacant shop units	1

Comments on town centre facilities

Provide leisure/entertainment/cultural facilities	7
Provide shopping malls	1
Encourage good restaurants	1

Comments on regeneration/development

Promote regeneration schemes/masterplanning	10
Improve the waterfront	2
Encourage mixed uses	1

Comments on local economy

Encourage business development/higher earning jobs	14
Provide more housing/development to support better shops	5
Lower rents/business rates	3
Provide grants/incentives for businesses/retailers	2
Encourage more tourism	1
Improve education	1
Charge full rates on empty shops	1
Plan for specific retail & service businesses	1

Other

Advertisng/image promotion	2
----------------------------	---

Locational Comments Analysis:

Not applicable.

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

The question was open ended and this is reflected in the wide range of responses received. The answers generally recognise that the success of the town centres and the towns as a whole depends on many inter-connected factors. Whilst some of these relate directly to planning policy, others relate more to other policy areas such as economic development, transport and parking. The LDF needs to take a holistic joined up approach linking land use planning to wider policies and initiatives.

Key areas raised which need to be addressed include:

- Improving the range and quality of shops, including attracting larger High Street stores;
- Parking policies – there is strong support for lower parking charges or free parking, but this will need to be balanced against wider aims of transport policy, e.g to reduce traffic in town centres to create safer and more pedestrian friendly environments;
- Transport and accessibility – including support for both road improvements and improved public transport;
- Improving the general environment and facilities in town centres;

- Encouraging more visitors to town centres, by providing a wider range of entertainment, leisure and cultural facilities;
- Promoting the physical regeneration of town centres, by (re)developing key sites;
- Promoting the local economy generally, through initiatives to attract or develop businesses and through providing additional land for employment and some residential development.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Town Centres and Retail Development

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q29 Should we secure the retention of local shops?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q29 Should we secure the retention of local shops?	13.8%	76.9%	2.6%	2.1%	4.6%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- There is very strong support for the retention of local shops, with 77% of respondents answering 'Yes' to this question.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Additional comments received:

- Essential local shops should be retained, such as foodstores and post offices.
- Local shops should be supported and retained in villages and rural areas.
- Only commercially successful and good quality shops should be retained.
- It should be left to market forces.
- How (can this be achieved)?
- The question, as worded, gives the impression that local authorities can directly maintain shops through planning policy. Would favour policy similar to Chichester DC's policy which sets a criterion for change of use that it would not result in the loss of a community facility. (WSCC)
- Redevelopment for alternative uses may be appropriate where it can be demonstrated that an existing shop is no longer viable.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Retain essential local shops/community facilities: 4
Retain successful good quality shops: 1
Leave it to market forces: 1
Questions how this could be achieved: 1
Allow alternative uses where shop no longer viable: 1
Other comments: 3

Locational Comments Analysis:

Not applicable.

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

Overall, there is very strong support for policies to secure the retention of local shops, particularly those providing essential day-to-day facilities in villages and smaller centres.

Implications for Preferred Options:

The main issue is how far planning policy can achieve this objective. One approach might be to include a reference to essential community facilities in policies relating to provision of new development and to ensure that relevant development control policies include protection of community facilities as a criterion.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Tourism

Relevant Question Numbers:

- 30 Do you agree with the identification of Core Areas for Tourism in Littlehampton and Bognor Regis?
31 Do you consider that Arundel, although not a coastal resort, should also be designated as a Core Area for Tourism?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q30 Do you agree with the identification of Core Areas for tourism in Littlehampton and Bognor Regis?	14.4%	62.1%	4.6%	9.7%	9.2%

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q31 Do you consider that Arundel, although not a coastal resort, should also be designated as a "core area" for tourism?	11.8%	69.2%	9.2%	5.1%	4.6%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- More people thought that Arundel should be designated a Core Area for Tourism than thought Bognor Regis and Littlehampton should be allocated as a Core Area for Tourism.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- To not identify Bognor Regis and Littlehampton as Core Tourism Areas would (probably) contravene the Draft SE Plan Part 1 (WSCC)
- Questioning whether quality of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton is sufficient to be designated as a core area.
- Promotion of Tourism but not at the expense of adequate protection of natural and historic environment.
- Identification/promotion of specific locations with tourism value.
- Identification/promotion of specific types of tourist activity "specific policies should support and encourage retention, consolidation, enhancement, diversification and intensification".

Comments Analysis Part 2:

- Promotion of tourism and protection of the environment: 3
- Tourist locations: 2
- Tourist activities: 2

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Comments Analysis Conclusions:

- There is a conflict between apparent requirement of the draft South East Plan to designate Bognor Regis and Littlehampton as Core Areas for Tourism and whether these resorts are actually considered quality tourist destinations.
- The comments that identify/promote certain activities important to tourism in the district potentially indicate the type of policy tools employed in a Tourism Core Area. It may be necessary to identify, through research, the type of built development policy tools that would support or hinder tourism i.e. increasing the standard of the rights of way network or allowing for diversification of certain types of tourist accommodation in Core Areas.

- The specific tourism locations identified in the comments may indicate areas to be included in tourism Core Areas.
- There is a clear need to ensure that the Core Areas for Tourism are consistent with protection policies.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Open Space.

Relevant Question Numbers:

- 32 Do you agree that areas with a concentration of flats or terraces and identified open space deficiencies should be prioritised for improvements in open space provision.

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q32 Do you agree that areas with a concentration of flats or terraces and identified open space deficiencies should be prioritised for improvements in open space provision?	12.3%	66.2%	7.2%	6.2%	8.2%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 66.2% agree that areas with a concentration of flats or terraces and identified open space deficiencies should be prioritised for improvements in open space provision.
- 26.7% of all respondents either did not reply, were not sure or required more information.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Open space provision prioritisation should be Countryside made in the context of a wider open space and green network strategy. Any strategy for improving open space provision should consider opportunities for a wide range of functions e.g. recreation, biodiversity, flood storage, improved links between town and country. In addition, innovative ways of building 'outdoor' space into high-density development should be advocated e.g. green roofs, balconies etc.
- Do not build on Royal Norfolk Hotel Land! Restore to former glory. Remove hedge - have wrought Iron fence similar to Styne. Improve landscaping e.g. like Hothampton Park. Also park near Butlins could be like Hothampton Park - extend the park. Buy the land!!! ASAP urgent!!!

Comments Analysis Part 2:

N/A

Implications for Preferred Options:

66.2% agree that areas with a concentration of flats or terraces and identified open space deficiencies should be prioritised for improvements in open space provision. This is opposed to 7.2% who did not agree. Therefore, in conclusion the Preferred Options should focus improvements for open space provision should be focused in areas with a high concentration of flats or terraces that have a open space deficiency.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Open Space

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q33 Do you agree that in areas with a concentration of flats or terraces open spaces should perform the same role as back gardens?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q33 Do you agree that in areas with a concentration of flats or terraces open spaces should perform the same role as back gardens?	12.3%	46.2%	19.0%	10.8%	11.8%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 46.2% of respondents who filled out a questionnaire agree with the idea that areas with a high concentration of flats or terraces open spaces should perform the same role as back gardens.
- 34.9% either did not reply, weren't sure or need more information.
- 19.0% disagree.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Not possible unless the public are excluded
- As modern houses have such tiny gardens it is imperative there is plenty of open space and playing fields for young people.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Excluding the general public 1
Open space is important 1

Implications for the Preferred Options

In conclusion open spaces should perform the same role as back gardens in areas with a high concentration of flats or terraces

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Open Space

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q34 Should priorities for improvements in Children's play facilities be:

- Targeted at those areas where there are inadequate existing facilities?
- Or should another approach be taken?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Targeted at those areas where there are inadequate existing facilities?	Or should another approach be taken? Please supply details below.
Should priorities for improvements in children's play facilities be:	17.9%	75.9%	6.2%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 75.9% of respondents who completed the questionnaire believe that the improvements for children's play facilities should be targeted at those areas where there are inadequate existing facilities.
- 6.2% feel that another approach should be taken (the comments below are linked to this figure)

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Selective targeting, but make use of existing facilities.
- Existing facilities should be properly maintained as priority.
- Provide where demand is greatest.
- Where is there a need?
- Only provide where the facilities will not be vandalised

- Blanket policies are the wrong approach.
- Comprehensive approach to recreation sited to give maximum benefit.
- Encourage people living in the area/parents to suggest what could benefit them.
- Both options.
- Along with the first option ensure that all play facilities are accessible.
- Equitable access for all areas.
- Should increase the provision of tennis courts in Aldwick and Pagham.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Access	2
Need	3
Increased provision	1
Involve local people	2
Policy	1
Comprehensive approach	1

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options.

The respondents favour the first approach which is to target Open Space at those areas where there are inadequate existing facilities. This approach should be investigated in relation to the Open Space and Leisure Study

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Open Space

Relevant Question Numbers:

- Q35 Which of the following approaches (suggested by the draft Open Space and Leisure study) should be given priority?
- Additional pitch provision to be prioritised in those areas which are currently deficient?
 - Pitch provision should be enhanced within areas of the District which are expected to experience significant population growth over the LDF period (if needs are not already catered for?)

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Additional pitch provision to be prioritised in those areas which are currently deficient?	Pitch provision should be enhanced within areas of the District....
Which of the following approaches (suggested by the draft Open Space and Leisure study) should be given priority:	29.7%	36.4%	33.8%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- The results are fairly even; (36.4% of respondents to the questionnaire think that additional pitch provision should be prioritised in the areas which are currently deficient, whilst 33.8% of respondents think that pitch provision should be enhanced within areas of the district which are expected to experience significant population growth over the LDF period)
- Large number of non-responses

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Unaware of the Open Space and Leisure Study (1)

Comments Analysis Part 2:

N/A

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options

It is necessary to finalise the Open Space Study.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Open Space

Relevant Question Numbers:

36 Which of the following approaches do you think should be taken to address deficiencies in access to swimming pools?

- Assist potential users to reach other facilities beyond a 15 minute journey time

- Encourage use of smaller facilities to which there is limited or restricted public access at present

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Assist potential users to reach other facilities beyond a 15 minute journey time	Encourage use of smaller facilities to which there is limited or restricted public access at present
Q36 Which of the following approaches do you think should be taken to address deficiencies in access to swimming pools?	28.2%	31.8%	40.0%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 31.8% of respondents who completed a questionnaire think the Council should assist potential users to reach other facilities beyond a 15 minute journey time.
- 40.0% think we should encourage use of smaller facilities to which there is limited or restricted public access at present.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Neither, if you want to go you find your own way.
- Swimming pools at schools, through assisting upgrading and life-guarding for public use during school holidays/after school

Comments Analysis Part 2:

N/A

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options:

40.0% think we should encourage use of smaller facilities to which there is limited or restricted public access at present. Therefore this should be the approach adopted in the Preferred Options.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Open Space

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q37 In which of the following ways do you feel access to sports hall provision could be improved?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Assisting potential users in reaching other facilities beyond the 15minute journey time	Improving access to halls with no public access, prioritising those located in deficiency areas	Enhancing the sports function of community centres to enhance their role in catering for sports need	Encouraging the use of secondary school and community school facilities...
In which of the following ways do you feel access to sports hall provision could be improved:	24.6%	21.0%	24.6%	45.1%	59.0%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Almost two thirds of respondents (59%) who filled in the questionnaire think that access to a sports hall could be achieved through the use of secondary and community school facilities to which there is currently limited or restricted public access at present.
- 45.1% feel that the sports function of sports facilities could be enhanced,
- 24.6% think that access to halls with no public access should be improved.
- Almost a quarter of respondents failed to reply.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Village and church halls have huge potential as sports halls.
- The use of schools would require altered school policies.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Village/church Halls	1
Schools	1

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options:

The most favourable option appears to be enhancing the sports function of community centres to enhance their role in catering for sports need. The final outcome will depend upon the outcomes of the Open Space and leisure Study.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Historic Environment

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q38 Do you think there is sufficient emphasis on preserving and enhancing the historic environment under current policies?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Do you think there is sufficient emphasis on preserving and enhancing the historic environment under current policies?	11.3%	26.7%	37.9%	15.4%	8.7%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 37.9% of all respondents who filled in a questionnaire do not think that there is sufficient emphasis on preserving and enhancing the historic environment under current policies.
- 26.7% think that there is sufficient emphasis on preserving the historic environment.
- 24.1% either don't know/ not sure or need more information.
- 11.2% did not reply.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Lack of emphasis given to historic designed landscape in the Core Strategy Issues and Options. Formal recognition, through the LDF, should be given to parks and gardens that are important for the contribution that they make to local heritage but are given no specific protection in planning policies.

PPGs

- The role of assessment of archaeological remains or historic buildings (PPG15 and 16) is missing. I would recommend emphasis should be placed on early consultation, and that the relevant paragraphs of PPG15 and 16 are cited under the national context. In particular para 2.11 of PPG15 with its request

for early consultation and provision of “such written information or drawings as may be required to understand the significance of a site or structure before an application is determined”, and para’s 19 and 20 of PPG16

- The concept of preservation by record outlined in PPG16 is not referenced. I would recommend referencing and quoting from paragraphs 13, 24 and 25 of PPG16.
- Many sites fall out of the remit of PPG15 and the non-statutory register, therefore receive no protection.

Policies:

- Existing policies that cover sites do not provide enough protection.
- Sites should be identified with an overarching policy; this would accord with draft SE Plan D7. Unless such a policy is included there is no real need for officers to recognise the value of such sites.

Other:

- Arun District has only one registered park (Arundel Castle) but eleven parks and gardens of special local historic interest, these deserve to be recognised as such.
- Protection of historic environment: LDF should recognise opportunities for tourism attractions and activities to be located in historic buildings and support this wherever possible.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Lack of emphasis on the historic designed landscape	1
PPG’s	3
Policies	2
Other	2

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for Preferred Options

The historic environment policies from the Local Plan will be saved. In addition the SPD on archaeology will also be saved.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Health

Relevant Question Numbers:

- 39 Do you think all major development proposals should be subject to a Health Impact Assessment?
- 40 Should all major developments have a positive Health Impact?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

		No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q39	Do you think all major development proposals should be subject to a Health Impact Assessment?	13.3%	69.2%	4.1%	5.6%	7.7%
Q40	Should all major developments have a positive Health Impact Assessment?	13.3%	67.7%	6.2%	5.6%	7.2%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- The majority of people (approximately 68%) support major developments being subject to positive Health Impact Assessments.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Health Impact Assessment is unnecessary for all major planning applications (+10 units or +0.5 hectares) and should only be applied to development of strategic importance.
- HIA do not consider the opportunities of extending health facilities to reach patients (**see ODPM report “multi-services rural outlets”**)
- Any deficiencies identified by HIA can be mitigated through suitable (negotiated) planning contributions.

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for Preferred Options:

- The size of site to which a HIA is applied will have to be considered and addressed in the preferred options. This will require research on HIA methodologies, resource implications and best practice application by other

LPA. A process for requiring HIA will have to be established (this level of detail may not be applicable to the preferred options stage).

- The purpose of HIA is not considering the provision of health care facilities. However further work may be required to address the concerns relating to accessing health services. The ODPM report “multi-service rural outlets” will be scoped for implications.
- Further work relating to infrastructure and planning obligations has been identified in relation to the infrastructure section. The findings of this work will be applied to health infrastructure.
- Raise the issue of HIA with LSP.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Community

Relevant Question Numbers:

- 41 Should all new housing provide a contribution towards the provision or enhancement of new or existing community facilities?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

		No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q41	Should all new housing provide a contribution towards the provision or enhancement of new or existing community facilities?	12.3%	74.9%	7.7%	2.1%	3.1%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- Strong support for development contributing towards new or enhanced community facilities

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Contributions must comply with the tests set out in **Circular 05/2005**.
- Consider more provision of allotments

Comments Analysis Part 2:

- Compliance with Circular 05/2005 tests: 4

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for Preferred Options:

- There is clear need to ensure that any policies requiring development contributions comply with Circular 05/2005. A re-assessment of the circular may need to be carried out. Examples of best practice in the application of planning obligations may also be applicable.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Waste

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q42 Should we incorporate storage for bins within house design and/or residential plots?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q42 Should we incorporate storage for bins within house design and/or residential plots?	11.3%	76.9%	4.1%	4.6%	3.1%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 76.9% of respondents to the questionnaire think that we should incorporate storage for bins within house design and/or residential plots.
- 4.1% are opposed.
- 7.7% are not sure or need more information.
- 11.3% did not reply.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Support for the incorporation of storage bins in household design.

- The incorporation of storage bins is wholly dependent upon the density and layout of the scheme. In some cases it may not be appropriate, in terms of urban design principles, to incorporate bin storage areas outside each individual property, e.g. terraced developments. Therefore, the provision of bin storage areas should be informed by the proposed layout and design of the scheme in discussion with the Local Planning Authority.
- The Core Strategy Issues and Options Document does not recognise the need to make provision for new waste management facilities for new development, yet this required by the Revised Deposit Draft Waste Local Plan (Policy G12).

The section on Waste should include reference to the fact that the Revised Deposit Draft Waste Local Plan (WLP) states a need to make provision for new waste management facilities for new development, in addition to the locations specified for major waste sites in the WLP.

Other:

- You already have done this in your section 106 agreement.
- Need to expand collection of green waste and recycling of wood chippings.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Support	1
Incorporation is dependent upon density and layout	1
Waste management	1
Other	2

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A.

Implications for the Preferred Options.

76.9% of respondents to the questionnaire think that we should incorporate storage for bins within house design and/or residential plots. However, although an individual has expressed concern over a blanket policy the Council should include this in the Preferred Options document.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Waste

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q43 Should we require developers to produce a detailed waste management plan, in order to show how they will manage their construction and demolition waste?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q43 Should we require developers to produce a detailed waste management plan, in order to show how they will manage their construction and demolition waste?	10.8%	73.3%	9.2%	2.1%	4.6%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 73.3% of respondents who filled in the Questionnaire think that the Council Should require developers to produce a detailed waste management plan, in order to show how they will manage their construction and demolition waste.
- 9.2% do not think that the Council should require a detailed waste management plan.
- 6.7% don't know or need more information.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Support

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Support 1

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options.

73.3% of respondents think the Council should require developers to produce a detailed waste management plan, in order to show how they will manage their construction and demolition waste? Therefore this issue should be included in the Preferred Options.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Waste

Relevant Question Numbers:

Q44 Should waste management plans show how much recycled material is to be used in the new construction?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

		No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q44	Should waste management plans show how much recycled material is to be used in the new construction?	11.8%	64.6%	9.2%	7.2%	7.2%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 64.6% of respondents who completed the questionnaire think that waste management plans should show how much recycled material is to be used in new construction.

- 9.2% think that they shouldn't.
- 14.4% are not sure or need more information.
- 11.8% did not complete this question.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Development should be designed to incorporate recycling facilities, as well as design for waste in households.

Support

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Support 1
Other 1

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options.

Waste management plans should show how much recycled material is to be used in new construction

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Transport

Relevant Question Numbers:

45 Are railway level crossings a barrier to new and/or existing development?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

		No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q45	Are railway level crossings a barrier to new and/or existing development?	15.4%	48.2%	20.0%	9.7%	6.7%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 48.2% of respondents think that railway crossings are a barrier to new and/or existing development.
- 20% disagree.
- 16.4% are either not sure or require more information.

- 15.4% have not replied.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

- Imprudent to locate new development where it will be adversely affected by operational crossings.
- Inadvisable to exacerbate existing level crossing problems by adding new development which required access via the crossing area and/or could be affected by queuing.
- They can often cause congestion and increase journey times. Also dangerous in areas where there are lots of families with children.
- Provided the risks associated with level crossings are mitigated adequately (generally by grade separation) new development may be acceptable.
- National Rail do not have monies for enhancements and funds for such improvements would need to be sourced externally. There are examples of developers paying for such improvements, where this is critical to viability of their development. (Network Rail)
- West Sussex County Council accepted the inspector's recommendation to remove level crossing and this is an objective in the County Transport Plan. Arun District Council must work towards this objective.
- Old style slow gates perhaps.
- Pleased that Arun District Council recognises that level crossings are an impediment to new development. Therefore respond "yes" to this question.
- Railway level crossings may currently be considered barriers to new and or existing in certain locations. However, improvements to accessibility and reduced road congestion can be delivered as part of new development. Development North of Littlehampton can deliver such improvements as well as links between the A27 and the A259 through the implementation of the Lyminster bypass.
- This discussion (transport) lacks statistical credibility.

Comments Analysis Part 2:

▪ Railway crossings and new development	1
▪ Remove Railway crossings	2
▪ New development	1
▪ Agree	2
▪ Other	1

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options.

48.2% of respondents think that railway crossings are a barrier to new and/or existing development. Further consultation needs to be undertaken with the County Council regarding Level Crossings and a range of costing needs to be considered.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Transport

Relevant Question Numbers:

46 Are there any locations where you feel transport interchange facilities could be improved?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

	No reply	Yes	No	Don't know / not sure	Need more information
Q46 Are there any locations where you feel transport interchange facilities could be improved?	23.6%	42.6%	5.6%	19.0%	9.2%

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

- 43.6% of respondents who completed a questionnaire think that there are locations within the district where transport interchange facilities could be improved.

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Locations

- Westergate
- Littlehampton
- Bognor Regis
- Barnham
- Ford
- Arundel
- Chichester
- Wick
- Angmering,
- Five villages area to Chichester

Littlehampton

- Littlehampton, bus links. Ford, bus links
- Littlehampton Town Centre - Busses/trains/car parking
- Littlehampton station

Barnham

- between Barnham and Chichester

- Barnham to Chichester bus going through the village which would encourage more people to use public transport
- Barnham station and more bus services which are inadequate if you wish car users to use public transport
- Barnham railway station. no direct bus links from Felpham/Middleton or Elmer.
- Barnham junction, Arundel Station
- Barnham bus stop re-sited
- Barnham - no effective interchange between bus and train (very limited Public transport at Aldingbourne and Fo
- Barnham - Littlehampton. Ford for interchange hub. Park and Ride.
- Barnham - insufficient parking for railway stations no bad service.
- A frequent mini-bus service to Barnham junction to link up with rail services.
- 18 Hour daily bus service including weekends
- More car parking at Barnham Station
- Another rail station in Lyminster / Wick area

Bognor Regis

- Bognor Regis Railway Station
- Bognor Rail station - parking –

Angmering

- Angmering Railway Station - Rail/Bus interchange
- Angmering rail station and bus service

Ford

- Ford station provides a ideal opportunity for development as a transport hub for a new settlement at Ford and I
- Ford station badly need loop to enable faster links to london, also better facility as hub/interchange. More p
- Ford Station - Extend car parking facilities. Barnham station - extend car parking facilities.
- Ford Railway station
- Ford Area, potential for East-West or coast to London interchange

Arundel

- Arundel station - Rail/Bus interchange
- Arundel By-pass, level crossing at Ford and Lyminster

Buses

- Buses need to call at the railway stations e.g. Arundel
- Westergate - better bus times into Chichester, better direct routes
- A bus station at Rustington.
- Get rid of stage coach and replace with community transport - why pay them to provide them with profits and no
- Providing a frequent, reliable, cheap bus service that is close to hand.
- Chichester Bus Station shelter & toilets (out of district)

- All areas to the West of the area between Arundel and Chichester. We need bus services.

Cycling:

Quality cycle lanes on all main roads.

Stations

- Links between main stations e.g. Barnham & buses to Westergate (especially during school times)
- Improve links between trains from buses to Bognor and Barnham
- If frequent mini-bus service to Barnham junction to link up with rail services.
- Investigate shuttle buses to serve railway stations
- Return of a railway station in Woodgate area
- Railway stations. Little or no interface with Bus timetables and vice versa
- New rail site between Barnham and Bognor [BRRR new A259] for Park and Ride.
- Parking facilities at railway stations within the region.
- North Littlehampton - A284 Lyminster by-pass/potential rail stop nr. Body Shop
- Dry, clean bus shelters linked to rail stations and taxi ranks preferably in one complex which are policed and
- Divert A29 from using the Woodgate Level Crossing.
- Cost too high
- Chichester station needs upgrading (take a look at the average Dutch railway station)
- Chichester railway and bus station are very outdated - major upgrade would help
- Bridge the level crossing at Woodgate

Bus and trains:

- Bus and train timetables could be co-ordinated to enable passengers from the former to join the latter.
- But needs improved bus services e.g. at Barnham junction, Bognor, Arundel etc.
- Buses could meet trains - I know of no such integration either Angmering or Arundel station
- Connection times with the bus service and trains if the car is not to be used provide affordable local buses.

Roads:

- Woodgate level crossing
- With new development at Toddington and north of Littlehampton housing some new roads.
- Wick/Lyminster By-Pass

- Need By-passes for Arundel, Chichester and Worthing as prerequisite for any further development
- Junction on A27 leading to Westergate. Many accidents will continue until a fly-over is built.
- Improvements to the A259 between Bognor Regis and Merston
- Fontwell roundabout and Avenue
- A27 at Crossbush. A27 at Fontwell junction with A29. A27/B2233 junction at Crockerhill. A27 Chichester bypass

Other

- From roads to buses to rail there are deficiencies in both facilities for individual forms

Comments Analysis Part 2:

N/A

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options:

A number of locations were suggested as areas where transport interchange facilities could be improved. Suggestions also focused on improving both the bus and rail systems as well as linking the services up. Improvements to the road network have also been suggested

The Council will need to work closely with West Sussex County Council Highways department in order to assess the feasibility of such schemes.

Issues and Options: Analysis

Section: Transport

Relevant Question Numbers:

- 47 What improvements would you or your household use public transport more often?

Statistical Questionnaire Data:

N/A

Statistical Questionnaire Analysis:

N/A

Comments Analysis Part 1:

Interchanges

- Bus services to coordinate with main line rail services
- Barnham made into rail/road interchange to serve new developments

Park and Ride

- Park and Ride in Chichester, and other places e.g. Bognor, Littlehampton.

Buses

- Provision of a regular and frequent bus between outlying villages to Littlehampton for access to Civic Offices and facilities such as leisure centre
- More Frequent bus services to/from rural areas to towns, rail stations.
- More frequent bus services from rural areas to town centres
- More frequent bus service to Barnham Station from Westergate so my son can get to school in Chichester more easily.
- More and smaller community buses at off-peak times
- Many more regular buses through the 5 villages into Chichester.
- Knowing where local buses go to and the times they run.
- more buses especially on rural routes,
- drop floor buses
- . Reinstate the bus service for Westergate/Aldingbourne. Children or people without cars can only catch a bus to Chichester at very limited restricted times. No development in this area should proceed until this has been addressed.
- A bus from Westergate to Chichester every half hour and with a journey time of less than 30 minutes.
- Our route 55 has just been terminated
- A regular bus route within walking distance. A bus to Barnham station.
- A proper bus service to Chichester
- A bus route straight into Chichester from Westergate that does not go all around the houses as it does at present! And introduction of school busses for all the high Schools and Colleges.
- A regular service from Aldingbourne to and from Chichester, Arundel and Barnham.
- Regular and reliable bus service to Chichester town centre
- More frequent bus services outside of rush hour and at weekends.
- Bus services to outlying villages - particularly for non-car owners (under 20's, retired) - both categories in my household.
- Bus service Fontwell - Chichester along the A27
- Bus run on time and arrive on time
- Bus routes from Aldingbourne to Chichester have been greatly reduced, therefore my daughters have to be taken to and from work by car which is not good for the environment etc and also the elderly residents find it difficult to get to the shops with no other transport. I believe regular buses should be reinstated at an affordable rate.
- Bus passes for senior citizens. Regular bus service!!!

- There are very few buses, so, for example it is often necessary to drive the 2km to Barnham station and always necessary to drive into Chichester. We would very much prefer to use public transport. Perhaps mini-bus services could be encouraged.
- Start with providing a bus, that would be a start. At present I have to use a car to get to either a bus or train. This does not make any sense. No wonder that there is no need for buses in Aldingbourne!
- Limited stop 'express' bus service to larger towns.
- Comprehensive network of bus services
- More local / rural bus routes (especially linking with rail stations / train times)
- Electronic displays of the kind found at bus stops in Brighton and Hove, indicating bus arrival times (thereby ensuring passengers to know how long they must wait for the next scheduled bus).
- bus service to be re-instated through to Chichester/hospital etc. from East
- Re-introduction of the bus-services
- , faster bus service to Chichester (which is focal point for those of us in the 5 villages, not Bognor - a point which ADC fails to realise). For working families with children car use is inevitable owing to economies of scale and lack of time to wait for buses and trundle around the place. The new bus service to Chichester.
- Westergate - better bus times into Chichester, better direct routes

Car

- But for Arun area own car is more convenient than any other form.
- Personally use public transport as much as possible. Generally - the car will always be in used even if improvements to public transport are made.

Trains

- Reinstallation of various halts
- Better train service to London via Arun Valley line.
- Better access to information
- More welcoming, warm waiting areas.
- dedicated space on trains for bicycles
- If I lived nearer a railway station
- A railway station at Rustington!
- Elimination of vandalism and yobs. More guards on trains. Ban alcohol use on public transport. Improve the style and efficiency of stations / trains / buses. Heavy subsidies for fares to encourage more use of public transport. (P.S. trains should be much more reliable and always on time e.g. as in most of Europe).

Parking:

- better parking near stations,
- Enlarged station car parks
- Reduced car parking charges at railway stations
- Free parking at railways.
- Better 'high-speed / main route' rail links.

- Improved safety and security (especially on trains),
- and easier (smarter / cleaner) pedestrian access to stations
- Rail transport seems disproportionately expensive when more than one of use travelling together

None

- None. People will put up with considerable inconvenience to use their cars. Pricing them off the road is the only thing that will work (eg. inner London)
- None - Monday I drive to Great Yarmouth - Tuesday its Crawley - Wednesday Portslade (could take the train but I have too much equipment to carry) - Thursday Westminster (I will take the train from Barnham!) - Friday Basingstoke. Train, bus - whatever - I need to use a car for most of my business journeys. However - there is talk of closing the Gatwick Express
- No opinion

Access

- It has to be available in the first place! It has to be reliable, frequent and clean. All of which it is not at present (try getting to doctor/dentist at Yapton/Walberton and hospital at Chichester from Woodgate/Westergate by public transport)
- Location of bus stops/railway stations within close proximity of home
- I walk everywhere at present because buses and trains are still not user-friendly to those who use walking aids such as 'walkers' or shopping trolleys. Buses should have hydraulic lifts instead of steps. Trains should eliminate completely steps and gaps between vehicle and platform (it is quite possible to fall between).

General

- Oxford strategy is a good example
- The existence of some
- Improve facilities to carry shopping and large objects on transport
- Raising the standard to the European level - i.e. re-nationalising of railways, improve greatly the frequency, reliability, keeping to timetables - eliminate vandalism and alcohol consumption on public transport
- Put a local tax on petrol/diesel to help pay for Public transport and make the latter more widely available.
- If public transport could be run on a bookable basis e.g. book day before - in small villages etc.
- Not suffering same congestion as private transport, run by Public Sector [not commercial bus companies] to ensure it is a Public Service.
- What happens when oil runs out/increases in expense? Start planning now. Quick service to Brighton/London? Cheaper? Services to Portsmouth from Bognor being cut. Rail service needs more investment/research. Integrated system. Subsidised in other countries?
- The people of Fontwell, Westergate, Eastergate etc. live within 5 miles of Chichester and Arundel but have no direct link.

Cycle

- Cycle routes

Fares

- Cheaper fares especially OAP's with free passes (example - London Transport through out their system) or give more free parking in towns to encourage the public to use local traders.
- If fares on bus and rail transport were about the same, i.e. between Littlehampton and Worthing, and interchangeable, I think more people would use the buses and trains. Cheaper Day Return tickets and Bank Holiday special offer are a good incentive.
- Free travel or reduced fares for pensioners.
- Ticket promotion/offers.
- Cheaper fares. Easier access to trains, bring back local halt/stops. Buses to run to stricter or more feasible timetables to inspire confidence to users. Use of smaller buses to cut costs on rural less used routes. Improvements in bus shelters and information technology re whereabouts of bus and estimated time of arrival currently used on many bus routes in London
- Cheaper fares 07.30 - 09.30 hours. it's now virtually impossible to take a bicycle on a train to commute during business travelling hours.
- Cheap[er],

Car

- restricted use of town centres by car

School

- More help for children's journeys to school

Other

- I would like to be able to walk to my nearest post box without having to cross a 60mph road with my 4 year old daughter. Restricted speed and a crossing would stop me making short journeys by car.
- We already use it frequently

Funding

- Public transport funding should not be left to the whims of developers.
- Guidelines to cost of local journeys.

Lack of services

- Living in Fontwell - no public transport whatsoever - car or cars are essential

Speed of services –

- faster trains to Gatwick/London

Timetables

- Well publicised timetables.
- A more practicable timetable.
- better availability of bus timetable information (including 'live' on-street messaging),
- Clearer but timetables, more widely available,
- Connecting bus/train times. .

Comments Analysis Part 2:

Interchanges:

Co-ordinate bus services with train services	5
Barnham as an interchange	1

Park and Ride: 2

Car 2

None 2

Trains

- Reinstallation of various halts	2
- Better train service to London via Arun Valley line.	1
-	
- better access to information	1
-	
- More welcoming, warm waiting areas.	1
- dedicated space on trains for bicycles	1
- If I lived nearer a railway station	1
- A railway station at Rustington!	1
-	
- Elimination of vandalism and yobs.	1
- better parking near stations,	3
- Enlarged station car parks	1
- Reduced car parking charges at railway stations	1
- Free parking at railways.	4
-	
- Better 'high-speed / main route' rail links.	
- Improved safety and security (especially on trains),	1
-	

- Improved pedestrian access 1

None 2

Please see table on the page below. The table identifies

Locational Comments Analysis:

N/A

Implications for the Preferred Options:

A large number of suggestions have been made regarding the improvements that need to be made in order to encourage members of the public to use public transport more. Suggestions range from the introduction of interchanges, Park and Ride Schemes, improvement to bus and rail services as well as improved parking and access. Other subjects include timetable and service provision as well as reducing the cost of travel, comfort, safety, security frequency of services and reliability.

Reference should be made to improving public transport service in the Preferred Options. Arun District Council Planners will forward these comments to West Sussex County Council as Highways Authority, and work jointly to see what can be done regarding these suggestions.

Mode	Size	Safe	Frequency	Reliability	Earlier/later service	Costs	More service	Quality	Flexible	Speed	Regular	Efficient	More routes/busses	Modern	Better shelters etc	Cleaner	Distance to bus stop	Available service	Link with other	Convenient	Availability	Time keeping	Adequate parking	Near to bus stops	Timing	Increased provision	Comfort	More accessible info	Security	Safety	Convenience
All transport	0	1	17	4	0	30	0	2	1	0	4	1	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	0		1	1	1	1	1	1
Bus	3	0	19	7	3	9	1	0	0	2	4	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1		1	0	0	0	0	0
Rail	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0