

**ASSESSMENT OF CORE COMMUNITY
SERVICES & FACILITIES**

CONSULTATION DRAFT
SEPTEMBER 2004

Contents	Page
Introduction	1
Methodology:	
Phase 1	2
• Which settlements were assessed.	2
• What Services should be examined.	3
• What distance thresholds should be set .	4
Methodology:	
Phase 2 The three methods	6
• Method 1- how many types of facility occur in each settlement.	6
• Method 2- are more than 200 people living within the distance threshold of each facility.	7
• Method 3- How many people live in each facility.	8
Results:	
• Bringing the data together, and analysing the relationships.	12
Conclusions	13
Appendices:	
Appendix 1: How the assessment might assist in preparation of the Local Development Framework.	15
Appendix 2: Determining the list of settlements.	19
Appendix 3: Data sources.	20
Appendix 4: How the data were mapped electronically.	22
Appendix 5: Calculating the population of a settlement and The population within distance thresholds.	23
Appendix 6: The number of people within the distance thresholds of facilities.	24
Appendix 7: Maps covering the settlements and facilities considered in this assessment..	25

Lists:

List 1: The 49 settlements to be assessed.	2
List 2: The three natural groups of settlements according to service and facility ratings.	12

Tables:

Table 1: The facilities and distance thresholds that permit the assessment of each settlement's services and facilities.	5
Table 2: Presence/ absence of facilities in settlements.	9
Table 3: The no. of facilities with 200 people in their catchment area.	10
Table 4: Population per settlement (PPS.)	11
Appendix 6: The number of people within the distance of the thresholds of facilities.	24

Assessment of Core Community Services & Facilities

Introduction

Core community services and facilities are those that are used regularly by all of us to meet our daily needs. They provide a service that is relied upon, such as, a local bus service, doctor's surgery, primary school and convenience store. Core community services and facilities are important to the life and well being of our communities and are key to the vitality of our town and village centres.

There are different measures by which services and facilities can be 'counted' – three are used in this assessment and each is explained in detail.

The assessment will be of use as the Council prepares its first Local Development Framework.

A key concept for planning is achieving "sustainability". The definition of sustainability, the levels of development that the district faces and the contribution that this assessment might make are explored in appendix 1.

This document is very much an initial background document - a starting point that looks at the current situation. The District Council will be engaging in other studies that will inform the location of development (such as the Urban Capacity Study which identifies brownfield, conversion and infill development potential), and will liase with West Sussex County Council on, for example, the need for new schools and health services.

Methodology:

Phase 1 – Identifying the settlements, the services, and threshold distances

Which settlements were assessed?

In order to identify what settlements should be assessed two approaches were taken:

1. As a starting point, all the Settlement Policy Areas identified in the Chichester District Local Plan First Review (CDLPFR) were listed.
2. Additional settlements were then added by determining those groups of dwellings that had at least one of the following facilities (see appendix 2 for further details):
 - School
 - Post Office
 - Doctors’ Surgery
 - Convenience Store
 - Newsagents
 - Library

This produced a list of 49 settlements (some of which are coalesced). These settlements were then subjected to an assessment of their facilities. The 49 settlements to be assessed are:

Birdham	Graffham	Plaistow
Bosham	Hambrook	Rake/ Hill Brow
Boxgrove	Hammer	Rogate
Bracklesham & East Wittering	Hermitage	Runcton
Broadbridge	Hunston	Selsey
Bury	Ifold	Sidlesham (North - Common)
Camelsdale	Kirdford	Sidlesham (South - Keynor)
Chichester (inc Stockbridge)	Lavant	Singleton
Chidham	Lodsworth	South Harting
Cocking	Loxwood	Southbourne (inc Prinsted)
Compton	Midhurst	Stedham
Easebourne	North Mundham	Tangmere
Fernhurst	Northchapel	West Ashling
Fishbourne	Nutbourne East	West Wittering
Fittleworth	Nutbourne West	Westbourne
Funtington	Petworth	Westhampnett
		Wisborough Green

List 1: The 49 settlements to be assessed

It may be that local residents identify other places that they consider should be assessed. If this is the case then they could be evaluated using the same methodology.

What services should be examined?

Paragraph 267 of the CDLPFR (adopted in April 1999) states that ten services (food shop, post office, chemist, pub, garage, church, doctors, library, primary school, and hall) are considered necessary to meet the basic requirements for an average household, and that a basic range of these facilities exists in most Settlement Policy Areas (SPAs). Whilst these services are important to every village and should be protected, this assessment takes into account only those services which we consider are likely to be visited regularly by a high proportion of the population. Thus the list of facilities and services used to assess the existing level of core community provision varies from the CDLPFR paragraph 267 list as follows:

- Some of the community facilities identified in the CDLPFR are unlikely to be used regularly by a high proportion of the population. For example:
 - i. a garage is not considered in this assessment unless it includes a general store. This is because a local general store is likely to reduce the need to travel by car, whereas a garage is not likely to be used as regularly.
 - ii. a chemist is a resource that a high proportion of the population need not visit often. Therefore, a chemist is unlikely to be used as often as, say, a convenience store;
 - iii. churches are not visited regularly by the majority of the population. Although it may be desirable to have a place of worship in each village, the presence or absence of a church is unlikely to affect the majority of the population.

These facilities are therefore not included in this analysis.

- Some community facilities are included in this assessment that are not identified in the CDLPFR list. For example:
 - i. facilities such as bus stops, train stations, and the presence of a frequent public transport service are necessary if the increase in alternatives to car use are to be promoted.
 - ii. access to employment facilities is included because a significant proportion of the population need to work 5 days a week. It would be beneficial if employment was available near to the settlements. It is difficult to assess the availability of local jobs for local people; the presence of an employment facility in a settlement does not necessarily mean that local people work there. However, we are assessing the *opportunity* for someone to work close to home should this be their choice. For the purpose of this assessment only industrial estates have been included, as these are likely to offer a range of manual, semi-skilled and skilled employment opportunities that are, by and large, available to local people. It may be possible to refine this assessment by considering other employment opportunities, although it is difficult to collect such information to a uniform standard;
 - iii. secondary schools are included in addition to primary schools as schooling is compulsory up to the age of 16 and therefore is used regularly by a significant proportion of the population.

- iv. community leisure centres and sports pitches are included as these offer healthy lifestyle opportunities and therefore should be available to a high proportion of the population.

What distance thresholds should be set?

The determination of a reasonable distance for people to travel to each type of facility has been informed by two publications – "Sustainable Settlements; a guide for planners, designers and developers" ¹ and "PPG13; a guide to better practice"². These give distance thresholds for travel by different modes and suggest appropriate proximity thresholds for various types of facilities. In brief:

- Important facilities which people can usually be expected to walk to should be a maximum of 400m away³.
- Local facilities which should ideally be accessible by foot should be a maximum of 800m away; this is within 10 minutes walk for most people, and a short enough distance to dissuade most from using a car⁴.
- Local facilities which it is not reasonable to expect all people to walk to, but which could be walked to for those who choose to, should be a maximum of 1600m away⁵.
- Facilities which are less local but should be within cycling distance should preferably be within 5000m (as the number of people who are prepared to cycle further than this declines rapidly)⁶, and a maximum of 8000m away. 5000m can be cycled in about 20 minutes⁷.

The list of facilities and distance thresholds that (it is suggested here) will permit the assessment of each settlement's sustainability is given in table 1⁸.

¹ (1995) Authors: Hugh Barton, Geoff David and Richard Guise. Publishers: University of the West of England, Bristol, and the Local Government Management Board.

² (1998) Department of the Environment, Department of Transport, London: HMSO.

³ Sustainable Settlements:

- paragraph 2.2.5, 2nd bullet point, suggests a standard of 400m maximum to a bus stop
- paragraph 2.2.6, 3rd bullet point, recommends 400m as the maximum distance for a number of facilities
- figure 5.6(d) page 115 illustrates possible distance standards for a number of facilities
- paragraph 5.6.7, 2nd bullet point, states that a bus stop should be within 400m of every home
- paragraph 5.6.7, 3rd bullet point, states that a primary school should be within 400m of most homes

⁴ Sustainable Settlements, paragraph 5.67 page 116 states that 400m can be walked in 5 minutes, and PPG13 A Guide to Better Practice, paragraph 2.05 states that motorised modes are rarely used for trips of around 800m.

⁵ PPG13 A Guide to Better Practice:

- paragraph 2.05 states that "where distances exceed 1 mile (about 1.6km) only a small proportion of people will walk".
- paragraph 6.24 states that 81% of journeys under 1 mile (1.6km) are undertaken on foot (as indicated by the 1992/94 National Travel Survey).

⁶ See graph on page 6 of PPG13 A Guide to Better Practice.

⁷ Sustainable settlements, page 116, last bullet point.

⁸ The distances assume a flat terrain and direct route because of the difficulty in mapping these variables - see appendix 5

Facility	Distance Threshold
Primary School	400m
Secondary School	1600m
More than hourly bus service Monday to Friday	400m
Less than hourly bus service Monday to Friday	400m
Certain days only bus service between Monday and Friday	400m
Demand on response bus service	Operates in specific settlement
Railway station	800m
Permanent library	800m
Mobile library stop	800m
GP surgery	800m
Convenience store (including petrol stations with a convenience store)	800m
Public house	800m
Post office	800m
Village hall / community centre	800m
Community leisure centre	1600m
Community sports pitch	1600m
Industrial estate (local employment facility)	5000m

Table 1: The facilities and distance thresholds that permit the assessment of each settlement's sustainability - see appendix 3 for the data sources.

Methodology:

Phase 2 – The three methods used to ‘count’ core community services and facilities.

There are various ways to assess the settlements’ existing level of core community services and facilities, the three principle methods used to rank each settlement are outlined below:

Method 1 - how many types of facility occur in each settlement?

Our assumption here is that the greater the range of services and facilities a settlement has, the greater the likelihood that the communities everyday needs are being met by the settlement. In order to avoid subjectivity the different types of facility are not weighted – for example, no attempt has been made to determine whether a post office is more or less important to the viability of a settlement than a primary school. Rather, each type of facility is either present or absent, and is attributed 1 or 0 accordingly. The scores are then summed for each settlement to give a total, ranging from 13 (most) to 0 (least), and the list is then sorted and ranked. For those types of facility which have different levels of service the most comprehensive service is awarded 1 point. Lesser levels of service are awarded a value between 0 and 1. This only affects two types of facility: libraries and bus services.

There are two levels of library service:

- permanent (attributed a value of 1)
- mobile (attributed a value of 0.25)

There are three levels of bus service:

- more than hourly Monday to Friday (attributed a value of 1)
- less than hourly and/or demand on response Monday to Friday (attributed a value of 0.25)
- certain days only between Monday and Friday (attributed a value of 0.1)

Lesser levels of service have been given a value of below 0.5 so that poor levels of more than one service will always score more poorly than the presence of one full service.

The results of this analysis are given in table 2 below. It should be noted that some facilities which serve a settlement are actually some distance from it and therefore do not contribute to the totals in method 1; for example, Chidham Primary School is to the north of the main settlement of Chidham, and therefore is outside of the settlement area as we have defined it. The second method of analysis addresses this issue.

Method 2 - are more than 200 people living within the distance threshold of each facility?

The assumption here is that where core services and facilities are easily accessible to a large number of the community, the settlement is likely to be more viable and active than a settlement where only a small proportion of the community have access to the core services and facilities. The figure 200 has been chosen because it constitutes what seems to be a reasonable patronage for most facilities and is small enough to ensure that smaller settlements have a reasonable chance to register a level of core services and facilities which can be usefully ranked. We think that this measure is adequate when looked at in conjunction with the other methods described. Note that the ability of a facility to service the number of people within its catchments will be examined when the Council considers site specific housing allocations.

The catchment areas given in table 1 are drawn around each facility. Where there are different levels of service (as with bus services and libraries) only the highest level has been included⁹. The number of dwellings in each catchment are then counted, and the approximate population each facility serves is determined (see appendix 5 for more detail). This method picks up those people who live within the catchment area of facilities regardless of whether they are in a specific settlement area. For example:

- the number of people living within 400m of Chidham Primary School includes some people who live in Chidham Lane but not in the settlement area of Chidham as we have defined it for the purpose of this study;
- the number of people living within 800m of Nutbourne railway station includes some people from the settlement of Hambrook as well as Nutbourne.

The table produced gives the approximate number of people each facility serves within its catchment area (see appendix 6). The settlements are ranked accordingly see table 3.

⁹ Different levels of service were assessed in method 1. Lesser levels have been excluded from this method because to include them would skew the results. The settlements are ranked by counting the number of facilities which serve 200 or more people. There are three levels of bus service; it would be inconsistent to count a good bus service serving 200 or more people the same as a poor bus service serving 200 or more people. Therefore only the highest level of service has been assessed.

Method 3 - How many people live in each settlement?

The assumption here is that the more people there are in a settlement, the more viable its core community services and facilities will be. This is because a greater variety of facilities and services are likely to be patronised. Although this is a crude measure, it is acceptable as one of several indicators to determine the level of core community provisions.

The population of each settlement is determined by counting the number of dwellings within each settlement area and multiplying this by the average household size as given in the 2001 Census statistics - see appendix 5 for more details. The list is then sorted and ranked - see table 4.

Table 2: Presence/absence of facilities in settlements, with core services and facilities score and rank (rank 1 = good service and facilities provisions)

Settlement	Primary School	Secondary School	More than hourly bus service Monday to Friday	Less than hourly bus service and/or demand on response Certain days only between Monday and Friday	Railway Station	Permanent library	Mobile library	GP Surgery	Industrial Estate	Convenience Store	Public House	Post Office	Leisure Centre	Community Sports Pitch	Village/Community Hall	Sustainability Score	Rank
Southbourne (inc	1	1	1			1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13	1
Chichester (inc.	1	1	1			1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13	1
Midhurst	1	1	1			1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	3
Selsey	1	1	1			1		1	1	1	1	1			1	11	3
Bracklesham and East	1		1			1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	10	5
Petworth	1	1	1			1		1		1	1	1		1	1	10	5
South Harting	1			0.25			0.25	1		1	1	1		1	1	7.5	7
Fernhurst	1		1				0.25			1	1	1		1	1	7.25	8
North Mundham	1		1				0.25		1	1	1	1		1	1	7.25	8
Tangmere	1		1				0.25		1	1	1			1	1	7.25	8
West Wittering	1		1				0.25			1	1	1		1	1	7.25	8
Birdham	1		1						1	1	1	1		1	1	7	12
Easebourne		1	1					1		1	1	1		1		7	12
Kirdford	1			0.25			0.25			1	1	1		1	1	6.5	14
Northchapel	1			0.25			0.25			1	1	1		1	1	6.5	14
Plaistow	1			0.25			0.25			1	1	1		1	1	6.5	14
Rogate	1			0.25			0.25	1		1	1	1			1	6.5	14
Westbourne	1			0.25			0.25	1		1	1	1		1		6.5	14
Wisborough Green	1			0.25			0.25			1	1	1		1	1	6.5	14
Graffham	1			0.25			0.25			1	1	1		1	1	6.5	14
Hunston			1				0.25			1	1	1		1	1	6.25	21
Bosham	1						0.25		1	1	1			1	1	6.25	21
Boxgrove	1		1				0.25			1		1		1	1	6.25	21
Compton	1		1				0.25			1	1	1			1	6.25	21
Fittleworth	1		1				0.25			1	1			1	1	6.25	21
Stedham	1			0.25			0.25		1	1				1	1	5.5	26
Loxwood	1			0.25			0.25			1	1	1			1	5.5	26
Bury	1			0.25						1	1			1	1	5.25	28
Lavant	1		1				0.25		1	1	1					5.25	28
Singleton	1		1				0.25				1			1	1	5.25	28
Fishbourne	1		1			1					1			1		5	31
Sidlesham (South -	1		1						1	1				1		5	31
Lodsworth				0.25			0.25	1			1			1	1	4.5	33
West Ashling	1				0.1		0.25				1			1	1	4.35	34
Broadbridge			1			1	0.25			1	1					4.25	35
Nutbourne East			1			1				1					1	4	36
Sidlesham (North -			1				0.25			1	1					3.25	37
Funtington							0.25			1	1	1				3.25	37
Nutbourne West			1				0.25			1		1				3.25	37
Rake/Hill Brow					0.1					1	1	1				3.1	40
Camelsdale	1		1							1						3	41
Cocking			1								1	1				3	41
Hammer				0.25			0.25				1				1	2.5	43
Ifold				0.25			0.25			1					1	2.5	43
Hambrook					0.1					1		1				2.1	45
Hermitage			1								1					2	46
Runcton			1								1					2	46
Westhampnett	1		1													2	46
Chidham											1					1	49

Table 3: The number of facilities with 200 or more people in their catchment area, and the rank (1 = Good service and facilities provisions).

Settlement	Number of facilities with a catchment_population of 200 or more	Rank
Southbourne (inc Prinsted)	13	1
Chichester (inc. Stockbridge)	13	1
Hermitage	12	3
Midhurst	12	3
Petworth	11	5
Selsey	11	5
Bracklesham and East	10	7
Camelsdale	9	8
Easebourne	9	8
Nutbourne West	9	8
Westbourne	9	8
Boxgrove	8	12
West Wittering	8	12
Tangmere	8	12
South Harting	8	12
North Mundham	8	12
Fernhurst	8	12
Fishbourne	8	12
Rogate	7	19
Birdham	7	19
Fittleworth	7	19
Hammer	7	19
Hunston	7	19
Kirdford	7	19
Runcton	7	19
Wisborough Green	7	19
Northchapel	7	19
Lavant	7	19
Bosham	6	29
Broadbridge	6	29
Loxwood	6	29
Nutbourne East	6	29
Plaistow	6	29
Singleton	6	29
Funtington	5	35
West Ashling	5	35
Stedham	5	35
Graffham	5	35
Bury	5	35
Sidlesham (South - Keynor)	5	35
Cocking	4	41
Hambrook	4	41
Lodsworth	4	41
Rake/Hill Brow	4	41
Sidlesham (North -	4	41
Ifold	3	46
Westhampnett	2	47
Compton	0	48
Chidham	0	48

Table 4: Population Per Settlement (PPS) sorted and ranked (1 = Good services and facilities).

Settlement	PPS	RANK
Chichester (inc. Stockbridge)	27602	1
Selsey	11138	2
Bracklesham and East Wittering	7139	3
Midhurst	5644	4
Southbourne (inc Prinsted)	3534	5
Tangmere	2621	6
Petworth	2506	7
Fernhurst	2020	8
Westbourne	1972	9
Fishbourne	1919	10
Hermitage	1918	11
Bosham	1887	12
West Wittering	1427	13
Easebourne	1351	14
Lavant	1242	15
Ifold	1115	16
Broadbridge	1099	17
Hunston	1076	18
Camelsdale	1027	19
Loxwood	1005	20
Birdham	996	21
Wisborough Green	976	22
South Harting	888	23
Fittleworth	724	24
Northchapel	689	25
Boxgrove	672	26
Stedham	660	27
Hambrook	644	28
Nutbourne East	642	29
Kirdford	639	30
North Mundham	592	31
Hammer	578	32
Sidlesham (South - Keynor)	571	33
Bury	536	34
Runcton	458	35
Rake/Hill Brow	433	36
Rogate	433	36
Lodsworth	429	38
West Ashling	422	39
Funtington	420	40
Cocking	418	41
Graffham	404	42
Sidlesham (North - Common)	382	43
Plaistow	380	44
Singleton	377	45
Nutbourne West	350	46
Westhampnett	202	47
Compton	180	48
Chidham	171	49

RESULTS: Bringing the data together, and analysing the relationships.

Rather than prioritising the methods, each settlement was ranked using each of the three methods. The settlements which consistently fell at the top (suggesting relatively good service and facility provision), and which consistently fell at the bottom (suggesting relatively poor service and facility provision) were noted. This produced three natural groups of settlements with relatively good, medium and poor service and facility ratings. The resultant groups are presented below (each in alphabetical order). Maps covering the settlements and showing the facilities considered are reproduced in appendix 7 at the end of this document¹⁰.

Good	Poor	Intermediate
Bracklesham and East Wittering	Chidham	Birdham
Chichester (inc. Stockbridge)	Cocking	Bosham
Easebourne	Funtington	Boxgrove
Fernhurst	Lodsworth	Broadbridge
Midhurst	Nutbourne East	Bury
Petworth	Rake/Hill Brow	Camelsdale
Selsey	Sidlesham (North - Common)	Compton
Southbourne (inc Prinsted)	Sidlesham (South - Keynor)	Fishbourne
Tangmere	West Ashling	Fittleworth
West Wittering	Westhampnett	Graffham
Westbourne		Hambrook
		Hammer
		Hermitage
		Hunston
		Ifold
		Kirdford
		Lavant
		Loxwood
		North Mundham
		Northchapel
		Nutbourne West
		Plaistow
		Rogate
		Runcton
		Singleton
		South Harting
		Stedham
		Wisborough Green

List 2: The three natural groups of settlements according to service and facility rating.

¹⁰ The settlements, facilities and services were mapped electronically using ArcView Geographic Information System (GIS) software (see appendix 4).

Conclusions

The ten settlements which consistently fall in the relatively good services and facilities group rank in the top 15 in each of the methods. These are the settlements that are able to cater for the majority of their community, enabling the community to be self sufficient and sustainable within their own settlement. It is considered that these settlements may also have the capacity to accommodate further development and meet additional housing requirement subject to environmental constraints (such as landscape impact) or infrastructure constraints (such as road capacity). In alphabetical order they are:

Good service and facility provision	
Bracklesham and East Wittering	Selsey
Chichester (inc. Stockbridge)	Southbourne (inc Prinsted)
Easebourne	Tangmere
Fernhurst	West Wittering
Midhurst	Westbourne
Petworth	

The ten settlements which consistently rank in the relatively poor services and facilities group fall at or below 29th in each of the methods. These are the settlements which are least likely to meet the every day needs of their community and therefore are considered to be unlikely to be suitable for new development . In alphabetical order, they are:

Poor service and facility provision	
Chidham	Rake/Hill Brow
Cocking	Sidlesham (North - Common)
Funtington	Sidlesham (South - Keynor)
Lodsworth	West Ashling
Nutbourne East	Westhampnett

All the remaining settlements fall in-between the good and poor service and facility provision group. These settlements have the potential to meet the needs of their community, it may be that they need additional support from the community to maintain their viability, e.g. a local primary school may need more pupils in order to ensure it stays open. As such it is considered that these settlements may be suitable to receive some new development on small sites (should not enough land be available in the most sustainable group), in addition to that required to meet needs for local housing or infrastructure improvements. In alphabetical order they are:

Intermediate		
Birdham	Hambrook	Northchapel
Bosham	Hammer	Nutbourne West
Boxgrove	Hermitage	Plaistow
Broadbridge	Hunston	Rogate
Bury	Ifold	Runcton
Camelsdale	Kirdford	Singleton
Compton	Lavant	South Harting
Fishbourne	Loxwood	Stedham
Fittleworth	North Mundham	Wisborough Green
Graffham		

Clearly, should a development proposal be accompanied by significant infrastructure improvements that a local community has identified it needs, it may result in a less sustainable location "moving up the list".

As stated earlier it is hoped that this assessment along with other studies, including the Urban Capacity Study, The Visual Impact Assessment of Development Options, The Chichester Constraints Study and The Housing Needs Survey, will be helpful in determining where housing will be located. Further analysis to determine the relative merits of individual sites for new development will also be undertaken at site level to take account of constraints not considered in this assessment.

APPENDIX 1: How this assessment might assist in preparation of the Local Development Framework.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, introduces the formal legislative requirement that plan makers have a duty to exercise their functions with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development¹¹. The Government set out its strategy for building sustainable communities in its document *Sustainable Communities: building for the future* in which it states:

"The way our communities develop, economically, socially and environmentally, must respect the needs of future generations as well as succeeding now. This is the key to lasting, rather than temporary, solutions; to creating communities that can stand on their own feet and adapt to the changing demands of modern life. Places where people want to live and will continue to want to live¹²."

To achieve this, development must address the community's requirements by having regard to:

- 1. Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;*
- 2. Effective protection of the environment;*
- 3. Prudent use of natural resources; and*
- 4. Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment¹³ ."*

West Sussex County Council states that:

Sustainable development, in a land-use planning context, is about controlling and managing the demand for development, including the use of land, so that the quality of life can be improved, both now and in the future, by meeting social and economic needs without causing unacceptable damage to the environment. Social progress, economic growth, and environmental protection (including the use of natural resources) should be integrated in such a way that trade-offs between these objectives are minimised.¹⁴

Sustainability must therefore be considered at all levels of planning. It could include the consideration of a request to change the use of a building (for example, from a local store to a family home). More generally, it suggests planning for development which will promote appropriate employment opportunities, enable good access and improved transport, facilitate the provision of improved services (such as health and education), and which will appropriately conserve finite resources.

Inevitably, settlement sustainability is an important consideration in the decision on where best to put new development in the district, and this assessment is conducted to help determine which settlements are the most sustainable. This is the first assessment that we have attempted, and as such it will probably need to be refined. It is hoped that it will be helpful in the preparation of our first Local Development Framework along with other studies including the Urban Capacity Study, The Visual Impact Assessment

¹¹ Part 3, section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

¹² Page 4 of: *Sustainable Communities: building for the future* (February 2003) ODPM.

¹³ Page 6 of : SEERA, GOSE, SEEDA, EA, NHS (June 2001) *A better Quality of Life in the South East; A Regional Sustainable Development Framework* Guildford: SEERA

¹⁴ West Sussex Structure Plan 2001 – 2016 resolved to be adopted July 2004, paragraph 61.

of Development Options, The Chichester Constraints Study and The Housing Needs Survey.

How the assessment of settlement sustainability will inform residential development

Chichester District Council is responsible for planning to meet the housing requirements for Chichester District. Regional Planning Guidance 9 sets out a spatial strategy for the South East region which includes the provision and distribution of housing. RPG9 covers the period up to 2016 and states that West Sussex should achieve an average of 2,890 dwellings per annum (Policy H2). The West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 Draft Modified Plan incorporating further changes (May 2004) equates this figure to a strategic housing requirement of 7,675 over the period 2001-2016 for Chichester District ¹⁵ at an average of 515 dwellings per annum (gross). The strategic requirement is broken down as follows:

Dwellings (Gross) (indicative figures, rounded to the nearest five).				
Commitments (including identified previously developed land)	Unidentified Previously Developed Land	Small-scale Greenfield	Large-scale Greenfield Strategic Locations	Total
1,990	3,810	625	1250	7,675

Table 1: Strategic Housing Requirement 2001-2016 for Chichester District

This assessment may help identify where the 625 small-scale greenfield dwellings might best be placed and to help define which settlements should have Settlement Policy Areas. Other studies will inform the contribution to be made by previously developed land and large-scale greenfield strategic locations.

In addition to Regional Policy Guidance, this Council must have regard to National Planning Policy Guidance. Planning Policy Guidance note 3, which promotes a sequential approach to the location of new housing. Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) must initially look to make use of previously developed land and buildings within urban areas before considering greenfield development around existing urban areas, and then other areas served well by good public transport¹⁶. (Within Chichester District it is suggested here that *urban* areas roughly equate to *settlement policy areas* which conform with the Structure Plan’s definition of "built up area boundary"). Significant residential development in rural areas should only be considered if urban areas fail to yield sufficient housing to meet identified needs. Otherwise, residential development in rural areas will only be acceptable if it meets local needs, can be proven to support local services which would otherwise become unviable, and is of sympathetic design and layout so as to be in keeping with the character of the area.

¹⁵ In July 2003 the Secretary of State decided not to support improvements (recommended by the South Coast Multi-Modal Study) to the A27 trunk road. Following on from this the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001 - 2016 Draft Modified Plan incorporating further changes (May 2004) states that "Work is being undertaken by the County Council and the Highways Agency to identify an integrated package of measures ... [which] will enable about 1,250 homes to be accommodated in one or more locations adjoining or very near Chichester City by 2016..." (paragraph 81 bullet point 3).

¹⁶ PPG3 paragraph 30

PPG3 specifically requires Local Planning Authorities to, among other things, "promote more sustainable patterns of development"¹⁷. This involves seeking to reduce car dependence and exploiting and delivering accessibility by public transport to education, leisure and health facilities, jobs, shops, and local services. PPG13 relates to Transport, and its objectives are

to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level to:

- *promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight;*
- *promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling, and*
- *reduce the need to travel, especially by car*¹⁸

Those settlements which have:

- a range of local facilities and services within easy reach of the population;
- access to public transport which is frequent and serves the wider area of interest; and
- access to employment locations;

might be more able to receive and successfully integrate new development than those which do not.

This assessment seeks to identify the current provision of core community services and facilities within Chichester District by examining their relative ability to offer a resident population access to services, facilities, employment and transport. This will result in a list of settlements which score:

- ii. well (such as Chichester City) and so might be among the first settlements that the Council will consider in deciding where to allocate new housing;
- iii. moderately, and so might be considered for housing if the settlements in (i) don't yield sufficient sites to meet the Structure Plan requirement;
- iv. poorly (those settlements with a severely limited infrastructure) and so might not be able to receive additional housing unless they are required to meet needs for local housing or infrastructure improvements.

This document is very much an initial background document - a starting point that looks at the current situation. The District Council will be engaging in other studies that will inform the location of development (such as the Urban Capacity Study which identifies brownfield, conversion and infill development potential), and will liaise with West Sussex County Council on, for example, the need for new schools and health services.

This assessment does not consider the fact that larger scale developments which bring additional services and facilities would influence settlement sustainability. If it is thought that settlements could benefit from larger scale expansion then full consultation on proposals will take place.

¹⁷ PPG3 paragraph 1

¹⁸ PPG 13 paragraph 4

Further analysis to determine the relative merits of individual sites for new development will be undertaken at site level to take account of constraints not considered in this assessment - such as areas that are subject to flooding, or are of nature conservation interest.

APPENDIX 2: Determining the list of settlements

As a starting point the current CDLPFR Settlement Policy Areas were listed. Additional settlements were then added by visually scanning a map of the district for groups of dwellings and systematically searching the internet yellow pages site "www.yell.com" to determine which had at least one of the following facilities :

- School
- Post Office
- Doctors' Surgery
- Convenience Store
- Newsagents
- Library

Where settlements coalesce (such as Bracklesham and East Wittering) they were considered together. The location of the facilities found was then checked on the internet map site "www.multimap.com" to ensure that it was in, or bordering on, the settlement. The information was collected from these sources in early June 2003.

APPENDIX 3: Data sources

Detailed local knowledge of all settlements was used, including information provided through interviews with development control officers, and field work undertaken by policy officers. In addition, data providers for specific information on services and facilities were approached. All sources are listed below.

Data sources for facilities inside Chichester District:

Facility	Data Provider/ Source
Primary School	David Parsons, Education Dept, West Sussex County Council
Secondary School	David Parsons, Education Dept, West Sussex County Council
More than hourly bus service Monday to Friday	Sarah Rees, West Sussex County Council, Passenger Transport Services
Less than hourly bus service Monday to Friday	Sarah Rees, West Sussex County Council, Passenger Transport Services
Certain days only bus service between Monday and Friday	Sarah Rees, West Sussex County Council, Passenger Transport Services
Demand on Response bus service	Sarah Rees, West Sussex County Council, Passenger Transport Services
Railway station	Sarah Rees, West Sussex County Council, Passenger Transport Services
Permanent library	Peter Ross, Planning Services, West Sussex County Council
Mobile library stop	Peter Ross, Planning Services, West Sussex County Council
GP surgery	Graham Ainsworth, Mapping and Information, West Sussex Shared Services Consortium
Convenience store (including petrol stations with a convenience store)	Survey conducted in July 2003, Planning Officers, Chichester District Council
Public house	Survey conducted in July 2003, Planning Officers, Chichester District Council
Post office	Post Office Outlet File, Post Office Stakeholder and Regulatory Affairs Dept
Village hall / community centre	Community Facilities Audit, Community Services, Chichester District Council, as at Nov 2003
Community Leisure centre	Sarah Peyman, Cultural Services, Chichester District Council
Community sports pitches	Draft Sports Playing Pitch Strategy, Cultural Services, Chichester District Council, as at Nov 2003
Industrial estate (local employment facility)	Mark Jennings, Information and Management Services, Chichester District Council

Data sources for facilities outside of Chichester District:

Primary schools	<p>http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performanceables/primary_02.shtml The query facility was used to determine primary schools within 0.5 mile of settlement area post codes, and these were then plotted on the relevant GIS shape-file.</p>
Secondary schools	<p>http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performanceables/schools_02.shtml The query facility was used to determine secondary schools within 1 mile of settlement area post codes, and these were then plotted on the relevant GIS shape-file.</p>
Railway stations	Ordnance survey map
GP surgeries	<p>http://www.nhs.uk/root/localnhservices/GP/Default.asp The nearest search facility was used, and surgeries noted as being 0.8km or less from a settlement area post code were plotted on the relevant GIS shape-file.</p>
Post offices	<p>www.royalmail.com, The "Find a post office branch" facility was used, and post office branches approximately 1km or less from a settlement area post code were plotted on the relevant GIS shape-file.</p>
Libraries and Community leisure centres	<p>Local Government web sites: http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/ http://www.arun.gov.uk/ http://www.horsham.gov.uk/ http://www.havant.gov.uk/ http://www.hants.gov.uk/ and Des Farnham, Hants CC http://www.easthants.gov.uk/ http://www.waverley.gov.uk http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/</p>
Convenience Stores	http://www.yell.co.uk and Planning Officer knowledge
Public Houses	http://www.yell.co.uk and Planning Officer knowledge
Village halls / community centres	<p>Brian Pratt, Havant District Council Liz Panton, East Hants District Council www.waverley.gov.uk/villagehalls Elaine Ticehurst, Horsham District Council Carrie Reynolds, Arun District Council</p>
Community sports pitches	<p>Peter Dooley, Horsham District Council; Joanne Wherrell, Waverley District Council; Laura Smith. East Hants District Council and Parish Clerks of Bramshott and Liphook, Liss, Steep, Petersfield, Buriton, and Rowlands Castle; Havant District Council Carrie Reynolds, Arun District Council</p>
Industrial estates	<p>Mike Hicks, West Sussex County Council Chris Hanson-Kahn, Surrey County Council Sally Stevens, Havant District Council Matt Callaghan, East Hants District Council</p>

APPENDIX 4: How the data were mapped electronically

The settlements, facilities and services were mapped electronically using ArcView Geographic Information System (GIS) software. Much of the information had been provided in spreadsheet format with XY coordinates (post office outlets, GP surgeries) or as "shape-files" (libraries, schools, stations, industrial estates) which were easily imported into an ArcView project file. The remaining data were digitised manually, although it was sometimes possible to use existing electronic data as a guide or base. The settlement areas were mapped by amalgamating post-code polygons which together covered the dwellings within each settlement. The bus frequency areas were provided as an ArcView graphic file, and these were digitised as polygon shape-files. Public houses and convenience stores were marked on paper maps out in the field and then digitised from electronic Ordnance Survey data. Village halls and community centres, playing pitches and municipal leisure centres, were provided as a list and then digitised from electronic Ordnance Survey data. The areas served by demand on response services were listed, but not digitised.

All of the digitisation and GIS analyses were undertaken by *David Bolton*, LLPG Custodian, Chichester District Council.

APPENDIX 5: Calculating the population of a settlement and the population within distance thresholds.

In order to determine the number of people living within an area two further sets of data were required: dwelling and population data (see table below).

Data	Source
Location of dwellings	Extracted as GIS layer from Ordnance Survey electronic map data – allows each dwelling in each settlement to be identified separately
Population data	Census 2001 key statistics: average household size by ward – provided by Keith Hardman, West Sussex County Council

Additional data used to determine populations within distance thresholds of facilities

The approximate population of each settlement was determined by:

- ascertaining which ward the settlement was in
- counting the dwellings within the settlement area (using ArcView GIS and a script "Count Points" written by *Yingming Zhou*, Dept. of Geography, University of South Carolina)
- multiplying the number of dwellings counted by the average household size for that ward. Note that where a settlement straddled more than one ward, the mean of the average household size for the wards was used.

This produced an approximate population per settlement (PPS) from the most appropriate and up-to-date data available. Note that the dwelling count is of buildings, not separate units within buildings, and therefore the higher the number of flats within dwellings there are in a settlement the greater the underestimation of settlement population.

The population within distance thresholds was ascertained by:

- creating zones around each settlement, e.g. a 400m zone around primary schools.
- counting the dwellings within each zone (using ArcView GIS and a script "Count Points" written by *Yingming Zhou*, Dept. of Geography, University of South Carolina)
- multiplying the number of dwellings counted by the average household size for that settlement

This produced an approximate population per catchment (PPC).

It should be noted that this method takes a direct "as the crow flies" measurement of distance. Whilst it would be preferable to look at the length of actual routes this is too complex to achieve in the absence of significant person-time and sophisticated software; route and direction information would need to be input, and complex computer algorithms programmed to account for pedestrian, cycle and car routes which may all be different when walkways, cycle routes and one-way streets are taken into account. It was therefore decided that an "as the crow flies" measurement of distance would suffice. However, an attempt was made to curtail zones when they met obvious barriers, for example, a railway line or river.

As before, the dwelling count is of buildings, not separate units within buildings, and therefore the higher the number of flats within dwellings there are in a catchment the greater the underestimation of catchment population.

APPENDIX 6 - The number of people within the distance thresholds of facilities

Settlement	# pop'n within 400m of primary school	# pop'n within 1600m of secondary school	# pop'n within 400m of frequent bus service	# pop'n within 800m of railway station	# pop'n within 800m of permanent library	# pop'n within 800m of GP surgery	# pop'n within 5000m of Industrial estates	# pop'n within 800m of convenience store	# pop'n within 800m of a public house	# pop'n within 800m of post office	# pop'n within 1600m of leisure centre	# pop'n within 1600m of community sports pitch	# pop'n within 800m of village/community hall
Birdham	536	0	770	0	0	0	996	770	87	782	0	988	882
Bosham	778	0	1719	60	0	0	1887	127	1826	0	0	1887	1717
Boxgrove	672	0	672	0	0	0	672	672	230	672	0	672	672
Bracklesham and East Wittering	1672	0	5435	0	3738	3415	7139	6477	6500	6380	0	7022	3688
Broadbridge	0	0	1075	1059	0	0	1099	1059	1059	0	0	1097	158
Bury	61	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	465	470	1001	536	470
Camelsdale	812	14	916	0	330	0	1027	1027	916	884	0	371	255
Chichester (inc. Stockbridge)	13078	22283	27115	5024	6572	15245	27602	23801	23163	23237	16892	27602	13797
Chidham	31	0	0	0	0	0	171	26	107	0	0	11	35
Cocking	0	0	409	0	0	0	418	0	411	409	0	0	0
Compton	134	0	180	0	0	0	0	180	180	180	0	180	180
Easebourne	142	1351	1322	0	185	1112	1351	1332	1311	1320	875	1351	33
Fernhurst	1046	0	1742	0	0	0	2020	1983	1863	1986	0	2020	1983
Fishbourne	877	1733	789	1862	0	0	1919	231	1609	0	43	1919	0
Fittleworth	597	0	574	0	0	0	724	0	531	686	0	724	708
Funtington	0	0	0	0	0	0	420	410	408	410	0	410	0
Graffham	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	308	388	308	0	404	338
Hambrook	0	2	9	355	0	0	644	644	0	644	2	2	52
Hammer	0	0	121	0	0	0	578	243	571	357	578	571	578
Hermitage	0	1873	1774	221	761	801	1918	1269	1918	1159	1894	1798	1231
Hunston	0	0	1061	0	0	0	1076	1061	1068	1056	0	1076	1061
Ifold	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535	0	0	0	676	1025
Kirdford	528	0	0	0	0	0	202	593	593	593	0	636	593
Lavant	483	0	1242	0	0	0	1242	0	1240	1007	0	1242	381
Lodsworth	0	0	0	0	0	190	429	0	410	0	0	429	405
Loxwood	856	0	0	0	0	0	0	977	869	977	0	828	897
Midhurst	1846	5164	3788	0	2835	853	5644	5181	3689	2402	5634	4614	3086
North Mundham	538	0	541	0	0	0	592	590	519	590	0	592	576
Northchapel	604	0	0	0	0	0	689	684	689	684	0	689	686
Nutbourne East	19	0	642	642	0	16	642	642	5	571	0	0	585
Nutbourne West	12	209	348	78	54	350	350	350	350	350	275	214	47
Petworth	1401	2506	2166	0	2359	2270	2506	2347	2415	2359	0	2483	2368
Plaistow	267	0	0	0	0	0	0	373	368	373	0	380	370
Rake/Hill Brow	5	0	0	0	0	0	219	216	394	216	0	190	180
Rogate	386	0	0	0	0	433	433	433	433	433	0	0	433
Runcton	7	0	350	0	0	0	458	322	407	322	0	458	284
Selsey	3014	11054	8592	0	5485	5929	11138	8749	10643	9753	0	10944	6268
Sidlesham (North - Common)	0	0	241	0	0	26	382	184	244	0	0	225	0
Sidlesham (South - Keynor)	81	0	399	0	0	416	571	29	337	0	0	571	0
Singleton	342	0	307	0	0	0	377	0	377	0	0	377	374
South Harting	722	0	0	0	0	842	888	879	872	881	0	888	844
Southbourne (inc Prinsted)	884	3534	1518	3384	3316	2089	3534	3525	2397	3281	3534	3534	3332
Stedham	465	0	0	0	0	0	660	0	637	0	0	660	658
Tangmere	1162	0	2499	0	0	0	2621	2560	2560	699	0	2621	2573
West Ashling	370	0	0	0	0	0	422	0	422	0	0	422	420
West Wittering	602	0	1128	0	0	0	1427	1253	1266	1249	0	1427	1276
Westbourne	1432	1150	0	0	0	1945	1972	1967	1969	1931	963	1972	0
Westhampnett	121	0	202	0	0	0	202	71	0	0	0	186	0
Wisborough Green	386	0	0	0	0	0	976	911	945	911	0	976	909

Appendix 7

Maps covering the settlements and facilities considered in this sustainability assessment.

Errata:

A settlement boundary is shown for Donnington (map 43), however Donnington is not one of the settlements assessed in this report.

The facilities legend and maps include colleges, however only primary and secondary schools have been considered in this report. This is because schooling is compulsory until the age of 16 and therefore generates a significant need to travel. It was decided that post 16 educational facilities often attract students from a much bigger catchment (especially those that are specialist) and therefore did not reflect local sustainability in the same way.

The maps produced in appendix 7 made use of a script called 'map sheet' that was written by **Brian Brettschneider** of SWCA Environmental Consultants.