CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTION: TANGMERE PARISH COUNCIL'S RESPONSES

Representation Form – ACT 1 Promoting an Active Lifestyle

Development of the South Downs National Park will be a huge opportunity to promote healthy activities such as walking and cycling. For Tangmere, the first step will be a safe route over the A27 from Tangmere to Boxgrove followed by the cycle routes to Barnham, Felpham and Bognor Regis. These proposals have been submitted to WSCC, CDC and ADC but are not mentioned in the Core Strategy.

Improvement of pedestrian and cycle routes along the A27 between Chichester and Fontwell are also required.

We have tried to promote a network of cycle routes based on the perimeter track of Tangmere airfield but with little success so far.

We want to see these specific proposals noted in the SPD or DPDs in due course.

Representation Form – ACT 2 Needs of Older People

Tangmere Parish Council has proposed that housing for older people be provided on a Brownfield site in the village. There is an urgent need but unfortunately this site has not been supported by the CDC prior to the LDF.

A more flexible approach could have satisfied this local need and address a section of derelict land, thus enhancing the amenity in Tangmere

Representation Form – ACT 3 Needs of the Young

One of the most pressing needs for the 21-35 age group is affordable housing. Some shared equity housing is available in the village and the results of the Parish Questionnaire made it quite clear that local people wanted smaller houses for sale and not social rented properties.

Such housing could be provided immediately on a Brownfield site in the village. There is an urgent need but unfortunately this site has not been supported by the CDC prior to the LDF.

Representation Form – ACT 4 Local and Community Facilities

The LDF must respect the views of the local community. A recent example of the provision of a doctor's surgery on the Western side of the village to the proposed new housing at the East shows a total lack of forward planning and a disregard for the views of the people who use the facility… and is contrary to the views set out in our Parish Plan.

We are keen to retain our village shop and have proposed changes that could make it more sustainable in the future.

Our Parish questionnaire identified that the community wanted to see the current shop relocated from it position in the Conservation area, to a more sustainable location possibly linked to some of the proposed Brownfield development.

If you view community facilities as being so important, why fail to mention the existence of the Tangmere Military Aviation Museum in Tourism 138 – this is an important facility in the area and we have plans promote its development as a major regional site for tourism

Representation Form – ENV 1 Landscape

The Tangmere Parish Plan proposes enhancements to the local environment in the form of woodland and wetlands. It also aims to preserve the remains of the historic Battle of Britain Airfield by the establishment of a Regional Aviation Museum. The new museum will need the open landscape of the old airfield to set the scene for visitors and as a reminder of the historic victory won in the skies overhead.

Representation Form – ENV 2 Wildlife and Geology

The open agricultural land at Tangmere is home to threatened species such as the Skylark and Great Crested Newts. The proposed woodland and ponds associated with the development of Tangmere Military Aviation Museum will help to increase biodiversity.

Representation Form – ENV 3 Air Quality/ Noise/ Light Pollution

Improvements to the A27 will need to take account of the air quality, noise and light pollution experienced in villages like Tangmere. A 50 mile per hour speed limit, for example, would significantly reduce pollution without interrupting the flow of traffic.

Any extensions to the glasshouses at Tangmere will need to take account of light pollution.
Better tree screens will reduce the problem and could be used to enhance biodiversity.

Representation Form – ENV 4 Strategic Gaps

The proposal for a strategic gap between Tangmere and Chichester is very welcome but the location shown on the Key Diagram would not preclude development of the green fields to the west of Tangmere.

The Tangmere Parish Plan is very clear that this land should form a strategic gap with further housing and commercial development to the east of the village.

The strategic gap, including the fields to the west, would also protect the important views of Chichester Cathedral which the Village benefits from.

Strategic Gaps are also required between Tangmere, Oving and Westhampnett.

Representation Form – ENV 5 Adapting to Climate Change

The development of a Regional Aviation Museum at Tangmere will provide opportunities to plant woodland that can help to counter the affects of climate change.

It will also be possible to preserve the natural flood basin that exists on the old airfield. This can be used to balance the surface water issues in Tangmere, as more intense rainfall is an expected outcome of climate change.

Representation Form – ENV 6 Development in areas at risk of flooding

Parts of Tangmere are included on the Environment Agencies Flood Risk Maps. Sensitive development of the glasshouses and the new museum should be able to minimise the risk of flooding in Tangmere.

Flood risk is another area where more care is needed in the analysis of housing development. It has been reported that District Councillors want a ban on housing below the 5m AOD level. This would not be in accordance with the Draft South East Plan which refers to the Environment Agencies Zone 2 and 3 risk areas. As you mention in the report there are some groundwater flooding areas on the Lavant and parts of Tangmere are on the latest EA maps.

Representation Form – ENV 8 Thorney Island

If the existing 'Intrusive' RAF Hangars at Thorney Island are to be removed they should offered for preservation elsewhere, such as at Tangmere for use by the Museum.

Representation Form – ENV 9 Strategic Tree Planting

We are pleased that strategic tree planting is proposed on the Manhood Peninsular and look forward to working with CDC on our proposals for Tangmere, which are linked to the development of a Regional Aviation Museum.

Representation Form – INF 1 Infrastructure

Why doesn't the consultation seek to encourage traffic calming?

In Tangmere, this was strongly supported in responses to our Parish Plan questionnaire.

We have had some success with the School Travel Plan. There is more to do and the LDF should examine how this is to be funded and delivered in the future.

Representation Form – INF 3 Managing travel demand and widening transport choice

Housing policy will be critical in delivering a reduction in the need to travel. Developments that take advantage of public transport corridors, such as railways, will offer more choices in terms of sustainable travel to work and for leisure.

We are pleased that cycling is to be encouraged and we have already proposed a network of routes from Tangmere to the coast and to the proposed National Park. Funding for rural routes cannot rely on housing developments and the Strategy must address this.

This view is supported by the Inspector's findings presented in the WSSP 2001-2016 Enquiry Report of Panel Chapter 7, Issue 7 Strategic Locations – Coast:
(ii) East of Chichester District, West of Arun District - Tangmere

7.18 Of greater concern is the lack of a station and the limited existing or potential services. A new or improved bus service could be introduced but, especially bearing in mind the very close access to the A27, it is most likely that movement to and from the new development would be by car. Our concern is that <u>Tangmere is not sufficiently close to Chichester for development there to be considered as a sustainable urban extension of Chichester; nor is it clear at present that sufficient opportunities exist to create sustainable transport links as to justify naming Tangmere as a location for strategic development in preference to other possible locations.</u>

7.19……..Development here (at Tangmere) would conform with neither the advice on PPG3 nor with the DDSP's overall strategy

7.30…..It may be, for instance, that there would be an advantage in a site or sites to the West of the City between it and Fishbourne, or even further west, but close to one of the existing stations. This report concluded that Chichester City was the most sustainable location in terms of PP3 and that it should be the location of any proposed new development.

Representation Form – INF 4 The A27 – Objection

We want this policy to be amended as follows …."access along and across the A27 must be improved for any large scale development to be acceptable at Chichester City, or any Greenfield sites on the Manhood Peninsular….**or any Greenfield sites at satellite villages around Chichester along the A27 corridor."**
Improvements to the A27 must be a prerequisite of any large scale Greenfield development in the area.

Representation Form – INF 4 The A27

We are still waiting for a safe route for pedestrians and cyclists between Tangmere and Boxgrove. This was clearly identified as a top 10 priority for the community in the responses to our Parish Plan Questionnaire.
The capacity of the Tangmere roundabout will have to be considered for any large-scale development either in Tangmere or Boxgrove.

Representation Form – INF 5 Car Parking

Parking Action Plans sound ideal for some of the problem areas in Tangmere, however specific proposals are required for problem areas such as the shop, around the school, Business Park and on the slip roads to the A27.

All new development in the village will require the provision of adequate parking – a large proportion of those who work in the village drive in via the A27 from other locations and it would be wrong to accept lower parking standards on the basis that workers will come from the village itself.

Representation Form – Key Diagram

The Key Diagram does not reflect the need for a strategic gap between Tangmere and Westhampnett in the north and Tangmere and Oving in the south.

The Strategic gap should include the open fields to the West of Tangmere.

What are the two lines to the east of Chichester supposed to represent?

Representation Form – LIV 1 Housing Provision – Paragraph 100

We are not surprised that 73% of responses think that the **main focus of housing should be in Chichester.** This reflects the housing needs of the community and the requirement for sustainable development.

- As we stated in our response to the Issues and Options Document, 'At Chichester' does not mean a satellite to the east!

- Where did 'adjoining Chichester to the south rank?

A core strategy should not be ruling out sites for development at Chichester as we feel this is the purpose of the later Development Options Document – we consider that there is a need to openly consult on all development opportunities in the district at this stage. This paper appears to have prejudged the possible conclusions prior to full consultation.

Flood risk is another area where more care is needed in the analysis of housing development. It has been reported that District Councillors want a ban on housing below the 5m AOD level. This would not be in accordance with the Draft South East Plan which refers to the Environment Agencies Zone 2 and 3 risk areas. As you mention in the text there are some groundwater flooding areas on the Lavant and parts of Tangmere are on the latest EA maps.

The Tangmere Parish Plan reported overwhelming support for small affordable homes for sale or part ownership.

Further development of Social Rented Housing will be opposed as Tangmere already has a large quota of this sector.

Representation Form – LI V 2 Previously developed land

We are pleased that CDC recognises the importance of archaeology and heritage in assessing previously developed land.

Tangmere Airfield and Military Aviation Museum is an important heritage site. Any development near by should respect its history and setting.

The Tangmere Parish Plan sets out a proposal to develop parts of the old airfield technical site for housing, to preserve the green fields around the old runways and to establish a regional aircraft museum that will provide interest for tourists and job opportunities. The proposal includes public open space that could include native woodland and ponds to help preserve protected wildlife species.

Representation Form – LI V 3 Small scale Greenfield sites

The Parish Council is very disappointed that CDC has supported Greenfield developments in Tangmere (Service Centre), when so much Brownfield (PDL) is still available.

The Brownfield Study has identified Tangmere as a strategic Brownfield location. The Parish Plan and Community supports further limited Brownfield Development, in accordance with our Parish Plan.

We would like Tangmere to be excluded from this section as we have made our views on further Greenfield development very clear.

We will support further limited Brownfield development in the Village and oppose any Greenfield proposals.

If Chichester cannot supply the required housing numbers (we cannot believe that this will not be possible!), then exception sites should be identified as a next stage…not as part of this study.

Representation Form – LI V 4 Large Greenfield Sites - Paragraph 114

It is not clear why views of the Cathedral from the south are so important that the South should be ruled out as a development option.

The Future Growth of Chichester Document identifies all of the important views to the Cathedral Spire, including the important view of the Cathedral over open fields to the West of the Tangmere.

In our Parish Plan Questionnaire, the residents of Tangmere made it clear that this view is important to them. Our Parish Plan therefore supports limited development on areas of PDL to the East of the Village, rather than on Greenfield to the west. Development to the West would have an adverse impact on the Amenity of the Village and would threaten the Strategic Gap.

The Spatial Vision states that views of Chichester Cathedral are important and that they will be preserved and enhanced where possible. Some housing sites to the south of Chichester are rejected on these grounds – why have they been ruled out at this stage in the process when other views are just as important.

We are pleased that CDC now accepts this argument put forward in the Tangmere Village Design Statement and the Tangmere Parish Plan. Views from this Village to the Cathedral are very important to local residents and a key reason for opposition to green field development to the west.

Representation Form – LI V4 Large Greenfield Sites – Objection

We are concerned that Tangmere is still listed as a possible Greenfield site 'in the event that large Greenfield extensions of Chichester are not possible'.

Extensions to Chichester **are** possible and several sites have been put forward by developers and have been considered by the **Land Use Allocation Committee**, a copy of the plan is attached**

It is not the place of the Core Strategy to dismiss possible sites on the grounds of flood risk, gravel working or landscape. These issues should be covered in the Development Opportunities Paper which should consider all the sites adjacent to Chichester before looking further a field.

Large scale expansion is already proposed at Tangmere on Brownfield land (as a strategic location) and it is right that there should be no Greenfield allocation.

The note referring to Tangmere is unnecessary because the village should not be listed in this section and we want the reference to Fishbourne, Tangmere and Westhampnett replaced with…..”other sustainable Greenfield locations”.

This is an options, not a conclusions paper after all. We consider naming our Village to be far too specific at this point in time. More work is needed to be done to consider sites at Chichester City before we start listing specific Greenfield locations.

Representation Form – LI V4 Large Greenfield sites

We agree that it should be a priority to firstly look at expanding Chichester City, before this option is considered. There are large areas of PDL such as the Barracks and Graylingwell (not identified in the Brownfield study – why?) which could accommodate a far higher number of units if higher density, affordable development were considered.

We prefer the option to develop more than one Greenfield location – if this is absolutely necessary – as the benefits that additional development could bring (in the form of new shops, doctors surgeries and businesses) can be spread more evenly throughout the district. In addition the transport impact of the development would be dispersed rather than focussed in one location.

Tangmere Parish Council favours sustainable urban extensions of Chichester City and the surrounding areas, in addition to the use of Brownfield land such as Tangmere, The Barracks and Graylingwell.

Tangmere Parish Council is very pleased that there are no Greenfield allocations in our village at the moment. This conforms to our Parish plan and the wishes of the local population.

Representation Form – LIV5 Overall Housing Location – Objection

The note referring to Tangmere with reference to specific Greenfield sites is unnecessary because the village should not be listed in this section.

- **We want the reference to Fishbourne, Tangmere and Westhampnett replaced with…..”other sustainable Greenfield locations”.**

This is an options, not a Conclusions paper after all! More work is needed to consider Chichester City before we start identifying specific Greenfield locations.

- **We want this policy to note that ….”access along and across the A27 must be improved for any large scale development to be acceptable at Chichester City, or any Greenfield sites on the Manhood Peninsular…..(insert)** ***or any Greenfield sites at satellite villages around Chichester along the A27 corridor.”***

All discounted Brownfield sites should be reviewed in Public and considered as a potential alternative to unspecified Greenfield sites. Potential Brownfield sites should only be discounted if the site specific conditions are so onerous that there is no viable alternative other than to consider Greenfield development.

LIV5 refers to Para 119 “Urban Potential Study” and “Taking into account the search sequence set out above”

This **objection** relates to the completeness of the sequence search and is based on a proposition that the Urban Potential Study was not complete and exhaustive – as such CDC have not carried out adequate due diligence.

In the annual meeting with the Parishes 2005 on 10th October 2005, the Head of CDC Environmental Policy Services said that **CDC had not calculated the urban potential on discounted sites**.

We consider that the Potential study is therefore incomplete and therefore prevents full consultation on all options in the LDF.

Representation Form – LIV5 Overall Housing Location

The Core Strategy makes no reference to the immediate availability of WSCC land at Tangmere and the fact that these sites have been included in the Parish Plan. There is no uncertainty about how or when these sites could be developed and it is not clear why they have to wait for the LDF process. If there is a critical housing shortage at the moment, is it not sensible to push ahead with these sites and the associated business and tourism proposals?

The upper ‘Target’ for Tangmere in the table does not reflect the views of the Tangmere Community stated in the Parish Plan and will restrict the opportunities for business and tourism. It would threaten the heritage of the old airfield and the remains of the historic battlefield. The UPS

needs to reflect the other uses for Brownfield land that have been proposed, namely expansion of the Business Park and the proposed relocation of the Military Aviation Museum at Tangmere.

Representation Form – LI V6 Housing Density

The comment about housing density will apply to extensions to Chichester City where Higher Densities are more appropriate. However, such densities may not be suitable for villages like Tangmere.

Our village does not need more housing just to provide community facilities. We consider that higher densities development on Brownfield land in Chichester is preferable to Greenfield developments at Chichester or elsewhere.

Representation Form – LI V7 Housing Mix

In our paper on affordable housing we set out the clear need to provide more, smaller houses for private or shared equity ownership.

Tangmere does not want or need more social housing for rent.

Representation Form – LI V8 Affordable Housing

Tangmere Parish Council has already set out its views on affordable housing and the key issue now appears to be how they are to be funded.

More imaginative use of the land owners and developers capital could result in **more shared equity property which we consider will encourage a longer term commitment to the community.**

Representation Form - SUS 1 Spatial Sustainable Development Principles

Tangmere Parish Council agrees with the need for sustainable development and the importance of minimising the use of the private car. We have encouraged the development of the Chichester Business Park, the HDA and the network of cycle routes around Tangmere.

It remains clear however that the majority of new houses will need to be at Chichester' to achieve the sustainability objectives. Land now available at Graylingwell and the Barracks for example could satisfy these objectives and should be developed early on in the plan. The demand for affordable houses in Chichester will be satisfied by such development and this will reduce the pressure on villages like Tangmere.

This view is supported by the Inspector's findings presented in the WSSP 2001-2016 Enquiry Report of Panel Chapter 7, Issue 7 Strategic Locations – Coast:
ii) East of Chichester District, West of Arun District - Tangmere

7.18 Of greater concern is the lack of a station and the limited existing or potential services. A new or improved bus service could be introduced but, especially bearing in mind the very close access to the A27, it is most likely that movement to and from the new development would be by car. Our concern is that <u>Tangmere is not sufficiently close to Chichester for development there to be considered as a sustainable urban extension of Chichester; nor is it clear at present that sufficient opportunities exist to create sustainable transport links as to justify naming Tangmere as a location for strategic development in preference to other possible locations.</u>

7.19……Development here (at Tangmere) would conform with neither the advice on PPG3 nor with the DDSP's overall strategy

7.30…..It may be, for instance, that there would be an advantage in a site or sites to the West of the City between it and Fishbourne, or even further west, but close to one of the existing stations.

This report concluded that Chichester City was the most sustainable location in terms of PPG3 and that it should be the location of any proposed new large scale development.

In terms of facilities required by a sustainable community, we are keen to retain our village shop and have proposed changes that could make it more sustainable in the future.

Our Parish questionnaire identified that the community wanted to see the current shop relocated (No 1 Priority) from its current position in the Conservation area, to a more sustainable location possibly linked to some of the proposed Brownfield development.

Representation Form - SUS 2 Role of Settlements and Service Centres

We agree that Tangmere is a local service centre with significant employment opportunities.

It is not clear why you have chosen to ignore the importance of the Military Aviation Museum and the contribution that it makes to tourism in the area. We specifically highlighted the need to develop the Military Aviation Museum to ensure its long-term survival.

Our Parish Plan aligned the need for more housing with the desire to preserve the cultural heritage of Tangmere Airfield with its key roles in the Battle of Britain and during D Day.

Representation Form - SUS 4 Inclusive Communities

Tangmere does not have the same age profile as the rest of the Chichester area. We have more young people and our facilities and housing need to reflect this. At the same time we need to provide some specialist housing for older residents. This has been proposed at the Fire Depot site, but proposals do not currently have CDC support.

Please note that Tangmere currently has a site for travellers.

Representation Form - SUS 5 Built Up Areas

We assume these will be equivalent to the existing Settlement Policy Areas and that development outside these boundaries will be for special needs such as the HDA, Museum and Agriculture.

Within the SPA we do not support the cramming of infill housing into gardens or public open space such as allotments.

Tangmere would like to retain a mix of house types, safeguarding the historic feel of the conservation area and focus development on the areas of PDL identified and supported by the Tangmere Parish Plan.

The ex MoD housing should also be considered for protection as part of the historic context of Tangmere

Representation Form - SUS 6 Rural Strategy

The ranking of holiday homes above affordable housing in rural areas seems unlikely to have much local support.

Representation Form - TLS 1 High Quality Development

We agree that Tangmere should be a safe and successful village and this is why we have proposed additional housing and commercial developments such as the Glasshouses, Business Park and the Regional Museum. There is a limit to the sustainable size of a village that is not on a major public transport corridor and which does not have a station.

With the removal of the derelict Brownfield land Tangmere will be an ideal size for a large village with a thriving school, village centre, medical centre and business park.

Tangmere produced a Village Design Statement and this has been incorporated in the Parish Plan. CDC did not adopt the recommendations of the local population at the time of the Local Plan but we now recommend that CDC look very closely at what we have proposed and consider the depth of feeling in this village about the issues. We should have had a Master Plan for Tangmere in the 1980's and this has now been rectified by the production of the Parish Plan.

We trust that our Parish Plan and VDS will be considered for adoption in a DPD in due course.

Representation Form - WRK 5 Horticultural Development – Objection

WKR 5 states that the existing businesses at Tangmere have plans to expand into related facilities such as cooked food. In our discussions with this business they have stated that they do **not** intend to cook food on this site.

The text in this section will need to be amended accordingly as it is factually incorrect.

We think that you will find that the provision of cooked food facilities in the HDA relates solely to Runcton!

Representation Form - WRK 5 Horticultural Development

The Tangmere Parish Plan includes a proposal to help the existing glasshouses to expand. This requires the cooperation of CDC and possibly the use of their compulsory purchase powers.

The problem is one of land ownership and the need to preserve part of the historic airfield from further development. Our Parish Plan offers a practical solution to the need for additional employment but to preserve the amenity of the local residents. We have suggested additional woodland to screen the glasshouses and public access to ponds and other habitats such as ponds and wetlands.

We are pleased that the problem of light pollution has been recognized.

Tangmere Airfield is of particular Historic importance and we are pleased that the HDA proposals seek to avoid harm to such important sites.

Representation Form – WRK 6 Working Communities Background Paragraph 138 Tourism

Reference to Tangmere Military Aviation Museum is required.

Representation Form - WRK 6 Tourism Strategy

We are very disappointed that there is no reference to Tangmere Military Aviation Museum in the Tourism Strategy or anywhere else in the Core Strategy. Relocation and expansion of this museum is a key part of our Parish Plan and CDC has recently provided additional grant aid to allow more aircraft to be housed under cover. Tourism is seen by many to be a future growth area in the region and CDC should be helping to provide the attractions that bring people to the area in the first place.

How can the Core Strategy say that high quality facilities for tourists are required and then completely ignore an important Tourism facility in the area which has major plans for expansion?

More work is obviously required if the advantages of a regional museum linked to the Royal Airforce Museum are not understood. District Councillors in the West Midlands had the necessary vision and the will reap the benefits of the new museum at Cosford when it is opened.

We have an even more historic site, with a garden of remembrance and war graves in the Village Church. It should be noted that the ashes of many deceased servicemen have been scattered on the air field itself.

Further development of this site (which has links to Billy Fiske and Sir Douglas Bader will provide good publicity for the area and compliments the other attractions such as the Festival of Speed and the Goodwood Revival.

It is essential that the museum is expanded and modernised to ensure that it survives.

We require specific reference to the current facility at Tangmere and the expansion proposals to be noted in WRK6.

Representation Form – WRK 9 District Canals

If the tourist potential of canals has been recognized why has Tangmere Military Aviation Museum been totally ignored? All the benefits associated with canals can be provided at Tangmere including enhanced wildlife and educational opportunities.

Representation Form - WRK 10 Access to the Coast and Countryside

The Tangmere Parish Plan made reference to improved cycle routes around the village. Proposals have been made to WSCC and Arun DC for an integrated network that would provide access to the coast and to the proposed National Park.

Use of the existing airfield perimeter track is an essential part of the network and we would like to see a policy to safeguard these routes.

Representation Form - WRK 13 Tourism and the South Downs

Tangmere has already been proposed as a non-car gateway to the Downs. This would require cycle routes to Felpham and Bognor and a cycle bridge over the A27 to Boxgrove.