

Comments on paragraphs

Consultee ID	Consultee Name	Consultee Organisation	Title	No.	Do you have any comments on this paragraph?	Council's response
1117611	Penelope Shaw		Paragraph	1.1	<p>Transport to The City. There is a canal see your Plan for re-development. As you were aware there was a scheme (check date on the Internet and retrieve the existing plans) This has blighted this area for years. There has been World Wide wonder that Chichester Gate was built at the Gateway to Chichester. Architects of any renown have always wondered why The Planning Department of Chichester let an inward complex be built. The temporary structures which now blight all our out of town shops warehouses etc. were built at The Gateway to The City (Novium) Could you please explain the reasoning for this? Surely any entrance to a City deserves a reflection of its past. Tourists do not come to Chichester to see the most appalling aspect of our building poor structures. The Council is aware that the footfall in Chichester has fallen by 30 per cent. This is not surprising as there are no lavatories at the Bus Station a building that the Council owns. Though it is rented to Stage Coach This does not only concern The Southern Gateway Masterplan The North Side Of Chichester Please look up on the Internet for The Proposal from The Chichester District Council? The proposal to take some land North of The City for cars is beyond the sense of normal people living in Chichester. Why blight the land for something that will be obsolete as we know a little about the future cars will not even be on the radar. Logically we have to use what we are given. The monies allocated to these re-developments should be utilised to pull down what is ugly and ungainly and not fit for purpose in this City. This does not include the wonderful brick building of the garages where the buses are stored. Why aren't the buses stored in the land on Terminus Road and then brought back quietly and gently to the train station. Utilise the canal build a bridge to allow the canal boats as is their right to proceed to Chichester Yacht basin. Utilise the line that stops at the canal. Open it up again so the train can proceed to Selsey. East Dean has a tunnel that runs from the gardens to Midhurst. To utilise this existing mode of transport would be very easy environmentally friendly etc., etc. (Please look up on The Internet this tunnel and other existing tunnels). Just as an aside This Council and previous councils here in Chichester have decimated this City. Now we have to work with what we have been left. I suggest that the car parks in the centre of Chichester have a roof (on stilts) that then can be used as tennis courts, children's playgrounds beautiful open air parks. The Local residents I am sure in their historic houses would love to see this vista. As our MP Gillian Keegan one of her skills is Spanish perhaps we could negotiate with the Spanish as they have the most wonderful roundabouts. Obviously they have allowed for a watering system. The towns and cities in Southern Spain (I do not know the North) take pride in their habitat and the roundabouts are a great source of pride. (Please look up on the internet why we have to have sponsors for our public spaces). As you can see from the above I am not in agreement with The Southern Gateway Masterplan produced by The Country Council (As Highways are involved) and Chichester district Council. I would suggest that as This Council Is Not Fit For Purpose. We ask The Council of our Twinned Cities Chartres a very beautiful city, and Ravenna another beautiful city to lend us their Planning Departments and Governing bodies to help us with their Sister City. The Chinese are now planning for their future for their citizens and have employed the famous Italian Architect STEFANO BOERI. STEFANO BOERI and his works and his thoughts on how we should be living is available to all on the Internet. I hope with The World Wide Interest that Chichester has created by this council in trying to further ruin a city. The People At Ede House Can Have A Public Meeting So That This Can Be Discussed With Architects and Planners from around The World. As You have probably surmised I Penelope Shaw a resident of Chichester IS NOT IN AGREEMENT with this ill thought out scheme which we would say was designed on the back of AN ENVELOPE.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council considers that the Masterplan strategy will provide for considerable changes to improve the Southern Gateway into Chichester. No change to Masterplan.</p>

1104382	Reverend D A Hider		Paragraph	1.1	Is this the time to 'dream dreams' fit for the twenty first century? To dream for; an integrated travel hub; developments of housing aimed at keeping the young; encouragement for small businesses to set up in close proximity to the town; social provision to entertain across the age and social ranges of people. To achieve them will require a total break with current thinking. It will require train and bus services to be greatly enhanced. It will require a fix to the A27 problems in order to provide more capacity. It will require developers to build for need, rather than profit. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	1.1	Concerns regarding public consultation. All options should be presented to the public, not the preferred ones, so they understand why others discounted. Two options lack a true explanation as to why they are preferred. Consultation period too short. Carried out when people are on holiday. Period started on 29 June, but no meaningful publicity until 15 July. Public viewings inadequate. Staff knew nothing about the development of the scheme. Background documents grudgingly permitted to be looked at for a limited period. A proper venue and more information is needed for a scheme as important at this. The flyer was illegible. Most important and controversial aspect - closure of Stockbridge Road level crossing to cars - is not mentioned. Graphics show it as being accessible for all traffic. Online questionnaire geared to 2 options and is very difficult for people to express dissatisfaction about both options and the concept of the masterplan. The whole process is predetermined to choose one of the options disregards the main issue and questions the legality of the consultation. See full representation under introduction.	The Masterplan was out for consultation over a six week period with consultation carried out at a number of locations. Copies of the Masterplan document were available to view online and hard copies were available on request. Both options set out within the Masterplan propose the introduction of a bus gate to Stockbridge Road limiting vehicular access and enhancing the public realm for pedestrians and cyclists however part of the route under Option A will still run alongside vehicular traffic due to the retention of the gyratory system. The Consultation has generated a reasonable return in comments in which responses could be completed in a range of different formats. These could be submitted not only through the Consultation portal but also by email and post.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.1	This is not for town planners but for innovative designers.... and creators Town planners will have no desire to find a solution to the transport issues. They have done little to improve the environment and enhance the feel... from what I see....	Comment noted.
1117592	Mr Simon Davenport		Paragraph	1.1	The text is overly long. I had to re-read it; plans were confusing; colour pictures added nothing. Recommend you brief your consultants to produce a more concise summary and special version for public consultation. I was unable to visit the public exhibitions. The Council office appeared to know nothing useful about the document. I was very disappointed with the presentation. Applaud the council for making provision for the future of the city. I don't believe that, especially in these times of austerity, the scale and ambitions of the total project are at all justified and would urge the council to reject it as written. See full representation in the introduction.	The Council considers that appropriate content and terminology has been used within the Masterplan which will assist in guiding architects and developers in future development proposals.
1103023	Jane Church		Paragraph	1.1	What I like about the plan The emphasis on tree planting, priority for pedestrians, noise mitigation and enhancing the streetscape by greater uniformity. What concerns me 1. I found the various documents confusing and inconsistent, and with some strange omissions The objectives for the various parts vary, making comparisons difficult. Symbols vary between documents and according to whether public realm or development opportunities are being illustrated and plans do not always have adequate keys. Numbers used in some parts disagree with other parts (e.g. Masterplan S3 numbers disagree with those of Transport Appraisal S 8 e.g. S3.47 25 apartments, 1500 sq. metres commercial and 2100 sq. metres business v S8 25 dwellings, no commercial and 2000 sq. m retail).	The Transport Appraisal was based on a provisional Masterplan but given minor changes is considered to be fit for purpose.
1118031	Louise Hartman		Paragraph	1.2	I am very concerned about aspects of the consultation process. I was unaware of the process until I received an A5 leaflet through my door on 26th July. This informed me the period for consultation on the plans was between 29th June and 10th August with one remaining opportunity to hear more on 28th July at Whyke Road. With such short notice I was unable to attend. I strongly feel the consultation period should be extended and cannot understand how plans to transform the southern gateway to Chichester can move forward in isolation to any prospective plans for the A27.	The Masterplan was out for consultation over a six week period with consultation carried out at a number of locations. The Council considers that given the uncertainty over the A27 it is not feasible to wait for a final solution. The traffic modelling has taken into account the improvements identified through work on the existing Local Plan.

376056	Mrs Caroline West	West Sussex County Council	Paragraph	1.2	County Council welcomes the positive approach to considering how to balance the regeneration of the Southern Gateway to meet future needs and protected what is valued. Work is needed to identify the necessary infrastructure and transport mitigation package alongside redevelopment proposals and explored in detail at the planning application stage. See attached representation under introduction.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
1103426	Ms Joan Whibley		Paragraph	1.3	I agree that it is important to ensure that both visitors and locals are welcomed into this historic city via the Southern Gateway. It is therefore imperative not to lose this chance to enable traffic to flow easily through and not be held up constantly by the train gates. This causes pollution, and is frustrating for everyone. The buses can't easily come in and out of the bus station because of the gridlock caused by the train gates being down sometimes for as long as 10 minutes at a time.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.3	This is a key gateway and deserves more than some ton planners producing a report that is very difficult to understand and will not encourage people to comment	Comment noted. The Council considers that appropriate terminology has been used within the Masterplan which will assist in guiding architects and developers in future development proposals. The consultation has generated a reasonable return in comments.
375268	Parish Clerk	Earnley Parish Council	Paragraph	1.3	While the Gateway plans intention to provide the opportunity for low cost housing development and desire to improve the quality of access to the city centre for those arriving by train or bus are both admirable aims, the overall impact of the plan on those living south of the city would be entirely negative. The broad design considerations ignore the role that Stockbridge and Basin Roads play as the major means of entry to Chichester from the South. The emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport is understandable and even desirable, but most of Chichester's catchment area is not within walking or cycling distance, and if use of private cars is to decrease the provision of alternative public transport must increase: there is no indication of how this will be achieved.	There is no current indication from Stagecoach that there will be any changes in their services provided.
1105801	Dr Richard Hancock		Paragraph	1.4	Of course business and leisure are important in the development, particularly close to transport links. What is lacking in the plans is an integrated Hotel/Conference Centre. There are no buildings apart from the Theatres with raked seating. for performance space. The...Assembly Room and the Cathedral are used, both being not very satisfactory. There are huge advantages of integrating conference auditoria with raked seating for plenary sessions with adjacent accommodation. Most hotels provide hireable rooms for meetings and these would be called upon for break out sessions for conferences. Many conference venues require delegates to be accommodated in a range of hotels and this is not usually very satisfactory. .The adjacent transport would be an additional very desirable feature. International delegates arriving at Gatwick would find the venue close to the station highly desirable. Performance space for numerous amateur groups or orchestras or bands would be taken when not in use for conferences. . Chichester does need to have the attributes of a modern city.	Should a proposal for an integrated hotel and conference centre come forward then this would be welcomed however it has not been set out within the Masterplan for reasons of viability.
1114638	Ms Jacqueline Jones		Paragraph	1.4	Chichester lacks modern infrastructure, reliable rail connection and has abysmal internet connectivity. It is therefore questionable that business or commerce would want to invest in the town	Comment noted.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	1.6	Need to ensure any scheme is part of a fully integrated cycling network. Current cycling provision across the city it patchy at best	Comment noted in which further consideration will be given at the detailed design stage.
1117592	Mr Simon Davenport		Paragraph	1.6	Do not believe that the plan will improve life for existing residents who want to drive from our 'semi-rural' situation to the town's resources. The plan does little to define the character of the area and leaves much to potential developers which has had a disastrous effect on the architecture of the Chichester Gate area. I do not see how the Southern Gateway has become such an important idea when the majority of traffic will enter the city from St Pancras or the Avenue de Chartres by road. Those entering from Stockbridge Road will be residents of Donnington, Birdham, Witterings etc and will probably be using the road as access to the schools, shops, theatre, cinema etc. They do not need to see an impressive gateway to the city but they might like to drop people and luggage at the bus or railway station. All could benefit from more, well maintained, open green space in this area of the town and not just some minimal tree planting and shrub 'planters'. The plan is not ambitious enough in some areas	The Council agrees that the Southern Gateway is the principal approach into Chichester city and is therefore a key point of access and arrival.

					and, if it is needed at all, should focus on a few important sites that need council intervention and not try to find a solution to all perceived problems at once. See full representation in introduction.	
1022521	Mrs M Devitt		Paragraph	1.7	Why does the Southern Gateway plan make no mention of the disabled? We are an elderly community and the disabled make a lot of use of public transport but need to be able to park near it so as to be able to make easy links with the Transport assistance especially at the railway station. Trees in the car park may be attractive but only if they are properly cared for and do not reduce the availability of disabled parking for both lines.	Disabled parking has been considered with the re-provision of any spaces at the railway station.
1103426	Ms Joan Whibley		Paragraph	1.8	The drab approach to the city from the south is dominated by the car and traffic.	Comment noted.
1116983	Mr David Rozier		Paragraph	1.9	With regards the planning and environmental impacts of the proposals I am personally not really bothered but am concerned that there is no mention of toilet, waiting and/or Cafe provision on either side of the station. If it is desirable to make the southern gateway to be as welcoming to visitors as possible etc then such provision would be most desirable. See attached representation under introduction.	These facilities currently exist at the Railway Station. There are no proposals in the Masterplan to remove them.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	1.10	Any proposed scheme should include strong soft landscaping, with a commitment to maintain in the long term. I have noticed that trees within Chichester Gate have been removed, which creates a very barren appearance with just lots of multi-coloured sheds. Not in keeping with Chichester's character.	Comment noted.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	1.14	To be effective there must be an effective interchange between bus and rail services such as a transport hub to the north of the railway station	Comment noted.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	1.14	Cycling routes need to be joined up with wider network, which also needs enhancing. Developer contributions should, in part, pay for making Chichester a much more bike friendly city.	Comment noted in which further consideration will be given at the detailed design stage. The Council will seek to include Masterplan projects within the Infrastructure Business Plan to ensure that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding can be sought, where appropriate.
375268	Parish Clerk	Earnley Parish Council	Paragraph	1.14	The problem with the bus station is the lack of facilities, not the layout of the yard. Bus stops on streets will make changing buses and train-bus connections more difficult, especially for visitors. This is hardly an enhancement of bus facilities (1.14), which provision of a waiting room, public toilets and perhaps an information office would be. Apart from the services to the Witterings all buses whose stops are south of the gyratory system will have to turn round in the station yard, which goes against the concept of easier and safer pedestrian access to the station.	There are currently no facilities provided at the bus station and there is no proposal to provide any. The existing bus station would be replaced in both options with a new bus and taxi interchange which would be located to the north and south of the railway station.
558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	1.14	You say a lot about encouraging pedestrians and cyclists, but I detected very little detail. Map on p16, no mention of cycle routes. There are general statements about how much better cycle and pedestrian access will be from the station into the city, but there is no detail about how this is to be achieved. The only piece of detail about cycle routes I noticed was a reference to the bollards at the southern end of South Pallant. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Comment noted. The public realm priorities seek to achieve a better balance between the different modes of transport, with a particular focus on public transport, walking and cycling. Further detail regarding routes, linkages, etc. will be given at the detailed design stage.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.14	Integrated transport including cycling and walking are critical. These are very vague words. We need to ensure that the bicycle becomes a fundamental part of the transport system. We must positively encourage cycling. We also need to connect the gateway with an easy to access bridge to the entertainment complex	Comment noted. The public realm priorities seek to achieve a better balance between the different modes of transport, with a particular focus on public transport, walking and cycling. No bridges are proposed however the Masterplan sets out a new pedestrian crossing at Canal Wharf to improve pedestrian access between Chichester Gate and Canal Wharf.

375268	Parish Clerk	Earnley Parish Council	Paragraph	1.15	The clear aim of the plan is to have no private car access to the railway station except for staff and operational use. This flies in the face of reality. Not all rail users can walk or cycle to the station, not all can afford (or are willing to afford) a taxi, and rural bus services do not serve the earliest trains, and stop hours before the last train. Regrettable though it might be from an environmental point of view, a station car park and access to the station for private cars remain essential. These problems could be mitigated by provision of a north-western access to the station, deemed not necessary to facilitate the main highway network changes proposed. Surely public and private transport users, the TOC and Network Rail would prefer road access and a car park to having the chance, as the Plan puts it, to celebrate the route of the culverted watercourse	The Masterplan seeks to improve the Southern Gateway of Chichester as it is a key point of access and arrival. It is considered that the removal of through traffic along South Street and Southgate (except for public transport, access and servicing) would help to achieve this.
1110164	Mr Brian Bird		Paragraph	1.15	To the two proposals should be added the Freeflow proposal of a bridge and the closure of BOTH level crossings	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	1.19	As such it needs to be enforced by case officers when determining applications.	Comment noted.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.19	This needs to be more than a guide. It needs to be an imaginative blueprint that enables Chichester to have a really exciting development on the side of the canal	The Masterplan identifies that it is not a blue-print for the Southern Gateway but a flexible document to assist in guiding development proposals. Over time different opportunities for the city centre may present themselves alongside those already identified. A guiding document will enable these opportunities to be appropriately considered.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.20	These are very simple words and do not give the impression of an exciting place for people to work, live and enjoy recreation.....	Comment noted.
375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	1.20	In terms of non-designated heritage assets, the southern gateway of the city had Roman roads converging upon it and this must produce enhanced archaeological potential in this part of Chichester. The development of suburbs in the medieval and later periods is a further factor with both the canal and railway as examples of later uses of the area. Despite this rich heritage, the historic environment is referenced as the last clause of the last Key Objective. Whilst we welcome this clause in principle, we would like to see it expressed rather more forcefully and refer not just to the setting of heritage assets, but also to their conservation and enhancement (including that of archaeological remains), and to their playing a key role in the future of the Southern Gateway. We would suggest that the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment be a separate key objective in its own right, given the importance attached by the Government to heritage assets in the National Planning Policy Framework and their significance in Chichester. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
1114489	Mr Jonathan Brown	Chichester Liberal Democrats	Paragraph	1.20	While there are attractive elements to the Masterplan, we feel that overall it lacks ambition . Beyond the increased pedestrian provision and replacing old fashioned and dilapidated buildings with newer, more attractive ones, it misses the opportunity to address some of the larger, long term problems the city and the district faces. These problems will only be solved with determined political and financial support. See attached representation uploaded to introduction.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.

1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.24	Why is the canal not mentioned. The canal should be the focal point of this redevelopment	The Masterplan sets out a number of positive improvements to the setting of the historic Canal Basin and seeks to reinforce its role and function.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	1.24	Why not extend the master plan to include the lorry park and Dudman yard off Via Ravenna? Could move the bus station here, with enhanced connection to rail station? Lorry park could be down Terminus Road?	These sites have not been considered as they are outside of the Masterplan area. No change to Masterplan.
375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	1.24	Overall, we feel there is a general lack of guidance about how historic environment issues are relevant in these locations and advice about how proposals should take these into account. References are made to national planning policy and the Local Plan but there is a lack of any analysis of how these should apply in this specific location. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
1105638	Mr Clive Sayer		Paragraph	1.24	The bus depot is locally listed because, as stated, it is a good and early example of a thin pre-stressed concrete clear span roof - not quite unique in UK but close. It would be best if a clever reuse could be found rather than destroying this piece of history.	It is considered that the re-use of this building would be unlikely due to its size, scale and layout making it unviable and commercially undeliverable. Any redevelopment proposals would have to be of such high design to mitigate and justify the loss of this locally listed building.
1117075	Merrill Investments		Paragraph	1.24	Our clients premises (referred to as Development Opportunity 6) are outlined and included in the Masterplan without seeking their input. Making specific reference to the premises will have an adverse affect commercially; create uncertainty; and may hinder sale of the premises in the future. Occupational tenants of our client have expressed grave concern and may result in them reviewing their future occupation and not renewing their Lease. Our clients object to redevelopment opportunity 6 and generally to the proposals put forward in the Masterplan. Their Premises is a long established, successful commercial building. The principal effect will be to place blight on improvements to buildings therein and commercial activity in the South of Chichester. Representation uploaded under introduction.	This site is not fundamental to the overall aims and objectives of the Masterplan. Change Masterplan to remove site.
376056	Mrs Caroline West	West Sussex County Council	Paragraph	1.24	All development proposals have potential to reduce flood risk. Development Opportunity Areas could benefit from more public open space and landscaping with potential for environmental enhancements incorporating 'Blue-Green Infrastructure'. SuDs, rain gardens and rainwater harvesting should be explored at detailed design stage. Water features intercepting natural runoff would help reduce volumes / flows in regard to surface water drainage flows and enhance public amenity. See attached representation in introduction.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
376056	Mrs Caroline West	West Sussex County Council	Paragraph	1.30	All development proposals have potential to reduce flood risk. Public realm priorities could benefit from more public open space and landscaping with potential for environmental enhancements incorporating 'Blue-Green Infrastructure'. SuDs, rain gardens and rainwater harvesting should be explored at detailed design stage. Water features intercepting natural runoff would help reduce volumes / flows in regard to surface water drainage flows and enhance public amenity. See attached representation in introduction.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.32	The design quality needs to be exceptional. The last two significant developments by CDC have been in my view unimaginative. Chichester Gate is hardly exciting and up to the standard of what Chichester should have The Multi level carpark is very poor in design concept. Please can we really design something that we can all be proud of.	Comment noted.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	1.33	Need to make sure any design code reflects Chichester's history and character. Unlike what has been done at Chichester Gate, which has a few flints on the wall of the imax. Need some really strong architecture, not cheap boxes. If it is attractive, people with use it.	Comment noted. The Masterplan identifies the use and importance of high quality materials in which further consideration will be given at the detailed design stage.

375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	1.33	We welcome the design principles, particularly principles One and Five, but we would prefer conserving to preserving in Principle One as terminology more consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and as recognising that sensitive change can take place that maintains or even enhances the significance of heritage assets. The principle should also refer to significance as this is what is special about heritage assets. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.33	The canal area must be used and enhanced. it is a vital landmark and could really become focal point	The Masterplan sets out a number of positive improvements to the setting of the historic Canal Basin and seeks to reinforce its role and function.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	1.44	Principles are good. Need to make sure future developers are obliged to follow these and not substituted for cheap alternatives	Comment noted.
1114489	Mr Jonathan Brown	Chichester Liberal Democrats	Paragraph	1.44	Attractive high density, urban housing would be appropriate in the redevelopment and would help make the area feel a vibrant, forward looking place to be. Good use of public open space will be important to making this work, and may need to double as water catchment areas due to some of it being in a flood zone. See attached representation uploaded to introduction.	The Masterplan has identified the importance of a flood risk assessment to mitigate against the impacts of flooding. It also identifies the need for open space not only for public use but also as an additional means for mitigating against flooding.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.46	Also integrate Citygate	Chichester Gate has not been considered as it is not part of the Masterplan area. No change to Masterplan.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	1.49	Personally I am sure we must ensure enough walking space in front of the canal. I think this should be a centre point for people and entertainment	The Masterplan sets out a number of positive improvements to the setting of the historic Canal Basin and seeks to reinforce its role and function. The development aspirations set out mixed use developments with cafes/bars/restaurants fronting onto the canal basin and the removal of vehicular traffic provide opportunities for new public open space and seating areas. All of which will improve the use of this area.
1105638	Mr Clive Sayer		Paragraph	1.52	With two days to go there seem to be very few comments posted. It is a pity that the consultation period coincides with peak holiday season which may have influenced this.	The Masterplan was out for consultation over a six week period. The Council received a reasonable response to the consultation.
584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.1	You forgot to mention the chaos and frustration when the railway crossing gates come down and the confusion caused by the poor signage.	Comment noted.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	2.1	Need to be considering population growth. Local plan will be pushing for 10000 homes in/around Chichester over next 15 years, which will double the population. Visions for Chichester need to allow for this and beyond. The city will very quickly become over congested and a far less attractive destination - just look at Worthing - regularly gridlocked.	The impact of population growth will be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.
584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.2	This sums up Chichester's problem. It is squeezed between the Southdowns National Park and the Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Therefore the pressure for Housing and Transport improvements for the whole district are focused on the narrow strip with Chichester at its centre. Without a resolution to the A27 upgrade and the construction of a bridge over the railway the area will become even more congested and polluted.	The Council considers that given the uncertainty over the A27 it is not feasible to wait for a final solution. The traffic modelling has taken into account the improvements identified through work on the existing Local Plan. The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.

584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.3	I'm not sure the River Lavant connects the city to the harbour if you are a Human rather than a Duck or a Rat.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.4	I think the Romans have now left. It is time to upgrade our infrastructure in line with modern requirements.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.5	Aren't local people who come in from outside Chichester stakeholders too? Coming from the Peninsula we are subject to huge delays on the A27 crossing, then further delays at the level crossings. This scheme will make it worse. People will avoid the City centre and use the out of town retail parks instead, meaning the shops and businesses in the centre will suffer. They already are. All that we want to do is to easily and enjoyably be able to come in to town, park and use the facilities of the City. We can't all cycle, walk or use public transport for all sorts of reasons - we have to drive in and shouldn't be penalised for it	Comment noted but this does not reflect the objectives of the Masterplan.
1114638	Ms Jacqueline Jones		Paragraph	2.6	Just 2% of Chichester population - under 500 - individuals responded to the Chichester Vision consultation and of that 2% the largest group of 26.4% were over 65 These figures speak for themselves. Chichester's future is firmly planted in the past	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.7	You could add "if the railway gates are up".	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	2.7	It will be essential to take forward plans to upgrade the A27 around the south if the City in order to meet the accessibility objective.	The Council considers that given the uncertainty over the A27 it is not feasible to wait for a final solution. The traffic modelling has taken into account the improvements identified through work on the existing Local Plan.
584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.7	You could add "if the railway gates are up".	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.10	This is a golden opportunity to achieve a solution to the railway gates which have blighted our lives for years.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.10	add in entertainment a destination for people.	Comment noted. The Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.10	This is just not true. Where is the "enhanced transport exchange" and especially where is the "improved road layout"? Either of the road layout options would be disastrous resulting in huge queues of traffic blighting the whole area.	The Council considers that this paragraph in the Masterplan is accurate and will provide for an enhanced transport interchange and an improved road layout. These are shown on the Masterplan.
1110164	Mr Brian Bird		Paragraph	2.10	It should include a conference centre and concert hall. There is no public building in Chichester capable of accommodating more than about 150 people and nowhere (other than the Festival Theatre) that has a raked floor. Such a centre would contribute to tourism.	Should a proposal for a conference centre and concert hall come forward then this would be welcomed however it has not been set out within the Masterplan for reasons of viability.
584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.11	As you state the area has potential for all sorts of enhancements. It is a shame that this plan is so inadequate.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	2.13	just as well, its ideals were never enforced and the Southern Gateway Forum, set up to monitor it, was soon abolished by Cllr Myles Cullen.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.

1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.20	This is a huge opportunity to ensure this part of the city is reinvented. It would not be difficult to ensure the railway area and surrounding area are all included in a revamp that focus on real quality. We need to ensure that the law courts are part of this as well. It is also essential that the level crossings are removed and a single simple bridge incorporated. This is not rocket science	The Law Courts have been considered within the Masterplan area. The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.21	I would like to understand what CDC thinks is sustainable transport..... We need to think of the new transport driverless cars, trams etc.. simple ways of moving people around Chichester without parking....	Sustainable transport is generally interpreted as referring to walking, cycling and public transport.
375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	2.23	The table under paragraph 2.23 on background documents should identify the specific assets (designated and non-designated) within the Study area rather than within the district as a whole, and reference the Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Chichester Historic Environment Record. The former could be used as a basis of identifying what aspects of significance should be considered as part of proposals. Are there any buildings at risk within the Study area ? We note that there is no Urban Archaeological Database for Chichester and that it was not covered by the Sussex Historic Towns Survey. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	2.25	We welcome paragraphs 2.25, 2.27, but references to potential archaeological interest seem to be too high level and we feel more could be said about archaeological potential and the types of responses that development proposals might require. Historic England cannot offer a screening service for buried archaeological remains but the City Archaeologist could be asked to deepen the description of the likely significance of potential remains and to provide guidance about probable responses under the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan policies. Historic England could consider providing a paid for screening service for potential listings if this is requested and thought to be necessary. It is for the Council to consider how big an issue/risk the current list coverage might be and possibly follow this up with our Listing Group. See attached rep under 'Introduction'	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	2.29	Fully agree the walk to Southgate is horrible and must discourage many visitors	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375337	Mrs Hannah Hyland	Environment Agency	Paragraph	2.34	Pleased to note that the draft SPD identifies areas shown to be in Flood Zone 2 and 3. Support the recognition that the Sequential Test will need to be satisfied for these sites, in accordance with paragraph 100-102 of the NPPF, and where met, necessary measures are incorporated into the development, as informed by a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment. Representation uploaded under introduction.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.34	If at all possible we should seek to uncover the River Lavant. We must ensure that we manage not just the 100 year possibility of flooding but the long term possibility. For those of us who remember the floods in Chichester we must protect the City.	The River Lavant is not situated within the Masterplan area and therefore has not been considered. No change to the Masterplan.
558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	2.36	I would also mention the paucity of bungalows in Chichester which I think is a particular aspect of Chichester's housing stock. You refer to downsizing in 2.43 and lack of bungalows is a major consideration. If there is an adequate supply of bungalows people (including myself) would be more likely to consider downsizing. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Comment noted. The Council considers that single storey dwellings would result in an inefficient use of land in this location.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.37	This frankly is not true. The shops are the same as every other city. One opportunity is to encourage some really unique shops that can AFFORD to be in Chichester. We have almost no independent shops left now	The Council considers that this paragraph is accurate. No change to Masterplan.

375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	2.39	Yes, but housing and a bustling night-time economy don't sit easily alongside each other.	Comment noted. The Council considers that the location is appropriate for a mix of uses.
375337	Mrs Hannah Hyland	Environment Agency	Paragraph	2.39	The SPD makes no recognition to the current and future constraints on available treatment capacity at Apuldram Waste Water Treatment Plant. From our calculation the SPD proposes 320+ houses and a hotel. This level of development is not anticipated to be accommodated within the current headroom capacity at the WwTW. Further consideration is needed regarding additional infrastructure and reference to it should be made within the Draft SPD itself. Pleased to see that the SEA notes the issues in this area.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
376056	Mrs Caroline West	West Sussex County Council	Paragraph	2.39	The County Council will require development contributions in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations to ensure essential infrastructure is met. The indicative number of homes - minimum of 319 apartments - is not considered to significantly increase pupil numbers in the District. See attached representation under introduction.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	2.39	General issue concerning building new housing close to a railway line. I know that there is a need for social housing, but should the beneficiaries of that be condemned to major railway noise? The same applies to students, who, being mainly young, will have good hearing - I know that I would have avoided a hall of residence so close to a railway. Perhaps it would not be quite so bad for elderly who cannot now hear so well - but we pensioners are not all hard of hearing, we probably are in our homes more than average, and are equally entitled not to be inflicted with constant noise pollution. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Any residential development within close proximity to the railway line will address the issue of railway noise through appropriate noise mitigation measures.
592116	Miss Margaret Rochester		Paragraph	2.39	Concern that the Southern Gateway will become a housing ghetto and create more traffic, parking and access problems. More new housing will destroy the historic environment of Chichester. Representation uploaded under introduction.	The Masterplan seeks improvements to enhance this area of the city for visitors, businesses and residents, providing opportunities to contribute to local need. It also seeks to conserve the historic character of Chichester.
756716	Mr and Mrs B Bird		Paragraph	2.39	Chichester does not need more city centre housing and retail outlets. What is desperately needed is a meeting place that can accommodate more than the limited capacity of the Assembly Rooms in North Street. There is nowhere in the city that meets this need. The Festival Theatre and Minerva are beyond the resources of most local organisations. There are many housing development already in progress or planned in and around Chichester but very little attention appears to have been given to local employment meaning that new residents will have to travel to work elsewhere adding to the traffic on our already congested roads. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Masterplan is not a blue-print for the Southern Gateway but a flexible document to assist in guiding development proposals. Over time different opportunities for the city centre may present themselves alongside those already identified.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.39	We need affordable housing for local people. Not expensive housing from people moving from London.	A number of the redevelopment sites make reference to the provision of affordable housing. In any event residential development will need to comply with Local Plan policy in which a 30% affordable housing contribution will be sought where there is a net increase of dwellings.

1114489	Mr Jonathan Brown	Chichester Liberal Democrats	Paragraph	2.39	The Masterplan notes that The residential market is characterised by high values compared to other nearby centres, such as Havant and Portsmouth, but with a comparatively low supply of affordable housing. High housing prices are not matched by local wages meaning that Chichester as one of the most challenging markets in the UK for local workers to buy a home. Demand and supply are skewed towards the larger, more expensive properties. The lack of affordability is an issue, and the inability to either settle or remain Chichester represents a threat to the availability of a local skilled workforce. This supports the principle of the introduction of discounted products which improve affordability. The redevelopment of the Southern Gateway offers an opportunity to improve things, but simply leaving the market to create the supply of genuinely affordable housing is not going to work. Developments that are for obvious reasons skewed towards maximising rental or for sale values are not going to solve this problem, as so-called Affordable Housing is unaffordable to people on local wages. In practice we face a choice: do we attempt to maximise the income from the land OR do we attempt to address the local housing need? The Masterplan is vague on this and retains a deal of flexibility with regards to what proposals will be considered. Where there is a choice it ought to more firmly support and emphasise the need for genuinely affordable and ecologically sustainable - local housing . See attached representation uploaded to introduction.	A number of the redevelopment sites makes reference to the provision of affordable housing and starter homes. In any event residential development will need to comply with Local Plan policy in which a 30% affordable housing contribution will be sought where there is a net increase of dwellings.
1117592	Mr Simon Davenport		Paragraph	2.39	Provision for economic housing, including well designed and environmentally sound, council accommodation, should be a priority. See full representation in the introduction.	A number of the redevelopment sites make reference to the provision of affordable housing and starter homes. In any event residential development will need to comply with Local Plan policy in which a 30% affordable housing contribution will be sought where there is a net increase of dwellings.
558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	2.40	I notice the reference to a lack of housing for the less affluent, which I think is a major problem in this area and needs urgent addressing. See attached rep under intro.	A number of the redevelopment sites make reference to the provision of affordable housing and starter homes. In any event residential development will need to comply with Local Plan policy in which a 30% affordable housing contribution will be sought where there is a net increase of dwellings.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.40	So you see the issue what is the solution? Leaving the statement sitting does not help. We need to dedicate some land for affordable housing and ensure the cost of the land is not too high	A number of the redevelopment sites make reference to the provision of affordable housing and starter homes. In any event residential development will need to comply with Local Plan policy in which a 30% affordable housing contribution will be sought where there is a net increase of dwellings.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.41	Is the demand from local people though. How can our children afford local houses or flats?	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	2.42	The council should be more proactive in leading on delivery of lower cost housing, with the new ability to raise funds and reinvest returns, the council should be looking at ways to deliver good quality "council housing" that would meet affordable housing targets without the need developers have for returns to shareholders etc. This could achieve much more than the 30% affordable 70% private that is currently the only tool. Have a look at what Croydon are doing.	A number of the redevelopment sites make reference to the provision of affordable housing and the inclusion of the starter homes initiative. In any event residential development will need to comply with Local Plan policy in which a 30% affordable housing contribution will be sought where there is a net increase of dwellings.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.42	We do not need to discount we need to build affordable housing by ensuring we do not pay too much for the land. land for affordable housing should not be at the normal land value....	Land value is determined by the market and is influenced by the planning policies related to affordable housing, including discounted products.

1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.43	Yes we must cater for this but we also need accommodation that suits people who do not need care but need to live in accommodation that supports the elderly	The Masterplan has identified a demand for suitable properties for people wishing to downsize. The document is however not a blueprint for development and therefore until such time that proposals come forward, the type of housing cannot be confirmed with the exception of compliance with Local Plan policy in which a 30% affordable housing contribution will be sought where there is a net increase of dwellings.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.45	But will CDC stick to them???? Or will the developers have the last word???	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.47	We must find a way of incorporating some form of night club here. The ideal location close the station..	Comment noted. The Masterplan does not refer to a nightclub however the type and mix of night time uses will be considered at the detailed application stage.
1103023	Jane Church		Paragraph	2.47	The documents contain several unevidenced statements (eg Masterplan S2.48 city centre is constrained in meeting the needs of the food and beverage trade aimed at the younger population. In this case, who are brands such as Wahaca, Pizza Express, Wagamama, Wildwood, The Burger Kitchen and many others aimed at?	The paragraph reflects research carried out in formatting the Chichester Vision.
1117592	Mr Simon Davenport		Paragraph	2.47	Do not understand or support the provision of more cafe/ restaurant space- it would appear to be rivalling the number of charity shops we have. Generally, we could be maintaining the character of the city of Chichester and not replacing everything with houses and restaurants . See full representation in the introduction.	The Masterplan provides an opportunity to expand upon the night time economy which is currently under developed in Chichester, encouraging non residential uses which will link with established restaurants in the city centre.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	2.48	Once again you ahve ignored the effect that evening activity can have on the existing residents. This is NOT the ideal site.	The re-development sites are located within a city location. The Masterplan provides an opportunity to expand upon the night time economy which is currently under developed in Chichester, encouraging non residential uses which will link with established restaurants in the city centre. Appropriate noise mitigation measures could be incorporated into buildings depending on their use.
375268	Parish Clerk	Earnley Parish Council	Paragraph	2.48	Does Chichester really need more shops, restaurants, cafes? With respect to the canal basin, it certainly seems inappropriate to create a focus for evening activity in what is essentially a residential area, many of whose residents are elderly.	The re-development sites are located within a city location. The Masterplan provides an opportunity to expand upon the night time economy which is currently under developed in Chichester, encouraging non residential uses which will link with established restaurants in the city centre. Appropriate noise mitigation measures could be incorporated into buildings depending on their use.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.48	I agree with this. Very important to support the younger members and the students. We will need inexpensive restaurants as well. How about street food??	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
756716	Mr and Mrs B Bird		Paragraph	2.49	May I suggest that the Southern Gateway Master plan be varied to provide for a Conference Centre/Public Hall and Hotel? Chichester is an attractive place to visit but lacks hotel facilities. A first class Conference Centre and Hotel would stimulate tourism, create jobs and business opportunities and meet a real local need. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Should a proposal for an integrated hotel and conference centre come forward then this would be welcomed however it has not been set out within the Masterplan for reasons of viability.

1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.49	Other uses such as a Conference, exhibition centre and high quality performance venue should be included within the masterplan. This would then attract high end hotel operators.	Should proposals for a conference centre, exhibition centre or performance venue come forward then this would be welcomed and considered however they have not been set out within the Masterplan for reasons of viability.
375337	Mrs Hannah Hyland	Environment Agency	Paragraph	2.50	The SPD makes no recognition to the current and future constraints on available treatment capacity at Apuldram Waste Water Treatment Plant. From our calculation the SPD proposes 320+ houses and a hotel. This level of development is not anticipated to be accommodated within the current headroom capacity at the WwTW. Further consideration is needed regarding additional infrastructure and reference to it should be made within the Draft SPD itself. Pleased to see that the SEA notes the issues in this area. Representation uploaded under introduction.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.50	High end hotel operators will want a special location. The canal basin should be looked at as a possibility - it can add vibrancy and activity to the basin and increase awareness of this major asset to visitors	The Masterplan sets out a number of positive improvements to the setting of the historic Canal Basin and seeks to reinforce its role and function. This location is not considered appropriate for a hotel use but other non residential uses are considered to the north of the site which would enhance the vibrancy and activity within the area.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.53	We need to ensure that the current situation is resolved. This is a polluting area with standing vehicles when the railways gates are down, This must be resolved with a way to take traffic into the city without stopping at the gates.....	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester. It is considered that by restricting vehicular access along Stockbridge Road this would allow the Basin Road level crossing to work independently and therefore give more time for vehicles to cross the Basin Road level crossing.
584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.54	I think it would be appropriate to mention the effect of the railway gates when closed. This creates large areas of standing traffic producing pollution. Not sure where there are four lanes on the gyratory system, I can only count three, still it's only a car park most of the time.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester. It is considered that by restricting vehicular access along Stockbridge Road this would allow the Basin Road level crossing to work independently and therefore give more time for vehicles to cross the Basin Road level crossing.
375268	Parish Clerk	Earnley Parish Council	Paragraph	2.55	If there is any gain from having nearly all traffic turn into a new Basin Road, this will be lost by the necessary provision of a pedestrian crossing just north of Terminus Road. Access to and exit from Kingsham Road will be more difficult.	Matters such as junctions and crossings will be addressed as part of the detailed design stage.

558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	2.57	Please do not underplay significance of railway crossings. All local people know how much delay there is at those crossings, especially while one waits even while the train that will use them is static in the station, and it is not uncommon for the gates to be down while two (if not three) trains come by. The crossings have to be a major cause of traffic congestion in Chichester, for all that I accept (as the report does) that there is probably not much that can be done about this. See attached rep under intro.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	2.57	Most of the delay results from the way individual signalmen operate the crossing, issues which are not safety-related as Network rail would have us believe	Safety regulations in respect to the level crossings are set by Network Rail. No change to Masterplan.
584640	Mr Colin Molyneux		Paragraph	2.57	As previously stated, the crossing gate delays are subject to the whim of the operators. The obvious solution is a bridge for traffic, however if this does not come to pass, relocation of the eastbound platform to the east of Basin Road gates on the site of the Bus Garage will mean that the gates can be raised as soon as the train has stopped at the platform, rather than having to remain down while the train is boarded	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester. Safety regulations in respect to the level crossings are set by Network Rail. It is considered that by restricting vehicular access along Stockbridge Road this would allow the Basin Road level crossing to work independently and therefore give more time for vehicles to cross the Basin Road level crossing.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.57	I think this is the first mention of what is the biggest problem and what this whole study should be about - the level crossings.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.57	I refer to my earlier comment. I do not accept that it is not possible to find a solution to the level crossing issues. We want more visitors and to have a strong economy but with the current wait at the level crossings we are putting people off coming to Chichester	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1110164	Mr Brian Bird		Paragraph	2.57	The Freeflow proposal addresses this issue	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1116946	Mrs B.D Colwell		Paragraph	2.57	This plan seems quite acceptable except for the fact that the level crossings will still be there. Whilst this is a wonderful way of reviving the City, it seems a very big waste of money if these are still in place. The tailback they cause some days causes traffic to back up as far as the A27 and it is not unknown for drivers to have to wait whilst four or five trains go through. This causes pollution in the City and wastes many hours of business time. I would suggest that although it might be more expensive to remove these and build a bridge, in the long run it will be an opportunity lost if it is not done. I have seen the alternative plans put forward by Freeway which suggests a bridge being built over one of the crossings with the other being closed and I would suggest that the Council thinks again and adopts this plan.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.

1116971	Mrs P.R Winfield		Paragraph	2.57	On looking at the recent map of what is proposed for the Southern Gateway I am surprised that an opportunity is going to be lost in getting rid of the level crossings. These cause problems every day to the personal and business traffic going through the City. Sometimes it is possible to wait over 10 minutes for the various trains to go through. Having seen the alternative plan whereby a bridge is built following the present bus route and closing both crossings I would suggest that, although it might be more expensive option, it should be one the Council look at before making a bad decision and leaving the crossings there.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1117540	Mr Bernard Adkins		Paragraph	2.57	Southern Gateway Consultation: There is currently in the "Southern Gateway" part of Chichester unacceptable traffic holdup because of the level crossings. Any Southern Gateway development will make the situation worse and therefore I cannot accept the development proposals. Should not the start point be a road transport study which should consider the option of closing both level crossings. Any such study must also take into account the A27. This was at one time a "Chichester Bypass"; but is no longer because of the increased volume of traffic and considerable use by local traffic. We need a Chichester bypass for through traffic which will not impact adversely on local traffic.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester. The Council considers that given the uncertainty over the A27 it is not feasible to wait for a final solution. The traffic modelling has taken into account the improvements identified through work on the existing Local Plan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.58	It is madness to provide a masterplan for the area that does not address the level crossings. Apart from all of the massive traffic congestion problems they should be closed for safety reasons alone. They are inherently dangerous and Network Rail want to close all of them. All options to be able to close them should be investigated.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester. Network Rail policy is to seek to close level crossings where practicable and where there are substantial safety concerns. The crossings in Chichester are not identified as priorities as part of that policy.
1110164	Mr Brian Bird		Paragraph	2.58	It seems likely that the crossings will have to be closed at some stage in the future	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1117356	Helen Hawdon		Paragraph	2.59	It can be seen that there are 3 dwellings coloured in yellow on the left hand side of this Plan showing the 3 houses looking over Stockbridge Road and the Canal Basin. These are envisaged in this consultation document as townscape which positively frames and addresses streets and space. I thus take from this that my house is a positive addition to the local streetscape. It can then be seen that my house, along with the other 2, suffers the weakness of having a pedestrian environment which is unattractive and car dominated, as well as Stockbridge Road having engineered character breaking apart grain and character and including street clutter. Thus, at first blush, it appears this document is endeavouring to address what are seen as detriments to an otherwise strong streetscape. It is also notable that my property is not within the designated are of the Plan, falling just outside the red demarcation line. I seek to show whether this Plan does indeed achieve its stated objective.	Comment noted. The Council considers that the Masterplan strategy will provide considerable changes to improve the Southern Gateway into Chichester. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.60	As previously stated, not all people can walk or cycle in to the City as we live too far away. To take public transport would take too long, so we want to drive in. Soon we will all have electric cars so we will not pollute the environment. Why can't car drivers' experiences be improved too, by making it easier for cars to come in to the city and people to then enjoy the facilities and help the City's shops and businesses by their patronage?	Comment noted but this does not reflect the objectives of the Masterplan.

376056	Mrs Caroline West	West Sussex County Council	Paragraph	2.60	The Masterplan area is adjacent to the Stockbridge Road Air Quality Management Area. There is potential for the proposals to impact on the AQMA through traffic reassignment resulting from changes in journey times. In finalising the Masterplan, CDC is requested to have regard to potential impacts on the AQMA. This should be considered alongside cost and viability. Increasing the number of people walking and cycling can meet key aims of local authorities, from reducing air pollution and carbon emissions to addressing congestion and keeping people active. Conditions that encourage walking and cycling can help create an attractive environment for all, support the local economy and provide a vibrant setting. Green space can support social inclusion and community cohesion.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1103023	Jane Church		Paragraph	2.60	The Transport Appraisal preferred options clearly limit access across the Stockbridge Road to pedestrians, cyclists and buses but in discussions with a District Council officer he insisted that this included emergency vehicles despite these appearing in a separate Specialist Service Vehicles category (and dealt with separately in some of the rejected options) in the document itself. The documents mention the footpath from the station west of the Lavant but make no mention of the footpath to the east of the Lavant, which could be enhanced and widened by utilising a small space to the rear of the Government buildings into a prominently signposted 400 yard promenade to the city centre, coming out as now - beyond all the traffic near The Chantry.	The Specialist Service Vehicles category forms part of the user hierarchy. The Council can confirm that emergency vehicles would be able to access the part of Stockbridge Road that would otherwise be restricted to pedestrians , cyclists and buses. Whilst the land to the east of the River Lavant could be an alternative route for enhancement this would be likely to require third party land acquisition and would not be possible to the north of the access road to the government buildings.
1114525	Mr David Bowie	Highways England	Paragraph	2.60	Highways England met with Chichester District Council and their transport consultants Peter Brett Associates on the 26th April 2017 to discuss the Southern Gateway Masterplan Chichester Transport Appraisal Volume 1 Report and its Technical Appendices. It was identified that, despite the simplicity of the model adjustment process adopted for this appraisal, it represents a robust preliminary assessment. The results presented demonstrate that the masterplan proposals for the Southgate area of Chichester City Centre is unlikely to have a material impact on the operation of the SRN A27 Chichester bypass. If the masterplanning proposals are taken forward from this preliminary assessment then it is expected that any subsequent and more detailed appraisal undertaken should include: - A review of Local Plan development proposals to ensure that the quantum of developments that is predicted to come forward within Chichester and Arun District Councils, in the future, is accurately reflected in the model forecast demand matrices. - A review of the Highways England A27 Chichester Bypass model in the area surrounding the Southgate area of Chichester City Centre. This should include a review of the model network, to ensure that the network described in the model gives an accurate and relevant representation of the existing road network in light of the proposals. - An assessment of the accuracy of base model assignment to identify any significant discrepancy between modelled and observed conditions. Taking appropriate account of growth in flow levels between the base model (2014) and observed flows. - Should updates be required to demand matrices to ensure the correct level and definition of trip making was represented in the model, then a more robust methodology for matrix update should be developed. - A series of traffic surveys should be undertaken to allow a comparison between the base model and current conditions, and also to inform more detailed operational junction modelling. - The preparation of operational junction modelling, for key junctions within the masterplan area, together with junctions on the SRN A27 Chichester Bypass, should be undertaken where a material change to junction operation is predicted as a result of traffic generated by the proposed masterplan development. See attached representation under introduction.	Comment noted. The Masterplan will be changed accordingly with appropriate referencing to any subsequent and more detailed appraisals.

558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	2.62	Please do not be surprised that there is "uncontrolled pedestrian traffic between the railway and bus stations when the gates are down". Of course there is - if you see the gates down, you know that you probably have several minutes to cross with total protection from vehicular traffic and there is a very convenient path alongside the railway into the bus station, which is all the more attractive when one has luggage. I will freely confess to taking advantage of this if I see the gates are down, and it is clear that others share my view. See attached rep under intro.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.62	So given those observations how does closing Stockbridge road crossing to cars and diverting all traffic via Basin road crossing help the situation?	The primary pedestrian movement is north-south between the railway station towards the city centre. It is considered that by restricting vehicular access along Stockbridge Road this would allow the Basin Road level crossing to work independently and therefore give more time for vehicles to cross the Basin Road level crossing.
1103023	Jane Church		Paragraph	2.62	Other statements of dubious validity concern the level crossings. From my timed observations, I would say that most congestion at peak times is caused not by level crossings but by the A27. Even so, level crossing congestion (and pollution) does occur. The Transport Appraisal seems to imply that the main delays are caused by eastbound trains. My own research, undertaken over several days and at different times, show that the barriers are down on average for 150 seconds for eastbound trains, 185 seconds for westbound trains, and much longer when trains are going both ways and the barriers are left down between them for several minutes for no apparent reason. In all cases the barriers often come down well before a train is in sight. The times I recorded between the barriers going down and a westbound-only train appearing in the distance (I could see well past Quarry Lane) ranged from 10 seconds to 185 seconds, whereas for eastbound-only the times from the barriers going down and the train appearing round the bend close to the station ranged from -13 seconds (that is, 13 seconds after the train had stopped at the platform), to 72 seconds. On average, based on observing 14 trains, the barriers are down for 150 seconds eastbound and 185 seconds westbound, and for over 400 seconds when both are expected. It seems apparent that the long delays could be reduced by closing the gates for shorter times (eg by raising them between trains, and by closing them, on average, several seconds later).	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.65	Why not look at an option that could prioritise EVERYONE - by providing a bridge! If the policy is to deliberately make car drivers' lives hell by exasperating the traffic problem they will go elsewhere. This will create other problems elsewhere in the City as people try to find alternative routes meaning they are driving twice as far as they need to. Alternatively they will go to another town where access is easier, shops and businesses in Chichester will suffer and the City will become a Museum.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
376056	Mrs Caroline West	West Sussex County Council	Paragraph	2.67	Support the choice of two preferred highway layouts from the transport study included in the Masterplan as options A and B. Of the two layouts, Option B provides the greatest transport benefits, providing greater separation between traffic and other road users. Both options would provide a realigned Basin Road at the south of the Masterplan area, relieving Canal Wharf of traffic and increasing separation between traffic and other road users on Stockbridge Road from the junction with Terminus Road, should ease traffic conditions in this area. See attached representation under introduction.	Comments noted. Option A is the option selected for inclusion in the final Masterplan.

558390	Mr Ian Sedgley		Paragraph	2.67	The only public visual access outside the immediate environs of the canal basin is that seen from Basin Road/Canal Wharf, the southern edge of which adjoins the narrow green sword between the roadside footpath and the canal basin. This should not be enclosed by yet another building/buildings between the road and the basin, regardless of planting shown pictorially adjacent to this structure and presumably intended to soften the impact of such a building or buildings. The design and adoption of the alternative schemes lack both empathy and sympathy with the historic nature of Chichester. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Comment noted. The Council considers that the building is in an appropriate location which will facilitate the redevelopment of an unattractive building and re-routing of Basin Road. The final form and layout will be determined at the planning application stage.
558390	Mr Ian Sedgley		Paragraph	2.67	Considered overall brings me to the simple truth that neither of the proposals now presented have any merit other than as an expedient sticking plaster at minimal cost, based on a design concept which may work in a grid iron new town, but which fails to blend with the historic character of the city, address the unique opportunities this provides, enhance the city as a place in every respect and take Chichester forward through the 21st century. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Comment noted. Option A is the option selected for inclusion in the final Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.67	£5.3 million would go a significant way towards paying for a bridge solution such as the Freeflow one	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.67	All options should be presented to the public, not the preferred ones, so they understand why others discounted. Two options lack a true explanation as to why they are preferred. The most important and controversial aspect of the proposal - closure of Stockbridge Road level crossing to cars - is not mentioned. The graphics show this as still being accessible for all traffic. This is misleading. Online questionnaire geared to 2 options and is very difficult for people to express dissatisfaction about both options and the concept of the masterplan. The whole process is predetermined to choose one of the options disregards the main issue and questions the legality of the consultation. See representation uploaded to introduction.	The Council considers that options A and B would meet the Masterplan objectives and would maintain movement through the study area.
1117469	Mr Mark Clark		Paragraph	2.67	Proposed new road from Basin Road to Stockbridge Road Surprised to see this new proposal in contrast to the earlier ideas of making the southern part of Basin Road access only with no through way for traffic to Stockbridge Road and which included the pedestrianisation of the northern part of the canal basin. This would have been a big improvement to the public realm on the northern side of the canal basin and southern part of Basin Road. Basin Road is now proposed as the main route south from the city centre of all traffic with two right angle turns, within two hundred meters, by the creation of a new main traffic flow road through the heart of the proposed new residential development (Royal Mail site). This would be a put off to any development partners and have an adverse environmental impact on the residents with traffic noise, sound and air pollution on the current residents on the south of Basin Road - most have frontages on the street and are not protected by front gardens. A better option would be to upgrade the current traffic access from Basin Road to Stockbridge Road (between the law courts and bus station) to three lanes . This would improve traffic flow both southwards onto Stockbridge Road and northwards onto Southgate. This would be a cheaper option and ensure that many more residential units could be located on the Royal Mail site than would be the case with the current proposal. Most secondary school students access school via the southern section of Basin Road. The proposal in the master plan would contribute to greater risk to these students to road traffic accidents whereas the better option we refer to would cancel out this risk. We are aware that many of the residents in Basin Road have a similar view. See attached representation in introduction.	It is accepted that redirected traffic along Basin Road could have a negative impact on the residents however it is considered necessary to deliver the wider benefits to the area.

1117488	Alison Crisp		Paragraph	2.67	<p>Proposed new road from Basin Road to Stockbridge Road Surprised to see this new proposal in contrast to the earlier ideas of making the southern part of Basin Road access only with no through way for traffic to Stockbridge Road and which included the pedestrianisation of the northern part of the canal basin. This would have been a big improvement to the public realm on the northern side of the canal basin and southern part of Basin Road. Basin Road is now proposed as the main route south from the city centre of all traffic with two right angle turns, within two hundred meters, by the creation of a new main traffic flow road through the heart of the proposed new residential development (Royal Mail site). This would be a put off to any development partners and have an adverse environmental impact on the residents with traffic noise, sound and air pollution on the current residents on the south of Basin Road - most have frontages on the street and are not protected by front gardens. A better option would be to upgrade the current traffic access from Basin Road to Stockbridge Road (between the law courts and bus station) to three lanes . This would improve traffic flow both southwards onto Stockbridge Road and northwards onto Southgate. This would be a cheaper option and ensure that many more residential units could be located on the Royal Mail site than would be the case with the current proposal. Most secondary school students access school via the southern section of Basin Road. The proposal in the master plan would contribute to greater risk to these students to road traffic accidents whereas the better option we refer to would cancel out this risk. We are aware that many of the residents in Basin Road have a similar view. See attached representation in introduction.</p>	<p>It is accepted that redirected traffic along Basin Road could have a negative impact on the residents however it is considered necessary to deliver the wider benefits to the area.</p>
1103023	Jane Church		Paragraph	2.67	<p>I do not support either of the two preferred options. Other options How about placing weight and/or size restrictions on HGVs through Chichester centre? How about a congestion charge for traffic between certain hours to dissuade people from driving-in unnecessarily? How about creating Red Routes (as in Reading) to prevent stopping for any reason, to ease congestion caused by loading etc? How about making the Stockbridge Road exit from the A27 access only through traffic to use Fishbourne or Bognor junctions? I have designed a further option, which is similar to Option 4 but with southern route of gyratory rather than northern one. This gets over the problem with articulated vehicles and the need to demolish listed buildings See attached rep under 'Introduction'.</p>	<p>The transport interventions suggested would need to be taken forward by West Sussex County Council as the Highway Authority. The proposed alternative highway changes would not bring the same benefits as the proposed scheme in removing through traffic from Southgate/Stockbridge Road outside the Railway Station and prioritising space and clear routes to the city centre for cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed alternative highway changes would not bring the same benefits as the proposed scheme in removing through traffic from Southgate/Stockbridge Road outside of the Railway Station and prioritising space and clear routes to the city centre for cyclists and pedestrians</p>
1117356	Helen Hawdon		Paragraph	2.67	<p>I have only looked at Option A as both options have the same end result for me in any event. It can be seen that the revised Basin Road will now turn directly onto Stockbridge Road right in front of my house. Bearing in mind that Stockbridge Road is proposed in its northerly section from my house up to the train station to be barred to general traffic and only to be used by buses, taxis, emergency vehicles, etc, that effectively means that all general north/south traffic will now be routed directly in front of my house. As a pedestrian, I fail to see how this will improve accessibility for me. I will now have an even more major road directly at my front door with no direct means of crossing this stream of traffic. This will not raise the quality and appearance of the portion of the public realm I share at all. It will detract from the strength that my dwelling provides to the local streetscape. There will necessarily be an increase in the pollution from additional vehicular traffic in this location. With the unspecified location of further bus stops south of the train station and along Stockbridge Road, that pollution would only be exacerbated further. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.</p>	<p>It is accepted that redirected traffic along Basin Road could have a negative impact on the residents however it is considered necessary to deliver the wider benefits to the area. Crossing points will be addressed as part of the detailed design stage.</p>

558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	2.68	I am afraid that I burst out laughing when I read the aspiration that more traffic be switched to the by-pass. No local in his/ her right mind is going to use the congested by-pass if there is an intra-city alternative. Moreover I would argue that the exit to the A27 from Stockbridge Road is so bad that many will seek other routes to avoid that roundabout - I know that I do - and that this may well reduce what would be a normal traffic volume along Stockbridge Road. If you really want to help pedestrians, I think that thought needs to be given to bridges and/or tunnels (like that leading into Northgate car park). If Option B is adjudged to be the better alternative, surely the extra £3 million should be by the by - better by far to use the one opportunity really to get the solution right, and surely cost-benefit analysis would support this view. See attached rep under intro.	Comment noted. The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester. Option A is the favoured option for reasons of preservation of the historic environment.
1103272	Mr David Leah		Paragraph	2.68	Whichever option that is chosen it is infinitely better than attracting more south/north traffic through the city by adding bridges or tunnels. Sooner or later, certainly within the lifetime of this plan, the A27 problems will be addressed allowing the city to become traffic free in the central area. My solution would actually be to close both crossings to car traffic and to enhance parking around the inner loop of the historic city. Do not pander to the car lobby.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1114489	Mr Jonathan Brown	Chichester Liberal Democrats	Paragraph	2.68	Between Options A and B we lean towards support for Option B. Option A retains the Southern Gyratory and the land in the centre of the area remains compromised. See attached representation under introduction.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	2.69	Concerned about the issues of traffic flow. I am left wondering what the impact of the proposed changes will be on traffic flow, especially option B. If the Avenue de Chartres is to be extended to the east, how will its junction with Market Avenue/Basin Road be regulated? I can envisage the most almighty hold-ups there, all the more so if it is to remain a major bus route. Traffic flows remain important, and good traffic flows are what people are coming to work, shop, do activities in, or visit Chichester will rightly expect. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Matters such as junctions will be addressed as part of the detailed design stage.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.69	This sort of scheme went out in the sixties, it's unbelievable it is seriously being proposed. The three buildings are very attractive and add a lot to the streetscape. I suspect this option is just to make option A look good, which it doesn't.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	2.69	We naturally have concerns about Traffic Option B, which we note would necessitate the demolition of three Grade II listed buildings. As you will be aware, the National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and to conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. The Framework further advises that as heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification and that substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings should be exceptional , only justified where necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss (or all of the circumstances in paragraph 133 of the Framework apply). Given that Option A would provide substantially the same public benefits, as noted by paragraphs 2.71 and 2.75, Option B is not justified and should be discounted immediately. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
375248	Parish Clerk	Chichester City Council	Paragraph	2.70	Members decided against expressing a preference for either Option A or Option B. To do so may be misrepresented as an indication that one or other of the 2 options may be sufficient, whereas it was generally felt that neither goes far enough to meet the Vision. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Comment noted. Option A is the option selected for inclusion in the final Masterplan.

375268	Parish Clerk	Earnley Parish Council	Paragraph	2.70	The plan notes that on the gyratory system East-West traffic is greater than North-South. Yet it is the North-South flow which is now regularly stopped. Under the plan, traffic approaching the level crossing from the north will have less queueing space than at present when the gates are closed, which will have a negative impact on the flow round the whole gyratory system, especially if Option B is adopted. It is noted that the Freeflow Scheme, currently the subject of a public petition, attempts to solve these problems by provision of a bridge between the two level crossings. Despite the closeness of the bridge to housing and the lack of detail with regard to public transport, it would seem to provide the framework for a viable solution.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1116983	Mr David Rozier		Paragraph	2.70	As a retired Highways Design Engineer I am most concerned at the apparent lack of consideration for the Kingsham Road / Basin Road junction in both Options 1 & 2. Such lack of consideration will involve heavily on local residents, the 600 bus route and possibly block access to and from the Police Station. With all of the vehicular movements excepting buses using Basin Road obviously the queue of northbound traffic will quickly block any right turn egress from Kingsham Road. As soon as the level crossing barriers are raised then southbound traffic will continue to block right turn movements out of Kingsham Road for quite some time. Just one or two cars waiting in Kingsham Road to turn right into Basin Road will effectively block buses turning left to get to the southern bus gate in Stockbridge Road. Such an increase in the amount of queueing traffic in Basin Road when the level crossing barriers are down could have a similar effect on the access to and egress from the Police Station which in an emergency could be disastrous. See attached representation under introduction.	Matters such as junctions and crossings will be addressed as part of the detailed design stage.
1103023	Jane Church		Paragraph	2.71	The documents claim that the preferred options will reduce traffic in the city centre by getting people to use the A27. This seems doubtful at best. If people wanted to use the A27 they would be doing so already rather than suffering delays in the city. There seems to be no evidence for this view, which was repeated by an Officer of the Council at a recent meeting at Brampton Court	The traffic modelling shows that traffic will be re-assigned to the A27.
1117356	Helen Hawdon		Paragraph	2.72	There is then mention at 2.72 that there be a new bus and taxi interchange north and south of the train station. Why on both sides? Surely that just spread the pollution from such vehicles across both sectors. I seem to recall there was a proposal for the new interchange to be set north of the train station, where there is a more plentiful availability of land for the sort of area such an interchange would require.	An interchange to the north and south of the train station will assist in providing an enhanced transport exchange. It will facilitate interchange to bus stands on Southgate and Stockbridge Road.
375268	Parish Clerk	Earnley Parish Council	Paragraph	2.73	The problem of congestion at the end of Terminus Road is mentioned but not addressed. A possible solution would be to block Terminus Road west of the entrance to the Chichester Gate car park, or to do almost the opposite: reroute Stockbridge Road traffic up Terminus Road and over a new bridge west of the signal box.	Terminus Road does not form part of the Masterplan area. No change to Masterplan.
375268	Parish Clerk	Earnley Parish Council	Paragraph	2.73	The problem of congestion at the end of Terminus Road is mentioned but not addressed. A possible solution would be to block Terminus Road west of the entrance to the Chichester Gate car park, or to do almost the opposite: reroute Stockbridge Road traffic up Terminus Road and over a new bridge west of the signal box.	This is outside of the Masterplan area and therefore has not been considered. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.73	The traffic build up from the Basin road crossing will almost certainly at times extend back to the Stockbridge road / Chichester Gate junction (it does at the moment at times) so when priority is most needed for emergency vehicles they will still be blocked. IT REALLY DOESN'T WORK. A bridge however would enable buses, fire engines and ambulances clear access at all times.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.

1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.73	I do not understand what a Bus gate is? What it does and how it help.....	A bus gate is a signposted stretch of road, along which use is restricted to public transport and (where specified) taxis and other authorised vehicles. Reducing traffic volumes will enhance the public realm of this area.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.75	£5.3-8.2 million would go a long way to a real solution - a bridge	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.75	My first response is that Option B will be better as it is a better scheme. I am not happy about knocking down listed buildings. We need to understand this more. In both options i there enough land close to the canal so we make best use of this resource?	Comment noted. It is considered that the proposed redevelopment of the land to the north and the realignment of Basin Road will enhance the function of the Canal Basin.
1103272	Mr David Leah		Paragraph	2.77	Simple. Stop car traffic using either crossing and send them around an enhanced inner city loop.	This option is not considered feasible or viable. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.78	All level crossings are dangerous and should be closed. We've been lucky with the relatively low number of recorded incidents. However if you stand watching either crossing at busy times there are several near incidents every day. Pedestrians and cyclists cross the railway lines with cars / lorries inches from them as there is no pavement for protection and vehicles accelerate to ensure they get through the barrier before it comes down.	Network Rail policy is to seek to close level crossings where practicable and where there are substantial safety concerns. The crossings in Chichester are not identified as priorities as part of that policy.
1110164	Mr Brian Bird		Paragraph	2.78	The Freeflow proposal shows how this could be done	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1110164	Mr Brian Bird		Paragraph	2.79	The Freeflow proposal should be carefully considered	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
374905	Mr David Renton-Rose		Paragraph	2.79	A bridge over is too urban and will not align with Chichester's historic character. Plus impacts to residents from noise and pollution, visual impact would be very damaging.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375248	Parish Clerk	Chichester City Council	Paragraph	2.79	Requested that Chichester District Council look into the possibility of a bridge or a tunnel over or under the railway line. Representation uploaded under introduction.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.

375315	Parish Clerk	West Itchenor Parish Council	Paragraph	2.79	The Parish Council welcomes the proposals, but wishes to see the removal of the level crossings by either a tunnel/underpass beneath or a bridge. There has to be an engineered solution. The Masterplan covers land on both sides of the crossings and is the above opportunity to resolve the issue.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
383360	Mr Christopher Mead-Briggs	Chichester Society	Paragraph	2.79	The decision not to consider a further solution to the level crossing is a mistake. There has to be an engineered solution. The Master plan covers land both sides of the level crossings and is the obvious opportunity to resolve the issue. To proceed without either a bridge or a tunnel suggests the Plan is flawed.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
558390	Mr Ian Sedgley		Paragraph	2.79	A fundamental element of the Southern Gateway must be to incorporate a road bridge across the railway to inter alia, materially relieve traffic congestion and reduce pollution. The current northern entrance to the station is dangerous and inappropriate. This should be closed and a new access to the station and the buildings accessed from the station forecourt area should provide between the former government offices (6 on drawing No. CSG001/017/B) and the eastern end of the multi storey car park on the south side of Avenue de Chartres - in view of the fact the River Lavant passes underneath much of the city, this part of the Lavant could also be culverted to facilitate construction of a wider access/egress into/out of the station forecourt area if required. This would then enable a bridge for light vehicular traffic (with a width restriction) to be constructed on the line of Stockbridge Road/Southgate, whilst preserving access to the buildings on the Stockbridge Road frontage, south of the level crossing - minor land takes might be required under the Land Compensation code. The benefit of a bridge over a railway is that it is much lower than a bridge required to clear the height of commercial vehicles, with a margin, over a road. A design solution should be found that will provide an attractive cutting edge solution. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
584233	Mr John Wilton		Paragraph	2.79	I support the proposals regarding the two level crossings, although I feel the option of creating a bridge to replace both level crossings should not be excluded at this stage, but investigated further.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
592116	Miss Margaret Rochester		Paragraph	2.79	A tunnel is not possible because of the high water table. A bridge option would be slightly better, but an eyesore.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	2.79	They have missed a really viable option - to bridge over the railway line BETWEEN Stockbridge road and Basin road. £10 million is well worth it. Provision of access to the Stockbridge road and Basin road properties can be maintained and the approach road ramps can be accommodated within highway gradient guidelines. Construction can proceed without interfering with either existing route It must be investigated further.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.79	We must remove One of the railway gates. is it not possible to remove both gates and only have one access point?? I believe it must be possible to have a tunnel.....	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as issues of flood risk.

1114489	Mr Jonathan Brown	Chichester Liberal Democrats	Paragraph	2.79	While constructing a bridge where we currently have a road and a level crossing would create problematic bulk and height, it might well be possible to design the bridge in conjunction with entirely new building on either side, such that it didn't appear intrusive or oppressive. E.g. the 'street level' could be raised by putting the ground floor of neighbouring shops on the first floor of the new buildings. This could work in the same way as when shops are built on hillsides it is possible to enter a ground floor on one side, go up a staircase and exit on the ground floor on the other. It is a concept that should be explored. The stated desire of driving traffic out of central Chichester (which is part of what lies behind the no bridge/tunnel policy - along with cost) is an attractive one, but it is very hard to see how this goal can be achieved without also considering the future of the A27 and potentially other major developments. While we can perhaps plan new housing, new offices, etc. regardless of what happens with the A27, redesigning Chichester's roads with the goal of shifting traffic elsewhere really does need to be done as part of looking at the bigger picture. The public should have been consulted on the desirability of trying to improve traffic flow through this area. Without a bridge or tunnel, it is not hard to see traffic congestion remaining or even growing as a significant problem, blighting the area which we are trying to make more attractive for pedestrians. See attached representation under introduction.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester. The Council considers that given the uncertainty over the A27 it is not feasible to wait for a final solution. The traffic modelling has taken into account the improvements identified through work on the existing Local Plan.
1118028	Mr Steve Green		Paragraph	2.79	I would like to add my name to the growing number who see the opportunity to improve the lives of so many people in Chichester and the approaches by installing a bridge over the railway at Stockbridge crossing. It causes untold frustration and pollution levels off the scale. The opportunity was missed when the gasometer was dismantled and this may be our last chance.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1119073	Mr Brian Turbfield		Paragraph	2.79	Whatever is decided, it must include as priority a bridge over the railway to avoid the intolerable delays we experience with the crossings closed. Clearly the crossing at Canal Basin is the ideal candidate for this. Anything else pails into insignificance and should be designed around such a bridge.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1105331	Mrs Kate Beach		Paragraph	2.79	I feel that there is a glaring omission in your options. It is essential that the issue of the railway crossings are addressed with a longterm solution. Chichester does not deserve this ancient method of allowing the trains through the city. This is central to the success of the redevelopment.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or a tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1118036	Brian Turbfield		Paragraph	2.79	Whatever is decided, it must include as priority a bridge over the railway to avoid the intolerable delays we experience with the crossings closed. Clearly the crossing at Canal Basin is the ideal candidate for this. Anything else pails into insignificance and should be designed around such a bridge.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	2.80	We must consider other options. This is a typical CDC response unimaginative. We must look outside the box	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1110164	Mr Brian Bird		Paragraph	2.80	They should be	Comment noted. No change to the Masterplan.
1114606	Mr Philip Ladds		Paragraph	2.80	Any solution which does not address this real barrier to traffic movement cannot effectively deliver a southern gateway - with the current crossings it's a southern traffic jam - despite the cost a bridge should really be looked at seriously	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.

585632	Mrs A Jefferies		Paragraph	3.1	Having studied this document carefully I should like to make the following representation: There appears to be very little provision, if any, for public conveniences in these plans, particularly at strategic locations such as: Railway station Bus & Coach station Coach drop-off locations. May I suggest that this important provision is given serious consideration before final plans are drawn?	There are currently no facilities provided at the bus station and there is no proposal to provide any. Facilities currently exist at the Railway Station. There are no proposals in the Masterplan to remove them.
1103023	Jane Church		Paragraph	3.1	<p>The documents emphasise the need to extend the city centre, but there are currently 20+ retail units of varying sizes vacant or preparing to become vacant in the main shopping streets (East Street, South, West and North Streets) is there really a need to provide more, given the general decline in the use of High Streets across the UK? Do we really want to make Chichester a clone of neighbouring cities which we can reach easily if we really want what they have on offer when we have so much more to offer in terms of environment, cityscape and culture and which we are putting into danger by over-development? Why? Most of the development opportunities identified in the documents include cafes, pubs and restaurants. There are already approx 40 cafes, restaurants, bars, pubs and take-aways within 800 yards of the station (including those aimed at younger people at Chichester Gate) is there really a need for any more? More specifically, cafes, bars, restaurants, pubs etc especially those with spill-out areas are incompatible with the residential nature of the canal basin/delivery office site, where residents already suffer from late-night noise from Chichester Gate and local pubs as well as noise from traffic. Given the stated concerns about railway noise on the bus station site, does it not make more sense to keep the already-residential canalside/delivery office area purely residential (or, at least, 0900-1800 operation only) and make the bus station site all commercial, without any residences at all? Similarly, why consider housing by the rail station surely this should be a prime site for developments aimed at visitors (such as a Chichester or South Downs Experience building, publicising, and selling tickets for, things to do and local events and this would, in fact, justify a nice cafe. The City of Bath has The Box Office next to the Abbey which serves that purpose there.)</p> <p>The councils own website shows that unemployment in the district is <2% - equivalent to full employment so why emphasise job creation? Jobs in cafes, bars etc are not likely to generate high wages, and due to low unemployment jobs are likely to go to people from other areas and create further road congestion and/or further housing and infrastructure pressures Noise, pollution and congestion from combining what are two roads into one will place undue burden on properties near the proposed new Basin Road. Noise-damping road surface, bunds (where appropriate) and tree planting might help but it is likely that, with both your preferred options, delays at the level crossing (and possibly also at Terminus Road and A27) will lead to tail-backs into the gyratory at peak times. The Masterplan makes little mention of the elderly residents of several retirement blocks in and approaching the Gateway area from the south. How will they - and the projected canalside visitors - be expected to cross the new Basin Road when going to and from the railway station and South Street? How will traffic turn right from Kingsham Road across two lanes of heavy traffic? How will buses and vehicles accessing the station, office block and Brampton Court etc get across two lanes of traffic onto the southern section of Stockbridge Road? Given that the lights at Terminus Road would be close to any lights at Basin Road, their phasing would have to be very accurate in order to prevent gridlock at peak times.</p>	The Masterplan is not prescriptive in terms of the uses it suggests for individual sites. The Council considers that a small amount of retail and food and drink uses would be appropriate in this area, linking the City Centre with Chichester Gate. Noise mitigation will need to be addressed at planning application stage.
375130	Ms C Mayall	Southern Water	Paragraph	3.3	Six development opportunities include around 320 residential units at The Law Courts and Bus Station (50), Bus Depot & Basin Road Car Park (80), Royal Mail Sorting Office (25), Police Station & High School (144) and Government Offices (20). A number has not been specified for the site at Chichester Station 'could include apartments or student accommodation'. We have therefore not been able to assess this particular site. We have undertaken an assessment of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposed development (NPPF paragraph 162; NPPG). Additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development at all five above named sites (involving making a connection to the local sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity). Our assessment also reveals that Southern Waters infrastructure crosses the Royal	Comment noted. The Masterplan will be changed accordingly with appropriate reference made to the Chichester Surface and Foul Drainage SPD.

					<p>Mail Sorting Office site, which needs to be taken into account when designing any proposed development. An easement would be required, which may affect the site layout. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. 320 new residential units within the Southern Gateway would be in addition to the 235 residential units already allocated headroom at Apuldram Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) in the Chichester City Local Plan, as identified in paragraph 5.3 of the Chichester Site Allocations Plan which is presently in Examination. Prior to the implementation of a solution to the current environmental constraints at Apuldram WwTW, it will be necessary to direct any forthcoming proposals for these developments to Flowchart 2 on Page 8 of the adopted Chichester Surface and Foul Drainage SPD and associated Headroom Tables for Apuldram and other Wastewater Treatment Works document. If proposals can demonstrate that flows to the sewerage network will be no greater than the current input by existing development, the proposals would be acceptable in principle, subject to a further assessment at the time such proposals come forward. This could potentially be achieved by removing any existing surface water connections from the foul or combined sewer network.</p> <p>We therefore suggest the following additions to the Key Design and Development Considerations section of each of the five Development Opportunity sites which have specified numbers of residential units: Foul Drainage: Proposals will be acceptable if they can demonstrate that redevelopment of the site will not result in a net increase to flows presently arising from the existing development. If this is not possible, it will be required for the development to provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider and with reference to the Chichester Surface and Foul Drainage SPD. See attached representation under Introduction.</p>	
1114616	Mr Simon Pierce	Chichester Hockey Club Limited	Paragraph	3.5	<p>Kingsham All Weather Pitch - I write in reference to following sections of the Southern Gateway Draft Masterplan. Four: Land at the Police Station and High School Page 36, Paragraph 3.54 - The school buildings are currently vacant, and consist of a largely single-storey pitched roof building. The southern section of the former school site contains an all-weather sports pitch. Later in the same section in 3.56 the plan states that The former Chichester High School for Boys site is currently vacant and available for redevelopment. Site Four - Former Police Station and High School land at Kingsham Road - Page 56 - The eastern half of the site is owned by WSCC leased to the Academy, and is now vacant and unused other than the all-weather pitch to the south which is to be relocated to an identified alternative site. Chichester Hockey Club Background My name is Simon Pierce and I am the Chairman of Chichester Hockey Club. We have over 450 members and run 14 league sides on Saturdays and 3 more on Sundays during the Hockey season as well as providing full evening training programs on Mondays to Thursday for all sides at the Kingsham All Weather pitch. The bulk of our sides compete in the Sussex and Hampshire Leagues but our Mens 1sts compete in the National League East Conference and in 2016y played in the hockey equivalent of the FA Cup Final at the Lee Valley Olympic Stadium. They are arguably the highest performing sports side in the Chichester area and we are justifiably proud of them, especially given the true community nature of our club. We punch way above our weight for the city and last season completed against representative sides from major cities such as Cardiff, Bath, Bristol, Birmingham and Exeter. Our Ladies 1sts also recently won the National English Hockey Vase at the Lee Valley Stadium, which was covered extensively in the local press and TV. As important we have over 100 kids from 8 to 12 turn up every Monday at the Kingsham pitch to play hockey and receive professional coaching. We have players from 8 to 80 all playing and competing and our sport is truly booming especially following the Rio Girls epic Gold Medal last year, which did more for women's team sport than any event in the last 20 years. We are run entirely by volunteers and receive no funding from local government or from English Hockey. We are a self-supporting organisation with a proud history in our city since our foundation in 1898. Chichester Hockey Club and the Kingsham All Weather Pitch The pitch was built in the late 80s on land provided by WSCC at the site but entirely funded by Chichester Hockey Club at the approx. cost of £250K. This money was raised through the enterprise of our</p>	Comment noted. Private contract matters are not matters for the planning process. Were the all weather pitch be developed it will have to be relocated elsewhere within the school site.

					members and from the proceeds of the Chichester Real Ale and Jazz Festival, founded and run by members of our club. The pitch was re-surfaced in 2006 again using substantial funds from the club and a four way contract put in place between WSCC, CHSB, CHSG and the Club. This contract still exists is the basis for our use of the facility. As such we have a considerable interest in continued use of the pitch for which we have valid contract having invested substantial amounts of our members money to see it built and carefully maintained in conjunction with the High Schools and now TKAT. The pitch is absolutely critical to our future as a club and we would like to register our interest any decisions being made as to its future. We note from the document that the allweather pitch to the south which is to be relocated to an identified alternative site. Clearly if this is to take place as a club we would like to make the following observations 1. Any movement of the pitch would need to take into account our existing contract and weekend and evening playing/training rights as a club 2. The movement would require careful timing given the extensive playing commitments of our 14 league sides between September and the end of April 3. Any alternative sites would need to be within walking distance of the city centre and our clubhouse at Chichester College. We would like to confirm where the planned replacement pitch would be situated. 4. The all-weather pitch would need to be of Hockey standard as approved by English Hockey as is the current Kingsham Pitch. 5. The pitch would require floodlights to a min of 500 lux and on site changing and parking facilities as does the current Kingsham pitch The Kingsham pitch is critical to our future as a club and we would like to request that our club is fully involved in any decisions regarding its future.	
1114489	Mr Jonathan Brown	Chichester Liberal Democrats	Paragraph	3.8	Although the ultimate decision on the fate of the Chichester Law Courts is out of the District Councils hands, it would nevertheless be welcome to see the plan put forward a proposal to accommodate and promote such provision demonstrating that retention has the backing of the community. See attached representation uploaded to introduction.	The Masterplan acknowledges that the Crown Court and Magistrates Court are locally listed. It identifies that conversion to accommodate new uses may be feasible although due to their internal layout and construction this may not be practicable.
1117592	Mr Simon Davenport		Paragraph	3.8	I would like to see the Law Court preserved as a prestige site, public building or hotel. See full representation under introduction.	The Masterplan acknowledges that the Crown Court and Magistrates Court are locally listed. It identifies that conversion to accommodate new uses may be feasible although due to their internal layout and construction this may not be practicable.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.9	as important buildings new uses should be found rather than demolition and redevelopment	The Masterplan acknowledges that the Crown Court and Magistrates Court are locally listed. It identifies that conversion to accommodate new uses may be feasible although due to their internal layout and construction this may not be practicable.
1114638	Ms Jacqueline Jones		Paragraph	3.12	Both commercial and housing development of these sites will result in many more cars exiting on Basin Road with planned parking provision and no provision made for greatly increased noise and light pollution both late night and early morning for the residents of Basin Road.	It is accepted that redirected traffic along Basin Road could have a negative impact on the residents however it is considered necessary to deliver the wider benefits to the area.
1117164	Tess Pinto	Twentieth Century Society	Paragraph	3.12	The Society urges that the document is redrafted in order to explicitly state the proposed retention of the bus depot, in line with the recommendation of the NPPF. Chichester Bus Depot, designed by Alfred Goldstein and R Travers is locally listed. It is a rare example of a thin-shell, pre-stressed concrete roof, providing clear span and unobstructed floor space. It is of great engineering interest. It contributes to Chichester's history and identity, and is within the Chichester Conservation Area. The Masterplan acknowledges this interest. There is scope for sensitive improvement. We do not consider that comprehensive or partial redevelopment would be appropriate. Any attempt to do so would go against paragraph 126 of the NPPF. Representation uploaded under introduction.	It is considered that the re-use of this building would be unlikely due to its size, scale and layout making it unviable and commercially undeliverable. Any redevelopment proposals would have to be of such high design to mitigate and justify the loss of this locally listed building.

375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.14	As above these important buildings should find new uses and not be demolished	The Masterplan acknowledges that the Crown Court and Magistrates Court are locally listed. It identifies that conversion to accommodate new uses may be feasible although due to their internal layout and construction this may not be practicable.
558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	3.14	I have not understood what is to happen to the bus station. I want it to stay where it is because of the present proximity to the railway station and also its very reasonable distance from the city centre. I would also like some seats there and for it generally to look less run-down. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The existing bus station would be replaced in both options with a new bus and taxi interchange located immediately north and south of the railway station.
1103272	Mr David Leah		Paragraph	3.14	Neither building can really be considered important or attractive and provided their replacements are in character with the city's vernacular architecture designed to complement the plan then this would be an improvement. I agree with 3.14	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1114489	Mr Jonathan Brown	Chichester Liberal Democrats	Paragraph	3.14	We are not opposed to the redevelopment of the bus station in principle, but further thought needs to be given to the needs of customers who stand to lose facilities such as an information desk, toilets, seating/waiting areas and how easy it is going to be to navigate between bus stops spread throughout the area. See attached representation uploaded under introduction.	There are currently no facilities provided at the bus station and there is no proposal to provide any facilities. The existing bus station would be replaced in both options with a new bus and taxi interchange located immediately north and south of the railway station.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	3.15	This must include enough soft and hard landscaping to make it really environmental	Comment noted in which further consideration will be given at the detailed design stage.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.17	see above re importance of reusing these buildings	The Masterplan acknowledges that the Crown Court and Magistrates Court are locally listed. It identifies that conversion to accommodate new uses may be feasible although due to their internal layout and construction this may not be practicable.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.18	strongly agree	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	3.18	We welcome, in principle paragraph 3.18 but would prefer them to more positive than simply saying regard must be had consideration should be given by actually requiring development proposals to conserve or enhance heritage assets (including archaeological remains) and their settings. See attached rep under 'Introduction'	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.20	The storey heights proposed are too high. It should be two storey to the north and only three to the south	Comment noted. The Council considers that storey heights are generally appropriate with the exception of one of the buildings within the Royal Mail Sorting Office and Depot which is being reviewed.
1117356	Helen Hawdon		Paragraph	3.20	There are suggestions for various mixed uses on these sites at 3 storey level rising to 4 on the south and opposite the train station. Chichester is characterised by 2/3 storey developments with that level of street scene homogeneity. It would be most unattractive to raise this to 4 and symptomatic of overdevelopment, in terms of greater numbers of people and vehicles than the area can realistically accommodate. This is also relevant to the aspiration of servicing and parking being accessed at this location from Basin Road at 3.20. This will be yet another pressure on the realigned Basin Road in terms of numbers of vehicle movements and consequent pollution. During term time, traffic emerging from the school exit on Basin Road will only add to this.	Comment noted. The Council considers that the storey heights of buildings within this site are appropriate for a city centre location. Traffic control matters will be addressed as part of the detailed design stage.

375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	3.24	We are concerned at paragraph 3.24, which suggests that the demolition of listed buildings might be possible within the context of wider regeneration benefits. This does not compare well with the precise wording of paragraphs 132-134 of the National Planning Policy Framework which set the bar set high for the substantial harm that demolition would mean as noted in above. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	3.27	Just to show housing on this site sums up the entire lack of vision and imagination of this exercise. It is a City centre site, next to the railway station with great connectivity, let's have some ambition. It is not good for housing due to the proximity of the railway.	Comment noted. Any residential development within close proximity to the railway line will address the issue of railway noise through appropriate noise mitigation measures.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	3.28	I do not want more car parking but we must address the short term need for parking if we are developing more leisure facilities and wanting people to use the trains and busses...	The operational requirements for parking for any new uses will be considered at planning application stage. Car parking will remain at the Railway Station and Avenue de Chartres public car park.
1117010	Mrs P G Peacock	Chichester Christian Spiritualist Church	Paragraph	3.28	Access for elderly and disabled members will be extremely difficult if redevelopment of the carpark goes ahead. We want to be reassured that parking facilities will be provided for Church Members. Representation uploaded under introduction.	Other public car parks are available in the vicinity. There can be no guarantee that dedicated parking facilities will be available for the Church.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.30	The proposed storey heights should be reduced by one	The Council considers that the storey heights suggested are appropriate for the sites identified.
1117356	Helen Hawdon		Paragraph	3.30	At 3.30 it is suggested that the residential density for this area could be comparable to the John Rennie Road development. I do not think that is a development we should aspire to in terms of either its density or aesthetic aspect. Buildings of such undistinguished bland quality as this should not be deemed to be any sort of template for the future. The canal deserves better and has already been let down by this development. Again 4 storeys are suggested as a suitable elevation fronting Basin Road. I disagree for the reasons already set out. Further we then still have the parking/servicing problem and the potential overuse of Basin Road. I also raise the issue of the contaminated land bound to be found on the 2 bus sites above. It has not been costed for remediation anywhere in this draft Plan. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	Comment noted. The Council considers that the storey heights of buildings within this site are appropriate for a city centre location. The Masterplan acknowledges that there may be a cost involved in remediation works due to potential contamination on site but cannot confirm any exact costs at this stage.
1103272	Mr David Leah		Paragraph	3.31	A new bus station should be totally integrated into the railway station north and south of the track and platforms.	A new bus station is not considered as part of the Masterplan. The existing bus station would be replaced in both options with a new bus and taxi interchange located immediately north and south of the railway station.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.34	I disagree totally. Demolition is unjustified	It is considered that the re-use of this building would be unlikely due to its size, scale and layout making it unviable and commercially undeliverable. Any redevelopment proposals would have to be of such high design to mitigate and justify the loss of this locally listed building.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	3.34	That is incredibly short sighted, unimaginative and goes against all guidance concerning looking after locally listed assets - see NPPF para 126.	It is considered that the re-use of this building would be unlikely due to its size, scale and layout making it unviable and commercially undeliverable. Any redevelopment proposal would have to be of such high design to mitigate and justify the loss of this locally listed building.

1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	3.35	Therefore why is it shown as housing?	Appropriate noise mitigation measures can be incorporated within development to prevent restrictions to the type of development around uses such as the railway line. Residential development is therefore possible within this location.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.36	I agree totally. Sadly the proposals so far do not seem to honour this concept, including demolition of listed and locally-listed buildings	The final Masterplan does not include the demolition of any listed buildings. Demolition and redevelopment of any locally listed buildings will need to take account of their potential for re-use.
375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	3.36	We welcome, in principle paragraph 3.36, but would prefer them to more positive than simply saying regard must be had or consideration should be given by actually requiring development proposals to conserve or enhance heritage assets (including archaeological remains) and their settings. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
1103272	Mr David Leah		Paragraph	3.36	The conservation area should not include 20th century buildings that are blatantly out of character with the city centre as a whole.	The Masterplan does not designate or review the Conservation Areas.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.39	Please pay regard to the existing residential use of this area.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375130	Ms C Mayall	Southern Water	Paragraph	3.39	The Royal Mail Sorting Office & Depot site should contain an additional criteria to the above to take account of infrastructure crossing the site: Foul Drainage: Proposals will be acceptable if they can demonstrate that redevelopment of the site will not result in a net increase to flows presently arising from the existing development. If this is not possible, it will be required for the development to provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider and with reference to the Chichester Surface and Foul Drainage SPD. Development will need to provide for future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. See attached representation under introduction.	Comment noted. The Masterplan will be changed accordingly with appropriate reference made to the Chichester Surface and Foul Drainage SPD.
1117502	Tessa Brai		Paragraph	3.39	Concern that the Royal Mail site looks to be over the boundary of both mine and my neighbours land. Proposal is for up to three story buildings. The site would only be a few metres from our house and as such would not only be hideously invading it would completely block out light from the whole of our house and garden. New layout of the road is a big concern. With this proposal traffic would have to sit outside our house instead of using the main road behind. I don't understand why the main road is not to be used and that Basin Road should be blocked off at the canal. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council agrees that there has been a drafting error with respect to the siting of the development over neighbouring land. This will be amended accordingly. The Masterplan seeks to improve the public realm and therefore considers that to achieve this vehicular movements should be restricted along Stockbridge Road. It is accepted that redirected traffic along Basin Road could have a negative impact on the residents however it is considered necessary to deliver the wider benefits to the area.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.43	The Royal Mail buildings are indeed an eyesore and so any redevelopment should provide a visual enhancement	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.

1117469	Mr Mark Clark		Paragraph	3.43	Broadly welcome the redevelopment of the Royal Mail site for residential use of two and perhaps on part of the site three stories, with the pedestrianisation of the northern side of the canal basin as indicated in the master plan C and 3. Concerns with one aspect of the proposal: the line of units would be positioned abutting the Business Centre in Basin Road and in a south westerly direction to the rear of 76 and 78 Basin Road and then continuing onto to the current position of the workshop depot of the Royal Mail site. The land on which this proposed development is situated behind 76 and 78 Basin Road is owned by the owners (it is the private car park of these two properties) of these two properties and is not part of the Royal Mail site. Trust this is a drafting error in the compiling of the map in the master plan and is not part of the proposal . We would be grateful if you could advise us promptly that this is the case. See attached representation uploaded to the introduction.	The Council agrees that there has been a drafting error with respect to the siting of the development over neighbouring land. This will be amended accordingly.
1117488	Alison Crisp		Paragraph	3.43	Broadly welcome the redevelopment of the Royal Mail site for residential use of two and perhaps on part of the site three stories, with the pedestrianisation of the northern side of the canal basin as indicated in the master plan C and 3. Concerns with one aspect of the proposal: the line of units would be positioned abutting the Business Centre in Basin Road and in a south westerly direction to the rear of 76 and 78 Basin Road and then continuing onto to the current position of the workshop depot of the Royal Mail site. The land on which this proposed development is situated behind 76 and 78 Basin Road is owned by the owners (it is the private car park of these two properties) of these two properties and is not part of the Royal Mail site. Trust this is a drafting error in the compiling of the map in the master plan and is not part of the proposal. We would be grateful if you could advise us promptly that this is the case. See attached representation uploaded to the introduction.	The Council agrees that there has been a drafting error with respect to the siting of the development over neighbouring land. This will be amended accordingly.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.44	agreed	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.45	agreed	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.

1105827	Mr Ian Milton	Chichester Ship Canal Trust	Paragraph	3.46	<p>The Chichester Ship Canal Trustees are grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Southern Gateway Draft Masterplan. While each Trustee may wish to comment individually on the wide nature of the proposals, this letter relates only to the impact of the proposals on the Canal Basin and the Trust public service and other operations. The canal and its facilities offer an attractive and, in the wider context of a southern Cathedral city, unusual experience for the many visitors to Chichester. Since the canal shop/cafe opened four years ago, and more recently with the launch of our new, larger, scheduled trip boat, there has been a huge increase in demand for the facilities we offer; many cyclists and walkers using the towpath also benefit from these facilities and the shop/cafe has also become a community hub for many residents of the properties within the immediate area. The Trustees support the desire to improve safe access for pedestrians from the city centre to the Canal Basin. They also welcome redevelopment of the north side of the basin to complete the area as an attractive experience for local residents and visitors to the city. There is, however, a very practical issue that cannot be overlooked. It is essential for good road access to the Canal Basin to be maintained, an aspect of which is recognised in para 3.46 of the consultation document. A priority for the Trust is to provide adequate and easily accessible car parking for our customers. This is especially important for the significant number of disabled people who visit the cafe and are also passengers on our trip boats, both of which have lift access. Parking is also vital for our volunteers, without whom the canal operations could not be maintained. There are very serious operational considerations. We have daily delivery of goods by van to the canal shop/cafe. Access is also essential for vehicles required for canal and boat maintenance. Such vehicles include a giant 160 ton mobile crane for lifting our 16-metre trip boats out of the canal for at least annual inspection and maintenance. Articulated lorries also need access on occasion. There are no practical alternatives for these vehicle movements along the navigable length of the canal, nor would anywhere along the canal other than the Canal Basin provide the space required for manoeuvring such large vehicles and boats. Additionally, access is required for events held at the Canal Basin. Dragon Boat races have been held annually in recent years, attracting a good number of visitors but also involving offloading and manoeuvring 12-metre boats. Model boat events have also been held and in future years the basin may be host to other events such as regattas. Good access, adequate parking facilities and the provision of a wide turning circle are therefore key now and in the future. The maps after page 57 of the Masterplan show the road access from Basin Road along the north side of the basin. Clearly, this would not be a wide road to highway standards. It may have sufficient width but the corners from Basin Road and into the current car parking behind the Richmond Arms are likely to be too tight to cope with the large vehicles that are essential to our operations. The Trustees are grateful for the opportunity to express our serious concerns about the Southern Gateway proposals and are eager to work with appropriate CDC Members and officers to seek ways forward.</p>	Comments noted. The highway design will allow for the access of operational vehicles required in association with the use of the canal basin.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	3.46	<p>The fundamental here is to move the road away from the canal and make this a special feature. It must also have soft landscaping that brings a park like area to the canal side</p>	The realignment of Basin Road will remove vehicular traffic away from the canal basin.
1117356	Helen Hawdon		Paragraph	3.47	<p>Again we have the problem of the uncostered contaminated land also bound to be found at this location due to the former gas works usage. Whilst I am supportive of leisure usage fronting onto the Canal Basin, I wonder at those who would wish to live in the residential units above and behind now that they will be bisected by the newly very busy Basin Road realigned road. It would surely not be an attractive residential location and I wonder how it can be compatible with the Councils clean air objectives given that further residential units here will suffer pollution from the new road. Councils are abjured from exacerbating current local air quality conditions. I also question the need for yet more parking provision which, as with the other sites above, can only contribute to both congestion and pollution.</p>	The Masterplan acknowledges that there may be a cost involved in remediation works due to potential contamination on site but cannot confirm any exact costs at this stage. The Royal Mail Sorting Office and Depot site is located within a city location. The Masterplan provides an opportunity to expand upon the night time economy which is currently under developed in Chichester, encouraging non residential uses which will link with established restaurants in the city centre. Appropriate noise mitigation measures could be incorporated into buildings depending on their use.

1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	3.48	The Sorting office needs to be moved. it has been discussed for years..... It is time NOW	The Council agrees with this comment.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.49	Relocating the road, which will now take all N-S traffic adjacent to Brampton Court will not be welcome to its residents	The Council accepts that there is a negative impact in re-routing Basin Road alongside the southern boundary of Brampton Court, however there are also positive benefits from removing the through traffic from the northern part of Stockbridge Road.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.51	agreed	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.54	WHAT??? Kingsham Primary school is a long way away - in Kingsham, still in use and nowhere near the Southern Gateway. Do you mean for former High School for Boys?.	The Council agrees with this comment and the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
584233	Mr John Wilton		Paragraph	3.60	One of Chichester's biggest problems is housing affordability, both for those on modest incomes and first time buyers. The sites included in this study offer the opportunity for significant housing development, but the challenge remains how to make a significant proportion of this truly affordable. The reliance on developers to provide 30% so called affordable housing (current rules state 20% below market price) does not achieve that.	A number of the redevelopment sites make reference to the provision of affordable housing and the inclusion of the starter homes initiative. In any event residential development will need to comply with Local Plan policy in which a 30% affordable housing contribution will be sought where there is a net increase of dwellings.
1117356	Helen Hawdon		Paragraph	3.60	It is suggested here that the land available be given over to mixed residential with office/workshop use on the Kingsham Road frontage. I doubt that the residents on the other side of Kingsham Road will find this in any way acceptable. Such usage will lead to pressure on local parking for residents, as well as noise issues. I also question the density of the residential development too and the further vehicular movements that will be created, adding to the already burdened realigned Basin Road in terms of congestion and pollution. Again current air quality studies would assist in modelling for the future risk that such a development would result in decreasing air quality.	Matters such as parking controls and parking provision will be dealt with at the detailed design stage/planning application stage. The Masterplan only provides an indicative figure of potential housing density however the Council does not consider the figure stated to be unreasonable in this location.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.67	The railway station dates from 1958	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	3.68	I am afraid that I also burst out laughing at the reference to the "award-winning" Avenue de Chartres car park. That car park is absolutely dreadful, with impossibly narrow passageways. I think that the architects should be sentenced to drive a large family car round it for two hours! See attached rep under intro.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	3.7 (it is assumed the rep relates to para 3.70)	I am all in favour of a mixed development but suggest Hotel accommodation may be suitable we reuse exiting building in an innovative fashion we ensure there is suitable housing for young the they can afford We have enough green space...	The Council agrees that a hotel would be appropriate on this site and as such the Masterplan (para 3.70) will be changed accordingly.
1117356	Helen Hawdon		Paragraph	3.70	Here we see mention again of further bus stands on Stockbridge Road, with no specified locations. Surely all bus stands could be part of a northern transport interchange-a well laid out one. There is the suggestion of student accommodation/apartments. I do not think the Council should condemn future occupiers of such accommodation to the pollution and congestion engendered by the interchange. I would suggest such a location is quite unsuitable for any sort of residential accommodation.	Specific locations of bus stands will considered at the detailed design stage. Appropriate noise mitigation measures could be incorporated into residential buildings should it be considered necessary.

375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.71	Bus stands on Stockbridge Road? These would be outside houses and thus residents would face bus queues outside their windows. The pavements are too narrow for shelters. A barmy idea.	The location of the bus stops will be addressed as part of the detailed design stage. Their location may result in the congregation of pedestrians outside residential properties however this is considered acceptable to deliver the wider benefits of the area.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.77	agreed	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	3.77	We welcome, in principle paragraphs 3.77, but would prefer them to more positive than simply saying regard must be had or consideration should be given by actually requiring development proposals to conserve or enhance heritage assets (including archaeological remains) and their settings. See attached rep under 'Introduction'	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.79	these buildings do not enhance the Conservation Area so redevelopment with something more 'Chichester' is to be welcomed	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.80	agreed	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	3.81	agreed	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1117356	Helen Hawdon		Paragraph	3.84	There appears to be little future in retail generally due to modern technology and this location is some distance from the principal shopping centre. I doubt retail will be viable in this location. Nor is there any under provision of cafe/bar uses locally to this site. However, a new area of public open space would greatly enhance the public realm in this rather drab corner of Chichester, providing leisure opportunities for the older person accommodation opposite, as well as a recreation and relaxation area for those awaiting onward transport from the revised transport interchange. In effect this area could function as a breathing space for the public-an oasis as it were-in the midst of the entire bustle.	The uses proposed will assist in providing a better link between the Masterplan area and the city centre and will assist in expanding upon the night time economy which is currently under developed in Chichester.
1117075	Merrill Investments		Paragraph	3.85	Our clients reject the assessment of their property at paragraph 3.85. The Draft Masterplan has just come to our Client's attention and will have a material and adverse effect on their business. They need more time to consider further objections. Representation uploaded under introduction.	The Masterplan will be annotated to remove this site.
375142	Mr Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph	3.86	We welcome, in principle paragraph 3.86, but would prefer them to more positive than simply saying regard must be had or consideration should be given by actually requiring development proposals to conserve or enhance heritage assets (including archaeological remains) and their settings. See attached rep under 'Introduction'.	The Council agrees with this comment and as such the Masterplan will be changed accordingly.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	4.1	It would of course be good to improve the public realm, but unless the traffic problem at the level crossings is sorted out the area will constantly be blighted by huge traffic queues. Any improvements will be meaningless and a waste of money until this is sorted out.	The improvements to the public realms have many positive benefits such as contributing to the character of the city and providing important linkages between spaces. The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossings and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	4.1	I believe we need to ensure that the cycle and pedestrian access is really interesting. is it possible to provide a route that is really environmental that takes people from one here in to the centre.....	Comment noted. One of the objectives identified within the Masterplan is to improve facilities for cycling and walking. The detailed design of this will be developed at a later stage.

375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	4.2	Agree with all of this - the current approach to the city is defiled by Chichester Gate, the John Rennie Road Development and the Royal Mail site. This has to become a proper gateway.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	4.2	This masterplan does not provide any sort of gateway to the City. "reconfigure highway access" presumably means create increased traffic queues.	Comment noted. The Council considers that the Masterplan does provide for an enhanced gateway improving the quality of the environment for visitors, businesses and residents.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	4.3	As before Option B is unacceptable owing to demolition of historic listed buildings	The Council agrees with this comment. Option A is the favoured option for reasons of preservation of the historic environment.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	4.3	Option B is there just to make Option A look good as it doesn't demolish any listed buildings. However it still is unacceptable as it doesn't address the fundamental issues. This is no sort of consultation. Its a bit like offering someone a box of chocolate where they have all been eaten apart from two which are stale and the flavours that no-one likes. We need a new consultation with the full box available please.	The Council considers that options A and B would meet the Masterplan objectives and would maintain movement through the study area. Option A is the favoured option for reasons of preservation of the historic environment.
1103272	Mr David Leah		Paragraph	4.4	As stated earlier I do not see why we need north/south route for cars. Crossing both to them means only a connection between Market Road and Chartres Av is required.	Comment noted. The Council considers the North/South access through the Masterplan area should be maintained.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	4.8	agreed - but making Stockbridge Road a bus stand will not achieve this goal	Comment noted. The Council considers that the interchange facilities will be appropriate and will facilitate the redevelopment of the bus station site.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	4.9	We wouldn't need a bus gate if we had a road bridge. A bridge between Stockbridge road and Basin road would also enable the public realm of those two streets to be dramatically improved and help congestion on the gyrator, as traffic would run steadily and not be bunched because of the crossings.	The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	4.11	agreed	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	4.14	again uses must respect the residential nature - the basin is bounded by dwellings on all four sides - most of it of recent construction	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104753	Mr Adrian Moss		Paragraph	4.14	We need some proper landscaping	Comment noted. Appropriate landscaping schemes will be addressed as part of the detailed design stage.
558740	Mr John Newman		Paragraph	4.16	How is traffic coming west out of Kingsham Road to join the revised Southern Gateway road network? I can imagine that the residents of that road will find frequent delays as a consequence and may well be tempted to drive east and come in up Whyke Road and add to the congestion coming into The Hornet from the east. See attached rep under intro.	Details regarding junctions/traffic control will be addressed as part of the detailed design stage.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	5.1	What is meant by "vibrant"?	A good synonym would be 'lively'. No change to Masterplan.

376056	Mrs Caroline West	West Sussex County Council	Paragraph	5.1	Study area is situated within the sharp sand and gravel mineral safeguarding area (MSA) and is safeguarded from sterilisation under policy M9. Proposals for non-mineral development within the MSA, such as those in the Masterplan, should not be progressed unless meeting the criteria of policy M9. Before progressing the Masterplan, the District Council should satisfy itself that the issue has been satisfactorily addressed (to comply with national and local policy). Even if the District Council determines that prior extraction could not take place, it needs to determine whether development in the Masterplan outweighs safeguarding of the mineral resource. The area is within 250 metres of Chichester Railway Sidings, safeguarded by policy M10. Certain types of development (residential) may not be compatible with minerals infrastructure. Development should be subject to consultation with the Mineral Planning Authority and considered against criteria of policy M10. It is recommended that reference is made to the safeguarded site in the SPD and the need to assess the impact of non-mineral development on the Chichester Railhead. See full representation in the introduction. See the full representation under introduction.	The Council agrees that suitable wording should be introduced to flag up these issues and the Masterplan will be amended accordingly.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	5.2	We shall see!	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1103272	Mr David Leah		Paragraph	5.2	The scheme needs to take account of the needs and aspirations of the citizens over the next 20/30 years and not be constrained by today's thinking and technology.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	5.2	Absolutely agree, but the obstacle that needs unlocking is the level crossing(s). Provide a solution to those and there really will be the confidence to enable a mix of uses to be provided and create a true gateway.	Comment noted. The Council has looked in detail at the possibility of removing the crossing and replacing with a bridge or tunnel and concluded that this would not be financially viable and would result in other implications such as having an adverse impact on the townscape of Chichester. No change to Masterplan.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	5.7	Will it really be a "material consideration" or simply ignored by planning officers as per the existing plan?	Supplementary Planning Documents provide further details, guidance and principles for development and are material planning considerations when processing planning applications and as such must be considered when making a planning decision.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	5.7	Surely sites should be ear marked for the uses that the City needs, which almost certainly wouldn't be housing for large inner city sites near a railway. Developers and operators for hotels, conference centres, performance venues, commercial or leisure space are unlikely to be attracted to opportunities when the sites are identified as housing.	Whilst development opportunities have been identified it is accepted that other opportunities may present themselves. The Masterplan is a flexible document , and therefore should not be considered a blue print for the Southern Gateway.
376056	Mrs Caroline West	West Sussex County Council	Paragraph	5.11	Southern Gateway development potential and infrastructure requirements were not taken into account in the preparation of the Local Plan and CIL. The Masterplan states that projects will be included in future iterations of the Infrastructure Business Plan so that CIL funding can be sought where appropriate. The Masterplan should make clear that in order to grant planning permission, applicant's will need to demonstrate the site and associated infrastructure package is deliverable. The County Council will be concerned if other site allocations in the Adopted Local Plan became unaffordable due to costs of the Southern Gateway. This would require the County Council and other infrastructure providers to find additional resources to deliver projects and meet statutory duties. The District Council should have regard to viability in the preparation of the SPD. See full representation in the introduction.	The Council agrees that suitable wording should be included to flag up these issues and the Masterplan will be amended accordingly.
1104691	Mr Richard Hutchinson		Paragraph	5.11	The masterplan lacks ambition. By identifying sites just for housing it is selling the city short. These sites are just about the last opportunity to have large land areas near the City centre. They are too important to use just for housing.	The Masterplan contains other uses apart from housing. However, the inclusion of a significant proportion of residential development will allow values to be generated that can help deliver non-residential uses and changes to the highway.

375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	5.15	I hope this figure will be enforced and developers not let off the hook by claiming such provision makes the development unviable.	Local Plan policy requires a 30% affordable housing contribution to be sought as part of a residential development where there is a net increase of dwellings. Where developers are unable to meet the requirements, the Council will expect this to be demonstrated through an 'open book' process in which an independent valuer will provide a viability assessment.
1103272	Mr David Leah		Paragraph	5.15	I agree with the other comment but would also question the 30% figure. If social housing is required fund and build it rather than build 70% of housing which may or not be required.	The wording of the Masterplan reflects Local Plan policy.
375108	Mr A.M.J. Green		Paragraph	5.18	ditto	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.
584233	Mr John Wilton		Paragraph	5.25	For any of this to be successfully delivered it will require substantial upfront public sector funding. How many times have planned and necessary infrastructure improvements associated with major residential developments been the subject of Section 106 agreements with developers only for them either to be delivered much later than they should have been or worse still, not been delivered at all due to the developer wriggling out of the commitment or the Council failing to spend the money within the time specified.	Comment noted. No change to Masterplan.