

**Project Documentation****PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT  
(PID)****Southern Gateway – Preparation of Masterplan**

<b>Release:</b>	3rd Draft
<b>Date:</b>	9/05/2016
<b>Authors:</b>	Mike Allgrove Amy Loaring
<b>Approved by:</b>	Andrew Frost

Note: the completion of this document is required for medium and large projects as defined by the Project Type Matrix. The final version should be saved in a sub folder on the x drive under project management / project documentation.

**Document History**

<b>Revision Date</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Summary of Changes</b>	<b>Reviewer(s)</b>
4/5/16	2		Mike Allgrove
9/5/16	3		Andrew Frost

**Consideration by the Corporate Improvement Team**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Reviewing Officer</b>	<b>Comments for Consideration</b>
09/05/2016	Joe Mildred	Minor amendments.

**Approvals**

This document requires the following approvals:

<b>Name of person, group or committee</b>
Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel
Cabinet

**Distribution**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job Title</b>
Andrew Frost	Head of Planning Services
Steve Carvell	Executive Director
Cllr Susan Taylor	Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning
Tony Dignum	Leader of the council
Paul Over	Executive Director
Lone Le Vay	Conservation and Design Manager
Nicola Golding	Principal Solicitor
Mike Allgrove	Planning Policy, Conservation and Design Service Manager
Helen Lowe	Growth Lead, West Sussex County Council
Jamie Dallen	Highways West Sussex County, Council
Tom Oliver	Homes & Communities Agency

## **1. PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT**

This Project Initiation Document (PID) defines the Southern Gateway Masterplan project. It builds upon the initial report to Cabinet on 3 May 2016, when the Cabinet resolved to support the Southern Gateway Project in principle. It sets out why the master planning project should go ahead, who is involved and their responsibilities. This PID will provide the baseline for the project's management and for an assessment of its overall success.

## **2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project will have as its overriding objective the delivery of a masterplan for the Southern Gateway area of Chichester.

## **3. BACKGROUND**

3.1. The Southern Gateway area has long been seen as an opportunity to make better use of the southern approach to Chichester city. In 2001 the Southern Gateway Framework was adopted by the District Council and retains its status as Supplementary Planning Guidance. Whilst much progress has been made (e.g. with the former Osborne's site, the Girls High School and the Southern Sidings development) significant opportunities remain to regenerate the area. These opportunities have not been realised as a result of the recent economic downturns, the costs of relocating existing users and the extraordinary development costs associated with some of the sites. These barriers are considered to be surmountable with public sector support and investment.

3.2. Recent developments make this an opportune time to review the existing guidance and produce a new masterplan for the Southern Gateway area. Those developments include:

- I. The recent announcement that the Law Courts are to be closed;
- II. The District Council led Chichester Vision initiative;
- III. The WSCC Place Plan; and
- IV. The Government's emphasis on growth and jobs (with new funding streams to assist).

3.3. The area within the Southern Gateway where there is now an opportunity includes the Bus Station and Depot, the Basin Street Car Park, the Courts Buildings, the Police Station and the Royal Mail depot

## **4. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND SUCCESS CRITERIA**

### **4.1. Outputs**

The project will have as its overriding objective the production of a masterplan for the Southern Gateway area. It will, following consultation and formal adoption by the Council, have the status of a supplementary planning document, providing further guidance as to how policy 10 (Chichester City Development Principles) of the Chichester Local Plan will be applied. The delivery of the masterplan will facilitate development that will result in an

improved public perception of the area and deliver substantial outcomes supporting the national growth and housing strategies. The latter are expressed locally in the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (C2C LEP) Strategic Economic Plan; the WSCC's Growth Plan; the County's Place Plan for Chichester; and the District Council's Local Plan and Economic Development and Housing Strategies.

#### 4.2. **Outcomes**

The main outcomes that will flow from the production of a masterplan are as follows:

- I. The identification of opportunities for development
- II. The facilitation of new homes, jobs, retail and other facilities
- III. That key constraints are identified so that they are not compromised through new development
- IV. The coordination of the development of a number of different sites
- V. The coordination of proposals that are the subject of different bids for funding to facilitate development
- VI. Clear guidance to assist in the preparation and assessment of planning applications to ensure the achievement of quality development.

#### 4.3. **Outcome Measures**

The specific outcomes sought are as follows:

- Increase in house numbers – starter, affordable, rented, market and student
- Increase in jobs created
- Increase in Gross Value Added<sup>1</sup> (GVA) and average salary levels
- Increase in footfall (retail and leisure)
- Increase in day and staying visitor numbers (visitor economy, leisure, hotel accommodation)
- Priority to pedestrians; increase modal shift; decrease in traffic congestion; reduction in CO2 emissions.

#### 4.4. **Dis-benefits**

- None.

#### 4.5. **Out of Scope**

The project will not include:

- Implementation of development. This will be addressed as a separate project following approval by the Council of the masterplan although preliminary discussions with landowners will commence in parallel with this project.
- Any regulatory processes or obtaining of necessary permissions and consents. This would form part of the implementation stage above.
- Relocation of the railway line which crosses the southern gateway area.
- Strategic infrastructure constraints.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gross Value Added is normally measured per head and takes economic output - including wages, business profits, rental income and taxes on production and divides them by the number of people living in an area

## **5. PROJECT CONSTRAINTS**

- Timing and expenditure constraints of certain funding streams
- Planning constraints of land
- Contaminated land
- Fragmented land ownership
- Government and local planning policy.

## **6. PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS**

Delivery of the project assumes:

- Project timescales and milestones are achievable and can be met
- On-going political support for the masterplan
- Willingness of partners to engage in the masterplan preparation process
- Waste water capacity for development can be provided.

## **7. PROJECT COSTS**

### **7.1. Project Delivery Costs**

The cost of the project comprises staff costs of the Project Team which are included within the existing base budget and consultancy costs which are estimated at up to £50,000.

### **7.2. On-going Costs Following Project Completion**

At present the only additional funding required is for the production of a masterplan. Should the Council be successful in securing external funding there will be on-going staff costs associated with the implementation of development set out in the masterplan.

## **8. OPTIONS SUMMARY**

8.1 The Council could decide to leave the future development of the Southern Gateway area to be market-led and assess planning applications against the existing supplementary planning guidance (where applicable) and policies in the Chichester Local Plan.

8.2 Rather than procure consultants to prepare a masterplan, the Council could utilise existing staff resources. However, it is likely that consultants will be able to draw on a wider range of staff resources not available within the Council and also the use of existing staff would mean that other projects would have to be delayed.

8.3 An alternative to the preparation of a masterplan would be to run an architectural competition to generate proposals for the redevelopment of the area. However, there is a large degree of uncertainty about what such a competition would deliver and whether architectural practices would respond to such a competition given the need to undertake work on an at risk basis.

## 9. PROJECT APPROACH

- 9.1 The Southern Gateway masterplan will involve a mix of in-house, partnership and external consultancy resources. There will need to be a public consultation on the contents of the draft masterplan which will be refined in the light of representations received.

## 10. PROJECT PLAN

Task No.	Task / milestone	Completion Date	Responsible Owner	Dependency
<b>Stage 1</b>				
1	Complete drafting of Masterplan brief	6 May 2016	Lone le Vay	
2	Steering group to Sign off Master Plan Brief	12 May 2016	Steering Group	1
3	Masterplan PID and Brief to DPIP	19 May 2016	Mike Allgrove	2
4	Masterplan PID and Brief to Cabinet	7 June 2016	Mike Allgrove	3
<b>Stage 2</b>				
5	Appointment of Masterplan consultants	20 June 2016	Andrew Frost	4
6	First Draft Masterplan received	20 August		5
7	Draft masterplan finalised	1 September 2016	Lone Le Vay	6
8	Draft Masterplan to DPIP	15 September	Lone Le Vay	6&7
9	Special Cabinet and Council approves document for consultation	20 September	Andrew Frost	8
10	Consultation carried out	29 September – 10 November	Lone Le Vay	9
11	Revisions to masterplan received from consultants	25 November	Lone Le Vay	Amendments agreed with consultants following consultation responses
12	Representations, proposed responses and amendments to masterplan considered by DPIP and Cabinet and masterplan adopted by Council	December	Andrew Frost	11

**11. PROJECT TEAM**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>
Andrew Frost	Project Leader
Jane Hotchkiss	Project Implementation
Mike Allgrove	Planning
Lone LeVay	Planning
Nicola Golding	Legal
Patrick Harrison	Estates
Linda Grange	Housing
Representative of Economic Development Service	Economic Development
Thomas Oliver	HCA
Helen Lowe	WSCC
Jamie Dallen	WSCC Highways
Amy Loaring	Project Coordinator

**12. COMMUNICATION**

Elected members will be kept informed through the monthly Members' Bulletin, bespoke email communication as necessary, workshops and regular reports to the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel meetings. Officers will be kept informed through reports to Corporate Management Team.

Consultation material will be made available on the website and in hard copy at Council offices and public libraries. All public consultation will be carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. A communication strategy will be developed.

**13. RISK LOG**

The following risks have been identified together with an assessment of their severity and actions that can be taken to mitigate/reduce the risk. Details of all project risks will be recorded as and when they are identified.

<b>Risk No</b>	<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Likelihood</b> Unlikely Possible Probable Certain	<b>Impact</b> Minor Significant Serious Major	<b>Planned Actions to Reduce Risk</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>
1	Lack of member agreement over the contents of the masterplan	2	4	Member briefing before DPIP/Cabinet	Andrew Frost
2	Disengagement of partner organisations	1	3	Steering group to sign off draft documents and on-going liaison with other partners	Steve Carvell
3	Consultation identifies constraints that require further work	2	2	On-going liaison with masterplan consultants	Lone Le Vay

Chichester District Council

4	Consultants don't deliver to deadline	2	2	Contract to ensure delivery	Lone Le Vay
5	Masterplan identifies development proposals that are not commercially viable	2	3	On-going liaison with masterplan consultants and seek viability advice if necessary	Andrew Frost