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Given this item is for 1300 dwellings I hope you will indulge me in trying to cover some of its many aspects which today extend beyond the main access details.

The fields immediately West of Tangmere have long been expected to be developed, especially from the mid 1990’s when the Temple Bar junction was put in and in the late 2000’s when the Medical Centre was built with capacity to further expand on its site.

Despite going through two periods of not having a 5year housing land supply, the principle of it coming forward as a Masterplanned whole has been maintained via the Local and Neighbourhood Plan process and ultimately by this council’s eventual use of its compulsory purchase powers.

The maintenance of that Masterplanned whole has provided the opportunity to provide a range of built, drainage and green infrastructure within the site to support up to 1300 dwellings, respect the setting of the church and assist in expanding the aviation museum. With a primary school site that can meet the one village school vision of the Neighbourhood Plan and land available to expand the churches cemetery, it has provision for cradle to the grave.

There is no immediate concern over foul sewage infrastructure provision for this site. However by the early 2030’s additional pumping station and treatment capacity will be required, but that is two OFWAT price review cycles away.

The Highways England technical issue with the temple bar junction is something we will have to allow to work itself through. The uncertainties over what levels of overall vehicle traffic there will be in the early 2030’s means the proposed monitor and, if necessary, manage approach to WSCC junction improvements is entirely reasonable. Crucially condition 8 on page 119 ensures construction traffic will only access the site directly off of the A27.

A lot is left to s106 negotiations, and consequent planning applications and we are asked to take a lot on trust.

The site’s layout provides considerable foot and cycle path provision, including a significant link in the chain for an overall Barnham – Chichester cycle route, including south of the A27. By not making the village main street a through vehicle route, foot and cycle movement is prioritised. Options, for using the additional £630,000 s106 contribution for off-site cycle works, are left open and given the complexities the proposed timescales are in my view appropriate. Separating out the Temple Bar bridge and Westhamnett route studies from the £630k contribution is welcome.

For the record could it be confirmed that the three proposed controlled crossings of the Temple Bar junction will be provided separately to the £630k contribution?

I am keen though to avoid missing some opportunities and the fixing of some details at this stage which might not be able to be revisited later. We should also be seeking to enhance walking opportunities and not just be tied to avoiding severe impacts, noting this is an application for 1300 dwellings.

Officers are aware that I would raise the following issues.

Firstly, the initial Southern phase of development will only be able to access the village’s services via Tangmere Road. That footway is in a number of places less than 1m wide, hardly conducive to attracting new residents to opt for walking rather than the car. Given this, could it be explained why no scheme of footway improvements is proposed from the East side of the site’s SE corner foot/cycle crossing up to meadow way?

Condition 36 on page 129 at least needs amending to include immediate East and Northwards foot and cycle path connectivity from the se crossing point.

Given the indicated far south alignment of the SE corner crossing, a pedestrian desire line will form further North across Tangmere Road. Later provided internal routes will not be on the most direct line to the village’s services for the Southeastern most dwellings. Given the safety implications of this, by what means might this issue be addressed?

The addition of provision in the s106 for the probable move of the Gamecock Terrace bus stop onto Tangmere Road, as a result of the No. 55 route’s extension into the site is appreciated.

At the NE corner of the site another foot and cycle access is indicated, but no condition proposed. How will its delivery be assured, noting the Saxon Meadow and SE connections are the subject of conditions 35 and 36?

The additional s106 provision within the site to provide for a link to Nettleton Avenue (to provide an alternative to going along the sub-standard A27 path to the N of the village) is again appreciated. In due course the Parish Council will need to formally consider committing its land to complete this link.

Condition 53 on page 133 makes provision for a controlled crossing in the vicinity of the Malcolm/Tangmere road junction. In the past however WSCC has declined to entertain such a crossing here due to design standard issues. What has changed? If such a crossing cannot be installed, what compulsion is there to provide an alternative?

Given this application is mainly for access, should there not be a Condition for the allotment car park access onto Church Lane?

The trigger for the new Church Lane footway, subject of Condition 35 on page 129, should also link its completion to the allotments if they come forward first, given they will attract additional pedestrian movements from the existing village (a similar induced use rational to the Meadow Way footway improvements provided for in condition 51).

My final two points relate to the parameter plans, which fix many aspects of this site.

Condition 46 on page 132 requires no planting within 3m of a watercourse. The open space and landscape plan, subject for approval under condition 2, fixes the locations of a number of up to 5m wide hedgerows with trees immediately adjacent to watercourses. This means those belts will only be 2m wide. What is intended to ensure those important planting belts are 5m wide?

Another hedgerow and watercourse maintenance issue arises to the west of the Cheshire Crescent estate, where a 5m wide hedgerow with trees is shown on the east side of the open watercourse. Apart from the width issue raised before, given the watercourse and width of that strip it does not appear safe maintenance access could be achieved in the long term to work on the trees. I would suggest a condition is provided to allow a modification of the planting layout and increase the foot/cycle path deviation allowance to provide for some flexibility from the parameter plans to resolve these issues and allow for an alternative alignment of the foot/cycle path wholly or partially east of the water course at this point which would also provide a maintenance access and protection for the watercourse and away from the adjacent residential parcel.