

Supplementary Report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 1st February 2017

Ringmer
LW/16/0775

Page 18

Comments received from East Sussex County Council:

As noted by the applicant in the Planning Statement, East Sussex County Council granted planning permission in 1999 for “Improvements to landing strip by stripping, filling with 154,000 cubic metres of imported material, infilling, levelling and drainage works phased over 4 years and improved access”.

The Statement further states that this proposal included perimeter drainage works. However, it should be noted that the approved drainage scheme associated with the permission granted by the County Council actually covered the entire site, with drains running north to south at 10 metre intervals – not just perimeter drainage. Perhaps it might be worth seeking confirmation from the applicant as to whether these drainage works were carried out in full, as poor drainage seems to be one of the drivers for the current application. If the drainage hasn't been fully installed, this could be a solution as opposed to further raising the land with imported materials.

As mentioned during our conversation, there also appears to be a miscalculation with regard to the number of vehicle movements (HGVs) that would be generated from the current proposal. The Statement states that based on 95,000 cubic metres, there would be 10,555 vehicle movements (assuming approximately 14-15 cubic metres of material per load). However, this actually appears that it should equate to between 12,666 - 13,572 movements. Also, loads often only take 12 cubic metres, depending on how compacted the material is. If this is the case, there could be up to 15,834 vehicle movements.

Notwithstanding any impacts from the subsequent use of the land for gliding, in relation to this application the main impacts will be during the construction itself. Therefore, if LDC is minded to grant planning permission, I would recommend a number of conditions to control matters such as: (i) number of vehicle movements; (ii) provision and use of wheel washing facilities; (iii) restricting the type of materials that can be imported, and where they can be used; and (iv) the provision of marker posts to delineate the tipping area.

It might also be worth considering a condition requiring a topographical survey to be undertaken and submitted to the LPA three months after tipping has ceased. This will enable you to check that there hasn't been over tipping. This is of course dependant on the applicant having submitted a contour plan of the proposed finished levels.

Suggest additional condition:

Within three months of the completion on the works hereby approved a topographical survey of the site shall be undertaken and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To demonstrate that the works have been implemented as approved and to accord with Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan.

Amend condition 2 to remove clause (e)

Amend condition 13 to removed clause (b)

Both of these clauses restrict works within a 100 metre buffer zone from the nearest residential property. Such a restriction would potentially negate the consent that is being granted and therefore would be unreasonable. Notwithstanding their removal it is considered that sufficient measures remain in place to mitigate harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Further informative:

The committee raised the issue of suitability of chalk as a surface treatment and wished to make the applicant aware of their concerns and to ensure that full regard was had to surface materials.

**Telscombe Cliffs
LW/16/1009**

Page 31

Amended Planning Statement received (31.01.2017) changing the wording describing the flats leased to Lewes District Council, to Brighton and Hove City Council.

4. REPRESENTATIONS FROM STANDARD CONSULTEES

4.4

Further comments have been received from The Highway Authority following questions raised by Members at the 'call over' meeting.

"Taking into account the application is for an additional 6 studio flats a refusal on parking grounds would be difficult to substantiate.

Parking restrictions along The South Coast Road and Telscombe Cliffs Way prevent unauthorised parking and as previously stated the 2011 census data indicates 70% of people living in studio accommodation in the Lewes District do not own vehicles.

The information provided by the applicant indicates the use of the existing car park was monitored by visiting at different times and days on a total of 8 occasions, on each occasion only 3 cars were observed as using the car park, this would substantiate the census data on car ownership.

It should be noted that parking should be unallocated for the whole development. Providing parking permits for each unit, both existing and new would allow the parking to be used on a first come first serve basis rather than forcing the existing occupants to park elsewhere even if parking is available."

This is a low income, low car ownership development which is in a sustainable location. There is a bus stop immediately outside the front of the building. Car parking is also limited in Brighton which is likely to further discourage occupants travelling to and from Brighton, to have a car.

Agent's comments

"The spaces were previously exclusively for the ground floor office (now removed). The owner had problems with people parking in there so placed signs stating permit holders only. There were no permits issued this was just a deterrent to ensure the office users could park.

When the office space was recently converted to residential units the spaces were not incorporated into any agreements and as such remain unallocated to anyone because the owner knows they are important to the future development. So technically no one has permission to use these spaces currently.

Therefore all the spaces can be given to the whole block once the future development is resolved.

I am not aware that any existing residents have any special needs and it is unlikely there would be many as there is no lift to the upper floors. I agree with the transport officers' recommendation that all spaces should be unallocated but we could perhaps reserve one visitor space to allow for carer/visitor use?"

Recommendation

Condition 2. To read as:

The development shall not be occupied until the parking area has been provided in accordance with the drawing submitted numbered YO133-1200 and approved by the Planning Authority. The area shall be accessible to all the occupants of Aqua House and shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of motor vehicles in accordance with policy ST3 of the Lewes District Council, CP11 of the Joint Core Strategy and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 3. To read as:

The development shall not be occupied until cycle parking areas have been provided in accordance with details shown on drawing numbered YO133-1200 as submitted and approved in writing by the Planning Authority and the areas shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used for any other purpose in accordance with

policy ST3 of the Lewes District Council, CP11 of the Joint Core Strategy and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 4. To read as:

The development shall not be occupied until a turning space for vehicles has been provided and constructed in accordance with the approved plan Y0133-1200 and the turning space shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used for any other purpose in accordance with policy ST3 of the Lewes District Council, CP11 of the Joint Core Strategy and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 7 to be added.

If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, an amendment to the remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors [in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework, sections 120 and 121].

Wivelsfield
LW/16/1002

Page 39

Wivelsfield Parish Council raised a number of detailed objections to the proposals in respect of the extent of works that have already taken place, non-compliance with the conditions of Class Q of the GPDO, potential harm to protected species, absence of historic surveys, the creation of the track, conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan, setting of a precedence and sketchy nature of the submitted details.

Full details of these objections are available on file.

Many of the matters raised are not actually relevant to the consideration of this application and they are in outside the remit of this application for prior approval e.g. harm to protected species, absence of historic surveys, creation of the track, conflict with neighbourhood plan. The other matters raised are already addressed in the committee report.

Saltdean
LW/16/0842

Page 48

Environmental Health – No objection

Subject to conditions which would help protect local residents from noise impacts associated with the construction of the proposed building and an advisory comment being attached to any permission granted in respect of waste management.

Recommended conditions include 1) Dust Control 2) Hours of Operation; and 3) an Informative to ensure that waste material arising from any clearance and construction activity at the site should be stored, removed from the site and disposed of in an appropriate manner. It is an offence to burn trade waste, so there should be no bonfires on site.

[Note: The Environmental Health comments already included in the main report relate to Contaminated Land].

Agenda Item: 11

Report No. 17/17

Page 54

Report Title: Tree Preservation Order (No.6) 2016

Recommend to defer the matter to the 22 February 2017 PAC meeting to enable further consultations to be undertaken.

