

**Supplementary Report to the Planning Applications Committee**  
**on 15th March 2017**

**Peacehaven**  
**LW/16/0841**

The applicant has requested that:

1. Occupation of the development be restricted as set out in the 'Recommendation', but 'unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority' (in case, for example, a spouse is 54 instead of 55 and would otherwise be eligible for occupancy);
2. The affordable housing contribution be paid prior to first occupation of the development instead of 'prior to the commencement of development';
3. Condition 7 (access details) to be due before first occupation instead of 'prior to the commencement of development'.

Officer's note: It is considered that point 1 above should not be agreed. Point 2 is, however, considered to be reasonable (after discussion with the Council's Housing Policy Officer). Point 3 is also considered to be reasonable (after discussion with the Highway Authority).

Add to S106 requirements:

Requirement for off-site highway works (footway along southern side of link road widened to 2m, with dropped kerbs/tactile paving).

Further representation:

GP at Rowe Avenue Surgery objects on grounds that:

The application takes insufficient account of local need, both in terms of medical services and adult social care.

No further expansion of Rowe Avenue Surgery is possible. There are gaps in the medical team and district nurse teams which are difficult to solve. Retirement flats put a very high strain on the medical and social care services. In medical terms there is no increase in the funding associated with this kind of development even though the demand from the residents is higher than would be the case for other developments. In addition, the ambulance trust persistently misses the 8 min target for urgent calls in the area. The local A and E unit has failed its Care Quality Commission inspection and the hospital trust to which it belongs has now been placed in special measures.

Overall I have significant concerns about the safety of future residents. There is good reason to believe that residents would get less good care than they might elsewhere. The local CCG has tried to address these issues but the issues often relate to local staffing levels and are very difficult to solve.

The possibility of overspill parking is also of concern. A sensible suggestion might be that additional parking is provided, and a space for the CTLA bus, which currently parks on the grass verge outside the surgery.

**Ringmer  
LW/16/0775**

**4 Additional letters of representation:**

1 letter stating:

- *Past experience suggests the period of disruption will be longer than suggested.*
- *Huge number of lorries will generate significant noise pollution and diesel emissions. This is against the need to reduce pollution in rural areas.*
- *Access through Laughton is a problem with traffic volume*
- *Lorry movements via Shortgate Lane is fraught with regard to congestion and damage to the verges. Shortgate lane is totally unsuitable for significant lorry movements is presently a significant problem.*
- *Is clear that the gliding club wish to extend flying suitability at least at present we get some relief from the persistent tow plane movements”*

2 letters supporting the application but requesting that the 30mph speed limit is extended to the edge of the village (Knowle Lane). A lower speed will reduce the impact of noise and vibrations to the houses adjoining the road and make it safer for road users and pedestrians.”

Representations received from Laughton Parish Council (LPC): fully support Ringmer Parish Council and their comments and observations. LPC are concerned that this application infers a future where the field is used more of the year with an inevitable increase in flights. LPC also request the ‘knock on’ increase in road traffic through Laughton Parish ‘B’ and ‘C’ roads during the long materials importation period is considered. Should the application be approved LPC request that Common Lane in Laughton and the B2124 are clearly included in the ‘no access’ list with a ‘fine’ system in place.

Amend condition 20 to add the following wording:

“and evidence (including photographs) should be submitted showing that the drainage has been constructed as per the final agreed detailed drainage designs on completion of the approved works.”

Additional condition:

“A maintenance and management plan for the entire drainage system should be submitted to the planning authority before any works commence on site. The plan should clearly state who will be responsible for managing all aspects of the surface water drainage system, including piped drains, and the appropriate authority should be satisfied with the submitted details. Evidence that these responsibility arrangements will remain in place throughout the lifetime of the development should be provided to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the adequate drainage of the site and to prevent water pollution and to accord with Policy CP12 of the Joint Core Strategy.”

**Seaford**  
**LW/17/0064**

REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS:

Letters have been received from 10 households, objecting to the application for the reasons below:

- The world’s great cities include green spaces in their plans
- New towns and cities are needed
- Will degrade town
- Loss of open space
- Loss of trees
- Contrary to policy
- Building in the countryside
- Conservation significance
- Effect on AONB
- Effect on wildlife
- Overlooking, loss of privacy
- Noise and disturbance
- Over development
- Out of character
- Will sanitise the signature of Seaford
- Highway hazards
- Inadequate access
- Parking issues
- Land protected by Covenant

[Officer Response] – The letters received do not raise any additional material considerations and the recommendation stands as per the main report.

**Kingston**  
**SDNP/17/00182/FUL**

Kingston Parish Council has submitted revised comments to advise that:

*“...it is clear that the application does not have the full support of the village residents and KPC therefore wishes to put on record that it is no longer able to support the application as we originally submitted.”*

Environmental Health Officer recommends contaminated land conditions if consent is granted.

The South Downs National Park Authority Policy officer comments that the SDNPA ‘Preferred Options’ document (SDNP Local Plan) are currently afforded limited weight and are not relied on in the consideration of this application (given that the

Local Plan is at a relatively early stage). The draft 'Settlement Policy Boundary' for Kingston in the Preferred Options shows the site outside that Boundary.

The Policy officer adds that the aim is to allocate a site or sites to provide Kingston with some modest housing growth, and 6 houses is the number most recently proposed. However, this is subject to further change, depending on site availability. The application site is very small (less than 0.1ha) and in the Policy officer's view would be unlikely to meet the threshold of having capacity for 5 or more dwellings, and would therefore not be an allocated site. If SDNP policies were being applied, it is likely that the application would be a refusal in principle.

#### Further residents representations

A letter has been received from a resident in response to points raised by the applicant's agent. The response comments indicates that the site is in the SDNP; 'Flintstones was approved over 10 years ago, before the Village Plan and SDNP; the proposed dwelling would overlook the most historic part of Kingston Manor and its garden; there are now only three Councillors left in the Parish Council, and we and several other residents in the village are challenging their letter of support; this is not a brownfield site; allowing the site to fall into disrepair to support the argument for a dwelling is no justification to over-ride the environmental impact on the countryside.

The local resident has also submitted a 'mock-up' of the proposed house when viewed from Kingston Manor, saying that it gives an indication of the scale and mass of the property and its proximity to the gazebo in the wall (both listed).

An additional 5 letters of representation have been received, one objecting (living on The Street) and four in support (one living in Lewes and two from the same household in The Street. The main points are:

#### Objecting:

- Unacceptable in principle. It is a new dwelling outside of the village boundary. It is also a sensitive location being within South Downs National Park countryside and the Conservation Area.
- There is no justifiable argument to allow this, in principle and unacceptable development.
- The fact that the application site has been allowed to become unsightly does not overcome the harm caused to the countryside if a permanent dwelling were allowed.
- There is no planning policy justification for allowing housing in the countryside for the children of farming families.
- It would create a dangerous precedent for allowing new houses in the countryside outside of the village boundary. The Council may then find it difficult to resist other new houses in the countryside which would cumulatively erode the settlement of Kingston and the SDNP countryside.
- Some years ago planning permission was granted to Mr Rea, the applicant, for the listed barn owned by the farm to the north east of the Top Yard. No action was taken on this.

- A new dwelling on the application site would be prominent in public vantage points from the South Downs Way which would detract from the vestige of this medieval village. The views from the top of the Downs on the South Downs Way and towards the settlement of Kingston are currently of a natural woodland area, the stone roof and other stonework of Kingston Manor. A modern house would detract from this historic and rural setting.
- The residents have a duty to preserve this application site which is in a beautiful village and historic environment and contains ecosystems such as trees, bats and birds.

Support:

*“I lived opposite this site for 10 years until January 2017. It is my opinion the development is in keeping with the area and vastly preferable to the current use as a dump for old vans and other odds and ends. It would be great to see the site used constructively for a house to provide much needed additional accommodation in the village”. Furthermore, the development will provide another home for a young family who have grown up in the village.*