

**First Supplementary Report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 11th December 2017**

**LW/17/0226
Peacehaven**

Page 1

4 Dec 2017

Peacehaven Focus Group has submitted a Briefing Document amplifying its objections to the planning application, primarily on the grounds of traffic impact and the use of inaccurate transport data.

[Officer Note]: This document has been circulated to all Councillors sitting on the Planning Applications Committee.

29-30 Nov 2017

Additional representations have been received from 62 Cissbury Crescent, Saltdean, raising the following concerns:-

- The Brighton and Hove City Council highway consultation comments do not reflect information contained within the Transport Assessment Addendum submitted.
- Residents have received additional letters of notification relating to amendments to property type 67 and the Transport Assessment Addendum.

[Officer Note]: Brighton & Hove City Council, as the adjoining highway authority, has confirmed that its consultation comments take into consideration both the Transport Assessment submitted and the Transport Assessment Addendum, as well as the review of this information carried out by GTA Civils on the behalf of East Sussex County Council as the highway authority for the Lewes district.

The statutory consultation comments received from East Sussex County Council as highway authority, and from Brighton & Hove City Council as the adjoining highway authority have not raised objections to the planning application, subject to conditions and the developer entering into a legal agreement for certain provisions including real-time bus information timetables, two new bus stops, the provision of more peak-time bus services and car club provision within the site and at the Meridian Centre, among others. In addition, CIL monies can be used in order to carry out the necessary improvements to the roundabouts, as identified in paragraphs ix) and 6.122 of policy SP8 of the Local Plan.

The consultation comments from East Sussex County Council have been provided following work done on its behalf by GTA Civils, a professional transport consultancy (and civil engineering consultancy). There is no reason, nor indeed any counter claim submitted by third parties in the form of a professional transport assessment, to conclude that the findings of the highway authority are incorrect.

The additional letters of neighbour notification received by some residents mean that a decision cannot be issued until the expiry date on those letters has passed. In any case, the decision notice cannot be issued until a S106 Agreement has been completed. In view of this, the recommendation is proposed to be amended as follows:-

That the Planning Applications Committee resolves to give the Director of Strategy, Planning and Regeneration delegated authority to issue the decision to approve planning permission, subject to the Heads of Terms and conditions as detailed in the report, following the expiry of the neighbour notification period.

Additional representations

Additional representations have been received from 46 The Bricky, 5 Crocks Dean and 5 Mayfield Avenue, objecting to the application for the following reasons:-

- Building in Countryside
- Contrary to Policy
- Effect on AONB
- Highway Hazards
- Lack of Infrastructure
- Over-development
- Smell/Fumes
- Traffic Generation
- Traffic on A259
- Effect on Town Centre Viability
- Inadequate Access
- Loss of Open Space
- Parking Issues
- Noise and Disturbance
- Not Sustainable
- Over-development
- Recommendation for approval despite the number of residents objecting as well as the Town Council raising objections

[Officer Note]: The additional representations received do not raise any new concerns that have not already been considered in the main report.

Sustainable Urban Drainage System

For clarity the SuDS system, including the balancing pond, will be owned and maintained by the management company to be set up by the developer. The ownership and maintenance of the SuDS system will be separate to the maintenance and management of the 2.3ha amenity space within the Phase 3 application area, which will adjoin the existing Big Park. This arrangement will allow Peacehaven Town Council to manage the amenity space whilst the SuDS system and associated pond, will be managed and maintained separately, by a management company in which future residents of the development will be stakeholders.

Air Pollution

It is accepted that there is existing congestion on the A259 through Peacehaven and beyond. The transport strategy submitted by the applicant does not, and cannot be expected to solve these existing problems. The key to the strategy proposed by the applicant is that alternative choices will be offered in order to make alternative modes of transport to the private car more attractive and easier to use. The net effect is that the development will not make existing highways matters worse – that the proposed development will have *nil detriment* on the A259.

In view of this, it follows that air pollution on the A259 should not increase. Furthermore, the applicant proposes various mitigation measures, such as provision of electric vehicle charging points within the development, and provision for car club parking spaces, these vehicles likely to become electric in the near future. The promotion and provision of electric vehicle facilities will have the effect of reducing the emissions which lead to pollution on the A259. It is also understood that the Government aims that by 2040 the sale of all petrol and diesel cars will be banned, further improving air quality over existing levels.

Amendment

At paragraph 7.1 of the report, the provision of additional bus services at peak hours to serve both the development and existing residents is deleted from the S106 Heads of Terms and moved into paragraph 7.2 because this provision will be secured by way of CIL payments.

.....