

Supplementary Report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 27 June 2018

LW/18/0331
Ringmer

Page 5

Deed of Variation

The applicant has confirmed that the mix of affordable rent units will be as per the existing S106 Agreement and the letter of approval from the Council's Housing Policy and Development Manager dated 22 June 2016:

This formal letter from the Council approved the 50:50 split and the following Affordable Housing Tenure Mix

Dwellings for Affordable Rent – To comprise 50% of the Affordable Housing Units comprising of:

- 1 Bed Flat – 16 Units (36% of AH Units)
- 2 Bed House – 4 Units (9% of AH Units)
- 3 Bed House – 2 units (5% of AH Units)

Dwellings for Shared Ownership - to comprise 50% of the Affordable Housing Units comprising of:

2 Bed Houses – 22 Units (50% of AH Units)

As such the current application may be approved without modification to the existing S106 Agreement.

Additional representations have been received from Orchard House and Ringmer Parish Council.

Further objections have been received from Dr John Kay of Ringmer Parish Council and from the occupier of Orchard House:-

- The application site does not include the RES7 land allocated for four houses in the RNP.
- It is wrong to claim that ESCC SuDS raises no objection.
- All key issues must be re-visited, not only the reasons cited for the previous refusal.
- There is no guarantee infrastructure will be provided from CIL monies.
- A LEAP within the site is not mandatory.
- Impact on neighbour amenity due to layout.
- Five-bedroom houses are not appropriate.
- Little change to the proposals.
- On-site roads not yet approved – no S.38 Agreement is yet in place with ESCC
- The important hedgerow is not safeguarded

- Insufficient response on external lighting
- Affordable housing split is not acceptable

The representations do not raise new material issues that are not addressed in the main report and by way of this Supplemental Report. For clarity:

- Site allocation RES7 of the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan is outside of the application site.
- The SuDS consultation comments of 18 May 2018 raise no objections subject to four recommendation conditions, which are listed below.
- The proposed development is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy, which will be around £1.3million. 25% of the CIL will be given to Ringmer Parish Council. Individual projects must be formulated and presented to the local authority in order to bid for CIL monies in addition to the above 25%.
- The LEAP is required by Condition 1 of the Outline planning approval, and for a development of this scale which will accommodate many families the LEAP will be a valuable resource because it will be near to people's homes. Retained policies RES19 and RE1 require new residential development to provide play space.
- The current proposals have been amended in comparison with the previous application that was refused. The applicant has specifically tried to overcome the six reasons for the refusal of the previous application and the result is a significantly improved and far better proposal in your officers' view.
- Section 38 agreements are considered by the highway authority and this matter does not relate to planning merits of the scheme, particularly as a condition relating to external lighting is recommended below.

Conditions 5 and 6 of the appeal decision relating to the outline application LW/14/0127 relate to flood mitigation and surface water drainage. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment Report, received 12 April 2018, indicates that ground levels will be modified a minimal amount in order to ensure the new dwellings are 300mm above the surface water flow routes. The SuDS team raises no objection to the current application for approval of the reserved matters, subject to the recommended condition below:

No development shall take place until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

- Investigations of the 600mm culvert on Bishop's Lane adjacent the application site into which an existing ditch. The investigations shall determine the route of the culvert and if the culvert is found to flow through the site and affected by the development, it shall be diverted to ensure there is build-over and access for its future maintenance is available.

- Details of the proposed site levels in order to demonstrate that the existing overland surface water flows conveying surface water from areas south (Chapters and Kerridge) and west (Norlington Court, Culverden and Sunnymede) will be retained by the development. Measures to ensure that these flow routes will not be obstructed through the lifetime of the development shall also be provided.
- Detailed design of the attenuation ponds and permeable pavements shall be informed by the findings of additional groundwater monitoring between autumn and spring as a minimum. The design should leave at least 1m unsaturated zone between the base of the ponds/permeable pavements and the highest recorded groundwater level. If this cannot be achieved, details of measures which will be taken to manage the impacts of high groundwater on the drainage system shall be provided.
- Prior to occupation of the development evidence (including photographs) shall be submitted to show that the drainage system has been constructed as per the final agreed detailed drainage designs.

Reason: In the interests of amenity, to mitigate flood risk and management surface water drainage in a sustainable fashion in accordance with Core Policy 12 of the Lewes District Local Plan Part One: Joint Core Strategy and having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework.

An additional condition relating to street lighting is also recommended:

No development shall commence until the details of all external lighting, including any street lighting, to the communal areas and access roads and footways, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details are maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in order to preserve the rural character of the local area in accordance with policy 4.11 of the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan, policy CP11 of the Lewes District Local Plan Part One: Joint Core Strategy and having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework.

[Informative] – The requirements of the external lighting condition will be subject to consultation with Ringmer Parish Council.

The following condition is recommended in order to specifically protect the ancient hedge at the application site:

No demolition, site clearance or building operations shall commence until hedge protection details, relating to all stages of development, for the protection of all internal and peripheral hedges and hedgerows throughout the site to be retained has been submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority. These details shall observe the principles

embodied within BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations), shall be implemented prior to any works commencing on site, shall be retained during the course of development, and shall not be varied without the written agreement of the District Planning Authority.

a) This condition may only be fully discharged on completion of the development subject to satisfactory written evidence of contemporaneous monitoring and compliance by the pre-appointed tree specialist during construction.

b) No retained hedge or hedgerow, or any tree and shrub forming part or wholly a hedge or hedgerow, shall be cut down, uprooted, destroyed, pruned, cut or damaged in any manner during the development process other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Note: *b) Necessary hedge cutting operations may only be undertaken in accordance with an agreed management plan (see condition 4).

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in order to preserve the rural character and heritage of the local area in accordance with Core Policies 10 and 11 of the Lewes District Local Plan Part One: Joint Core Strategy and having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 1 shall be amended in order to include the amended plans received between the main report having been drafted and the Planning Applications Committee meeting:

1. This decision relates solely to the following plan(s):

<u>PLAN TYPE</u>	<u>DATE RECEIVED</u>	<u>REFERENCE</u>
Design & Access Statement	3 May 2018	DAS_REV A_LOW RES_PART 6
Proposed Elevation(s)	8 June 2018	CB_45_110_SUB_01
Landscaping	8 June 2018	02C
Landscaping	8 June 2018	04C
Landscaping	8 June 2018	05C
Technical Report	8 June 2018	07 LEAP DETAILS
Other Plan(s)	18 June 2018	010E SWEPT PATH REFUSE VEHICLES
Other Plan(s)	18 June 2018	011E SWEPT PATH FIRE TENDER
Other Plan(s)	18 June 2018	012C SWEPT PATH REMOVAL LORRY
Other Plan(s)	18 June 2018	013D SWEPT PATH PRIVATE VEHICLE
Other Plan(s)	18 June 2018	BISHOP'S LANE IMPROVEMENTS
Planning	16 May 2018	COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Statement/Brief		
Other Plan(s)	20 June 2018	CD_45_110_009 REV A
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	A E01
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	A P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	A E02
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	A P02
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	B E01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	B E02
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	B P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	C E01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	C E02
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	C P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	D E01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	D E02
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	D P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	E E01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	E E02
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	E E03
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	E P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	F E01
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	F P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	G E01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	G E02
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	G P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	H E01
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	H P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	J E01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	J E02
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	J P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	K E01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	K E02
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	K E03
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	K E04
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	K P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	L E01
Proposed Floor Plan(s)	12 April 2018	L P01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	M E01
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	M P01

Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	NR E01
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	NR P01
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	R E01
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	R P01
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	P E01
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	P P01
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	S E01
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	S E02
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	S P01
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	S E03
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	S P02
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	S E04
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	S P03
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	S E05
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	S P04
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	S E06
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	S P05
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	GAR 01
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	GAR 01
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	GAR 02
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	GAR 02
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	GAR 03
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	GAR 03
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	GAR 04
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	GAR 04
Plan(s)		
Proposed Elevation(s)	12 April 2018	GAR 05
Proposed Floor	12 April 2018	GAR 05
Plan(s)		
Proposed Layout	13 June 2018	CB_45_110_001 REV D
Plan		
Landscaping	13 June 2018	01E
Landscaping	13 June 2018	03E
Additional Documents	12 April 2018	PARKING CALCULATOR
Additional Documents	12 April 2018	DRAINAGE CALCULATOR
Additional Documents	12 April 2018	ECOLOGY SUMMARY
Additional Documents	12 April 2018	ENERGY_SUSTAINABILITY
Design & Access	12 April 2018	DAS_REV A_LOW RES_PART 1

Statement		
Design & Access Statement	12 April 2018	DAS_REV A_LOW RES_PART2
Design & Access Statement	12 April 2018	DAS_REV A_LOW RES_PART 3
Design & Access Statement	12 April 2018	DAS_REV A_LOW RES_PART 4
Design & Access Statement	12 April 2018	DAS_REV A_LOW RES_PART 5
Design & Access Statement	12 April 2018	DAS_REV A_LOW RES_PART 7
Design & Access Statement	12 April 2018	DAS_REV A_LOW RES_PART 8
Flood Risk Assessment	12 April 2018	FLOOD STUDY REPORT -1
Flood Risk Assessment	12 April 2018	FLOOD STUDY REPORT -2
Flood Risk Assessment	12 April 2018	FLOOD STUDY REPORT -3
Flood Risk Assessment	12 April 2018	FLOOD STUDY REPORT -4
Flood Risk Assessment	12 April 2018	FLOOD STUDY REPORT -5
Illustration	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_BL_STREET SCEN
Illustration	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_CA_STREET SCEN
Illustration	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_GE_STREET SCEN
Illustration	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_VISUAL BOOKLET
Proposed Layout Plan	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_012
Location Plan	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_000
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_003
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_005
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	014B VISIBILITY SPLAYS
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_002
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_004
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_007
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_008
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_010
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_011
Other Plan(s)	12 April 2018	CB_45_110_006
Planning Statement/Brief	12 April 2018	
Tree Statement/Survey	12 April 2018	ARBORICULTURAL STATEMENT
Other Plan(s)	26 June 2018	16-099-008E
Other Plan(s)	26 June 2018	FIG 11B MAX FLOOD DEPTH
Other Plan(s)	26 June 2018	FIG 15 2D MODEL SCHEMATIC

Peacehaven

Objections received from 5 households in response to re-consultation on amended plans: Comments which are indicative of the opposition include:

“Another development that will generate more traffic and congestion. Doctors and schools are overstretched, yet the Council still approves virtually anything put before them. Please consider the residents that live here for once, and reject this application”.

“No more development until infrastructure is sorted”.

“Overlooking would certainly occur and is not acceptable just because it exists elsewhere on South Coast Road”

“Another hideous block of flats”.

“No guarantees that delivery/construction vehicles will not block local driveways”.

Objections also on grounds of:

“Highway hazards – Inadequate access – Lack of infrastructure – Noise and disturbance – Out of character – Over-development – Overbearing building/structure – Parking issues – Traffic generation – Traffic on A259”.

The proposal now includes vehicle charging points within the car park.

.....
LW/18/0234
Telscombe

Page 45

This application has been withdrawn.
.....

LW/18/0297
Peacehaven

Page 49

In relation to vehicle charging points, the LDC applicant says he “*can install 3 no. free standing charging units at 7kw, 32 amps and a connection running from each house to its dedicated parking bay charging unit*”.

.....
LW/18/0299
Peacehaven

Page 53

Ref para.1.3 of the report, the update on parking provision is as follows:

The 3 new parking spaces at the front of 31 Ashington Gardens have been deleted from the application, in response to a local concern (the resident is much more content with the scheme now). Instead, an unmarked area for parking at the back of 31-43 is to be marked out, with 3 spaces provided for

the bungalows. This proposal is considered to be much better because it leaves the grassed area at the front of no. 31 undisturbed. An amended plan has been received.

In relation to vehicle charging points, the LDC applicant says *“The distance from the houses to the parking bays is too great to install a connection. We can investigate the feasibility of using a solar powered charging unit or finding some other electricity distribution board, but because we have only recently made the decision to move the parking bays we cannot give a firm commitment to finding a satisfactory solution at this stage”*.

This page is intentionally left blank