

Summary of Representations and Responses

Includes all representations made during consultation period via Consultation Portal, Feedback Form and Email.

General

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
GN-1	27	Dr Keith Brent	Support for the proposals for Sovereign Harbour contained within the SPD to complete the development and provide the necessary amenities and facilities for the community.	Support welcomed.	No change
	28	MR PATRICK READING			
	33	Mr Eric Gibson			
	34	Mr Edward Francis			
	36	Mr Alfred Wickham			
	37	Mr Peter Young			
	41	Mr & Mrs Warton			
	42	Mrs Linda Martin			
	46	Christina Ewbank			
	51	Mr Derek Combs			
	57	Pamela Ferenc			
	68	Mrs Josie Mc Lean			
	86	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	88	Sarah Dennington			
	104	Mr David Boniface			
	188	Mr Mike Bolam			
	192	Mr John Valentine			
236	Mr Michael Greaves				
272	Mr Ryan Bushell				
392	Mr Stephen Nock				
445	Mr Ian Weeks				
456	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)				
532	Mr David Griffiths (Sovereign Harbour Yacht Club)				
GN-2	40	Mrs Alison Soper	Object to more residential development in Sovereign Harbour on the grounds that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the area is already overdeveloped • the area does not have the infrastructure, particularly community services, to cope • The remaining sites should be left as open space or for employment and leisure uses • There are already too many unoccupied flats • The council had previously said there would be no more residential development • the residents have already expressed their feelings 	Comments noted. The Council recognises residents concerns regarding the provision of additional housing at Sovereign Harbour. However in order to complete the development and provide the missing social and economic infrastructure that is required for it to become a sustainable community, a maximum of 150 new homes will be required.	No change
	58	John Schooley			
	64	Mr Peter Runacres			
	64	Mr Peter Runacres			
	75	Mrs Julia Wildman			
	94	Mr Geoff Chatterton			
	103	Mr Adrian Van Eugen			
	116	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	238	Mr Sonenthal Sonenthal			
	284	Mr Robert Stanborough			
	228	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	300	Mr Robert Hope			
	301	Mr Robert Robert Greenhead			
	311	Mrs Yvonne Elbro			
335	Mrs. Daphne Trefty				

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	424	Mrs Christine King	that they don't want any more homes.		
	434	Mr Brian Mulligan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will create additional traffic problems, particularly with parking and congestion It will have an adverse affect on property values 		
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
	525	Rosemary Brewster			
GN-3	116	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	The SPD allows too much flexibility and there is a concern that the developers will not develop the sites in line with the SPD. There is nothing to prevent landowners selling land to builders who may not adhere to agreement made.	The SPD provides guidance on what would be considered appropriate for each of the remaining development sites. The site specific proposals and development opportunities for the sites identified as suitable for housing include a range of housing numbers to allow the best use of the remaining sites and in order to ensure that the maximum number of units does not exceed 150.	No change
	118	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	There is a concern that it will be difficult to ensure that development takes place comprehensively and that future planning applications will be submitted to increase residential development. Also, there are reservations as to the Council's ability to deliver the plan if subjected to hostile planning applications.	The main landowner will be required to submit a composite outline planning application that will include all of their remaining sites in Sovereign Harbour in their ownership. This application will be determined in accordance with the guidance contained within the adopted SPD. Any planning permission granted will also be subject to a Section 106 agreement to ensure delivery of the proposed community benefits alongside any proposed residential and commercial development. Any applications submitted that do not accord with the advice given in the adopted SPD will be likely to be refused on policy grounds.	
	119	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	120	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	549	Mr. Richard Runalls			
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
GN-4	17	Ms Gillian Barr	Sovereign Harbour has not been built to original vision and has not provided adequate parking and access.	It is acknowledged that Sovereign Harbour has a long planning history and the SPD seeks to complete the harbour development. Comments regarding parking and access are noted and further development of the Harbour will be required to provide additional parking space.	No change
	70	Christina Creese			
GN-5	17	Ms Gillian Barr	The SPD is already decided so there is no point in putting it out for consultation.	The Council received 583 representations as part of the consultation on the SPD, all of which have been duly considered and this has resulted in amendments to the draft.	No change
GN-6	47	Mrs Julie Cronin	Charges for marine defences should be reduced due to more new homes sharing the costs.	It is understood that the proposed additional homes will be required to contribute towards the cost of maintaining the harbour and sea defences. However, specific costs are a private matter between residents and the Sovereign Harbour Trust.	No change
GN-7	60	Mr Mike Grant	There is no mention in the SPD about infrastructure delivery and funding and timescales need to be specified. Other sources of funding of infrastructure should also be investigated. Maintenance of existing facilities in Sovereign Harbour should be a priority.	Any grant of planning permission will be subject to a Section 106 agreement which would detail the community benefits to be delivered alongside the proposed residential and commercial development. Site specific infrastructure will be delivered as part of the detailed reserved matters applications that would need to be submitted following the grant of outline consent.	Amend para 3.2.1 to include reference to identifying funding opportunities. Amend para 1.1.8 to add reference at the end of the paragraph to the fact that any planning permission will be subject to a time limit commencement condition

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
				It is acknowledged that there are potential viability issues associated with delivering development on the remaining sites at Sovereign Harbour and landowners may well seek to identify opportunities for funding, as detailed in para 4.6.11 of the SPD. With regard to timescales, any planning permission that is granted will be subject to a condition requiring commencement within a set time. The comments regarding maintenance are noted.	
GN-8	67	Mr David Wells	All development should be fully considered and well designed and built.	The Council is committed to providing high quality developments within the Harbour setting.	No change.
GN-9	70	Christina Creese	There should be a reduction on Council Tax for residents of Sovereign Harbour.	The valuation of each property for the purposes of Council Tax is set by the Valuation Office and is not a matter for the SPD.	No change
GN-10	456	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Concern that sections of the SPD (particularly Section 1) appear to deal only with SHL's sites. Given the proposed lifespan of the document it does need to better reflect the potential for further possible redevelopment proposals.	Comments noted. Para 1.1.6 will be amended to have regard to SHL being the main landowner of the remaining sites.	Amend the first sentence of para 1.1.6 to read: In order to ensure the proposed community benefits are provided alongside any proposed residential and commercial development, proposals relating to the development of Sites referenced 1 to 8 in this SPD must be submitted together as part of a composite outline planning application.
GN-11	457	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Any reference to 'Carillion' should be amended to read 'Sovereign Harbour Ltd' or 'SHL'.	Agreed.	All references to 'Carillion' will be changed to 'Sovereign Harbour Ltd' or 'SHL'
	503	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The Site Plans for Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 should each be amended to refer to SHL as the landowner		
GN-12	559	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	No sites are seen as being undeliverable due to flood risk, ecology or potential contamination however further investigations will be needed for some sites to inform detailed designs. Protection and enhancements should be sought for the areas of vegetated shingle which has been identified in the Sussex Biodiversity Action Plan as a declining habitat.	Comments noted. Protection and enhancement of vegetated shingle will be sought where appropriate.	Reference will be made to this matter in the site specific proposals section of the SPD.
GN-13	586	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	The document lacks the weight required to ensure areas are allocated for marina use. If various options transpire Premier Marinas could be left without a boat storage area.	Para 4.10.8 recognises the importance of marine uses and acknowledges that the boat yard occupies a prominent site within the heart of Sovereign Harbour and along with the boat hoist, boat storage and berth holders facilities, it is essential for the maintenance of a fully served marina operation. The SPD also acknowledges that Site 2 could be used for boat storage. Boats would be able to be taken from the rear of the boat yard rather than be transported by the road to the temporary boat storage area on Site 6. It is also considered that boat storage could take place within the curtilage of the boat yard and within the existing storage area adjacent to the service road for the	Amend Appendix 10 to add 'Space for Boat Storage' to Site Characteristics Add new para 4.10.10 to read 'There may be potential for the boat yard to provide additional boat storage'.

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
				Waterfront.	

Introduction

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
IN-1	117	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Support for the delivery of infrastructure and specific community benefits, but should be coupled with the specific economic benefits	Support noted.	No change
	123	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	569	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)			
IN-2	121	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Concern about the submission of an outline application giving the developer the opportunity to change the development after it has been approved.	The outline planning application will be required to demonstrate the uses proposed on each of the sites, the amount of development, an indicative layout, information relating to the height and scale of development and indicative access points. In addition, the applicants will be required to submit supporting documents and plans, the full details of which are provided in Appendix 16 of the SPD. In order to secure the physical delivery of the community benefits and to confirm what is to be provided when and where, any grant of outline planning permission will be subject to a Section 106 agreement and planning conditions that developers will be required to comply with.	No change.
	122	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy			
IN-3	5	Mr. Anton de Bairacli Levy	Sovereign Harbour is not sustainable because there are few areas for children to play, far too few seating areas, no facilities such as a cafe or local corner shop and no community centre.	It is acknowledged that Sovereign Harbour is one of the least sustainable neighbourhoods in the town. The SPD is setting to address the missing social infrastructure that is required here.	No change
IN-4	6	Mr. Anton de Bairacli Levy	Community Centre must be completed and handed over before any residential building commences.	Para 4.5.10 acknowledges that the Community Centre must be built as a priority in the phasing of the overall development of the harbour and should therefore be provided prior to commencement of development on any of the remaining sites.	No change
IN-5	124	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	There is no explanation of what 'reserved matters' means.	Reserved matters applications are those that are submitted following the grant of outline planning permission that deals with the detailed design and layout proposals for each of the development sites.	No change
IN-6	458	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 1.1.6 to reflect the impracticality of submitting a single outline application for all remaining development sites due to sites being in ownership of different landowners. The purpose of the paragraph may be to relate to SHL's sites only, in which case it should make this clear, such that a composite application will be required for sites in SHL's ownership only.	Agreed. Para 1.1.6 will be amended to reflect the impracticality of submitting a single outline application for all sites as they are in different ownerships.	See Response ID GN-10

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
IN-7	459	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 1.1.7 to ensure that the requirements relate to future applications that may be made by all of the respective landowners / developer interests as they may bring new proposals forward.	Agreed. Para 1.1.7 will be amended to ensure requirements related to all land owners.	Amend para 1.1.7 to read: 'In addition, all applicants for proposed development relating to all of the sites and areas addressed within this SPD will be required to submit supporting documents and plans as part of their planning application, the full details of which are provided in Appendix 16.
IN-8	460	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 1.1.8 to refer to charges potentially being made under the new CIL arrangement; subject to the mechanisms that are in place at the time that an application is determined and to what is the most appropriate mechanism (s106 or CIL) given the development in question.	Agreed. In order to ensure that the SPD is relevant in the future, reference to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be included.	Amend para 1.1.8 to read: 'Finally, in order to secure the physical delivery of the community benefits and to confirm what is to be provided, where and when, any grant of permission would be subject to a Section 106 agreement and/or CIL as relevant and appropriate at the time of the consideration of their proposals and to planning conditions that the developers would be required to comply with'.
IN-9	461	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 1.1.9 to clarify that any future outline application that may be submitted for any part of the Harbour will thereafter be subject to reserved matters applications.	Agreed. Reference is outline applications being subject to reserved matters applications will be included.	Amend para 1.1.9 to read: 'Where an outline application has been submitted and approved for development on any part of Sovereign Harbour, the detailed design and layout proposals for each of the development sites would thereafter be the subject of 'reserved matters' applications.

Context and Background

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
CB-1	126	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	Concerned about previous legal agreement and how developer contributions were spent, particularly on sports facilities.	Comments Noted. Any grant of outline planning permission for development on the remaining sites at Sovereign Harbour will be subject to Section 106 agreements in order to secure the delivery of community benefits that the developer will be required to comply with.	No change
	229	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
CB-2	388	Mr Bruno Di Lieto	Amend para 2.3.11: 'In order to provide 'sufficient' parking, any residential development must provide one parking space per bedroom and one visitor space per two dwellings'.	Comments noted. East Sussex County Council has recently consulted on amended car parking standards for new development.	No change
	515	Mr Bruno Di Lieto			
CB-3	227	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	The document states that absolute priority should be given to the plans for the community facilities. This is not a statement that says 'will be given'. Amend para 2.4.2 to 'will be given'.	This paragraph refers to the consensus that arose from the previous consultation and acknowledges that residents wanted a community centre of an appropriate size to be delivered before any residential development has started as an absolute priority. Paragraph 3.1.8 of the SPD acknowledges that Core Strategy Policy C14, states that the provision of community facilities is an issue that should be addressed	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
				<p>through the development of the remaining sites and these need to be guaranteed before there is further housing development.</p> <p>In addition, Paragraph 4.5.10 of the SPD states that the community 'facility must be built as a priority in the phasing of the overall development of the Harbour and should therefore be provided prior to commencement of development on any of the remaining residential development sites.'</p>	
CB-4	243	Mr Peter S Thomas	<p>The Sovereign Harbour Vision and Neighbourhood Policy should be to ensure that planning applications will seek to address weaknesses in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Para 2.3.4 should be amended to: 'The primary aim of the vision statement is to ensure that subsequent planning applications that affect land and property falling within the boundaries of Sovereign Harbour will address the weaknesses identified in 2.3.10, resulting, to the fullest extent physically possible as a consequence of said planning application, in Sovereign Harbour, becoming one of the top quartile sustainable communities in Eastbourne, meeting, to the fullest extent physically possible, the present national standards of sustainability required of new developments of the size of Sovereign Harbour, and that the means to achieving this primary aim will include the subsidiary aims listed and promoted below:'</p>	<p>The Sovereign Harbour Vision and Neighbourhood Policy detailed in the SPD form part of the Core Strategy and therefore cannot be amended as part of this document.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the vision will address weaknesses in the neighbourhood as it seeks to increase its levels of sustainability.</p>	No change
CB-5	399	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	<p>The Vision and Policy for Sovereign Harbour within the emerging Eastbourne Plan makes no mention of the natural environment and should recognise the unique character of the area which is a result of its underlying geology and geomorphology (a shingle foreland), with associated biodiversity value that is internationally important and globally restricted (vegetated shingle).</p>	<p>The Sovereign Harbour Vision and Neighbourhood Policy detailed in the SPD form part of the Core Strategy and therefore cannot be amended as part of this document.</p> <p>Protection and enhancement of vegetated shingle habitat for biodiversity will be sought where appropriate, particularly through the provision of open space on Site 1 and the Shingle Mound and it is also recommended that for the Outer Harbour Peninsula, 'opportunities to revert to a shingle habitat should be explored.'</p>	No change
CB-6	435	Miss Hannah Fortune (Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners)	<p>Sovereign Harbour Retail Park should be identified as a District Centre</p> <p>Support for additional retail development would enhance the importance of these retail areas and provide an improved retail offer for local residents; additional food and drink uses would increase the offer and attraction of The Waterfront; and there is an opportunity to enhance the leisure and tourism offer within Sovereign Harbour through the development of well planned business and</p>	<p>This matter was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector recommended that Sovereign Harbour Retail Park should be designated as a District Shopping Centre, and this will be referenced in the SPD.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p>	<p>Amend para 3.1.12 to include reference to Sovereign Harbour Retail Park being designated as a District Shopping Centre.</p> <p>Amend para 4.9.1 to include reference to Sovereign Harbour Retail Park being designated as a District Shopping Centre.</p>

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			retail space.		
CB-7	436	Miss Hannah Fortune (Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners)	<p>The vision for Sovereign Harbour should be amended to read: 'Sovereign Harbour will increase its levels of sustainability through the designation of the District Centre and new shopping and service development within it, the delivery of community infrastructure and employment development, as well as improved accessibility, ensuring that a holistic view is taken of development across remaining sites.'</p> <p>Three amendments to as quoted at Policy C14 as follows: 'Providing extensive employment opportunities primarily through the development of a Business Park (B1a Office) but also elsewhere within the Neighbourhood area, such as within the District Centre'; 'Promotion of shopping and services within the District Centre'; 'Increasing the importance of the Waterfront and District Centre as a leisure and tourist centre'.</p>	<p>This matter was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The inspector's findings recommended that Sovereign Harbour Retail Park should be designated as a District Shopping Centre, and this will be referenced in the SPD.</p> <p>However, as a result of the Inspectors Report there has been no change to the Core Strategy vision for Sovereign Harbour, and the SPD needs to reflect the Core Strategy. Therefore the recommended change is not appropriate for the SPD.</p>	No change
CB-8	462	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	In para 2.3.7, the date of publication of the Sustainable Neighbourhood Assessment should be included alongside a statement that it only provides a snapshot in time. The facilities within the Harbour have already changed since then, with the completion of the new medical centre and if the vision for the Harbour is realised, it will change still further over the lifetime of the SPD.	The date of the Sustainable Neighbourhood Assessment will be included. However, reference to 'a snapshot in time' is not considered necessary.	Amend para 2.3.7 to include '(September 2011)' following 'Sustainable Neighbourhood Assessment'.
CB-9	463	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend paragraph 2.3.10 to reflect that the issue regarding jobs in Sovereign Harbour is one of a mismatch between Harbour residents and the jobs available / where residents currently choose to work.	This is a personal interpretation of the Sustainable Neighbourhood Assessment, the evidence from which does not specifically illustrate that there is a mismatch between residents and jobs available.	No change
CB-10	464	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	In para 2.4.2, the reference to the 'completion of the promenade' should be amended to 'the extension of the promenade'.	Agreed.	Amend fourth bullet point in para 2.4.2 to read: 'extension of the promenade to link it from Atlantic Drive to the harbour arm and the outer harbour promenade'.

Key Issues

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
KI-1	15	Mr Michael Cox	Support for the provision of infrastructure, particularly community facilities, children's play areas and open space, which the community needs, before the commencement of residential development	Support welcomed.	No change
	16	Mr Michael Cox			
	27	Dr Keith Brent			
	64	Mr Peter Runacres			
	117	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	134	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	135	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	137	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	138	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	144	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	145	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	146	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	147	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	186	Mr Robin Heal			
	194	Mrs Lynne Gumbleton			
	236	Mr Michael Greaves			
	357	Beavon			
	434	Mr Brian Mulligan			
KI-2	41	Mr & Mrs Warton	There are existing parking problems in Sovereign Harbour and adequate provision of parking to satisfy the demands should accompany proposed developments. Concern that undercroft parking will not be adequate to provide for needs of new development.	Para 2.3.11 of the SPD acknowledges that residents have expressed concerns about the ratio of residents to visitors parking facilities. In addition, para 3.1.17 acknowledges that there are car parking issues associated with the Haven School. Paras 2.3.11 and 3.1.16 recognises the importance of any new development should not impact on the current parking situation and should be provided with sufficient parking to meet its own needs. It is considered that undercroft parking could be an appropriate provision of parking space to meet needs of development and is specifically proposed for development on site (para 4.1.22) as it will not only limit the amount of hard surfacing on site but will also provide added security for habitable rooms on the ground floor. Parking provision for employment sites will be determined having regard to adopted policy standards.	Delete para 3.1.16 and replace with: 'Further development, especially commercial, retail, employment, leisure and tourism, will be required to provide additional car parking spaces in accordance with adopted parking standards, along with a holistic approach to transport planning'.
	52	Sarah Turner			
	55	Mrs J Hargraves			
	68	Mrs Josie Mc Lean			
	88	Sarah Dennington			
	130	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Further clarification needed on how parking provision for employment, retail and leisure development will be accommodated.		
	131	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	142	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	149	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	150	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	151	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	186	Mr Robin Heal			
	192	Mr John Valentine			
	230	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
443	Mr David Neilson				
KI-3	15	Mr Michael Cox	Object to the development of affordable housing in Sovereign Harbour on the grounds that it is a high value area that is not suitable for family housing, the area already has a significant amount of rented properties and it will lower the value of properties in the area.	Both Policy HO13 of the Borough Plan and Policy D5 of the Core Strategy require the provision of affordable housing on-site. However if it can be proved that this would be unviable that Council may accept an equivalent commuted sum to provide the affordable housing off-site. The comment that the area is not suitable for family housing is noted, however the consensus is that Sovereign Harbour is lacking family housing and this is why the majority of the proposed 150 new dwellings should be houses rather than flats. Affordable housing will be required to pay towards harbour fees. The Core Strategy Policy D5 has taken an area-based approach to the requirements for affordable housing. Development viability is better in 'High market value areas' and therefore the requirement for affordable housing in these areas has been increased to 40%. Sovereign Harbour is classified as a high market value area.	No change
	16	Mr Michael Cox			
	128	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Any affordable housing should pay towards maintenance costs and the harbour fees and should not all be placed in one location.		
	131	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	132	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	183	Miss Elizabeth Ann James	Concerned that the affordable housing requirement has increased from 30% to 40%.		
	244	Mr Peter S Thomas			
	271	Mr Bob Watts			
	279	Mr Philip Barnes			
	352	Mrs Sue Watts			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
KI-4	8	Mr. Anton de Bairacli Levy	<p>Object to the development of a business park on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there is no demand for additional office space in Eastbourne the road links are not sufficient it would exacerbate traffic problems and cause problems with parking of commercial vehicles Sovereign Harbour should not have to provide 50% of the require employment land for Eastbourne 	<p>There has been a long standing commitment by the Council to provide a business park at Sovereign Harbour. Indeed para 3.1.5 refers to Core Strategy Policy C14 which describes the Council's ambition to provide high quality skilled employment opportunities at the harbour.</p> <p>The issue regarding the amount of floorspace for the business park was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector concluded that although there is uncertainty over the viability of directing 30,000 square metres of employment floorspace to Sovereign Harbour, any delay in the adoption of the Core Strategy Local Plan would result in the Council being unable to take a pro-active, plan led approach to delivering development. Therefore no modification has been made to the amount of employment floorspace at Sovereign Harbour, although the Inspector recommends that Core Strategy Local Plan Policy D2: Economy should be subject to an early review and replacement policy by 2014.</p> <p>Issues relating to parking and access will be considered as part of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Add new para after 3.1.6 to state 'Policy D2 will be the subject of an early review and will eventually be replaced by an Employment Land Local Plan, which will be subject to examination and should be adopted by the end of 2014.'</p>
	52	Sarah Turner			
	70	Christina Creese			
	125	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	133	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	163	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	231	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	357	Beavon			
390	Mr Neville Goodman				
KI-5	29	Mr Geoff Geoff Willis	<p>The maximum range of housing across all sites exceeds 150. The SPD should be amended to be explicit in the number of dwellings to be developed on each site, and the overall total should be reduced from 150 to 100.</p>	<p>It is accepted that the maximum range of all sites does exceed 150. However this allows flexibility for the developer to make the most efficient use of each of the sites and allows the response to be design led. This does not mean that the maximum of 150 new dwellings in Sovereign Harbour can be exceeded. This figure will facilitate the provision of the community infrastructure that the neighbourhood is currently lacking. The provision of 100 units would not be able to do this.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	71	Dr Carol McCrum			
	108	Mrs Mary Davis			
	236	Mr Michael Greaves			
	378	Mr Roger Kiernan			
	534	Mr David Gunn			
KI-6	7	Mr. Anton de Bairacli Levy	<p>The SPD does not address the issues and will not do anything to increase the sustainability of Sovereign Harbour</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Sovereign Harbour is one of the least sustainable neighbourhoods in the town. The SPD is setting to address the missing social infrastructure that is required in order to increase the sustainability of the area.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	17	Ms Gillian Barr			
	97	Mr Clive Narrainen			
	534	Mr David Gunn			
KI-7	47	Mrs Julie Cronin	<p>Object to residents paying more fees and charges for marine defences should be reduced due to more new homes sharing the costs. The SPD makes no mention of the Sovereign Harbour Trust or Harbour fees.</p>	<p>It is understood that the proposed additional homes will be required to contribute towards the cost of maintaining the harbour and sea defences.</p> <p>However, specific costs are a private matter between residents and the Sovereign Harbour Trust.</p>	<p>No change</p>
	156	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	250	Mr Peter S Thomas			
	308	Mr David Hitchcock			
KI-8	65	Mr & Mrs Rhodes	<p>The area needs more shops, particularly convenience shops, and restaurants, and these should be included in the SPD.</p>	<p>Para 3.1.12 recognises that the Sovereign Harbour Retail Park provides the main retail facility for the neighbourhood, and that the Waterfront also provides a retail function. The SPD supports the provision of</p>	<p>No change</p>
	96	Mr John Batchelor			
	103	Mr Adrian Van Eugen			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	232	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy		additional retail and other food and drink uses (paras 3.1.12 and 3.1.13)	
KI-9	75	Mrs Julia Wildman	Object to the development of a community centre on the grounds that the Sovereign Harbour Yacht Club can be converted to provide community facilities.	It is acknowledged that the Sovereign Harbour Yacht Club could provide space for the community to use. However the building would not meet all of the needs of the Sovereign Harbour neighbourhood and as such a purpose built community centre is proposed for Site 5.	No change
	424	Mrs Christine King			
	532	Mr David Griffiths (Sovereign Harbour Yacht Club)			
KI-10	89	Patricia Fontana	Affordable sheltered housing should be provided in Sovereign Harbour to allow residents to remain in the community.	Para 4.7.14 acknowledges that there is the opportunity to provide some sheltered or assisted living accommodation on Site 7 and perhaps a limited amount of care home accommodation.	No change
	183	Miss Elizabeth Ann James			
	358	Ms Jane Challen			
KI-11	94	Mr Geoff Chatterton	The cross harbour bus service will create a rat run between Pacific Drive and Atlantic Drive.	There has been a long standing commitment to provide a bus link between the North and South Harbour areas. Provision of this facility would not create a 'rat run' between Pacific Drive and Atlantic Drive as the link would ensure it could only be used by buses.	No change
	99	Mrs Brenda Bowers			
	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy			
KI-12	96	Mr John Batchelor	There should be more disabled access and parking and public toilets	Any commercial development proposed on the remaining sites will be required to provide disabled access and parking. Support would be given to the provision of public toilet facilities as part of the proposals for development of the remaining sites.	No change
	101	Mr Harold Henry Noble-Jacques			
	355	Dr Mary Morley			
KI-13	126	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Concerned that the community centre won't be of an adequate size to meet the needs of the community and more clarity on the size of the community centre should be provided.	Para 4.5.10 states that the proposed community centre would have a footprint of approximately 750m ² which it is considered will adequately meet the needs of the Sovereign Harbour neighbourhood.	No change
	245	Mr Peter S Thomas			
	309	Mr David Hitchcock			
KI-14	139	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Object to the provision of more restaurants, bars and takeaways in Sovereign Harbour	Comments noted. However the Waterfront bars and restaurants provide one of the main attractions of the area for visitors and residents and further food and drink facilities will increase the offer and attraction of the Harbour. By siting these uses adjacent to the Waterfront and on Site 4 (not directly adjacent to residential areas) minimises the potential impact of these uses on residential amenity.	No change
	148	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	186	Mr Robin Heal			
KI-15	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy	Support for the public slipway, provided such use is covered by the marina byelaws and regulations as set by the Harbourmaster	Support welcomed.	No change
	252	Mr Peter S Thomas			
	576	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)			
KI-16	33	Mr Eric Gibson	Concern about the increase of traffic on Sovereign Harbour roads, particularly Pacific Drive	Proposed development will be required to demonstrate that they have no detrimental impact on the highway	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	36	Mr Alfred Wickham		network. As part of any application for planning permission it will be necessary to submit a transport assessment.	
KI-17	46	Christina Ewbank	A covered walkway between the car park and the Waterfront would promote business in Winter	The development opportunities for Site 4 could incorporate such a walkway, if the developers considered it viable, between the car park and the Waterfront, and para 4.4.17 of the SPD acknowledges that development on Site 4 will also be expected to be integrated with the pedestrian link across Harbour Quay towards the Retail Park.	No change
	392	Mr Stephen Nock			
KI-18	55	Mrs J Hargraves	The SPD could include more trees, open spaces and community areas.	The SPD acknowledges that there is a lack of useable open green space in Sovereign Harbour along with play areas and other community facilities, and the SPD seeks to remedy this. Tree planting can however be difficult at Sovereign Harbour due to the exposed maritime location and salt laden winds.	No change
	103	Mr Adrian Van Eugen			
KI-19	60	Mr Mike Grant	There is a need for open space facilities for teenagers and there should be more creative ideas about open space provision. There is no need for more children's play areas. The open space could include allotments.	<p>Para 3.1.11 acknowledges that there is a demand from the local community, especially younger people, for a local playing field to allow informal sporting activities to take place, and has been suggested for part of Site 7. In addition, the development opportunities for Site 1 will include the provision of a significant area of public open space and there is an opportunity to provide a unique space.</p> <p>The comment relating to Children's play areas is noted, however there are only two children's play areas within Sovereign Harbour and both are located in the North Harbour. There are many part of the neighbourhood that do not have adequate and safe access to children's play areas. Policy C14 of the Core Strategy states that the number of children's play areas should be increased to improve the area's sustainability.</p> <p>The comment regarding the provision of allotments is noted, however it is considered that the ground conditions are unlikely to be appropriate for allotment use.</p>	No change
	69	Mr Stanley Williams			
KI-20	141	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	Support for increasing leisure and tourism in Sovereign Harbour, provided that there is more diversity in the types of facility provided.	Support welcomed.	No change
	143	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
KI-21	155	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	Support for the cross harbour bus link	Support welcomed.	No change
	238	Mr Sonenthal Sonenthal			
KI-22	188	Mr Mike Bolam	There should be more detail on the restrictions for residential development, particularly ratio of houses to flats.	Para 3.1.2 identifies that 150 dwellings is the maximum figure for delivery, and the majority of dwellings should be houses rather than flats.	No change
	357	Beavon			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
KI-23	233	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Support for the provision of cycle paths, but concerned for pedestrian safety where they route through residential areas.	Support welcomed. It is considered that para 3.1.19 already safeguards priority for pedestrians over cyclists. However this comment will be referred to East Sussex County Council as the Highway Authority for consideration.	No change
	247	Mr Peter S Thomas	Amend para 3.1.19 to read 'However, this could be improved further by providing additional routes and new harbour walkways <i>where the width of the existing route or walkway is equal to or less than double the standard pavement width</i> where pedestrians will be given priority over cyclists.'		
KI-24	272	Mr Ryan Bushell	Support for the provision of playing fields in Sovereign Harbour to meet demand from the local community, especially younger people.	Support welcomed. Para 3.1.11 acknowledges that there is a demand from younger people for a local playing field to allow informal sporting activities to take place and is proposed on part of Site 7.	No change.
	386	Mr Bruno Di Lieto			
KI-25	9	Mr. Anton de Bairacli Levy	The costs of dredging the outer harbour should not be passed on to the residents	The SPD is not suggesting that any costs of dredging the Outer Harbour will be met by residents.	No change
KI-26	34	Mr Edward Francis	The SPD should include proposals for a hotel and a bank.	It was originally proposed that a hotel could be accommodated on Site 1. However over the last 15 years there has been no interest in the market for such a facility. Likewise, we are unaware of demand for a bank in Sovereign Harbour. However the recent consent for the retail park and the development on Site 4 would not preclude provision of a class A2 use (financial and professional services) and is indeed identified in Appendix 4 as an acceptable use.	No change
KI-27	43	Mr Barry Milne	It is essential to have a good boat repair facility and out of water storage. The boat hoist is located in a public area and is an accident waiting to happen.	Para 4.10.8 recognises the importance of marine uses and acknowledges that the boat yard, the boat hoist, boat storage and berth holders facilities are essential for the maintenance of a fully served marina operation. There are no opportunities to relocate the boat hoist.	No change
KI-28	46	Christina Ewbank	Any further residential development should not include flats	Some development sites may lend themselves to the provision of apartments by reason of context and site surroundings. Furthermore, of the 150 units proposed, the majority would be houses.	No change
KI-29	55	Mrs J Hargraves	The area already has a high density and could become a focus of undesirable activity. Concerned about additional children's play areas having the potential to create vandalism.	It is understood that there is a regular presence of local PCSOs in Sovereign Harbour and they regularly contribute to the SHRA newsletter. Any problems of anti-social behaviour will be dealt with by them. Concerns about children's play areas are acknowledged but there is a real	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	88	Sarah Dennington	The bus service is insufficient.	shortage of children's play areas in Sovereign Harbour that needs to be addressed. Comments of bus service are noted. It is likely that the implementation of the bus link will help to improve the bus service.	
KI-30	59	Paul Risvold	A Community Centre should have been provided previously.	The SPD acknowledges that there is a need for the community centre which will be provided as a priority in the phasing of the overall development of the harbour.	No change
KI-31	72	Mr Michael Newton-Smith	Considers that there is enough housing already but understand there must be incentive for developers to follow through on community projects.	Comment noted.	No change
KI-32	75	Mrs Julia Wildman	More leisure and pleasure amenities should be considered in the SPD.	The provision of additional leisure amenities are considered in para 3.1.14 of the SPD, which aims to increase the importance of the Waterfront as a leisure and tourist destination	No change
KI-33	92	Linda Warner	A full study and public vote is needed before the implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone.	There is no reference to a Controlled Parking Zone within the SPD.	No change
KI-34	111	Mr David Wells	The SPD has not made adequate provision for fishermen	Agreed. The draft SPD has been amended so that the preferred option for Site 3 is to provide a permanent home for the fishermen to enable them to land their catch and to store their equipment. In addition, it is considered the site would also be suitable for associated and ancillary uses such as net shops	Delete final sentence of para 3.1.26 and replace with: 'In the event that Site 3 is proposed for either a commercial or residential development, arrangements to deal with the fishermen's needs will need to be put in place to provide for them to land their catch and store their equipment.' After final sentence of para 4.3.6, add: 'In addition, the West Channel is one of only two places in the Harbour (the other being adjacent to Site 4) that has deep water and can allow large fishing vessels to pull up against the Harbour walls.' Delete para 4.3.7 Add new paragraph after 4.3.9: 'The preferred option for Site 3 is to provide a permanent home for the fishermen to enable them to land their catch and to store their equipment. In addition, it is considered the site would also be suitable for associated and ancillary uses such as net shops'. Delete para 4.3.11 and replace with: 'However, should the site not become the permanent home of the fishermen and if it is demonstrated that the site would not be commercially viable to provide an extension to the Waterfront, it is considered that the site would be suitable for a residential development as this would be in keeping with the development on the opposite side of the West Channel. As part of any application for planning permission for residential development on this site it, would therefore

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
					<p>be necessary to confirm that the site is no longer needed for the fishermen as well as providing information to confirm that the provision of additional retail, and food and drink uses, is not commercially viable. Any residential development must be within the 250 limit.'</p> <p>Delete para 4.3.15 and replace with: 'In the event that an extension to the Waterfront or a residential development is proposed for Site 3, arrangements to deal with the fishermen's needs should be put in place to provide for them to land their catch and to store either equipment. Any residential development must be within the 150 limit.'</p> <p>In Appendix 3, replace 'Arrangements to deal with fishermen's needs to be put in place for landing of catch and storage of equipment' and replace with: 'Provision of enhanced, permanent facilities for the fishermen with appropriate storage alongside other ancillary and associated uses, such as a fresh fish shop'</p>
KI-35	129	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Concerned that the balance of housing cannot be assured	The SPD will require that the majority of the proposed new dwellings will be houses rather than flats.	No change
KI-36	136	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Shingle is not a suitable walking surface for either adults or children.	Comment noted.	No change
KI-37	140	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	The type of outlet in the retail units should be chosen by residents.	The type of outlets in the retail units will be a market-led decision and it will be up to the private owners how they decide on the allocation of the shops.	No change
KI-38	152	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Support for vehicular separation of North and South Harbour areas.	Support welcomed. However, the bus link will provide a bus route between the North and South Harbours.	No change
KI-39	154	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Support for the extension to the promenade to allow the dotto train to get to the Martello Tower	Support welcomed.	No change
KI-40	157	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Support for the release of surplus berth holder parking spaces	Support welcomed.	No change
KI-41	158	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Object to the relocation of the fishermen to Outer Harbour Peninsula on the grounds that dredging would be expensive and it would affect residential amenity of surrounding properties.	Whilst the SPD acknowledges that the fishermen could relocate to the Outer Harbour Peninsula, it also states that the dredging of the Outer Harbour and associated costs would make it unlikely that the fishermen would be able to relocate to this site. Proposals for this site are therefore for it to remain as a community space only with enhanced facilities for pedestrians.	No change
KI-42	159	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Support for the Boat Yard	Support welcomed.	No change
KI-43	160	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	No building difficulty is insurmountable. The document states that there are poor ground conditions and that the site would require piling or raft foundations before	Comment noted. None of the remaining development sites in Sovereign	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			building could be considered. Other landowners should give up some land for housing development.	Harbour that are not owned by SHL are considered appropriate for residential development (Boat yard, Outer Harbour Peninsula and Land adjacent to the Lock Gates)	
KI-44	161	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Support for development being required to pass a sequential and exception test	Support welcomed.	No change
KI-45	162	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Support for the requirement for development to provide a flood risk assessment	Support welcomed.	No change
KI-46	186	Mr Robin Heal	Any residential development should be no more than two storeys and leave views between buildings of the Waterfront /harbour	The height of proposed development will be influenced by the height of adjacent development in order to contribute to the townscape. Development over two storeys in height will therefore be appropriate on a number of development sites. However as part of any development proposed on Sites 3, 4 and 8 there is a requirement to provide new harbour walkways and views of the waterfront.	No change
KI-47	234	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Support for all development sites contributing to harbour infrastructure costs	Support welcomed.	No change
KI-48	235	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	The costs of complying with Code for Sustainable Homes should be classed as ongoing costs.	Any costs of complying with the Code for Sustainable Homes standards will be met by the developer.	No change
KI-49	246	Mr Peter S Thomas	Double yellow lines should prevent parking within 25 metres of the junctions of Jamaica Way and Galveston Close with Atlantic Drive.	Comment noted. This comment will be referred to East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority for a response.	No change
KI-50	251	Mr Peter S Thomas	Object to the provision of houseboats on the North Harbour. Instead the North Harbour should be a sailing nursery/school.	It is not clear what this objection specially relates to. The proposals for a sailing school would for the owners (Premier Marinas) to consider further.	No change
KI-51	307	Ms Susan Kerrison	The SPD should take a more sophisticated approach to public transport solutions to help reduce parking problems. For instance, why don't the buses go into the car park rather than stop on the road outside? Why do people have to cross a four lane highway with their shopping to catch a bus to Pevensey ?	Comment noted. This comment will be referred to East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority for a response, but there could be highway safety issues associated with buses gaining access through the car park. The car park is private land. Allowing access for buses into Sovereign Harbour Retail Park car park could be a matter to be discussed further between landowners and bus operators. There are however proposals for a bus link between the North and South Harbour areas (para 4.9.6).	No change
KI-52	312	Mr David Hitchcock	Pontoons & berth holders facilities must be allowed for even though it may take some considerable time in the future to complete	Comment noted. Para 3.3.14 acknowledges that alternative proposals for the northern edge of the North Harbour may be considered if additional pontoons and berth holder facilities are not required in the future	No change
KI-53	384	Mr Bruno Di Lieto	Support for the provision of additional parking spaces for the Waterfront. Adequate parking facilities must be	Support welcomed. Para 4.5.3 acknowledges that the Waterfront businesses have an agreement with SHL to	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			available to support and sustain the commercial centre.	retain a minimum number of parking spaces.	
KI-54	394	Mr Peter Holland (Sovereign Harbour Berth Holders Association)	The berth holders require a minimum of 50 car parking spaces ideally with berth holders access only to retain the 'Five Gold Anchor' award status which requires a certain ratio of car parking to boats.	Comment noted. However there are more than 50 berth holder parking spaces at the Harbour and the owners of these spaces will be encouraged to release them for other uses/purposes where there is a surplus to ensure the efficient uses of the parking areas.	No change
KI-55	400	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Support for the provision of 'natural areas' but these should be appropriate to the underlying geology and prevailing environmental conditions.	Support welcomed.	No change
KI-56	401	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Areas of open space should be planted with appropriate species to restore the naturally occurring habitat, particularly the Shingle Bank and beach frontages.	Comment noted. Amend para 4.1.16 and 4.11.6 to reference restoring naturally occurring habitat.	Amend para 4.1.16 to read: 'As part of any development on this site, it will be essential to provide a significant area of public open space (approximately two thirds of the site), which could be planted with appropriate species to restore the naturally occurring habitat along the beach frontage and must incorporate children's play space. The exposure and coastal location may limit the choice of hard and soft landscape finishes. There is however an opportunity to provide a unique space designed to reflect the maritime location.' Add sentence at end of para 4.11.6 to read: 'Appropriate restoration and sympathetic landscaping using native shingle species appropriate to the area would provide an attractive 'green space' within Sovereign Harbour and be of significant benefit to wildlife by restoring the naturally occurring habitat along the Shingle Bank'.
KI-57	402	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Support for the inclusion of the provision and protection of wildlife habitats within the initiatives for sustainable building design	Support welcomed.	No change
KI-58	408	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	The SPD could include more on what we understand about the history and archaeology of the area before the recent major development. Options to improve the setting and condition of the two surviving Martello Towers and identification of the former location of the missing ones could be considered further. The SPD should allow for the use of the Historic Environment Record (HER) to assess the potential impacts of future development, provide information for local residents about the history of the area and help develop proposals for future design and setting of surviving heritage assets. This understanding of historic land use can then be used to help consider future design options. Support for the proposed development areas and the provision for public open space and pedestrian linkages,	Comment noted. The SPD will be amended accordingly to provide more information on history and archaeology of the area. In addition the SPD will also use the Historic Environment Record (HER) to assess the potential impacts of future development, and the developments on Site 1, the Outer Harbour Peninsula and Martello Tower 64 will be required to provide archaeological interpretation information for local residents and visitors about the history of the area and help develop proposals for future design and setting of surviving heritage assets. Support welcomed.	Delete sub-title 'Heritage Assets' and replace with 'History and Heritage Assets' Delete para 3.3.10 and replace with following paragraphs: 'Sovereign Harbour, or the 'Crumbles' as this area of Eastbourne was originally known, is steeped in history. Originally a shingle spit, the area is of archaeological interest and prior to the relatively recent development of the Harbour, the area had an interesting military and industrial past. In 1805 work began on a series of evenly spaced Martello Towers along the south and east coasts and by 1808, all the ones at Eastbourne and along the shore of the Crumbles were completed. The Towers were used by garrisons of soldiers for many years. However many of them fell prey to the sea and there are now only two

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			<p>and for ensuring high quality public realm throughout the area. Sovereign Harbour has a unique sense of place and the original landscape philosophy which is reflected in the existing public space and planting areas can be built upon and enhanced.</p>		<p>which survive (Martello Towers 64 and 66). There was also a fort/battery close to Tower 66, rifle butts and a coast guard station at the Crumbles. In addition, the area used to have its own railway line, which was in use for some seventy years. The shingle bank of the Crumbles provided a source of ballast that was essential to the developing railway networks.</p> <p>In 1895, an Isolation Hospital was built at Langney Point, where patients infected by smallpox, scarlet fever and diphtheria could be isolated. The hospital closed in 1940 and was later demolished after the Second World War.</p> <p>In 1911, the Eastbourne Aviation Company was formed at the Crumbles. The Company not only taught people how to fly, but it also built planes and was particularly successful during the First World War. However work ceased in the factory in 1924 and after the sheds had remained unused for a number of years, they were demolished in 1940.</p> <p>The Historic Environment Record (HER) contains a range of information about the history and archaeology of Sovereign Harbour and it is considered that as part of any development proposed on the remaining sites, regard should be given to the HER in order to fully assess the potential impacts of future development. The HER also provides information for local residents about the history of the area and could help develop proposals for the future design and setting of surviving heritage assets. Having regard to Section 169 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it is considered that proposals for development should include an understanding of the historic land use, so that it can be used to help consider future design options and opportunities for enhancing the historic environment.</p> <p>The Martello Towers 64 and 66 referred to above are Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments. They are both currently in a poor condition and are on English Heritage's Buildings at Risk Register. They will therefore need to be protected from development that would adversely affect their setting, and from additions and alterations that would adversely affect their character. The setting of Martello Tower 66 in particular, contributes to its heritage significance. Aspects of this setting include the open surroundings which make it easier to appreciate the original intention to make the building defensible against incoming artillery or infantry.</p> <p>The views to and from Tower 64 and other Towers in the chain demonstrate the purpose of the Tower as a link in a defensive chain and the intention to create continuous</p>

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
					<p>fields of fire that would deny safe landing places to enemy boats. The sea views demonstrate the purpose of the Tower as a place for watching for and firing on enemy shipping. The Tower's isolation on the headland make it a visually prominent focal point in views from the beach to the east and west, which evokes its historic situation. In addition, the wildness of the beach (though now much degraded) creates a sense of the landscape character of the Tower during its military use. This is both an aesthetic value (the visual isolation within a typical Sussex beachscape, which many would consider iconic and locally distinctive) and an historical value (the historical narrative that can be told about the purpose of the Tower and the urgent local need for military defence against invasion at the time when the Towers were built).</p> <p>As part of any proposals for development on Site 1 it will be essential to ensure that this setting is protected. It will also be necessary to retain views between Towers 64 and 66. In addition, views of the two Towers from the beach on Site 1, in which Tower 66 is a prominent focal point, must be safeguarded.</p> <p>Any development proposals for Site 1 should therefore seek to retain or enhance the existing sense of isolation of Tower 66 to help promote an appreciation of the importance of this open setting to defensibility.</p> <p>It is also considered that any proposed landscaping should not reduce the natural character of the site. In particular, great care should be taken to ensure that the treatment of the open space around the Tower retains a naturalistic beachscape character, that hard landscaping is minimised, that planting maintains a shingle beach character and that any topographic profiling to create public spaces does not substantially change the open shingle beach character. This is not to say that any development within the setting of the Tower is impossible, on the contrary, development that enhances the setting should be positively encouraged. This means that development should certainly not undermine appreciation of the heritage significance of the Tower and should preferably do something to reveal that significance. It will be clear that having a clear appreciation of what the heritage significance of the Tower is, and how the setting contributes to this, will be an essential pre-requisite of any assessment.</p> <p>Having regard to possible new uses for Tower 66, the key criterion will be whether the heritage significance of the place will be protected and preferably revealed or enhanced. It is anticipated that such a use will have a low intensity such as a community, arts or heritage use, but</p>

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
					commercial uses, such as a cafe could also be feasible if they protect and reveal the heritage significance of the place'.
KI-59	409	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	<p>Add bullet points to 3.3.16: a) create a multifunctional green network incorporating recreation and biodiversity opportunities b) incorporate SuDs schemes into new development wherever possible including green roofs.</p> <p>Support for the incorporation of open space and pedestrian linkages, which could be taken forward through a Green Infrastructure Strategy to establish the multifunctional green network for the area</p> <p>The following opportunities could be included in a Green Infrastructure strategy: 1) Seafront promenade and open space areas with pedestrian/cycle linkages into and out of the area 2) Open spaces as the setting for the Martello towers 3) Existing planted areas along Pevensey Bay Road including TPO trees. 4) All existing and proposed green links incorporate cycle and pedestrian opportunities in green corridors 5) The shingle mound (restored landfill) indicating recreation and enhanced biodiversity opportunities</p>	<p>These bullet points relate to the Sustainable Building Design Supplementary Planning Document which has been subject to public consultation and is expected to be adopted soon, and covers the points you raise which means developments would need to conform to them.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The Council intends to prepare a Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document for the town, which will be subject to public consultation. These comments will be referred to the officer responsible for preparing the document.</p>	No change
KI-60	410	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	In order to allow cyclists as well as pedestrians these walkways would need to be either shared or segregated cycle/footways and therefore pedestrians and cyclists would have equal priority.	Comment noted. However, residents have expressed the view that along new harbour walkways, pedestrians should be given priority over cyclists.	No change
KI-61	411	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	<p>The actual conclusions from the Sovereign Harbour modelling were as follows: The analysis has indicated that the impact of introducing the Sovereign Harbour development is only slight, when compared with the background development scenario for Eastbourne and South Wealden, which excludes Sovereign Harbour. Network performance is likely to be compromised by overall development, particularly in terms of high junction Rates of Flow to Capacity values. The proposed package of transport interventions will by no means provide full resolution of the congestion issues, although they do give marginal improvement over the respective no-intervention scenarios. This largely reflects the absence of the A27 Folkington Link scheme. There is no clear indication from the South Wealden and Eastbourne Transport Study (SWETS) model that further mitigation is needed specifically to accommodate the marginal impacts of the Sovereign Harbour developments.</p> <p>The draft SPD rewords those conclusions and, in doing so, risks losing the sequential sense of the conclusions, i.e. impact of Sovereign Harbour is slight when compared to</p>	Agreed. Para 3.1.24 will be amended to ensure that the sense of the conclusions are not lost.	Amend para 3.1.24 to read: 'Transport modelling has been undertaken to assess the impacts of future development at Sovereign Harbour on the highway network. The analysis has indicated that the impact of development at Sovereign Harbour on the highways network is slight when compared to the impact of all development proposals in the Core Strategy. There is no clear indication that further mitigation is needed specifically to accommodate the marginal impacts of the Sovereign Harbour developments. However, all development in Eastbourne, including development at Sovereign Harbour, must contribute to delivery of the whole transport interventions package, the most important of which for Sovereign Harbour is the Seaside Quality Bus Corridor.'

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			<p>the impact of all development proposals in the Core Strategy. All development in Eastbourne must contribute to delivery of the whole transport interventions package, the most important of which for Sovereign Harbour is the Seaside Quality Bus Corridor (QBC).</p> <p>Para 3.1.24 implies that the Sovereign Harbour development need only contribute to the Seaside QBC - this is not so - the association between the two does however mean that Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) transport priorities must respect that.</p>		
KI-62	412	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Accessing any new boat storage site would need careful consideration and preferably avoid the public highway altogether.	Comment noted. This suggestion is backed up by development opportunities identified for Site 2 with access to proposed boat storage area through the rear of the boat yard and minimum use of the public highway, which is a significant improvement on the current temporary site.	No change
KI-63	413	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Replace reference in para 3.3.2 to 'Local Sustainable Accessibility Improvement Contributions' with 'Transport Contributions'.	Agreed.	Amend para 3.3.2 to replace 'Local Sustainable Accessibility Improvement Contributions' with 'Transport Contributions'.
KI-64	425	Mr Andy Thompson (Strategic Housing Manager Eastbourne Borough Council)	The SPD should define balanced housing growth by stating that it should lead to a balanced housing market, by reference to capital and revenue cost and property tenure and type.	The term balanced housing growth comes from the Core Strategy and means the balance of housing growth along with the social and economic infrastructure that is required to sustain the housing in the future. In addition, to address concerns regarding the balance of types and tenures, Policy D5 of the Core Strategy will achieve the range in housing types and tenures required to deliver sustainable development.	No change
KI-65	426	Mr Andy Thompson (Strategic Housing Manager Eastbourne Borough Council)	The target of 150 dwellings in Sovereign Harbour has been identified as the maximum figure for delivery, and the majority of the dwellings should be houses rather than flats. The housing will facilitate the provision of the other community infrastructure that the neighbourhood needs in order to make it sustainable	Agreed and this point is covered in para 3.1.2 of the SPD.	No change
KI-66	427	Mr Andy Thompson (Strategic Housing Manager Eastbourne Borough Council)	<p>Reword para 3.1.3 to highlight that the preferred option is for on-site provision of affordable housing because it will make a positive contribution to 'balanced housing growth'. If it is viable to provide a commuted sum for off site provision then there is no reason why the affordable housing could not be provided on site, and it is not appropriate to encourage provision off-site.</p> <p>The Council has been subject to scrutiny from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) for the lack of affordable housing to date being provided at Sovereign Harbour. By not providing on-site affordable housing, there may be</p>	<p>The provision of off-site affordable housing is referred to in Borough Plan Policy HO13 and Core Strategy Policy D5.</p> <p>The SPD acknowledge that there is potential viability issues associated with delivering development on the remaining sites in Sovereign Harbour. The provision of affordable housing either on-site or off-site, or by a commuted sum, may also impact on viability. In order to meet the objectives of the SPD, if development is found to be unviable then it is considered that the provision of the missing social and economic infrastructure that is required for it to become a sustainable community should be</p>	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			implications for the amount of investment being made in the town overall by housing providers and a negative impact on the willingness of the HCA to support future affordable housing schemes in the town.	prioritised as follows: Provision of community facilities, including community centre, play areas and public open spaces; Creation of jobs; Provision of additional retail/food and drink uses to enhance the existing offer; Off site transport provision; and Provision of affordable housing.	
KI-67	428	Mr Andy Thompson (Strategic Housing Manager Eastbourne Borough Council)	There should be further clarification regarding the amount of off-site affordable housing that should be provided. The total number of affordable homes would not increase although the total number of market homes would. The number of affordable homes to be provided at Sovereign Harbour is 40% of the total number of homes provided, which is between 100 and 176. This would suggest that on-site provision would be between 40 and 70 units, leaving market housing as being between 60 and 106 units. Should no affordable housing be provided at Sovereign Harbour, then the commuted sum payable would be equivalent to 40% of the total number of homes provided, that is to say between 60 and 70 units.	Agreed. The affordable housing requirement should be 40% of the total number of homes provided, regardless of whether the provision is made on-site, off-site or via a commuted sum. This means that the affordable housing provision should be 60 homes. Para 3.1.4 should be amended to make this clear.	Delete parag 3.1.4 and replace with: 'If provision were to be made off-site, the amount of affordable housing provision would still be 40% of the total number of homes provided in Sovereign Harbour, which equates to 60 units, subject to viability testing'.
KI-68	429	Mr Andy Thompson (Strategic Housing Manager Eastbourne Borough Council)	There is no reason to requirement Code for Sustainable Level Homes Level 4 for affordable housing whilst the requirement for market housing in Level 3. This should be amended to make the requirement equal for all tenures at Level 3.	Agreed. Para 3.2.2 will be amended to ensure that the requirement for Code for Sustainable Homes is equal for all tenures. However, the minimum requirement for Code for Sustainable Homes will increase to Level 4 in April 2013.	Amend para 3.2.2 to read: 'The provision of affordable housing, either on site or off-site or by a commuted sum, may also impact on the viability of development, as would compliance with the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 in respect of market and affordable housing. The minimum requirement for Code for Sustainable Homes is increasing to Level 4 from April 2013.'
KI-69	445	Mr Ian Weeks	If further residential development must go ahead, then the maximum community benefit should be achieved for minimal amount of residential development.	It is considered that the SPD does achieve the maximum community benefit for the minimal amount of residential development.	No change
KI-70	446	Mr William Kumar (Turley Associates)	In para 3.1.2, delete: 'Additional retail development would enhance the importance of these retail areas and provide an improved retail offer for local residents'	It is considered that the Sovereign Harbour Retail Park and the Waterfront are considered appropriate to provide an improved retail offer. However, para 4.9.5 of the SPD acknowledges that any improvement to the retail park should ensure that it does not affect the vitality and viability of the Town Centre.	No change
KI-71	447	Mr William Kumar (Turley Associates)	In para 3.1.13, delete: 'Further food and drink facilities.....and Site 4 (off Harbour Quay)'	The Waterfront, Sovereign Harbour Retail Park, Site 1, Site 4 and potentially Site 3 are all considered suitable for further food and drink facilities.	No change
KI-72	448	Mr William Kumar (Turley Associates)	In para 3.1.4, delete: 'and retail'	The Waterfront is an important centre within the neighbourhood and there is an opportunity to enhance the leisure and tourism offer through the development of well planned business and retail space.	No change
KI-73	449	Mr William Kumar (Turley Associates)	In para 3.2.5, delete: ' Provision of additional retail/food and drink uses to enhance the existing offer'	It is considered that these uses are required as a medium priority in the delivery of all of the missing social and	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
				economic infrastructure that is required for Sovereign Harbour to become a sustainable community.	
KI-74	465	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend paragraph 3.1.2 to refer to the form of new residential development being led in all instances by an appropriate design response that is informed by and responds to the setting and context of each individual site. This will ensure that the correct emphasis is placed on the quality of the scheme and its design contribution to the completion of the Harbour, as much as on the appropriate form of the new homes.	Whilst regard will be given to the setting and context of each individual site, we cannot accept proposals that the form of all new residential development will be led in all instances by an appropriate design response that is informed by and responds to the setting and context of each individual site if this increased the level of residential units or sought to change the overarching policy on housing type in the Core Strategy. The SPD will ensure that the majority of dwellings will be houses rather than flats.	No change
KI-75	466	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Object to the proposed amount of B1a (office) development on the grounds that it is unjustified, unrealistic and will limit creation of job opportunities. The SPD should allow other employment generating uses with a focus on 'clean' jobs	This matter is currently being considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector concluded that although there is uncertainty over the viability of directing 30,000 square metres of employment floorspace to Sovereign Harbour, any delay in the adoption of the Core Strategy Local Plan would result in the Council being unable to take a pro-active, plan led approach to delivering development. Therefore no modification has been made to the amount of employment floorspace at Sovereign Harbour, although the Inspector recommends that Core Strategy Local Plan Policy D2: Economy should be subject to an early review and replacement policy by 2014. Para 4.6.9 of the SPD does refer to other employment uses being considered.	Add new para after 3.1.6 to state 'Policy D2 will be the subject of an early review and will eventually be replaced by an Employment Land Local Plan, which will be subject to examination and should be adopted by the end of 2014.'
KI-76	467	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 3.1.9 to reflect the actual active leisure, recreation and amenity value of the Harbours which go far beyond the passive visual amenity role that is implied by the current wording of this text. Further clarification should be added to the paragraph with reference to useable open space being interpreted as green open space in contrast to the existing harbours and beaches.	Agreed. Para 3.1.9 will be amended to recognise the leisure, recreation and amenity value of the Harbours. It is considered that further clarification regarding reference to useable open space is not necessary.	Amend the fourth and fifth sentences of para 3.1.9 to read: 'The harbours provide an open space of leisure and recreation. They provide significant visual amenity and are a focus for walking and cycling activity.'
KI-77	468	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 3.1.15 to ensure that all 376 existing visitor car parking spaces are required to be retained.	Accepted. Para 3.1.15 will be amended to refer to retaining the requirement laid down in the local agreement.	Amend para 3.1.15 to read: 'There are five main car parks in Sovereign Harbour; the retail park car park, the Waterfront car park and the berth holders car parks in Atlantic Drive, under Midway Quay and under Hamilton Quay. It is understood that the Waterfront car park has a legal requirement to retain a minimum number of spaces and this will be recognised in any future changes to the car parking levels.'
KI-78	469	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend paragraph 3.1.16 to refer to a holistic approach being required to be taken to transport planning and	Agreed. Para 3.1.16 will be amended to refer to a holistic approach to transport planning.	Delete para 3.1.16 and replace with: 'Further development, especially commercial, retail, employment,

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			objectives to both reduce the impact of private car use and to retain the pedestrian friendly character of Sovereign Harbour.		leisure and tourism, will be required to provide additional car parking spaces in accordance with adopted parking standards, along with a holistic approach to transport planning’.
KI-79	470	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	In order to limit the impact of hardstanding on the shingle beach the cycle link would be better extended to the rear of the new buildings. This will still provide an attractive, safe and convenient route and indeed will be more sheltered.	It is the Council’s intention to provide a continuous cycle route along the seafront from the foot of the Downs to Sovereign Harbour. It is considered that this part of the cycle route can be properly planned with cycling in mind at the design stage and therefore should be provided on the proposed extension to the promenade.	No change
KI-80	471	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The provision of access by the Dotto Train across Site 1 must be subject to there being no unacceptable impact on the shingle beach and how it functions as providing the setting of the Martello Tower. On this basis, it is considered that the Dotto Train should be directed around Site 1, with a stopping point as close as possible to it, if not within the site.	Comment noted. It is considered wholly appropriate to plan, design and allow for the Dotto Train to access Site 1, subject to there being no detrimental impact on the scheduled monument.	No change
KI-81	472	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The SPD should not rule out any appropriate short or longer term options for the fishermen.	Agreed. It is considered that the SPD does not rule out any appropriate short or longer term options for the fishermen.	No change
KI-82	473	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Para 3.3.13 should be amended to acknowledge that the cost of works to upgrade the electricity supply will need to be taken into account when assessing development viability	Agreed. This is already referenced in para 3.2.1 so it is not considered necessary to make a further amendment.	No change
KI-83	474	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The requirement for the majority of new employment to be filled from local sources with a third direct from the local unemployment register would be difficult to impose upon incoming employers and is too specific in respect of the second target. Amend para 3.3.15 to state that an overall objective to create local jobs for local Harbour residents in particular and to draw from other local sources, such that developers / future businesses will be required to use all reasonable endeavours working with EBC to achieve this.	The local employment initiatives are not considered to be too onerous and have been used elsewhere in the town. Bearing in mind that the majority of jobs will be secured through the development of the proposed employment sites, it is now considered unreasonable to require a third of the new jobs to be filled direct from the local unemployment register.	Amend para 3.3.15 to delete ‘and that a third of the new jobs would be secured direct from the unemployment register.’
KI-84	475	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 3.3.18 to reflect that the acceptability of a public slipway on Site 1 should be dependent upon its impact on the setting of the Martello Tower, the shingle beach and sea defences and the compatibility of a slipway with any play space or other managed open space zones across the beach.	Agreed. Para 3.3.18 will be amend to reflect dependencies on the provision of a slipway.	Amend para 3.3.18 to add the sentence: ‘In addition, it is considered that the acceptability of the public slipway on Site 1 should be dependent upon its impact on the setting of the Martello Tower, the shingle beach and sea defences and the compatibility of a slipway with any play space or other managed open space zones across the beach.’
KI-85	516	Mr Bruno Di Lieto	No further development should be allowed until electricity	Para 3.3.13 acknowledge that there is currently an	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			infrastructure has been upgraded.	inadequate supply of electricity to serve any further development at Sovereign Harbour. Development is unlikely to go ahead until the required works have been undertaken.	
KI-86	526	Sarah Harrison (Southern Water)	Support for paras 3.3.7 and 3.3.9 as it is important that Southern Water's underground infrastructure is not built over and that adequate easement is allowed for future access. Support for paras 3.3.9 and 4.4.14 that consider easement strips. Similar text should be included for site 2, site 7 and the Boat Yard, where rising mains and/or sewers may constrain the layout of these sites. .	Support welcomed Comments noted. Similar text will be included for Sites 2, 7 and the boat yard where rising mains and/or sewers may constrain the layout of the sites.	No change Add new paragraphs 4.2.9, 4.7.6 and 4.10.7 to refer to constraints of rising mains and/or sewers associated with Sites 2, 7 and the boat yard.
KI-87	532	Mr David Griffiths (Sovereign Harbour Yacht Club)	Amend para 3.1.7 to remove reference to Sovereign Harbour Yacht Club costs and availability, as these comments have been made without justification, are potentially harmful to the reputation and operation of the Club.	Agreed. Para 3.1.7 will be amended to remove reference to cost and availability	Amend para 3.1.7 to delete: 'but these are not necessarily always available' and 'at an affordable cost'.
KI-88	549	Mr. Richard Runalls	Open spaces should be adopted by the council.	Comment noted. Such proposals/issues will be considered at the planning application stage and commuted sums for maintenance would be required to be secured by Section 106 agreement. Subject to developer agreement, open spaces are usually adopted by the Local Authority.	No change
KI-89	562	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	Early engagement on any proposed uses for the Outer Harbour Peninsula would be welcomed as it's an exposed position on the sea defences. Figure 6 classifies the access track from Pacific Drive onto the beach crest close to Martello tower 64 as an 'existing pedestrian route'. Initial consent for the track was 'for sea defence purposes only' and it is not possible to keep the track available to pedestrians whilst sea defence works are undertaken.	Comment noted. It is acknowledged that during sea defence works access to pedestrians is prohibited. However any other time pedestrians can access the beach via this route and therefore no change is required.	No change.
KI-90	568	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	Support for the further development of Sovereign Harbour for sustainable employment, residential and community uses. However, the quantity of new development and subsequent traffic implications must be sensitive to the unique requirement of the working marina. We do not feel that this is emphasised enough in this document. It is a working harbour and this must be reflected in the SPD. In order to enhance the Marina for tourism, consideration must be given to the operational side of the Marina, including the lifting of boats in and out of the water, the ability to transport boats around Sovereign Harbour on road and the provision of services for the commercial and	Support welcomed. It is considered that para 4.4.16 and paras 3.1.27, 3.1.28 and section 4.10 specifically refer to the operational requirements associated with running a harbour, namely the boat hoist, and access to the boat yard and boat storage area, are not disrupted. In addition, proposals for Site 2 would restrict the need to transport boats around Sovereign Harbour. Para 4.3.6 acknowledges that one option for Site 3 is for the fishermen to continue using the site to store equipment, park vehicles and land their catch. In addition, para 3.1.26 states that this site is not large enough to	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			<p>leisure based berth holders in the harbour.</p> <p>It is very important that adequate consideration must also be given to the land currently used for the commercial activities of those who utilise the marina e.g. the fishing fleet, because the draft SPD is currently lacking in sufficient detail on where these facilities will be replaced.</p> <p>The Council's wish for a maximum of 150 new homes to be developed in Sovereign Harbour can partly be provided by the installation of sensitively designed boathouses in the marina element, with particular emphasis in the northern harbour.</p>	<p>moor all of the fishing fleet. Therefore as part of any development proposed on Site 3 (other than proposals relating to the fishermen), arrangements to deal with the fishermen's needs will need to be put in place.</p> <p>Para 3.3.14 acknowledges that houseboats could be provided on the North Harbour.</p>	
KI-91	570	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	The bus link should have no adverse impact on the operation of the marina operations and boat moving activity.	Comment noted.	No change
KI-92	571	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	The release of berth holder parking should only apply to the winter months.	It is considered that para 3.1.25 adequately deals with seasonal fluctuations in demand.	No change
KI-93	572	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	If the fishing fleet were to be moved then there are only two possible relocations available in the Harbour. The only place available for the fleet to land their catch and for the provision of shore side facilities is at the western end of Site 4 off Harbour Quay, immediately adjacent to the Hoist Dock. But it is essential that sufficient space, equivalent to the existing space on Site 3 is provided at this location. The only other place for the provision of fishing fleet storage facilities is on the Outer Harbour Peninsula in suitable sensitively designed storage facilities.	Comment noted. However it is considered that because of the site required for the fishermen and the fact that Site 4 is a prime site on the harbour frontage, relocating the fishermen to Site 4 would undermine proposals for retail and food and drink.	No change
KI-94	573	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	It is unviable to move the boatyard at present, but it is essentially in the wrong place. The current boatyard should be used for the expansion of the Waterfront retail and leisure and car parking, and the boatyard should be located immediately opposite the Hoist Dock on the main car park.	It is acknowledged in para 4.10.9 that whilst it is currently unviable to move the boatyard, it is not ideally situated being adjacent to the Waterfront bars and restaurants. Should the opportunity arise for the boat yard to be relocated to another site, further consideration will be given to appropriate alternative uses for the boat yard.	It is considered that the possibility of moving the boatyard should be noted. However such a proposal would require extensive negotiations and could therefore be considered in a future iteration of the SPD.
KI-95	574	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	It is essential to provide boat storage facilities. If the boat storage facility on Site 6 is removed, then Site 2 and Site 4 should be allocated for Boat storage, as well as the existing Boatyard.	The SPD acknowledges that Site 2 could be used for boat storage and the SPD will be amended to include reference to boat storage at the rear of the boatyard. However it is not considered appropriate to use Site 4 for boat storage as it is a prime waterfront site. Instead the SPD proposed a mixed use development for this site incorporating retail, bars and restaurants on the ground and first floors with potential for B1 office use above.	No change
KI-96	575	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	There is an opportunity to provide houseboats within the marina element, and in particular in the Northern Harbour. Because the marina is a benign environment, then this	Comment noted. Para 3.3.14 of the SPD allows houseboats.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			would allow for part of the 150 residential unit provision to be located on the water. This would then ease pressure on the land uses around the Harbour and in particular remove the need for berth holder facilities on Site 8		

Remaining Development Sites and related Appendices

Site 1

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S1-1	1	Mr. Anton de Bairacli Levy	<p>Object to proposed residential development on Site 1 on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site is a prime site at the entrance to the harbour the area is already overpopulated and overdeveloped there are existing parking problems in the surrounding area. the whole site should be retained as a natural area/landscaped park the site should be used for tourist and leisure facilities It will have an adverse affect on biodiversity Existing surrounding roads have not been adopted It would obscure views of existing residents The site is too exposed to rough seas and high wind Access from Martinique Way would be unsafe It would create significant additional traffic on surrounding roads 	<p>It is agreed that Site 1 is a prominent site at the entrance to the Harbour. Para 4.1.12 and 4.1.15 recognises that development should be set back from the water front towards existing development in Martinique Way and due to the sites prominence when viewed from the sea, it is considered that any proposed residential development should provide an attractive frontage to the coast.</p> <p>It is not considered that the area is overdeveloped.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are parking problems within Sovereign Harbour and the SPD seeks to ensure that new development provides an appropriate amount of car parking.</p> <p>It is proposed in para 4.1.10 that approximately two thirds of the site would be open, which would restrict the amount of built form to one third of the site. As part of any development on this site it would be essential to provide a significant area of public open space. There is an opportunity to provide a unique space designed to reflect the maritime location.</p> <p>With the proposed extension to the promenade and extensive area of open space it is considered that the site will become an important destination and the Martello Tower could accommodate a new use.</p> <p>Protection and enhancement of vegetated shingle habitat for biodiversity will be sought where appropriate, particularly through the provision of public open space.</p> <p>The comment regarding the surrounding roads in noted.</p> <p>The comment regard obscuring view is noted, however loss of view is not a planning consideration</p> <p>Any design response to this site will have regard to the exposed maritime location</p>	No change
	3	Mr. Anton de Bairacli Levy			
	4	Mr. Anton de Bairacli Levy			
	12	Ms Tamasine Littlejohns			
	13	Mr Gary Hewitt			
	14	Mrs. Angela Summerford			
	15	Mr Michael Cox			
	16	Mr Michael Cox			
	18	Spencer			
	45	Ms Ruth Ashworth			
	63	Mrs R Eastham			
	66	Mrs Valerie Dormady			
	71	Dr Carol McCrum			
	75	Mrs Julia Wildman			
	77	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	105	Miss Clarissa Bird			
	109	Mr Graham Evans			
	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy			
	191	Mr Ian Newson			
	214	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
283	Ms Tamasine Littlejohns				
295	Mr Ray Blakebrough				
311	Mrs Yvonne Elbro				
320	Mr Trevor Welling				

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	338	Ms Janet Gouveia		East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority has raised no objection to access the site from Martinique Way. Neither have they raised any objection to proposals for Site 1 regarding impacts on the highway network.	
	365	Mrs. Daphne Trefty			
	517	Mr Bruno Di Lieto			
S1-2	39	Mr Barry Lee	Support for the proposals for Site 1, particularly the provision of open space, children's play space, the extension of the promenade, the retention of the Martello Tower, the provision of a public slipway	Support welcomed.	No change
	53	Rev Neville Manning			
	62	Mrs Judith Kewley			
	63	Mrs R Eastham			
	66	Mrs Valerie Dormady			
	77	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	108	Mrs Mary Davis			
	153	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	154	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	248	Mr Peter S Thomas			
	252	Mr Peter S Thomas			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	283	Ms Tamasine Littlejohns			
	295	Mr Ray Blakebrough			
445	Mr Ian Weeks				
548	Mr Brian Suttie				
549	Mr. Richard Runalls				
S1-3	11	Mr. George Gatland	The Martello Tower should be used as a visitor facility such as a museum or café and public toilets should be provided.	Support welcomed.	No change
	26	Mr. Anton de Biracli Levy			
	15	Mr Michael Cox			
	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy			
	63	Mrs R Eastham			
S1-4	260	Mr Bob Watts	Site 1 has the capacity to accommodate more than the 50 to 80 homes as stated in the SPD.	In assessing the level of housing to be provided on each of the residential development sites, regard was given to the setting of the site, the surrounding development and overall character of the area. In order to protect the openness of Site 1, deliver the necessary community benefits and respect the setting of the Martello Tower, it was considered that the amount of built form should be restricted to approximately one third of the site. As a result of this, between 50 and 80 homes could be accommodated on site.	No change
	306	Mr David Hitchcock			
	342	Mrs Sue Watts			
S1-5	1	Mr. Anton de Biracli Levy	Object to residential development on Site 1 on the grounds that it will increase public usage and abuse of the water feature. Any housing development on Site 1 should contribute to the water feature as many of the existing residents are obliged to.	It is unclear as to how development on Site 1 would increase public usage and abuse of the water feature. It is considered unreasonable that any residential development on Site 1 should contribute to the maintenance of the water feature as it is a different development site.	No change
	107	Mr John Kinnard			
S1-6	11	Mr. George Gatland	Access must be retained for vehicular access for beach replenishment works	It is acknowledged in para 4.1.8 and 4.1.23 that it will be necessary to maintain access for the Environment Agency to move shingle from the site to the other side of the harbour in order to maintain sea defences.	No change
	15	Mr Michael Cox			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S1-7	52	Sarah Turner	Site 1 should be developed as a tourist attraction in the form of a theme park, lido or hotel.	Comment noted. Whilst Site 1 is not considered to be appropriate as a theme park and there has been no market interest in developing a hotel, the Martello Tower could provide an opportunity to be converted into a café with external seating area. In addition, proposals for Site 1 include the provision of a significant area of public open space.	No change
	58	John Schooley			
S1-8	106	E Dudley	Residential development on Site 1 should be restricted to houses of no more than two storeys	The height of proposed development will be influenced by the height of adjacent development in order to contribute to the townscape. Development over two storeys in height will therefore be appropriate on Site 1 having regard to the character of the surrounding area.	No change
	191	Mr Ian Newson			
S1-9	236	Mr Michael Greaves	The amount of residential development on Site 1 should be restricted to 50 dwellings.	In assessing the level of housing to be provided on each of the residential development sites, regard was given to the setting of the site, the surrounding development and overall character of the area. In order to protect the openness of Site 1, deliver the necessary community benefits and respect the setting of the Martello Tower, it was considered that the amount of built form should be restricted to approximately one third of the site. As a result of this, between 50 and 80 homes could be accommodated on site.	No change
	549	Mr. Richard Runalls			
S1-10	11	Mr. George Gatland	There must be adequate car parking spaces for the new homes and visitors to the area.	Para 2.3.11 of the SPD acknowledges that residents have expressed concerns about the ratio of residents to visitors parking facilities. Paras 2.3.11 and 3.1.16 recognises the importance of any new development should not impact on the current parking situation and should be provided with sufficient parking to meet its own needs.	No change
S1-11	59	Paul Risvold	The seaward entrance to the harbour needs to be enhanced to make the visual impact as alluring as possible.	Agreed. Para 4.1.12 and 4.1.15 recognises that development should be set back from the water front towards existing development in Martinique Way and due to the sites prominence when viewed from the sea, it is considered that any proposed residential development should provide an attractive frontage to the coast.	No change
S1-12	63	Mrs R Eastham	The proposed exit onto Martinique Way is unsafe and the site should be accessed off the roundabout instead.	East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority has confirmed that vehicular access should be from Martinique Way rather than the roundabout at the junction of Atlantic Drive and Prince William Parade.	No change
S1-13	90	Mr Paul Roberts (English Heritage)	The SPD should include a description of what constitutes the setting of the Martello Tower and the characteristics of the setting and how it contributes to heritage significance. Amend final sentence of para 4.1.15 to state: However, this must avoid adverse effects on the setting of the Martello	Agreed. The SPD should include a description of what constitutes the setting of the Martello Tower. Agreed. Para 4.1.15 will be amended to refer to avoiding adverse impact on the Martello Tower. Comments noted. The proposed area of public open space	Delete sub-title 'Heritage Assets' and replace with 'History and Heritage Assets' Delete para 3.3.10 and replace with following paragraphs: 'Sovereign Harbour, or the 'Crumbles' as this area of Eastbourne was originally known, is steeped in history.

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			<p>Towers.</p> <p>Care should be taken to ensure that the treatment of the open space around the tower retains a naturalistic beachscape character, in particular that hard landscaping is minimised, that planting maintains a shingle beach character and that any topographic profiling to create public spaces does not substantially change the open shingle beach character.</p> <p>Development that enhances the setting of the Martello Tower should be positively encouraged, however it should be clear about what "enhancement" means: it means that development should certainly not undermine appreciation of the heritage significance of the tower and should preferably do something to reveal that significance.</p> <p>Where the SPD refers to potential new uses for the tower, the key criteria should be whether the heritage significance of the place will be protected and preferably revealed or enhanced. We would anticipate that a low intensity use such as a community, arts or heritage use would be preferable, but commercial uses, such as a cafe could also be feasible if they protect and reveal the heritage significance of the place.</p>	<p>is a matter of detail that will be dealt with at the planning application stage, however the SPD recognises that there is the opportunity to provide a unique space designed to reflect the maritime location and also to ensure that the setting of the Martello Tower 66 is to only maintained but that it should also be enhanced.</p> <p>Agreed. Para 4.1.20 should be amended to explain what 'enhancement' means, and to describe the key criteria of heritage significance being protected or enhanced.</p>	<p>Originally a shingle spit, the area is of archaeological interest and prior to the relatively recent development of the Harbour, the area had an interesting military and industrial past.</p> <p>In 1805 work began on a series of evenly spaced Martello Towers along the south and east coasts and by 1808, all the ones at Eastbourne and along the shore of the Crumbles were completed. The Towers were used by garrisons of soldiers for many years. However many of them fell prey to the sea and there are now only two which survive (Martello Towers 64 and 66). There was also a fort/battery close to Tower 66, rifle butts and a coast guard station at the Crumbles. In addition, the area used to have its own railway line, which was in use for some seventy years. The shingle bank of the Crumbles provided a source of ballast that was essential to the developing railway networks.</p> <p>In 1895, an Isolation Hospital was built at Langney Point, where patients infected by smallpox, scarlet fever and diphtheria could be isolated. The hospital closed in 1940 and was later demolished after the Second World War.</p> <p>In 1911, the Eastbourne Aviation Company was formed at the Crumbles. The Company not only taught people how to fly, but it also built planes and was particularly successful during the First World War. However work ceased in the factory in 1924 and after the sheds had remained unused for a number of years, they were demolished in 1940.</p> <p>The Historic Environment Record (HER) contains a range of information about the history and archaeology of Sovereign Harbour and it is considered that as part of any development proposed on the remaining sites, regard should be given to the HER in order to fully assess the potential impacts of future development. The HER also provides information for local residents about the history of the area and could help develop proposals for the future design and setting of surviving heritage assets. Having regard to Section 169 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it is considered that proposals for development should include an understanding of the historic land use, so that it can be used to help consider future design options and opportunities for enhancing the historic environment.</p> <p>The Martello Towers 64 and 66 referred to above are Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments. They are both currently in a poor condition and are on English Heritage's Buildings at Risk Register. They will therefore need to be protected from development that would adversely affect their setting, and from additions and alterations that would adversely affect their character. The setting of Martello</p>

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
					<p>Tower 66 in particular, contributes to its heritage significance. Aspects of this setting include the open surroundings which make it easier to appreciate the original intention to make the building defensible against incoming artillery or infantry.</p> <p>The views to and from Tower 64 and other Towers in the chain demonstrate the purpose of the Tower as a link in a defensive chain and the intention to create continuous fields of fire that would deny safe landing places to enemy boats. The sea views demonstrate the purpose of the Tower as a place for watching for and firing on enemy shipping. The Tower's isolation on the headland make it a visually prominent focal point in views from the beach to the east and west, which evokes its historic situation. In addition, the wildness of the beach (though now much degraded) creates a sense of the landscape character of the Tower during its military use. This is both an aesthetic value (the visual isolation within a typical Sussex beachscape, which many would consider iconic and locally distinctive) and an historical value (the historical narrative that can be told about the purpose of the Tower and the urgent local need for military defence against invasion at the time when the Towers were built).</p> <p>As part of any proposals for development on Site 1 it will be essential to ensure that this setting is protected. It will also be necessary to retain views between Towers 64 and 66. In addition, views of the two Towers from the beach on Site 1, in which Tower 66 is a prominent focal point, must be safeguarded.</p> <p>Any development proposals for Site 1 should therefore seek to retain or enhance the existing sense of isolation of Tower 66 to help promote an appreciation of the importance of this open setting to defensibility.</p> <p>It is also considered that any proposed landscaping should not reduce the natural character of the site. In particular, great care should be taken to ensure that the treatment of the open space around the Tower retains a naturalistic beachscape character, that hard landscaping is minimised, that planting maintains a shingle beach character and that any topographic profiling to create public spaces does not substantially change the open shingle beach character. This is not to say that any development within the setting of the Tower is impossible, on the contrary, development that enhances the setting should be positively encouraged. This means that development should certainly not undermine appreciation of the heritage significance of the Tower and should preferably do something to reveal that significance. It will be clear that having a clear appreciation of what the</p>

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
					<p>heritage significance of the Tower is, and how the setting contributes to this, will be an essential pre-requisite of any assessment.</p> <p>Having regard to possible new uses for Tower 66, the key criterion will be whether the heritage significance of the place will be protected and preferably revealed or enhanced. It is anticipated that such a use will have a low intensity such as a community, arts or heritage use, but commercial uses, such as a cafe could also be feasible if they protect and reveal the heritage significance of the place’.</p> <p>Amend para 4.1.15 to add sentence: ‘However, this must avoid adverse effects on the setting of the Martello Tower’.</p> <p>Amend para 4.1.20 to read: ‘As detailed in Paragraph 4.1.7 above, it will be essential to ensure the setting of Martello Tower 66 is maintained, but it should also be enhanced to reveal the heritage significance of the tower. With the proposed extension to the promenade and extensive area of open space, it is considered that the site will become an important destination and the Martello Towers could be converted to a new use. It could for example become a café, with an external seating area, where customers could take advantage of the long range views out to sea. However such a proposal would need to be discussed in detail with English Heritage, and the key criterion should be whether the heritage significance of the place will be protected and preferably revealed or enhanced. Care should be taken to ensure that the treatment of the open space around the tower retains a naturalistic beachscape character, in particular that hard landscaping is minimised, that planting maintains a shingle beach character and that any topographic profiling to create public spaces does not substantially change the open shingle beach character.’</p>
S1-14	160	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	The SPD does not address flood risk issues on Site 1.	The Environment Agency has confirmed that no sites are undeliverable due to flood risk.	No change
S1-15	214	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Cycle routes may compromise pedestrian safety.	Support welcomed. It is considered that para 3.1.19 already safeguards priority for pedestrians over cyclists.	No change
S1-16	403	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Support for the proposals for Site 1 to leave two thirds of the site as open space in order to reduce impacts on biodiversity including the potential for habitat fragmentation, disturbance, compaction and enrichment which are particularly damaging to vegetated shingle habitats. Further clarification is sought on how much of Site 1 would remain undeveloped.	Support welcomed. Para 4.4.10 confirms that approximately two thirds of the site will remain open.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S1-17	414	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	The roundabout which serves the Wastewater Treatment Works is not adopted public highway and as such any access would need to be agreed and secured with the land owner.	Para 4.1.21 confirms that Site 1 will be accessed off Martinique Way.	No change
S1-18	415	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	At the end of para 4.1.18, add: 'if the area is not to be adopted by the Highway Authority'.	Agreed.	Amend para 4.1.18 to add: 'if the area is not to be adopted by the Highway Authority'.
S1-19	445	Mr Ian Weeks	Any residential development should be restricted to the land adjacent to Martinique Way, be sympathetically located, and be of the highest quality. The majority must be family homes, with apartments being kept at a minimum, and should be no higher than the existing development.	It is agreed that development should be restricted to the land adjacent to Martinique Way, be sympathetically located, and be of the highest quality. Site 1 can accommodate a mix of apartments and family homes and proposals for Site 1 are not higher than existing development. The overall mix of homes to apartments is covered in the overarching policy and would be too restrictive if it applied to individual sites.	No change
S1-20	476	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 4.1.12 to reference the need for development to respond to the scale of the coastal setting of Site 1, the function of the site as a gateway to the Harbour and to the provision of an appropriate backdrop and setting for the Martello Tower	It is considered that the SPD, particularly paras 4.1.12 and 4.1.13 adequately confirm what would be acceptable development in terms of height, scale, form and setting, and the need to respect the setting of the Martello Tower.	No change
S1-21	477	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 4.1.13 to allow for new houses of up to four domestic storeys in height in order to provide scope and flexibility to allow for an interesting but still appropriate design response and to address site levels and flood defence responses.	Having regard to height, scale, form and setting of surrounding development, it is considered appropriate to restrict the height of houses to three storeys.	No change
S1-22	478	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Remove reference to limiting the scale of apartment development on this site to a maximum of 6 storeys. The upper limit should be led by an overall design-led response for the site	Having regard to height, scale, form and setting of surrounding development, it is considered appropriate to restrict the height of apartments to six storeys.	No change
S1-23	479	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Support for the incorporation of children's play space on Site 1. Amend para 4.1.16 to recognise that the nature, setting and exposed nature of the shingle beach and the setting of the Martello Tower is likely to limit the choice of hard and soft landscaping that will be appropriate here	Support welcomed. Agreed. Para 4.1.16 will be amended to recognise limitations to the landscaping that would be appropriate	Amend para 4.1.16 to read: 'As part of any development on this site, it will be essential to provide a significant area of public open space (approximately two thirds of the site), which could be planted with appropriate species to restore the naturally occurring habitat along the beach frontage and must incorporate children's play space. The exposure and coastal location may limit the choice of hard and soft landscape finishes. There is however an opportunity to provide a unique space designed to reflect the maritime location.'
S1-24	480	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The Dotto Train should be accommodated along Atlantic Drive with a stopping facility near to, if not within Site 1 in the interest of protecting residential amenity for existing	It is considered wholly appropriate to allow and design for the Dotto Train to access Site 1, subject to there being no	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			and future new residents and in order to ensure that the shingle beach is protected, with new hard surfaces limited as far as possible.	detrimental impact on the scheduled monument.	
S1-25	481	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 4.1.26 to refer to the need to protect the setting of the Tower and to opportunities for new uses to be accommodated within or directly alongside it, so long as these are sympathetic to the structure of the Tower and to the function of the proposed public open space.	Agreed. Amend para 4.1.26 to refer to the need to protect the setting of the Tower.	Amend para 4.1.26 to add to end: 'There is a need to protect the setting of the Tower and to opportunities for new uses to be accommodated within or directly alongside it, so long as these are sympathetic to the structure of the Tower and to the function of the proposed public open space.'
S1-26	503	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The Site Plan for Site 1 should show greater flexibility for the arrangement of buildings and open space at the southern part of the site, close to the roundabout junction.	It is considered that the very crude division between the areas shown on the site plan for Site 1 in Appendix 1 are suitably flexible.	No change
S1-27	508	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Add Introductory Vision Statement for Site 1: 'The setting, character and heritage of site 1 provide an opportunity for a unique and high quality architectural response. Currently, the site is characterized by an unfinished domestic edge that fails to mark out this gateway to the Harbour or provide a suitable destination at the northern end of the Eastbourne seafront. The development of this site offers the opportunity to address this by finishing this edge with built form of an appropriate scale and character, to provide an entrance to the Harbour and a backdrop to both the Martello tower and a new public open space. As part of the development of this site it will be necessary to provide a new public open space using the area of shingle that has been shaped by the sea defence works and is also the setting for Martello Tower 66. The provision of a public open space in this setting will have to meet the challenges of the exposed coastal location and climate, as well as being sympathetic and appropriate to the setting of the Martello Tower. There is an opportunity to use the character and ecology of the indigenous Sussex vegetated shingle habitat to achieve this and create a space that is rich in biodiversity and a positive addition to the Eastbourne seafront. The design proposals for site 1 should be treated as a 'set piece' with the architectural and landscape elements treated as one part of an integrated design approach, that focuses on 'placemaking' to ensure that all facets of the design are complimentary in their function and contribution to the setting of the Martello Tower, the creation of a Harbour gateway and the provision of a new public open space.'	The proposed additional vision statement is agreed in principle, subject to extension to the promenade being included.	Add Vision Statement for Site 1: 'The setting, character and heritage of Site 1 provide an opportunity for a unique and high quality architectural response. Currently, the site is characterised by an unfinished domestic edge that fails to mark out this gateway to the Harbour or provide a suitable destination at the eastern end of the Eastbourne seafront. The development of this site offers the opportunity to address this by finishing this edge with built form of an appropriate scale and character, to provide an entrance to the Harbour and a backdrop to both the Martello Tower and a new public open space. As part of the development of this site it will be necessary to provide a new public open space using the area of shingle that has been shaped by the sea defence works and is also the setting for Martello Tower 66. The provision of a public open space in this setting will have to meet the challenges of the exposed coastal location and climate, as well as being sympathetic and appropriate to the setting of the Martello Tower. There is an opportunity to use the character and ecology of the indigenous Sussex vegetated shingle habitat to achieve this and create a space that is rich in biodiversity and a positive addition to the Eastbourne seafront. Public access will be maintained along the frontage of the site. It is envisaged that this access way will not form a traditional hard surface but will still allow full access to the beach for the public and vehicles for sea defence replenishment works. In addition, a formal pedestrian/cycleway should be provided through the residential development. The design proposals for Site 1 should be treated as a 'set piece' with the architectural and landscape elements treated as one part of an integrated design approach, that focuses on 'place-making' to ensure that all facets of the design are complimentary in their function and contribution to the setting of the Martello Tower, the creation of a Harbour gateway and the provision of a new public open space.'

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S1-28	560	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	<p>Site 1 is in an exposed position adjacent to the sea defences, although flood risk can be managed. Pre-application engagement at the detailed design stage would be welcomed.</p> <p>The strip of shingle level between the track and the rock revetment, to the seaward side of the Martello Tower, should be protected and enhanced by removal of 'weed' species. The other shingle areas here have been heavily disturbed but there are opportunities for restoration of a section, particularly as the recommendation here is to retain two thirds as open space.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is recommended as part of the SPD that approximately two thirds of the site will remain open and it is proposed that the public open space will be a unique space designed to reflect the maritime location. However development of the site will also require the extension of the promenade from where it currently terminates adjacent to the Water Treatment Works up to the harbour walkway in the north, which may prevent the suggestions being implemented.</p>	No change

Site 2

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S2-1	50	Emel Fretwell	<p>Object to the proposals for Site 2 on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is already overcrowded The site is not large enough to accommodate all of the proposals The site should be used for parking and boat storage only Surrounding properties are losing value It will increase parking problems by reducing the number of spaces available The site should be a made into a green area/children's play area 	<p>It is not considered that the area is overcrowded</p> <p>The SPD identifies a variety of proposals for Site 2 but not all of them will be implemented. It is considered that the site is a suitable size for either residential development or boat storage.</p> <p>Having regard to the height, scale, form and density of surrounding residential properties, it is considered that the site should provide between 10 and 15 units. It is necessary to allow for these units to be provided in order to secure the social and economic infrastructure that is required to complete the harbour development.</p> <p>The perceived loss of value of surrounding properties is not a planning consideration that would restrict the development of this site.</p> <p>The site will retain at least 37 parking spaces for berth holders and development will need to include car parking sufficient to meet its own needs. It is considered that any berth holder parking provided will need to be retained and effectively managed.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there is a lack of green areas/children's play areas in the South Harbour. However, the proposals for Site 1 provide for a unique public open space and children's play area, which will help to address the deficiencies in the South Harbour.</p>	No change
	87	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	100	Mr Steven Bray			
	101	Mr Harold Henry Noble-Jacques			
	105	Miss Clarissa Bird			
	192	Mr John Valentine			
	215	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	261	Mr Bob Watts			
	293	Mrs Margaret Gunning			
	311	Mrs Yvonne Elbro			
	343	Mrs Sue Watts			
	379	Mr Roger Kiernan			
	389	Mr Michael Jones			
424	Mrs Christine King				
440	Mr David Neilson				

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S2-2	62	Mrs Judith Kewley	Support for the proposals for Site 2	Support welcomed.	No change
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	321	Mr Trevor Welling			
S2-3	282	Ms Tamasine Littlejohns	Number of dwellings on Site 2 should be increased to allow less development on Site 1.	In assessing the level of housing to be provided on each of the residential development sites, regard was given to the setting of the site, the surrounding development and overall character of the area. Having regard to the height, scale, form and density of surrounding residential properties, it is considered that the site should provide between 10 and 15 units	No change
S2-4	416	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Para 4.2.10: This would be subject to agreeing and securing a safe method of operation with the Highway Authority.	Comment noted.	Amend para 4.2.10 to add to end: 'This would be subject to agreeing and securing a safe method of operation with the Highway Authority.'
S2-5	417	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Future provision should be made for parents from the Haven School parking on Site 2 as the use of the car park may increase should enforcement action be taken.	This is a temporary arrangement which hasn't proved to be popular with parents. It is recognised that use of the site may increase should enforcement action be taken, but this is not a permanent option and the other proposals for site considered to be more appropriate.	No change
S2-6	482	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	In para 4.2.3, the details of the agreement with Premier Marinas should be corrected. The agreement is to allow up to 50 private vehicles to park on Site 2.	Agreed.	Amend first sentence of para 4.2.3 to read: 'The site, which is owned by Sovereign Harbour Ltd (SHL), is currently leased to Premier Marinas and there is an agreement that up to 50 spaces should be available for berth holder parking.'
S2-7	509	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Add Introductory Vision Statement for Site 2: 'In terms of placemaking and connectivity, there is the opportunity to improve the streetscape along Atlantic Drive through the development of site 2, by filling the gap in the frontages to complete the street. Built development of this site could also be used to improve oversight and surveillance of the pavement, footpath and cycle link that connect northwards to the retail area and Harbour Quay. Built development of this site will need to consider the relationship to scale and layout of the adjacent dwellings to ensure adequate levels of privacy. Any development of this site should also take into consideration the long term uses of the open spaces to the north of the site, including the areas occupied by utility companies, as part of the wider streetscape context.'	The proposed vision statement is agreed in principle.	Add Vision Statement for Site 2: 'In terms of place-making and connectivity, there is the opportunity to improve the streetscape along Atlantic Drive through the development of Site 2, by filling the gap in the frontages to complete the street. Built development of this site could also be used to improve oversight and surveillance of the pavement, footpath and cycle link that connect northwards to the retail area and Harbour Quay. Built development of this site will need to consider the relationship to scale and layout of the adjacent dwellings to ensure adequate levels of privacy are safeguarded. Any development of this site should also take into consideration the long term uses of the open spaces to the north of the site, including the areas occupied by utility companies, as part of the wider streetscape context.'
S2-8	527	Sarah Harrison (Southern Water)	It has been identified that there is a rising main which may constrain the layout on Site 2. Add additional text: 'There is a 450mm diameter rising main close to the boundary of site 2. This will constrain the layout of the site. Easement strips must be left to allow access for maintenance'.	Agreed. A new paragraph will be added to refer to the identified rising main.	Add new para 4.2.16: 'There is a 450mm diameter rising main close to the boundary of Site 2. This will constrain the layout of the site. Easement strips must be left to allow access for maintenance'. Amend Appendix 2 to include reference to easement strips.

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S2-9	577	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	Surplus car parking spaces can only be released in the winter months	Comment noted.	No change
S2-10	578	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	Boat storage is limited on Site 2, and cannot adequately replace Site 6. But as much boat storage on this land is welcome provided it does not impinge on berth holder car parking	Comment noted. The SPD identifies that Site 2 could be used for boat storage. Boats would be able to be taken from the rear of the boat yard rather than be transported by the road to the temporary boat storage area on Site 6. It is also considered that boat storage could take place within the curtilage of the boat yard and within the existing storage area adjacent to the service road for the Waterfront.	See Response ID GN-13
S2-11	579	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	Residential amenity can be preserved by limiting the boat hoist to normal working hours	Comment noted.	No change

Site 3

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S3-1	47	Mrs Julie Cronin	<p>Object to the proposed development on Site 3 on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is vital to the local fishing industry and should be retained as a permanent base for the commercial fishermen The site should be developed as a fishing quay and visitor attraction with storage houses, fish retail outlets and an education centre It is the only remaining 'essence' of the harbour and would result in a loss of harbour authenticity The fishermen should be supported to create a sustainable working area. There are no other suitable locations for the fishermen 	The draft SPD has been amended so that the preferred option for Site 3 is to provide a permanent home for the fishermen to enable them to land their catch and to store their equipment. In addition, it is considered the site would also be suitable for associated and ancillary uses such as net shops.	<p>Delete final sentence of para 3.1.26 and replace with: 'In the event that Site 3 is proposed for either a commercial or residential development, arrangements to deal with the fishermen's needs will need to be put in place to provide for them to land their catch and store their equipment.'</p> <p>After final sentence of para 4.3.6, add: 'In addition, the West Channel is one of only two places in the Harbour (the other being adjacent to Site 4) that has deep water and can allow large fishing vessels to pull up against the Harbour walls.'</p> <p>Delete para 4.3.7</p> <p>Add new paragraph after 4.3.9: 'The preferred option for Site 3 is to provide a permanent home for the fishermen to enable them to land their catch and to store their equipment. In addition, it is considered the site would also be suitable for associated and ancillary uses such as net shops.'</p> <p>Delete para 4.3.11 and replace with: 'However, should the site not become the permanent home of the fishermen and if it is demonstrated that the site would not be commercially viable to provide an extension to the Waterfront, it is considered that the site would be suitable for a residential development as this would be in keeping with the development on the opposite side of the West</p>
	72	Mr Michael Newton-Smith			
	100	Mr Steven Bray			
	115	Mr Stephen Nock			
	184	Miss Sophie Newton-Smith			
	185	Mr Desmond Davis			
	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy			
	193	Mr David Diamond			
	194	Mrs Lynne Gumbleton			
	204	Mr Jojn Sadler			
	237	Mr Geoff Chatterton			
	238	Mr Sonenthal Sonenthal			
	239	Mrs Mandy Emery			
	241	Mrs Julie Cronin			
	249	Mr Peter S Thomas			
	254	Mr Peter S Thomas			
	255	Mr Peter S Thomas			
	256	Miss Sharon Smith			
	257	Mrs. Sheila Daly			
	258	Mr Stephen Fairmaner			
259	Mr John Winship				
272	Mr Ryan Bushell				
273	Miss Esther Brown				
274	Ray & Linda James				
275	Dilys Iverson				
276	Victoria Macdonal				

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	277	Mr & Mrs Barnes			<p>Channel. As part of any application for planning permission for residential development on this site it, would therefore be necessary to confirm that the site is no longer needed for the fishermen as well as providing information to confirm that the provision of additional retail, and food and drink uses, is not commercially viable. Any residential development must be within the 250 limit.'</p> <p>Delete para 4.3.15 and replace with: 'In the event that an extension to the Waterfront or a residential development is proposed for Site 3, arrangements to deal with the fishermen's needs should be put in place to provide for them to land their catch and to store either equipment. Any residential development must be within the 150 limit.'</p> <p>In Appendix 3, replace 'Arrangements to deal with fishermen's needs to be put in place for landing of catch and storage of equipment' and replace with: 'Provision of enhanced, permanent facilities for the fishermen with appropriate storage alongside other ancillary and associated uses, such as a fresh fish shop'</p>
	281	Mrs K Box			
	284	Mr Robert Stanborough			
	285	Ms Sandra Kilburn			
	286	Mr Roger Green			
	289	Ms Alison Attwood			
	290	Mr John Valentine			
	291	Mrs Gemma Newton-Smith			
	292	Mr David Roberts			
	294	Mr Ray Blakebrough			
	297	Mrs Margaret Gunning			
	299	Mr Richard Graham-Evans			
	301	Mr Robert Robert Greenhead			
	302	M Jules Martin			
	303	Mrs. Jan Say			
	305	Ms Susan Kerrison			
	311	Mrs Yvonne Elbro			
	322	Mr Trevor Welling			
	335	Mrs. Daphne Trefty			
	339	Mr. Graham Doswell			
	354	Mr Trevor Duke			
	356	Mrs Vivienne Morris			
	357	Beavon			
	359	Mr Norman Lintott			
	360	Mr John Maynard			
	361	Mr Michael Newton-Smith			
	366	Mrs Daphne Trefty			
	368	Mr Michael Hilarion			
	369	Mrs Ernestina Newton-Smith			
	372	Mr Leo Newton-Smith			
	373	Mrs Loraine Hope			
	375	Mr. Barry Miles			
	389	Mr Michael Jones			
	392	Mr Stephen Nock			
	393	Mr Elliott Mansfield			
	424	Mrs Christine King			
	432	Ivor Harper			
	433	Miss Rona Harper			
	438	Mr David Neilson			
	455	Mr Mike & Di Loveland			
	519	Mr Bruno Di Lieto			
	535	Mr David Gunn			
	536	Mr David Gunn			
	549	Mr. Richard Runalls			
	518	Mr Bruno Di Lieto			
	552	Mr Brian Suttie			
S3-2	75	Mrs Julia Wildman	Object to the proposals for residential development,	As part of the determination of any planning application,	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	95	Mr Geoff Chatterton	particularly flats, on Site 3 on the grounds of noise, reduction in privacy, increases in traffic and loss of views, and that site should be used for open space, berth holder facilities and leisure facilities.	the siting of properties in relating to existing dwellings will be a material planning consideration in order to avoid detrimental effect on residential amenity. East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority has raised no objection to proposals for Site 3 regarding impacts on the highway network. The comment regarding obscuring view is noted, however loss of view is not a planning consideration.	
	113	Mr Robert Ashley Hill			
	105	Miss Clarissa Bird			
	306	Mr David Hitchcock			
	100	Mr Steven Bray			
S3-3	101	Mr Harold Henry Noble-Jacques	Support for the relocation of the fishing operation as the use of site has an adverse effect on residential amenity for surrounding properties.	Comments noted. However following significant support for the continued use of Site 3 by the fishermen, the draft SPD has been amended so that the preferred option for Site 3 is to provide a permanent home for them. Nevertheless, as part of any planning application for development proposed on the site, regards will be had to residential amenity considerations.	No change
	262	Mr Bob Watts			
	381	Mr Roger Kiernan			
	344	Mrs Sue Watts			
S3-4	62	Mrs Judith Kewley	Support for the proposals for Site 3	Support welcomed.	No change
	85	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	253	Mr Peter S Thomas			
S3-5	450	Mr William Kumar (Turley Associates)	In para 4.3.10, delete: 'Nevertheless, because of the site's proximity to the existing Waterfront facilities, proposals to provide additional retail and food and drink uses on Site 3 would be supported.' In para 4.3.11, delete: 'However, should it be demonstrated that it would not be commercially viable to provide an extension to the Waterfront'	Para 3.1.12 recognises that the Sovereign Harbour Retail Park provides the main retail facility for the neighbourhood, and that the Waterfront also provides a retail function. The SPD supports the provision of additional retail and other food and drink uses (paras 3.1.12 and 3.1.13). The Waterfront bars and restaurants provide one of the main attractions of the area for visitors and residents and further food and drink facilities adjacent to this area on Site 3 will increase the offer and attraction of the Harbour, should they prove to be commercially viable.	No change
	451	Mr William Kumar (Turley Associates)	In para 4.3.11, delete: 'As part of any application for planning permission for residential development on this site it would be necessary to provide information to confirm that the provision of additional retail and food and drink uses is not commercially viable'.		
S3-6	43	Mr Barry Milne	Site 3 should be used to run a small canal directly into the boat yard to improve boat repair facility and out of water storage.	Comment noted. However it is considered that such a development would require extensive engineering to provide an extension of west channel, which is likely to be financially prohibitive	No change
S3-7	47	Mrs Julie Cronin	The proposed development of Site 3 could put existing restaurants out of business because the area will become overcrowded and claustrophobic	Comments noted. However the Waterfront bars and restaurants provide one of the main attractions of the area for visitors and residents and further food and drink facilities will increase the offer and attraction of the Harbour. By siting these uses adjacent to the Waterfront and on Site 4 (not directly adjacent to residential areas) minimises the potential impact of these uses on residential amenity.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S3-8	54	Janis Say	Site 3 could be developed as a car park.	Site 3 is a prime waterfront site within heart of Sovereign Harbour and it is not considered that a car park on this site would be the best use of land.	No change
S3-9	101	Mr Harold Henry Noble-Jacques	Site 3 should be allocated to improve access for disabled people	It is not clear what is meant by this suggestion, however all development will be required to be accessible for disabled people.	No change
S3-10	216	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	The proposals for Site 3 are not specific enough.	The proposals for Site 3 provide a range of options for the use of the site. Development on Site 3 will be dependent on the commercial viability of additional retail, food and drink uses on the site, and arrangements to deal with the fishermen's needs to provide for them to land their catch and to store their equipment.	No change
S3-11	395	Mr Peter Holland (Sovereign Harbour Berth Holders Association)	The fishermen should be moved to Site 4 to allow them to develop a tourist attraction with a small fish farm and a retail fish shop. Site 3 should be developed as housing or retail.	Comment noted. However it is considered that because of the site required for the fishermen and the fact that Site 4 is a prime site on the harbour frontage, relocating the fishermen to Site 4 would undermine proposals for retail and food and drink.	No change
S3-12	445	Mr Ian Weeks	Support for the development of leisure and tourism uses on Site 3. Any development should be centred on providing permanent facilities for the fishing fleet to land and distribute its catch	Support welcomed. The draft SPD has been amended so that the preferred option for Site 3 is to provide a permanent home for the fishermen to enable them to land their catch and to store their equipment. In addition, it is considered the site would also be suitable for associated and ancillary uses such as net shops.	Delete final sentence of para 3.1.26 and replace with: 'In the event that Site 3 is proposed for either a commercial or residential development, arrangements to deal with the fishermen's needs will need to be put in place to provide for them to land their catch and store their equipment.' After final sentence of para 4.3.6, add: 'In addition, the West Channel is one of only two places in the Harbour (the other being adjacent to Site 4) that has deep water and can allow large fishing vessels to pull up against the Harbour walls.' Delete para 4.3.7 Add new paragraph after 4.3.9: 'The preferred option for Site 3 is to provide a permanent home for the fishermen to enable them to land their catch and to store their equipment. In addition, it is considered the site would also be suitable for associated and ancillary uses such as net shops'. Delete para 4.3.11 and replace with: 'However, should the site not become the permanent home of the fishermen and if it is demonstrated that the site would not be commercially viable to provide an extension to the Waterfront, it is considered that the site would be suitable for a residential development as this would be in keeping with the development on the opposite side of the West Channel. As part of any application for planning permission for residential development on this site it, would therefore be necessary to confirm that the site is no longer needed'

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
					<p>for the fishermen as well as providing information to confirm that the provision of additional retail, and food and drink uses, is not commercially viable. Any residential development must be within the 250 limit.'</p> <p>Delete para 4.3.15 and replace with: 'In the event that an extension to the Waterfront or a residential development is proposed for Site 3, arrangements to deal with the fishermen's needs should be put in place to provide for them to land their catch and to store either equipment. Any residential development must be within the 150 limit.'</p> <p>In Appendix 3, replace 'Arrangements to deal with fishermen's needs to be put in place for landing of catch and storage of equipment' and replace with: 'Provision of enhanced, permanent facilities for the fishermen with appropriate storage alongside other ancillary and associated uses, such as a fresh fish shop'</p>
S3-13	483	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 4.3.5 to provide additional context, setting out: the relationship of the site with the Harbour and the Waterfront; the constraint of the pedestrian links through to the latter; and the opportunity that exists to create a more positive frontage onto the Harbour in particular.	Agreed. Para 4.3.5 will be amended to provide additional context	Add new para after 4.3.5 to read: 'Pedestrian linkage from The Waterfront is currently constrained by the existing layout around the West Harbour Bridge with a reduced width, changes in level and a lack of clear line of sight. However the provision of the proposed cinema entrance at the Sovereign Harbour Retail Park will make it a major destination which will result in increased footfall and is also likely to raise the commercial value of the site, particularly having regard to the waterfront setting'.
S3-14	484	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The SPD should not limit or seek to restrict options to accommodate commercial fishing, such as access and landing facilities being provided via pontoons at deep water locations in both North and South Harbours.	It is considered that the SPD does not rule out any appropriate short or longer term options for the fishermen.	No change
S3-15	485	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The opportunity for the fishermen to relocate to the Outer Harbour Peninsula should not be ruled out.	It is considered that the SPD does not rule out any appropriate short or longer term options for the fishermen.	No change
S3-16	504	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The location of the bus link should be added to be consistent with the plan for Site 2 and these areas should be identified as a development opportunity focal point.	Agreed. The Site 2 site plan in Appendix 2 will be amended to identify the location of the bus link.	Amend Appendix 2 to identify the location of the bus link.
S3-17	510	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Add Introductory Vision Statement for Site 3: 'Due to its location and interim uses of the site to date, this SPD supports three uses on site 3: 1) Residential development of this site would help complete the street frontage to Atlantic Drive, improving surveillance and helping create a pedestrian linkage along the Harbour edge. 2) Extension of the Waterfront. Similar benefits could also be achieved through the extension of the Waterfront cafes/restaurants onto the site. However, there are concerns that there would be sufficient footfall to make this viable. 3)	The proposed vision statement is agreed in principle.	Add Vision Statement for Site 3: 'There is an opportunity to provide enhanced, permanent facilities for the fishermen on this site with appropriate storage. In addition, the provision of a new pedestrian link between the Waterfront and Atlantic Drive, via a new harbour walkway is likely to result in the site becoming more of a destination. It is therefore envisaged that alongside the fishermen, other ancillary and associated uses, such as a fresh fish shop could be provided, to the benefit of residents, visitors and Eastbourne's fishing community'.

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			Fishermen's landing area. The use of the site, or part of the site by the Fishermen for landing their catch and storage of essential equipment could also be continued on the site. However, if this were to be anything more than short term, consideration would need to be given to controlling the activity and uses on the site to ensure the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings is not compromised. Irrespective of the use or mix of uses on this site, any development should recognise the route of the proposed Bus Link from the Retail Park (which enters the Harbour opposite the western end of the site), and create a suitable waypoint. Any development or use should also seek to improve the pedestrian experience in terms of quality and surveillance.'		
S3-18	580	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	If the fishing fleet are to be relocated, then only the provision of adequate space on Site 4 will replicate the existing arrangements. Storage can be provided sensitively on the Outer Harbour Peninsula	Comment noted. However it is considered that because of the site required for the fishermen and the fact that Site 4 is a prime site on the harbour frontage, relocating the fishermen to Site 4 would undermine proposals for retail and food and drink. Storage on the Outer Harbour Peninsula is unlikely to be successful due to the poor access arrangements.	No change

Site 4

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S4-1	39	Mr Barry Lee	Support for proposals for the development of Site 4, particularly the open space, retail units and office space	Support welcomed.	No change
	62	Mrs Judith Kewley			
	109	Mr Graham Evans			
	164	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	323	Mr Trevor Welling			
	345	Mrs Sue Watts			
	392	Mr Stephen Nock			
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
	538	Mr Malcolm Rasala			
S4-2	47	Mrs Julie Cronin	Object to the proposals for development on Site 4 on the grounds that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is the only remaining 'essences' of the harbour. It will result in the loss of open space 	Comment regarding essence of the harbour noted. It is assumed that reference is being made to the boat hoist, boats sales area and the yacht club. It is proposed that the yacht club and the boat hoist remain and it is considered that the boat sales could take place in the water as is the case in other marinas.	No change
	75	Mrs Julia Wildman			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	240	Mrs Julie Cronin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It may put existing restaurants out of business. The site is often used for events and exhibitions. It will obscure the views of the Harbour. There will be an increase traffic in a pedestrian area On-site parking should be provided There is not enough detail regarding building height and capacity and the public open space 	<p>Para 4.4.10 identifies that Site 4 is one site that should incorporate an area of public open space so that visitors and the community can enjoy space close to the water. This space could be used for a variety of public purposes.</p> <p>The Waterfront bars and restaurants provide one of the main attractions of the area for visitors and residents and further food and drink facilities on Site 4 will increase the offer and attraction of the Harbour.</p> <p>As part of any development proposed on Site 4 there is a requirement to provide new harbour walkways and views of the waterfront.</p> <p>It is not considered that the development will result in any significant increase in traffic using Harbour Quay as visitors to the site will be using existing access to the Waterfront car park. Harbour Quay will only be used for servicing.</p> <p>Site 4 is immediately adjacent to the Waterfront car park. Visitors to the site will therefore use the existing parking facilities.</p> <p>The SPD provides details of the opportunities and constraints associated with each of the sites and the site specific proposals for Site 4 recommend that any building on Site 4 should be of a height that is appropriate in scale to the adjoining Waterfront development. In addition, it states that there will be a requirement to provide a public space adjacent to the water. The specific size and location of this open space will be a matter of detail as part of any planning application.</p>	
	263	Mr Bob Watts			
	311	Mrs Yvonne Elbro			
	341	Mrs Zara Baker			
	367	Mrs Daphne Trefty			
	375	Mr. Barry Miles			
	380	Mr Roger Kiernan			
	441	Mr David Neilson			
S4-3	66	Mrs Valerie Dormady	There should be restrictions on the use of the upper floors for use as office or residential.	<p>It is acknowledged in para 4.4.10 that there is potential for some B1 office space above the bars, restaurants and retail units on the ground and first floors. It is not considered appropriate to restrict this office use.</p> <p>However, it is considered that restriction of residential development on Site 4 would be appropriate as it would be a mixed use commercial scheme which could have impacts of residential amenity. It is worth noting that there is no residential development forming part of the Waterfront development.</p>	Amend para 4.4.10, add sentence after third sentence to state: 'As it is proposed that this will be a mixed use commercial development, it is considered inappropriate to include any residential units on this site'.
	164	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	263	Mr Bob Watts			
	345	Mrs Sue Watts			
S4-4	193	Mr David Diamond	<p>The height of any development on Site 4 should be restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single storey Two storey The height of surrounding development 	<p>The height of proposed development will be influenced by the height of adjacent development in order to contribute to the townscape. As part of any development proposed on Site 4 there is a requirement to provide new harbour walkways and views of the waterfront.</p>	No change
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
	520	Mr Bruno Di Lieto			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S4-5	375	Mr. Barry Miles	Site 4 should be used by the fishermen and developed into a fishing quay and visitor attraction with storage houses, fish retail outlets and an education centre	It is considered that because of the site required for the fishermen and the fact that Site 4 is a prime site on the harbour frontage, relocating the fishermen to Site 4 would undermine proposals for retail and food and drink.	No change
	395	Mr Peter Holland (Sovereign Harbour Berth Holders Association)			
S4-6	43	Mr Barry Milne	The high pressure spray used to clean boats at the boat hoist contain chemicals that could be harmful, which would affect the proposed public space on Site 4.	Para 4.4.15 identifies that the south eastern corner of the site (furthest away from the boat hoist) is considered likely to be the preferred location for the public open space. Therefore it should be far enough away from the boat hoist to reduce the potential impact of the high pressure spray.	No change
S4-7	112	Mr Robert Ashley Hill	An open space should be preserved on Site 4 to allow exhibitions by the marine industry.	As part of the development on Site 4 there will be a requirement to provide a new harbour walkway and a public space adjacent to the water that could be used for a variety of public purposes.	No change
S4-8	164	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Development of Site 4 should not include restaurants and bars as there is already an oversupply in the area	Comments noted. However the Waterfront bars and restaurants provide one of the main attractions of the area for visitors and residents and further food and drink facilities will increase the offer and attraction of the Harbour. Siting these uses on Site 4 (not directly adjacent to residential areas) minimises the potential impact of these uses on residential amenity.	No change
S4-9	190	Mr John Langton	The architecture of development on Site 4 must be inspirational and sympathetic to existing buildings.	The Council is committed to providing high quality developments within the Harbour setting.	No change.
S4-10	445	Mr Ian Weeks	Vehicles and pedestrians should be carefully segregated.	This is a matter to be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage, however Harbour Quay will only be used for servicing.	No change
S4-11	452	Mr William Kumar (Turley Associates)	In para 4.4.10, delete: 'and retail units'	Para 3.1.12 recognises that the Sovereign Harbour Retail Park provides the main retail facility for the neighbourhood, and that the Waterfront also provides a retail function. The SPD supports the provision of additional retail and other food and drink uses (paras 3.1.12 and 3.1.13). It is considered that retail units on this site is appropriate due to its close proximity to the Waterfront, and the fact that this will enhance the offer that already exists at the Waterfront for both residents and visitors and will maximise the opportunities associated with this centrally located, prime waterfront site.	No change
S4-12	486	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend reference to dry boat storage in para 4.4.4 to 'temporary dry boat storage'.	Agreed. Para 4.4.4 will be amended to refer to temporary dry boat storage	Amend para 4.4.4 to add 'temporary' before 'dry boat storage'
S4-13	487	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 4.4.10 to allow flexibility for a range of	Agreed. Reference to allowing other appropriate	Amend first sentence of para 4.4.10 to read: 'It is

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			commercial and employment generating uses on the upper floor(s) that are compatible with the ground floor leisure / tourist based uses and with providing public access along the harbour-side and within an adjoining market square.	employment generating use above the bars, restaurants and retail units will be included.	considered that Site 4 should comprise a mixed use development incorporating bars, restaurants and retail units on the ground and first floor with potential for some B1 office space or other appropriate employment generating uses above.'
S4-14	488	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Support for proposed public open space on Site 4, however it should be provided on opposite side of site close to the boat hoist.	Whilst this is a matter to be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage, having regard to the siting of the pump foul main in the south eastern corner of the site and the associated restriction on development, it is considered that this is likely to be the preferred location for the public open space on Site 4.	No change
S4-15	505	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	In Appendix 4, remove reference to the public open space that is identified as being the 'preferred location' as this should be determined by more detailed site testing.	The exact location of the proposed open space is yet to be determined, however having regard to the siting of the pump foul main in the south eastern corner of the site and the associated restriction on development, it is considered that this is likely to be the location for the public open space on Site 4.	No change
S4-16	511	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Add Introductory Vision Statement for Site 4: 'Site 4 occupies an important part of the Harbour where a number of existing and proposed routes, activities and connections come together. These include the existing links from the Retail Park, car parks and Waterfront and the proposed new Bus Link, Retail Park link and Harbour walkway. As such it is at the centre of the Harbour making it well suited for a public open space that could be used for a variety of events and activities. In addition to the creation of a new public space, the development of this site will also need to provide built form of an appropriate scale and uses to create a backdrop to the public space, add vitality and contain the Harbour edge. The layout of the built form will need to balance a number of design issues including; its function as a place of arrival and public activity, the approach from, and connection to the Waterfront, access to, and views of the Harbour and the management of traffic and servicing. The character of any development on this site, both the built form and public realm should seek to reinforce the Harbour identity and create a positive relationship to the waterfront for the benefit of residents and visitors and to make it more commercially attractive.'	The proposed vision statement is agreed in principle.	Add Vision Statement for Site 4: 'Site 4 occupies an important part of the Harbour where a number of existing and proposed routes, activities and connections come together. These include the existing links from the Retail Park, car parks and Waterfront and the proposed new Bus Link, Retail Park link and Harbour walkway. As such it is at the centre of the Harbour making it well suited for a public open space that could be used for a variety of events and activities. In addition to the creation of a new public space, of appropriate size for the proposed community activities, the development of this site will also need to provide built form of an appropriate scale and uses to create a backdrop to the public space, add vitality and contain the Harbour edge. The layout of the built form will need to balance a number of design issues including; its function as a place of arrival and public activity, the approach from, and connection to the Waterfront, access to and views of the Harbour and the management of traffic and servicing. The character of any development on this site, both the built form and public realm should seek to reinforce the Harbour identity and create a positive relationship to the waterfront for the benefit of residents and visitors and to make it more commercially attractive.'
S4-17	565	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	A section of the degraded vegetated shingle could be reinstated on Site 4 and protected by careful design of pathways and appropriate, attractive fencing.	Comment noted. It is acknowledged that Site 1 and the Shingle Bank should be partly reinstated as vegetated shingle habitat, and amendment have been made to have regard to this. Site 4, by reason of the development identified, would be unable to accommodate this suggestion.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S4-18	581	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	It is essential that the operation of the Harbour is not disrupted by development on Site 4. There is no solution in the SPD to the relocation of the existing boat storage and boat sales area. These are critical parts of the offer at Sovereign Harbour.	It is considered that para 4.4.16 and paras 3.1.27, 3.1.28 and section 4.10 specifically refer to the operational requirements associated with running a harbour, namely the boat hoist, and access to the boat yard and boat storage area are not disrupted. It is proposed that the yacht club and the boat hoist remain and it is considered that the boat sales could take place in the water as is the case in other marinas.	No change

Site 5

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S5-1	39	Mr Barry Lee	Support for proposals for a community centre on Site 5, to be completed before residential development commences. The Community Centre must be of a sufficient size to provide for the current and future residents of Sovereign Harbour	Support welcomed. Para 4.5.10 identifies that a community centre with a footprint of approximately 750 square metres will be needed to meet the needs of the Sovereign Harbour neighbourhood.	No change
	66	Mrs Valerie Dormady			
	84	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	93	Mr Geoff Chatterton			
	102	Mrs S Ridler			
	165	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	193	Mr David Diamond			
	217	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	324	Mr Trevor Welling			
	389	Mr Michael Jones			
	549	Mr. Richard Runalls			
	550	Mr Peter Walters			
558	Mrs Jan Weeks				
S5-2	264	Mr Bob Watts	Object to the location of the community centre on Site 5 on the grounds that it is an unsuitable location due to it being a former landfill site	It is not considered that the ground conditions mean that Site 5 is unsuitable for a community centre. However, para 4.5.4 does identify that any development proposed for Site 5 will need to have regard to the proximity of the adjacent landfill site and any potential contamination issues associated with it. Para 4.5.11 also acknowledges that the construction of the building will need to take into account the membrane that covers the landfill site and for this reason the building is likely to be only single storey.	No change
	304	Mr David Hitchcock			
	346	Mrs Sue Watts			
	363	Mrs Daphne Trefty			
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
S5-3	52	Sarah Turner	Object to the reconfiguration of parking spaces on Site 5 on the grounds that the current amount of spaces should be maintained and any community centre development should provide additional parking to meet its needs.	Para 4.5.9 states that in order to achieve the most efficient layout for the community centre, it may be necessary to reconfigure part of the adjacent car park that serves The Waterfront.	Amend para 4.5.9 to add sentence to end of para: 'However, this must not result in the overall loss of car parking spaces in the Waterfront car park'.
	392	Mr Stephen Nock	Amend para 4.5.3 to state that the existing full number of visitor parking spaces is not to be reduced as a result of the	However, the SPD also identifies that there is a requirement to retain the full number of existing car	

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	418	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	development of Site 5. Amend para 4.5.12: 'The site is accessible for pedestrians and cyclists, and there are car parking facilities in the adjacent Waterfront car park. However, there may be a requirement to reconfigure and increase the parking arrangements in the Waterfront car park to provide access, servicing, disabled parking and cycle parking'.	parking spaces at the Waterfront. Para 4.5.9 should be amended to make this clear. Because of the constraints on Site 5, there is no opportunity to provide extra car parking.	
	491	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)			
	521	Mr Bruno Di Lieto			
S5-4	43	Mr Barry Milne	Object to the proposals for a children's play area on Site 5 on the grounds that it will be unsafe due to its location next to a car park and its location close to the boat hoist, where the high pressure spray used to clean boats contains chemicals and could be harmful.	It is envisaged that the proposed children's play space on Site 5 will be a facility to complement the community centre use, for example if the centre was to be used for a children's nursery there would be safe external play space for the children.	No change
	54	Janis Say			
	62	Mrs Judith Kewley			
S5-5	114	Mr Robert Ashley Hill	An open space should be preserved on Site 5 to allow exhibitions by the marine industry.	It is not considered that Site 5 would be a suitable location for the provision of a public open space that is suitable for public exhibitions. A public open space will be provided on Site 4 that would meet this need.	No change
S5-6	193	Mr David Diamond	Commercial viability should take account of profits previously in the whole harbour development.	Comment noted. However, this is not a matter for the planning policy document.	No change
S5-7	304	Mr David Hitchcock	The community centre should be incorporated in the existing Yacht Club.	It is acknowledged that the Sovereign Harbour Yacht Club could provide space for the community to use. However the building would not meet all of the needs of the Sovereign Harbour neighbourhood and as such a purpose built community centre is proposed for Site 5.	No change
S5-8	464	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Support for the provision of a community hall facility. However, it is likely that the hall will be directly delivered by a third party, whose timetable and procurement and construction contracts will be outside of the control of other developers. Within this context, it is appropriate for the terms of the delivery of other sites alongside the community hall to be expressed as 'delivered alongside' residential development, whilst still ensuring the timely delivery of the hall itself.	Support welcomed. The SPD does not require SHL to provide a community centre building. It does on the other hand require them to provide a contribution that equates to a building with a footprint of at least 400m ² . Having regard to the lack of community facilities provided in the past, it is considered that the community centre must be built as a priority and provided prior to commencement of the development on any remaining residential development sites.	No change.
S5-9	489	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 4.5.2 to allow greater flexibility for the siting of a community hall within this area, adjacent to the visitor car park. This is to ensure that the siting of a building can be fully deliverable within the context of the technical constraints of the site, the adjacent shingle mound which is a regulated landfill site and the need to ensure the full number of existing visitor parking spaces is retained, even if this does require some limited reconfiguration.	The site identified on Appendix 5 provides adequate flexibility for the exact boundaries of the site, and detailed work is being undertaken to determine the precise site boundary and orientation of the community centre.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S5-10	492	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	A Travel Plan should be required as part of the development of community facility to minimise access by car. Development of the community centre should have regard to sustainable building policies.	Agreed. It is considered appropriate that the community facilities require a travel plan, and should have regard to sustainable building policies.	Add to end of para 4.5.12: 'As a community facility proposed to meet the needs of the Sovereign Harbour community and in view of the central location of the site within the Harbour, dedicated car parking for the community hall will be restricted to meeting essential operational requirements only. The facility will also be subjected to a bespoke travel plan that will set out how non car access for the employees and users of the hall will be promoted, achieved and maintained. The design of the building will additionally need to satisfy the requirements of the Sustainable Building Design SPD.
S5-11	506	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The area circled should be reoriented to sit more east-west across the north side of the car park, as there is potential for a building here to be set back further away from the road, subject to further technical site testing.	Agreed. The area circled will be increased to include the section to the rear of the car park	Amend the site plan in Appendix 5 to increase the boundary circle to include the area to the rear of the car park.

Site 6

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S6-1	75	Mrs Julia Wildman	Site 6 would not be suitable for office development due to there being no demand for office development and problems with ground conditions. It should be replaced with residential development or retail development.	<p>There has been a long standing commitment by the Council to provide a business park at Sovereign Harbour. Indeed para 3.1.5 refers to Core Strategy Policy C14 which describes the Council's ambition to provide high quality skilled employment opportunities at the harbour.</p> <p>The issue regarding the amount of floorspace for the business park was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector concluded that although there is uncertainty over the viability of directing 30,000 square metres of employment floorspace to Sovereign Harbour, any delay in the adoption of the Core Strategy Local Plan would result in the Council being unable to take a pro-active, plan led approach to delivering development. Therefore no modification has been made to the amount of employment floorspace at Sovereign Harbour, although the Inspector recommends that Core Strategy Local Plan Policy D2: Economy should be subject to an early review and replacement policy by 2014.</p> <p>Para 4.6.10 acknowledges that there are poor ground conditions on the site and that there may be a need for piling or raft foundations, but it is not considered that this is reason enough to restrict office development on this site.</p>	Add new para after 3.1.6 to state 'Policy D2 will be the subject of an early review and will eventually be replaced by an Employment Land Local Plan, which will be subject to examination and should be adopted by the end of 2014.'
	127	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	166	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	183	Miss Elizabeth Ann James			
	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy			
	218	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	219	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	551	Mr Peter Walters			
S6-2	62	Mrs Judith Kewley	Support for the proposals for the development of Site 6.	Support welcomed.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	275	Dilys Iverson	There should be an emphasis on marine businesses including the relocation of the boat yard to this site	Para 4.6.8 identifies that Site 6 should provide employment through development as an office/business park. However, subject to viability, other employment generating uses will be considered on the site, which could include marine businesses. It is acknowledged in para 4.10.9 that although the boat yard is not ideally situated, it is currently unviable to move it to an alternative location.	
	325	Mr Trevor Welling			
	389	Mr Michael Jones			
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
	522	Mr Bruno Di Lieto			
	537	Mr Malcolm Rasala			
S6-3	127	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	Object to the proposals for commercial development on Site 6 on the grounds that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will result in significant additional traffic movements, particularly commercial vehicles There is no demand for two office parks It should continued to be used for boat storage, sales and car parking 	East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority has raised no objection to proposals for Site 6 regarding impacts on the highway network. The matter relating to demand for office space was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector concluded that although there is uncertainty over the viability of directing 30,000 square metres of employment floorspace to Sovereign Harbour, any delay in the adoption of the Core Strategy Local Plan would result in the Council being unable to take a pro-active, plan led approach to delivering development. Therefore no modification has been made to the amount of employment floorspace at Sovereign Harbour, although the Inspector recommends that Core Strategy Local Plan Policy D2: Economy should be subject to an early review and replacement policy by 2014. The boat storage use is only temporary and will expire in January 2014 as there is a long standing commitment for this site to provide employment space.	Add new para after 3.1.6 to state 'Policy D2 will be the subject of an early review and will eventually be replaced by an Employment Land Local Plan, which will be subject to examination and should be adopted by the end of 2014.'
	166	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	183	Miss Elizabeth Ann James			
	370	Mrs Daphne Trefty			
	549	Mr. Richard Runalls			
S6-4	43	Mr Barry Milne	It is essential to have a good boat repair facility and out of water storage. A canal could be run from the present slipway to Site 6 and the boat yard could be relocated there.	Comment noted. It is acknowledged in para 4.10.9 that although the boat yard is not ideally situated, it is currently unviable to move it to an alternative location. However it is considered that such a development would not be possible due to the location of the shingle bank (former landfill site) between the slipway and Site 6, and the fact that such an engineering solution would be financially prohibitive.	No change
S6-5	166	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	There is no definition of 'other employment generating uses'.	The term 'other employment generating' uses has been used to provide flexibility in what could be appropriate development for the site. However para 4.6.9 makes it clear that this would not include a general retail use.	No change
S6-6	190	Mr John Langton	Vehicular access to Site 6 should be from Pevensey Bay Road.	This could form part of a detailed part of a planning application, however having regard to the proximity of the two roundabout serving the retail parks and Pacific drive it is not considered that an additional access off Pevensey Bay Road would be required.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S6-7	347	Mrs Sue Watts	The extent of moulding and slope gradients on Site 6 should be limited. The Membrane and capping should not be compromised.	Para 4.6.10 acknowledges that there are poor ground condition on the site and that there may be a need for piling or raft foundations. In addition, it is proposed that the surrounding shingle mound will be retained to provide shelter for the site.	No change
S6-8	405	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Any development of Site 6 should ensure that there is no impact on the nearby SNCIs, which could include indirect impacts such including run-off etc. Development should also incorporate restoration of important shingle habitats where possible. Whilst it is recognised that there is an existing tree belt on site (protected by a TPO), any new landscaping should be sympathetic to the underlying geology and prevailing conditions, i.e. shingle habitat.	Agreed. Para 4.6.12 will be amended to refer to ensuring no impact on the SNCI and being sympathetic to underlying geology and prevailing conditions.	Amend first sentence of para 4.6.12 to read: As a gateway site into the town, the site should be landscaped in order to improve the attractiveness of the site and any development will be required not to have an impact on the adjacent Langney Sewer SNCI. Amend final sentence of para 4.6.12 to read: There should also be high quality soft landscaping within the site, which should have regard to the underlying geology and prevailing conditions
S6-9	419	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Adequate cycle parking would also need to be provided, as well as linkages to the bus service in Pacific Drive	Agreed. Reference to cycle parking should be included in para 4.6.14	Amend the final sentence of para 4.6.14 to read: Adequate car and secure cycle parking to serve the development should also be provided on site.
S6-10	493	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Object to the proposed amount of B1a (office) development on the grounds that it is unjustified, unrealistic and will limit creation of job opportunities. The SPD should allow other employment generating uses with a focus on 'clean' jobs	This matter was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector concluded that although there is uncertainty over the viability of directing 30,000 square metres of employment floorspace to Sovereign Harbour, any delay in the adoption of the Core Strategy Local Plan would result in the Council being unable to take a pro-active, plan led approach to delivering development. Therefore no modification has been made to the amount of employment floorspace at Sovereign Harbour, although the Inspector recommends that Core Strategy Local Plan Policy D2: Economy should be subject to an early review and replacement policy by 2014. Para 4.6.9 of the SPD does refer to other employment uses being considered.	Add new para after 3.1.6 to state 'Policy D2 will be the subject of an early review and will eventually be replaced by an Employment Land Local Plan, which will be subject to examination and should be adopted by the end of 2014.'
S6-11	494	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Support for other employment generating uses on Site 6, however other general retail uses should be allowed provided that retail planning tests are satisfied.	One of the prime purposes of the SPD is to deliver a key spatial objective of the Core Strategy, to provide significant high quality employment. A general retail provision would not meet this requirement.	No change
S6-12	507	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Site Plan for Site 6 should also show the gateway locations as they relate to the main junctions into Sovereign Harbour from Pevensy Bay Road.	Agreed. Appendix 6 will be amended to show the gateway locations.	Amend site plan in Appendix 6 to show gateway locations
S6-13	512	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Add Introductory Vision Statement for Site 6: 'Site 6, along with site 7, forms the northern edge of Sovereign Harbour adjacent to the A259 Pevensy Bay Road and is a significant part of an important public frontage and entrance to the Harbour. As such it provides an opportunity to improve the	The proposed vision statement is agreed in principle.	Add Vision Statement for Site 6: 'Site 6, along with Site 7, forms the northern edge of Sovereign Harbour adjacent to the A259 Pevensy Bay Road and is a significant part of an important public frontage and entrance to the Harbour. As such it provides an opportunity to improve the presence

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			presence and access to the Harbour. It also has a role to play in creating a gateway to Eastbourne. Development proposals for this site therefore need to be part of an integrated design that includes site 7, linkages south to the Retail Park and Waterfront, and their combined gateway function. Sitting between the Pevensey Bay Road and the shingle mound and separated from the housing to the north, site 6 is less sensitive in terms of the proximity to residential development. This may make it more suitable for larger scale buildings. The southern end of site 6 overlooks the Harbour Entrance roundabout and the Retail Park, forming part of the main Harbour entrance. There is scope for a larger scale building here sufficient to anchor the site and define the entrance. At the northern end of site 6, built form needs to provide a similar gateway function, although here it will need to be considered alongside proposals for the southern part of site 7 opposite, and the same scale may not be required to establish presence. Landscape should form an integrated part of any design proposals for site 6 & 7 to create a setting along the Pevensey Bay Road as part of the Harbour character and gateway to Eastbourne. This could include use of the existing tree belt on site 6 and views across the Pevensey Levels to the north.'		and access to the Harbour. It also has a role to play in creating a gateway to Eastbourne. Development proposals for this site therefore need to be part of an integrated design that includes Site 7, linkages south to the Retail Park and Waterfront, and their combined gateway function. Sitting between the Pevensey Bay Road and the shingle mound and separated from the housing to the north, Site 6 is less sensitive in terms of the proximity to residential development. This may make it more suitable for larger scale buildings. The southern end of Site 6 overlooks the Harbour Entrance roundabout and the Retail Park, forming part of the main Harbour entrance. There is scope for a larger scale building here sufficient to anchor the site and define the entrance. At the northern end of Site 6, built form needs to provide a similar gateway function, although here it will need to be considered alongside proposals for the southern part of Site 7 opposite, and the same scale may not be required to establish presence. Landscape should form an integrated part of any design proposals for Sites 6 & 7 to create a setting along the Pevensey Bay Road as part of the Harbour character and gateway to Eastbourne. This could include use of the existing tree belt on Site 6 and views across the Pevensey Levels to the north.'
S6-14	537	Mr Malcolm Rasala	The business park should stand out in order to attract global businesses. This could be in the form of a lifestyle health park that combines healthcare and exercise and businesses. This will also help to increase tourism.	Comment noted.	No change
S6-15	563	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	Site 6 has been the subject of historic landfilling activities and it is possible that contamination may still be present either as impacted soils and groundwater or unidentified land filling. Therefore any proposed development would need a thorough investigation to ensure that the site had been fully characterised.	Agreed. Reference will be included to the site being subject to historic landfilling activities and development requiring thorough investigation.	Add new para after para 4.6.6 to read: 'Site 6 has been the subject of historic landfilling activities and it is possible that contamination may still be present either as impacted soils and groundwater or unidentified land filling.' Add new para after para 4.6.9 to read: Having regard to the fact that Site 6 has been subject of historic landfilling activities, any proposed development would need a thorough investigation to ensure that the site had been fully assessed. Amend para 4.6.10 to read: In addition, the poor ground conditions on the site may require piling or raft foundations. The surrounding shingle mound and tree belt provide shelter for the site.
S6-16	582	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	The issue of relocating the boat storage has not been properly considered. A marina needs adequate boat storage facilities and the marina has capacity for 1,300 boats and these need to be stored in the winter.	Para 4.10.8 recognises the importance of marine uses and acknowledges that along with the boat hoist, boat storage and berth holders facilities, it is essential for the maintenance of a fully served marina operation. The SPD also acknowledges that Site 2 could be used for boat	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
				<p>storage. Boats would be able to be taken from the rear of the boat yard rather than be transported by the road to the temporary boat storage area on Site 6.</p> <p>It is also considered that boat storage could take place within the curtilage of the boat yard and within the existing storage area adjacent to the service road for the Waterfront.</p>	

Site 7

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S7-1	62	Mrs Judith Kewley	Support for proposals for Site 7, particularly open space, children's play area and office park	Support welcomed	No change
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	83	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	102	Mrs S Ridler			
	167	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	326	Mr Trevor Welling			
	389	Mr Michael Jones			
	396	Mr Peter Holland (Sovereign Harbour Berth Holders Association)			
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
S7-2	539	Mr Malcolm Rasala	Site 7 should include an additional access road, provided before development commenced, from the existing roundabout on Pacific Drive to connect with Pevensy Bay Road, to alleviate the congestion at peak times at the only existing entrance to North Harbour.	<p>This could be a possible option for serving part of Site 7, however this would need to be the subject of a detailed planning application and discussions with the highways authority.</p> <p>However East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority has raised no objection in principle to proposals for Site 7 regarding impacts on the highway network.</p>	No change
	66	Mrs Valerie Dormady			
	102	Mrs S Ridler			
	190	Mr John Langton			
	278	Mr Michael Jones			
	371	Mrs Daphne Trefty			
	434	Mr Brian Mulligan			
	490	Mr Bruno Di Lieto			
	534	Mr David Gunn			
S7-3	523	Mr Bruno Di Lieto	<p>Object to the proposals for office development on Site 7 on the ground that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should be used to develop shops The area is already overdeveloped There is no demand for more offices in Eastbourne Site 6 will provide the necessary office development It would create significant additional traffic movements 	<p>Whilst the SPD supports the provision of additional retail and other food and drink uses (paras 3.1.12 and 3.1.13), it is considered that Site 7 is not an appropriate location for shops due to its distance from the main retail areas.</p> <p>It is not considered that the area is already overdeveloped.</p> <p>The matter relating to demand for office space on Sites 6 and 7 was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector concluded that although there is uncertainty over the viability of directing 30,000 square metres of employment</p>	Add new para after 3.1.6 to state 'Policy D2 will be the subject of an early review and will eventually be replaced by an Employment Land Local Plan, which will be subject to examination and should be adopted by the end of 2014.'
	17	Ms Gillian Barr			
	39	Mr Barry Lee			
	66	Mrs Valerie Dormady			
	83	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	96	Mr John Batchelor			
105	Miss Clarissa Bird				

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	183	Miss Elizabeth Ann James		floorspace to Sovereign Harbour, any delay in the adoption of the Core Strategy Local Plan would result in the Council being unable to take a pro-active, plan led approach to delivering development. Therefore no modification has been made to the amount of employment floorspace at Sovereign Harbour, although the Inspector recommends that Core Strategy Local Plan Policy D2: Economy should be subject to an early review and replacement policy by 2014. East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority has raised no objection to proposals for Site 7 regarding impacts on the highway network.	
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	371	Mrs Daphne Trefty			
S7-4	75	Mrs Julia Wildman	There is greater potential for residential development on Site 7	The amount of proposed residential development on Site 7 of between 30 and 70 units is considered to be appropriate in order to achieve the delivery of the proposed open space and employment space requirements also proposed for this site.	No change
	183	Miss Elizabeth Ann James			
	266	Mr Bob Watts			
	348	Mrs Sue Watts			
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
	534	Mr David Gunn			
S7-5	264	Mr Bob Watts	Site 7 would be a preferable and more suitable location for the Community Centre	Comment noted. However Site 5 is considered to be the preferred location for a community centre as it is more of a central location within the harbour to serve both North and South Harbour residents.	No change
	266	Mr Bob Watts			
	348	Mrs Sue Watts			
S7-6	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy	Any variation to Site 7 usage should not include any further dwellings	The amount of B1 office floorspace to be provided on Site 7 is was by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy,. The Inspector did not recommend any variations to proposals for Site 7 with regard to the potential decrease in employment space would result in the increase in number of dwellings.	No change
	236	Mr Michael Greaves			
S7-7	20	Spencer	Site 7 should include retail and hospitality development.	It is considered that retail, hospitality, bar and restaurants are better sited close to the existing facilities at the Waterfront in the heart of Sovereign Harbour.	No change
S7-8	48	Stephen Houghton	The proposal for a children's play area on Site 7 should include a pedestrian crossing as Pacific Drive is an extremely busy road	Comment noted. This matter could be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage in consultation with the Highway authority.	No change
S7-9	54	Janis Say	More car parking is required to provide for employment land on Site 7.	Para 2.3.11 of the SPD acknowledges that residents have expressed concerns about the ratio of residents to visitors parking facilities. Paras 2.3.11 and 3.1.16 recognises the importance of any new development should not impact on the current parking situation and should be provided with sufficient parking to meet its own needs. Parking provision for employment sites will be determined having regard to adopted policy standards.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S7-10	96	Mr John Batchelor	The site should be developed as football pitches, play areas and nurseries.	Para 4.7.12 identifies that the middle part of the site should be used to provide a usable open space. This space should be flexible enough to provide a range of informal open space uses, but should also include a children's play area. It is assumed that nursery means plant nursery. It is considered that the ground conditions are unlikely to be appropriate for a nursery use.	No change
S7-11	190	Mr John Langton	The children's play area will cause noise problems for the offices.	Para 4.7.12 acknowledges that the open space should be appropriately landscaped and sheltered from adjacent uses, which would minimise any impact of noise on the offices.	No change
S7-12	220	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	Object to the development of Sheltered/Assisting Living accommodation on Site 7 on the grounds that there is an existing vacant nursing home on the ASDA roundabout.	Comment noted. There has been support for this use during the consultation from Sovereign Harbour community who would like to remain in the community as they older.	No change
S7-13	406	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Support for the proposal for open space on Site 7 to help enhance the connectivity between the Langney Levels SNCI and Pevensey Levels SSSI. Landscaping should recognise and be sympathetic to the underlying nature of the site, i.e. shingle and recognise the links to adjacent freshwater habitats in the low-lying hinterland of the Langney and Pevensey Levels. Support for the statement that any development should not adversely affect the setting of the Pevensey Levels.	Support welcomed. As part of any proposals for Site 7, para 4.7.9 recognises that high quality landscaping should be provided on site, which could recognise and be sympathetic to the underlying nature of the site. The SPD also recognises that development should not adversely affect the setting of the Pevensey Levels.	No change
S7-14	420	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Sites 6 & 7 would be the main traffic generators and as such any application for each site would need to be supported by a Transport Assessment. Accessing sites 6 & 7 would also need careful consideration and alternative accesses should be investigated, for example, an 'in only' access off the A259, or a new roundabout at eastern end of site 7, if the existing access via Pacific Drive is not suitable.	Comment noted. A change will be made to reflect the option to provide access to the employment land on Site 7 off Pevensey Bay Road.	Amend para 4.7.10 to read: The site is accessible by road and public transport, and within walking distance for the residents of Sovereign Harbour. Vehicle access to the employment land on Site 7 will need careful consideration and the potential for an alternative access should be investigated and, if required should be subject to agreement with East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority. This would also need to be supported by a Transport Assessment. In addition, there should be adequate parking provided to serve the development. It is also important that pedestrian and cycle links through the site are provided to connect to the retail park, the community centre on Site 5 and the Waterfront. Amend Appendix 7 to include the following text: Further details of possible access to the employment land on Site 7 to be agreed with the Highway Authority.
S7-15	420	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Consideration should be given to improving the crossing point to ensure pedestrian safety due to provision of open space and children's play area.	Comment noted. This matter could be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage in consultation with the Highway authority.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S7-16	431	Mr Andy Thompson (Strategic Housing Manager Eastbourne Borough Council)	Reference to Extra Care housing should be included in paragraph 4.7.14.	Agreed. Para 4.7.14 will be amended to refer to Extra Care housing.	Amend para 4.7.14 to read: It is also considered that there is the opportunity to provide some sheltered or assisted living/extra care (C3 residential) accommodation on this site and perhaps a limited amount of care home accommodation (C2).
S7-17	495	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Object to the proposed amount of B1a (office) development on the grounds that it is unjustified, unrealistic and will limit creation of job opportunities. The SPD should allow other employment generating uses with a focus on 'clean' jobs	This matter was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector concluded that although there is uncertainty over the viability of directing 30,000 square metres of employment floorspace to Sovereign Harbour, any delay in the adoption of the Core Strategy Local Plan would result in the Council being unable to take a pro-active, plan led approach to delivering development. Therefore no modification has been made to the amount of employment floorspace at Sovereign Harbour, although the Inspector recommends that Core Strategy Local Plan Policy D2: Economy should be subject to an early review and replacement policy by 2014.	Add new para after 3.1.6 to state 'Policy D2 will be the subject of an early review and will eventually be replaced by an Employment Land Local Plan, which will be subject to examination and should be adopted by the end of 2014.'
S7-18	496	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Amend para 4.7.15 to replace the reference to the need for a landscape buffer to screen the development with a positive reference instead to the need for landscaping to be used to integrate new built development with the new open space / green park and to create an appropriate setting to Pevensey Bay Road as a gateway to the town.	Agreed. Para 4.7.15 will be amended to provide a more positive reference to landscaping.	Amend second sentence of para 4.7.15 to read: 'Landscaping should be used to integrate the development within the proposed open space and to create an appropriate setting to Pevensey Bay Road as part of the gateway to the town'.
S7-19	513	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Add Introductory Vision Statement for Site 7: 'Site 7 will provide a mix of uses including employment, residential and public open space. Along with site 6, it forms the northern edge of Sovereign Harbour adjacent to the A259 Pevensey Bay Road and is a significant part of an important public frontage and entrance to the Harbour. As such it provides an opportunity to improve the presence and access to the Harbour. It also has a role to play in creating a gateway to Eastbourne. Development proposals for this site therefore need to be part of an integrated design that includes site 6, their links ultimately with the Retail Park and the Waterfront, and their combined gateway function. Site 7 has a closer relationship with the existing residential development to the south along Pacific Drive and layout and scale should reflect this. In practice this may mean larger scale buildings located on the Pevensey Bay Road side of the site to help create presence, with smaller scale buildings on the Pacific Drive side of the site to blend with the domestic scale. Buildings should also be planned along the Pacific Drive edge to provide active frontages and surveillance to the street. Built form on the southern end of site 7 needs to be considered alongside proposals for the northern part of site 6 opposite to establish presence and a gateway. Residential development on the northern part of	The proposed vision statement is agreed in principle.	Add Vision Statement for Site 7: 'Site 7 will provide a mix of uses including employment, residential and public open space. Along with Site 6, it forms the northern edge of Sovereign Harbour adjacent to the A259 Pevensey Bay Road and is a significant part of an important public frontage and entrance to the Harbour. As such it provides an opportunity to improve the presence and access to the Harbour. It also has a role to play in creating a gateway to Eastbourne. Development proposals for this site therefore need to be part of an integrated design that includes Site 6, their links ultimately with the Retail Park and the Waterfront, and their combined gateway function. Site 7 has a closer relationship with the existing residential development to the south along Pacific Drive and layout and scale should reflect this. In practice this may mean larger scale buildings located on the Pevensey Bay Road side of the site to help create presence, with smaller scale buildings on the Pacific Drive side of the site to blend with the domestic scale. Buildings should also be planned along the Pacific Drive edge to provide active frontages and surveillance to the street. Built form on the southern end of Site 7 needs to be considered alongside proposals for the northern part of Site 6 opposite to establish presence and a gateway. Residential development on the northern part of

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			the site will need to be considered as part of the wider masterplan and its contribution to achieving a coordinated design approach along the Pevensey Bay Road. Proposals are to include a public open space which should be accessible and designed to provide recreation for a range of ages. The function of this space as part of a wider green infrastructure including pedestrian and cycle linkages, and an ecological resource will also need to be considered as part of the overall design. Landscape should form an integrated part of any design proposals for site 6 & 7 to create a setting along the Pevensey Bay Road as part of the Harbour character and gateway to Eastbourne.'		the site will need to be considered as part of the wider masterplan and its contribution to achieving a coordinated design approach along the Pevensey Bay Road. Proposals are to include a public open space which should be accessible and designed to provide recreation for a range of ages. The function of this space as part of a wider green infrastructure including pedestrian and cycle linkages, and an ecological resource will also need to be considered as part of the overall design. Landscape should form an integrated part of any design proposals for Sites 6 & 7 to create a setting along the Pevensey Bay Road as part of the Harbour character and gateway to Eastbourne.'
S7-20	528	Sarah Harrison (Southern Water)	It has been identified that there is a rising main which may constrain the layout of Site 7. Add additional text: 'There is a 350mm diameter rising main close to the boundary of site 7. This will constrain the layout of the site. Easement strips must be left to allow access for maintenance'.	Agreed. A new paragraph will be added to refer to the identified rising main.	Add new para after 4.7.7: 'There is a 350mm diameter rising main close to the boundary of Site 7. This will constrain the layout of the site. Easement strips must be left to allow access for maintenance'. Amend Appendix 7 to include reference to easement strips.
S7-21	539	Mr Malcolm Rasala	The business park should stand out in order to attract global businesses. This could be in the form of a lifestyle health park that combines healthcare and exercise and businesses. This will also help to increase tourism.	Comment noted.	No change
S7-22	265	Mr Bob Watts	Any children's play area should be well screened from Pevensey Bay Road.	Comment noted. Para 4.7.12 acknowledges that the open space (including the children's play area) should be appropriately landscaped and sheltered from adjacent uses.	No change

Site 8

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S8-1	17	Ms Gillian Barr	Object to proposals for the development of Site 8 on the grounds that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it will obscure the view across the harbour the site should be used as a parking area residents had previously been told that the site would not be developed for housing it will lower the value of surrounding properties it will create more traffic problems on Pacific Drive 	As part of any development proposed for Site 8, para 4.8.9 will ensure views of the harbour are maintained. It is considered that a car park would not the most efficient use of the site, however the site has the potential to provide a high quality residential scheme which would complete the development around the harbour but the proposals for the site also recognise that land needs to be set aside for future berth holders facilities. Comment noted regarding the site not being developed for housing. However, the principle of allowing residential development on this site was established by the grant of	Amend para 4.8.8 to read: 'It is considered that the site could accommodate a maximum of 8 homes and these should be houses rather than flats. The units should range in height from between two storeys fronting Pacific Drive and up to four storeys adjacent to the waterfront'. Amend para 4.8.11 to read: 'Access to the site should be off the existing access off Pacific Drive that serves the pumping station.' In Appendix 8, replace 'Residential development of 20-26 homes (2 storey adjacent to Pacific Drive, rising to 4 storey adjacent to the waterfront' with 'Residential development
	21	Spencer			
	31	Mr Peter Brown			
	35	Mr Raymond Morrell			
	38	Mr Norman Cruse			
	39	Mr Barry Lee			
	49	Stephen Houghton			
	54	Janis Say			
	61	Mr J Green			
	62	Mrs Judith Kewley			
73	Mrs Jackie Gandhi				
74	Mr David Wildman				

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	75	Mrs Julia Wildman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposal is disproportionate to the size of the site the site should be retained as a landscaped open space there is not sufficient parking provided with the development and it will increase parking problems in the area it would be out of character with the surrounding areas the future needs of boat owners are unknown 	<p>outline planning permission in 1997. In addition, Site 8 is within the predominantly residential area of the North Harbour. Therefore in land use planning terms the development of the site for residential purposes is acceptable in principle.</p> <p>Any perceived loss of value of surrounding properties is not a planning consideration that should restrict the development of this site.</p> <p>East Sussex County Council as Highway Authority has raised no objection to proposals for Site 8 regarding impacts on the highway network.</p> <p>The site specific proposals have evolved following an assessment of the site and the immediate surroundings. This assessment had regard to the scale, height and form of adjoining developments. In addition, it is proposed that 50% of the site should remain open. Furthermore, para 4.8.8 of the draft SPD will be amended so that instead of the previously proposed 20-26 homes for the site, the number of units has been reduced to 8 houses.</p> <p>It is considered that a retaining the whole site as landscaped open space would not be the most efficient use of the site as the site has the potential to provide a high quality residential scheme which would complete the development around the harbour but the proposals for the site also recognise that land needs to be set aside for future berth holders facilities. However, the SPD does propose that 50% of the site remain open.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are parking problems within Sovereign Harbour and the SPD seeks to ensure that new development provides an appropriate amount of car parking.</p> <p>It is not considered that the proposals for Site 8 would be out of character as regard has been given to surrounding developments.</p> <p>Comment noted about future berth holder facilities. As the future needs of the boat owners are unknown, the SPD acknowledges that land on Site 8 needs to be set aside for future berth holders facilities, should additional pontoons need to be provided at this end of the harbour in the future.</p>	<p>of 8 houses (2 storey adjacent to Pacific Drive, rising to 4 storey adjacent to the waterfront'</p> <p>In Appendix 8, delete 'Undercroft parking'</p>
	88	Sarah Dennington			
	91	Mrs J Green			
	92	Linda Warner			
	96	Mr John Batchelor			
	98	Mr John Townend			
	102	Mrs S Ridler			
	105	Miss Clarissa Bird			
	110	Mrs Barbara Spittal			
	168	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	187	Mr John Head			
	213	Mr Jojn Sadler			
	267	Mr Bob Watts			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	278	Mr Michael Jones			
	279	Mr Philip Barnes			
	280	Simon Tune Guy Brewer			
	287	Mr Roger Green			
	298	Mr David Hitchcock			
	311	Mrs Yvonne Elbro			
	313	Mr David Hitchcock			
	314	Mr David Hitchcock			
	315	Mr David Hitchcock			
	316	Mr David Hitchcock			
	337	Ms Janet Gouveia			
	340	Mrs Zara Baker			
	349	Mrs Sue Watts			
	362	Mr Michael Hilarion			
	374	Mrs Daphne Trefty			
	377	Mr Matthew Bailey			
	391	Mr & Mrs J Scheepers			
	434	Mr Brian Mulligan			
	444	Mrs Julia Wildman			
	534	Mr David Gunn			
	549	Mr. Richard Runalls			
	553	Mr Peter Walters			
S8-2	56	Robert Hancock	Support for the proposals for the development of Site 8	Support welcomed	No change
	66	Mrs Valerie Dormady			
	171	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	172	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	174	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	327	Mr Trevor Welling			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
S8-3	19	Mr David Diamond	Housing development on Site 8 should be restricted to two storeys in order to leave an open view through to the marina and be in scale with existing development.	The height of proposed development will be influenced by the height of adjacent development in order to contribute to the townscape. Para 4.8.8 identifies that development on Site 8 will range in height from 4 storeys adjacent to the waterfront to 2 storeys adjacent to Pacific Drive. In addition, para 4.8.9 acknowledges that in order to provide views through the site of the Harbour, and an area at the waters edge, it is considered that 50% of the site should remain public open space.	No change
	193	Mr David Diamond			
S8-4	74	Mr David Wildman	Object to the provision of berth holders facilities on Site 8. Demand for berth holder facilities is questioned due to declining number of boats berthed.	Comment noted. However, as the future needs of the boat owners are unknown, the SPD acknowledges that land on Site 8 needs to be set aside for future berth holders facilities, should additional pontoons need to be provided at this end of the harbour in the future.	No change
	175	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
S8-5	74	Mr David Wildman	Object to the use of undercroft parking on Site 8 as it is rarely used by the occupants of the homes and would not provide sufficient parking provision.	Para 2.3.11 of the SPD acknowledges that residents have expressed concerns about the ratio of residents to visitors parking facilities. Paras 2.3.11 and 3.1.16 recognises the importance of any new development should not impact on the current parking situation and should be provided with sufficient parking to meet its own needs. Comment noted. Reference to undercroft car parking has been deleted.	See Response ID KI-2 Amend para 4.8.11 to read: 'Access to the site should be off the existing access off Pacific Drive that serves the pumping station.' In Appendix 8, delete 'Undercroft parking'
	176	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
S8-6	267	Mr Bob Watts	Concerned that initial application will be later amended to build higher and close off the Marina from public view. Control must be strict and any attempt to vary the consent rigorously contested.	An outline planning application will be required to demonstrate the uses proposed on each of the sites, the amount of development, an indicative layout, information relating to the height and scale of development and indicative access points. The outline planning application will be determined in accordance with the guidance contained within the adopted SPD. A Reserved Matters application would then need to be submitted to deal with the detailed design and layout proposals, and these must be in line with the outline application. It would not be possible to make amendments to the outline application at the reserved matters stage without a completely new application which would then be judged against the SPD.	No change
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
S8-7	73	Mrs Jackie Gandhi	Leaving 50% of the site as public space is not enough.	It is considered that the proposed area of public open space is significant and will ensure views through the site of the harbour are maintained as well as a new harbour walkway adjacent to the water.	No change
S8-8	74	Mr David Wildman	Any development should be architecturally designed and built to a high quality of construction to become a	The Council is committed to providing high quality developments within the Harbour setting.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			landmark building.	Para 4.8.7 identifies that the site has the potential to provide a high quality residential scheme.	
S8-9	169	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	The pumping station on Site 8 should be moved or screened.	Southern Water has made no representations with regard to the moving of the pumping station. Regarding the screening, this could be considered as part of the detailed planning application.	No change
S8-10	170	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	It is not possible to comment on this paragraph 4.8.3.	Comment noted.	No change
S8-11	173	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Will affordable housing be provided on Site 8?	The Core Strategy requires up to 40% affordable housing to be sought as part of any proposed housing development. However this provision is subject to viability and if it can be proved that this would be unviable the Council may accept equivalent commuted sum to provide the affordable housing off-site.	No change
S8-12	187	Mr John Head	Development should be restricted to two rows of 2 storey terrace homes in town house design facing Pacific Drive.	Comments noted. The proposals for Site 8 have been amended and now propose that only 8 houses should be accommodated on this site and that these should be two storeys in height adjacent to Pacific Drive, and four storeys adjacent to the waterfront.	Amend para 4.8.8 to read: 'It is considered that the site could accommodate a maximum of 8 homes and these should be houses rather than flats. The units should range in height from between two storeys fronting Pacific Drive and up to four storeys adjacent to the waterfront'. In Appendix 8, replace 'Residential development of 20-26 homes (2 storey adjacent to Pacific Drive, rising to 4 storey adjacent to the waterfront' with 'Residential development of 8 houses (2 storey adjacent to Pacific Drive, rising to 4 storey adjacent to the waterfront'
S8-14	298	Mr David Hitchcock	The plan indicating the vista of the waterfront is incorrect as it only points to houses opposite and not a view of the whole Harbour.	As a result of the amendments made to the draft SPD to reduce the proposed number of units on site to 8, amendments to the layout of the site have taken place which involves removing reference to the view through the site.	Amend Appendix 8 to remove arrow representing the vista Delete 'Vista of Waterfront' with 'Views of the waterfront'
S8-15	375	Mr. Barry Miles	The 50% open space on Site 8 should not include roads or visitor parking.	The SPD makes it clear that the 50% of the site to remain open will comprise an area at the water's edge to provide views of the Harbour and public open space.	No change
S8-17	397	Mr Peter Holland (Sovereign Harbour Berth Holders Association)	Support for the provision of Berth holders facilities on Site 8	Support welcomed	No change
S8-18	497	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Support for the proposals for Site 8. The site has been set aside for development as indicated by the setting out of the immediately neighbouring development and of an access junction into the site. It however presents an opportunity to also provide public access to the North Harbour, with retained views and a recreation / amenity space that people will be able to use in a variety ways	Support welcomed	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S8-19	498	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Support for proposals for Site 8. However, Para 4.8.8 would benefit from further design references being added. For instance with references taken from the varying heights of the existing residential development within this part of the Harbour, development on Site 8 will need to respond to this and to the scale of the Harbour itself, but with careful massing and modelling this might enable a variety of design responses, including the possible use of penthouses to create interesting roof forms which will help landmark the site as a destination for those wishing to use the new public access and gardens.	Comment noted. It is considered that it is necessary to put a maximum height limit for development on Site 8 as is the case for all of the other development sites. The range of heights referred to in para 4.8.8 of the SPD have been informed by an assessment of adjacent development.	No change
S8-20	499	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	The reference to 50% of the site remaining as public open space should be amended to refer to 50% of the site should be planned and thereafter retained as new public open space as it is private land with access permitted at the landowners discretion.	Comment noted. It is not considered necessary to make any amendments to the reference to 50% of the site remaining as public open space.	No change
S8-21	514	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Add Introductory Vision Statement for Site 8: 'Site 8 occupies an important position at the head of the north Harbour where a combination of built form and public open space should be used to create a focal point that completes the Harbour edge. Half of the site should be left open for the creation of a new public space. There is an opportunity for a range of spaces with different hard and soft landscape characters to take advantage of the harbour side location and views. Apart from creating a setting for an attractive public open space, the scale and character of buildings will need to respond sympathetically to the existing residential development and create a positive focal point for the north Harbour.'	The proposed vision statement is agreed in principle.	Add Vision Statement for Site 8: 'Site 8 occupies an important position at the head of the North Harbour where a combination of built form and public open space should be used to create a focal point that completes the Harbour edge. 50% of the site should remain as public open space and there is an opportunity for a range of spaces with different hard and soft landscape characters to take advantage of the harbour side location and views. Apart from creating a setting for an attractive public open space, the scale and character of buildings will need to respond sympathetically to the existing residential development and create a positive focal point for the North Harbour.'
S8-22	529	Sarah Harrison (Southern Water)	Site 8 is located close to a waste water pumping station which can result in unpleasant odours and vibrations. Thus, the site layout should ensure that no habitable rooms are located fewer than 15 metres from the pumping station boundary. Add additional text: 'Site layout should ensure that no habitable rooms are located fewer than 15 metres from the pumping station boundaries'.	Agreed. Additional text will be added.	Add to end of para 4.8.11: 'Site layout should ensure that no habitable rooms are located fewer than 15 metres from the pumping station boundaries'.
S8-23	549	Mr. Richard Runalls	If residential development is necessary, proposals should limit quantity and design of residences to ensure they are in keeping with adjacent residential areas, views are maintained and at least half the site is kept as promenade, gardens and seating.	Para 4.8.8 limits the built form to between 20 and 26 homes with buildings ranging in height from 4 storeys adjacent to the waterfront to 2 storeys adjacent to Pacific Drive. Para 4.8.9 acknowledges the desire to provide views through the site and confirms that 50% of the site will remain as public open space.	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
S8-24	566	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	Support for proposals to retain 50% of the site as public open space as a good opportunity to retain and conserve a section of this existing vegetated shingle community.	Comment noted. Proposals to protect vegetated shingle community have been included as part of proposals for Site 1 and the Shingle Bank. However, it is envisaged that the public open space proposed for Site 8 will comprise formally landscaped areas and will include a new harbour walkway where the community can enjoy an area close to the water.	No change
S8-25	583	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	There must be land made available on Site 8 for berth holder facilities, services and a bridgehead, should pontoons be added to the North Harbour at some stage in the future. This should include car parking. However if Houseboats were provided in the Northern Harbour, then berth holder facilities could be reduced in size.	Para 4.8.10 acknowledges that land needs to be set aside for future berth holder's facilities, should additional pontoons need to be provided at this end of the Harbour in the future. The SPD also acknowledges in para 3.3.14 that if additional pontoons and berth holder facilities are not required in the future on the northern edge of the north harbour, then there may be the opportunity to moor houseboats there.	No change

Sovereign Harbour Retail Park

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
RP-1	75	Mrs Julia Wildman	Support for the proposals for additional retail facilities at the Retail Park to provide an improved retail offer for local residents and visitors.	Support welcomed	No change
	78	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	221	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	328	Mr Trevor Welling			
	435	Miss Hannah Fortune (Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners)			
	555	Mr Peter Walters			
RP-2	15	Mr Michael Cox	Sovereign Harbour Retail Park should be identified as a District Centre	This matter was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector's recommended that Sovereign Harbour Retail Park should be designated as a District Shopping Centre and this will be reflected in the SPD.	Amend para 3.1.12 to include reference to Sovereign Harbour Retail Park being designated as a District Shopping Centre. Amend para 4.9.1 to include reference to Sovereign Harbour Retail Park being designated as a District Shopping Centre.
	16	Mr Michael Cox			
	435	Miss Hannah Fortune (Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners)			
RP-3	22	Spencer	Delete para 4.9.5 and replaced with: 'The Council will not support additional retail and leisure development at this location to ensure that the vitality and viability of the Town Centre is not affected'.	It is considered that para 4.9.5 adequately protects the Town Centre as any improvements to the leisure and retail offer associated with the retail park will be required to demonstrate that it does not affect vitality and viability of the Town Centre.	No change
	454	Mr William Kumar (Turley Associates)			
	555	Mr Peter Walters			
RP-4	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy	Support for the proposals to provide a bus link at the Retail	Support welcomed	No change
	238	Mr Sonenthal Sonenthal			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	500	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	Park to provide a better bus service to Sovereign Harbour.		
RP-5	78	Mrs Amanda Beavon	Provision needs to be made for enhancement of pedestrian, cycle and landscaping links through to The Waterfront.	Para 4.9.6 acknowledges that it is important to ensure good pedestrian integration between the retail park and the existing complementary uses at the Waterfront It is accepted that it does not refer to cycling and this will be amended	Amend second sentence of para 4.9.6 to read: 'It is also important to ensure good pedestrian and cycle integration between the retail park and the existing complementary uses at the Waterfront and to ensure that any future development at the Sovereign Harbour Retail Park provides adequate on site car and cycle parking and good pedestrian/cycle links.'
	500	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	A requirement has been placed on the current application for the Retail Park to make such provisions but this must be retained within the SPD to guide any future new schemes.		
RP-6	177	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	The current methods of ingress and egress of the traffic to the Retail Park require improvement	The highway authority has made no representations on the existing access to Sovereign Harbour Retail Park, and it is not clear exactly what improvements are being referred to. As part of the recent application for the retail park the owners are redesigning the layout of the car park which may help with the circulation and use.	No change
	288	Mr Roger Green			
RP-7	178	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	There should be no more food outlets/eateries in the Retail Park	Comments noted. However the Retail Park provides one of the main attractions of the area for visitors and residents and further food and drink facilities will increase the offer and attraction of the Harbour. Para 4.9.5 recognises this.	No change
	179	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
RP-8	180	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	Support for the provision of additional parking, and former landfill sites can be used for this purpose.	Comment noted. However it is not clear which former landfill site is being referred to. In addition, if reference is being made to Site 5, 6 and/or 7, there are already detailed proposals for these sites which will include additional parking to serve development. If reference is being made to the Shingle Bank, the costs of removing the landfill material would be prohibitive.	No change
RP-9	181	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	Support for renewable energy at the Retail Park, although this shouldn't be funded by local residents.	Support welcomed. Residents would not be expected to make any financial contribution to the provision of renewable energy generation facilities at Sovereign Harbour Retail Park	No change
RP-10	421	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Adequate cycle parking would also be required. Reference should also be made to the need to provide adequate cycle parking with future proposals.	Agreed. Para 4.9.6 should refer to adequate cycling parking being provide with future proposals.	Amend second sentence of para 4.9.6 to read: 'It is also important to ensure good pedestrian and cycle integration between the retail park and the existing complementary uses at the Waterfront and to ensure that any future development at the Sovereign Harbour Retail Park provides adequate on site car and cycle parking and good pedestrian/cycle links.'
	501	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)			
RP-11	437	Miss Hannah Fortune (Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners)	Amend para 4.9.3 to read: 'At the time of writing this document, the Council has resolved to grant planning permission for the demolition of the existing health club and fitness building, and the erection of commercial units with a replacement cinema above. The proposals include a	Agreed in part. The amendment to the first part of the paragraph referring to the fact that planning permission has been granted is accepted. However, the final sentence regarding the improvements	Amend para 4.9.3 to read: 'At the time of writing this document, the Council has resolved to grant planning permission for the demolition of the existing health club and fitness building, and the erection of commercial units with a replacement cinema above. The proposals include a

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			change of use of the existing cinema to Class A1 retail use, and the extension of existing units for retail purposes and improvements to the pedestrian and parking facilities. As part of the application, provision will be made for bus access from Atlantic Drive and Harbour Quay to facilitate public transport connections between the North and South Harbour. The implementation of these improvements at Sovereign Harbour will help to maintain and enhance its role as a district centre.'	helping to maintain and enhance its role as a district centre cannot be accepted because the comment is considered to be in support of the planning application for the proposals at Sovereign Harbour Retail Park and as such is not relevant to the SPD.	change of use of the existing cinema to Class A1 retail use, and the extension of existing units for retail purposes and improvements to the pedestrian and parking facilities. As part of the application, provision will be made for bus access from Atlantic Drive and Harbour Quay to facilitate public transport connections between the North and South Harbour, as well as improvements to pedestrian/cycle links.'
RP-12	453	Mr William Kumar (Turley Associates)	Para 4.9.3 should be deleted and only inserted following the signing of the Section 106 and issue of Decision Notice.	This amendment is not considered necessary. The paragraph is a statement of fact at the time of writing the document and is relevant to the Sovereign Harbour Retail Park.	No change
RP-13	530	Sarah Harrison (Southern Water)	The Sovereign Harbour Retail park site is located close to two waste water pumping stations which can result in unpleasant odours and vibrations. Thus, the site layout should ensure that no habitable rooms are located fewer than 15 metres from the pumping station boundaries. Add additional text: 'Site layout should ensure that no habitable rooms are located fewer than 15 metres from the pumping station boundaries'.	This is amendment is not considered relevant to the Sovereign Harbour Retail Park as the development will not include any habitable rooms.	No change

The Boat Yard

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
BY-1	82	Mrs Amanda Beavon	Support for the proposals for the Boat Yard	Support welcomed	No change
	101	Mr Harold Henry Noble-Jacques			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	329	Mr Trevor Welling			
	442	Mr David Neilson			
	554	Mr Brian Suttie			
BY-2	195	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	More detail is required on the proposals for the Boat Yard	Para 4.10.9 acknowledges that the boat yard is not ideally situated, being adjacent to the Waterfront bars and restaurants, but there are currently no opportunities to provide an alternative site for the yard that has easy access to the water. Therefore it is not possible for provide additional detail on the proposals for the boat yard.	No change
	196	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
BY-3	531	Sarah Harrison (Southern Water)	It has been identified that there is a 450mm foul sewer and a 350mm rising main which may constrain the layout of the Boat Yard.	Agreed. A new paragraph will be added to refer to the identified 450mm foul sewer and a 350mm rising main.	Add new para 4.10.10: 'There is a 450mm diameter sewer and a 350mm diameter rising main close to the northern boundary of The Boat Yard site. This will constrain the layout of any future development of the site. Easement

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			Add additional text: 'There is a 450mm diameter sewer and a 350mm diameter rising main close to the northern boundary of The Boat Yard site. This will constrain the layout of the site. Easement strips must be left to allow access for maintenance'.		strips must be left to allow access for maintenance'. Amend Appendix 10 to include reference to easement strips.

The Shingle Bank

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
SB-1	165	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Object to proposals for the Shingle Bank on the grounds that the site could be put to better use as a car park or for residential development.	The cost of removing landfill from the site would be prohibitive to development, which is why site is being considered as open space.	No change
	182	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	197	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	198	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	222	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	418	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)			
	330	Mr Trevor Welling			
SB-2	268	Mr Bob Watts	Support for the proposals for the Shingle Bank	Support welcomed	No change
	200	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	350	Mrs Sue Watts			
SB-3	92	Linda Warner	Support for the proposals for the Shingle Bank as it has significant potential for the restoration of vegetated shingle. Appropriate restoration and sympathetic landscaping using native shingle species appropriate to the area would provide an attractive 'green space' within Sovereign Harbour and be of significant benefit to wildlife.	Agreed. Para 4.11.6 will be amended to refer to appropriate restoration and sympathetic landscaping.	Add sentence at end of para 4.11.6 to read: 'Appropriate restoration and sympathetic landscaping using native shingle species appropriate to the area would provide an attractive 'green space' within Sovereign Harbour and be of significant benefit to wildlife by restoring the naturally occurring habitat along the Shingle Bank'.
	407	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)			
	404	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)			
SB-4	310	Mr David Hitchcock	Object to the use of the Shingle Bank as an open space as it is not accessible to everyone.	Comment noted. The shingle bank is already used as a secondary open space for residents for activities such as dog walking and whilst it is noted that this open space is not accessible for all, proposals relating to other development sites in Sovereign Harbour will provide extensive areas of level, accessible public open space.	No change
	317	Mr David Hitchcock			
	318	Mr David Hitchcock			
SB-5	199	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	The cost of removing landfill should not prohibit development on the Shingle Bank.	Comment noted. However the costs associated with removing the landfill material would be likely to render any development on this site as unviable.	No change
SB-6	564	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	Concerned that the formalisation of the use of the Shingle Bank for recreational purposes poses potential risks as the site is actively gassing with only passive gas management measures in place. The status of the site is being reviewed and this includes the suitability of the management procedures and the potential risks posed by the site.	Comment noted. Para 4.11.7 acknowledges that further discussions regarding the proposals for this site would need to take place with the Environment Agency to ensure that there would be no impact on the protective membrane covering the landfill site. As part of the proposals to provide an enhanced open	See Response ID SB-3

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			The shingle bank area has great potential to be developed as a wildlife site with vegetated shingle, ponds and other coastal habitats. The existing vegetated shingle could be enhanced by removal of 'weed' species. The creation of a pond complex (subject to feasibility) using the existing dips and hollows would enable the site to support a far wider range of species and could encourage re-colonisation by rarer coastal species.	space, the Shingle Bank should provide appropriate restoration and sympathetic landscaping.	

Outer Harbour Peninsula

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
OP-1	23	Spencer	Support for the proposals for the Outer Harbour Peninsula	Support welcomed	No change
	32	Mr Peter Brown			
	44	Ms Ruth Ashworth			
	81	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	201	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	223	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	331	Mr Trevor Welling			
	269	Mr Bob Watts			
	351	Mrs Sue Watts			
OP-2	262	Mr Bob Watts	Support for the relocation of the fishing operation to the Outer Harbour Peninsula with sensitively designed fisherman seasonal storage facilities.	Para 4.12.8 indicates that it is unlikely that the fishermen would be able to relocate to the Outer Harbour Peninsula due to the considerable works that would be necessary, involving dredging the Outer Harbour and providing pontoons and access to the higher level spit. The proposals identifies for the Outer harbour Peninsula would not preclude access to the future provision of pontoons, small boating and a slipway. However, it is understood that the proposals would require the dredging of the Outer Harbour, which would involve considerable costs. In addition, proposals for Site 1 recognises that there may be opportunity to provide a public slipway into the sea from Site 1.	No change
	269	Mr Bob Watts	A safe area should also set aside for access to the future provision of pontoons, small boating and a slipway to the Outer Harbour.		
	351	Mrs Sue Watts			
	398	Mr Peter Holland (Sovereign Harbour Berth Holders Association)			
	584	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)			
OP-3	158	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Object to the relocation of the fishermen to Outer Harbour Peninsula on the grounds that dredging would be expensive and it would affect residential and visual amenity.	Para 4.12.8 indicates that it is unlikely that the fishermen would be able to relocate to the Outer Harbour Peninsula due to the considerable works that would be necessary, involving dredging the Outer Harbour and providing pontoons and access to the higher level spit.	No change
	59	Paul Risvold			
	556	Mr Peter Walters			
OP-4	190	Mr John Langton	The Outer Harbour Peninsula should be allowed to revert	The proposals identified in the SPD would not preclude the	Add sentence at end of para 4.12.9 to read: 'In addition,

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	445	Mr Ian Weeks	to a shingle habitat.	Outer Harbour Peninsula being allowed to revert to a shingle habitat. However, an amendment will be made to refer to this specifically.	opportunities for the Outer Harbour Peninsula to revert to a shingle habitat should be explored’.
OP-5	561	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	This area already has sections of high quality vegetated shingle and is an excellent seed-bank for the area. There is huge potential for further vegetated shingle restoration on this generally isolated and relatively undisturbed shingle spit. The shingle bank is retained for sea defence re-charge and there are designated tracks to protect the existing vegetated shingle. There should be no works to the east of the harbour arm. Any pedestrian access paths, seating or other amenity features should be carefully planned to avoid damage and disturbance to areas of existing high quality vegetated shingle.	Comment noted. The proposals identified in the SPD would not preclude the Outer Harbour Peninsula being allowed to revert to a shingle habitat. However, an amendment will be made to refer to this specifically. The siting of seats will be considered carefully as part of the detailed planning application with the intension of seeking to avoid damage and disturbance to areas of existing high quality vegetated shingle.	See Response ID OP-4
OP-6	562	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	Early engagement on any proposed uses for the Outer Harbour Peninsula would be welcomed as it’s an exposed position on the sea defences.	Comment noted.	No change
OP-7	584	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)	The Outer Harbour Peninsular is also perfectly suited as a location for a renewable energy facility and such a location should not be ruled out by the SPD.	The SPD would not preclude such proposals being brought forward and the appropriateness or not of any renewable energy facility would be considered on its merits as part of the planning application process.	No change

Land adjacent to the Lock Gates

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
LG-1	80	Mrs Amanda Beavon	Support for the proposals for the Land adjacent to the Lock Gates	Support welcomed	No change
	202	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	203	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	205	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	319	Mr David Hitchcock			
	332	Mr Trevor Welling			
	445	Mr Ian Weeks			
	224	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	242	Mrs Julie Cronin			
296	Mr Ray Blakebrough				
LG-2	10	Mr. Anton de Bairacli Levy	Support for the proposals for the Land adjacent to the Lock Gates, but the site should include parking for lifeboat crew	Comment noted. Para 4.13.7 of the SPD states that the site should be formally laid out as car parking for the public and possibly the berth holders. There is therefore no reason why this car park could not also be used by the lifeboat	No change
	224	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
	242	Mrs Julie Cronin			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
	207	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy		crew. However, this would be subject to further discussion with the landowners, Premier Marinas.	
LG-3	24	Spencer	The proposals for the Land adjacent to the Lock Gates should allow for few small commercial units to be built.	It is not considered appropriate to provide for any built development on this site which is relatively open and also is adjacent to a number of residential properties.	No change
	557	Mr Peter Walters			
LG-4	445	Mr Ian Weeks	Safe and secure public access and access for the maintenance of the lock gates must be retained	Comment noted. The proposals for this site will not prevent this access being maintained.	No change
	585	Mr Jonathon Stoddart (Premier Marinas)			
LG-5	206	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	Use of the site by commercial vehicles should be restricted	The parking of commercial vehicles on this land will be a matter for the landowner to enforce and is outside the scope of this planning policy document, however we would ask the landowner to consider this.	No change
LG-6	567	Mr Mark Luker (Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency)	Possible opportunity to re-create vegetated shingle or a more stable, erosion resistant coastal habitat could be created on the land adjacent to the Lock Gates, which would provide amenity value.	Comments noted. However, it is proposed that this site should be formally laid out as car parking. Nevertheless, it is also proposed that the site should be extensively landscaped which could include vegetated shingle or a more stable, erosion resistant coastal habitat.	No change

Martello Tower 64

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
MT-1	79	Mrs Amanda Beavon	Support for the proposals for the retention and protection of Martello Tower 64	Support welcomed	No change
	208	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	210	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	225	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	333	Mr Trevor Welling			
	364	Mr Michael Hilarion			
445	Mr Ian Weeks				
MT-2	30	Mr Geoff Walley	The proposals for Martello Tower 64 regarding 'repair and maintenance' are not specific enough. The wording should be amended to 'sympathetic repair and maintenance'. Also, any alternative use should be carefully considered due to restricted access.	It is considered that this paragraph is sufficiently specific as English Heritage would advise as to the appropriateness of any repair and maintenance. Any future plans to convert the building would be carefully considered to have regard to restricted access and would be subject to detailed discussions with English Heritage.	No change
MT-3	209	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	The use of the Martello Towers should be decided by the community.	Any future proposals for alternatives uses for the Martello Towers will be for the landowners, Sovereign Harbour Limited, to decide. However, such proposals would require Scheduled Monument consent and planning permission, which would be the subject of consultation with the	No change

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
				community.	
MT-4	430	Mr Andy Thompson (Strategic Housing Manager Eastbourne Borough Council)	Consideration should be given to accepting a change of use of the Martello Towers to include residential use.	Para 4.14.6 identifies that the Tower could in principle be converted into an alternative use. However having regard to its remote and exposed location and due to its poor state of repair and the associated costs of refurbishment, residential use is considered unlikely in the near future.	No change
MT-5	502	Marie Nagy (Teal Planning)	An appropriate response to this Scheduled Monument needs only to refer to the agreement of a long term plan with English Heritage.	It is considered that para 4.14.7 already provides for this as it is recommended that the owners should seek to secure long term repair and maintenance of the tower, which would be agreed with English Heritage.	No change
MT-6	408	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Options to improve the setting and condition of the two surviving Martello Towers and identification of the former location of the missing ones could be considered further.	Comment noted. With regard to the setting of Martello Tower 66, the SPD acknowledges that it would be essential to protect the setting of the Martello Tower and that it would also be necessary to retain views between Tower 66 and Martello Tower 64, which is on the opposite side of the Harbour. With regard to the setting of Martello Tower 64, the setting of this tower will be secured as part of the long term repair and maintenance regime which will be agreed with English Heritage. It is considered that the location of the missing Martello Towers could be included in the historic interpretation of the area.	No change

The Haven School

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
HS-1	67	Mr David Wells	Object to the further expansion of the Haven School on the grounds that there are already parking problems in the area and it will create additional traffic.	Comment noted. Para 3.1.17 acknowledges that there are car parking issues associated with the Haven School. However, para 4.15.9 acknowledges that the school is now well established and once the planned extensions are built there will be little land remaining for further development. There is therefore little scope for expanding the school on its current site and there is no other available land in the immediate vicinity.	No change
	76	Mrs Amanda Beavon			
	151	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy			
	357	Beavon			
	439	Mr David Neilson			
HS-2	226	Mrs Elaine de Biracli Levy	Support for the proposals for the Haven School	Support welcomed	No change
	275	Dilys Iverson			
	334	Mr Trevor Welling			

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
HS-3	25	Spencer	The Haven School should be relocated to a more accessible site and the current site should be used as a nursery and community centre.	The school is well established within the neighbourhood and there is no reason why it should be relocated. The site already includes a purpose built nursery building and there are plans to provide a community centre on Site 5 within the heart of the Sovereign Harbour development.	No change
	376	Mr Michael Hilarion			
HS-4	189	Miss Jocelyn McCarthy	Object to proposals for the Haven School on the grounds that the school is attracting children from areas outside Sovereign Harbour	Comment noted. However, issues relating to catchments of school places rest with ESCC and are outside the scope of a planning policy document.	No change
	212	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy			
HS-5	211	Mrs Elaine de Bairacli Levy	Sovereign Harbour is changing the demographic of Eastbourne and the extension to the Haven School has created problems with parking and lack of community facilities.	Comment noted. Para 3.1.17 acknowledges that there are car parking issues associated with the Haven School. During school starting and leaving time there is significant congestion around the school, due to the parents parking to drop off and pick up their children. There is therefore an agreement for the school to use Site 2 (Berth holders car park in Atlantic Drive) for parking. In addition, once the new extensions are built the school will have two halls and a larger replacement community room available for hire for community use ESCC are aware of the parking issues and proposing a Travel Plan to be in place when the school is extended to help manage the highway at peak times.	At the end of para 4.15.7 add new sentence to read: 'The School's Travel Plan will be updated before the extension opens, which may well increase the use of the berth holders car park by parents and should reduce congestion around the school by encouraging non car modes of transport. However this arrangement would be affected by any future plans for Site 2'.
HS-6	422	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	There is a condition that the School Travel Plan will be updated before the extension opens. This may well increase use of the Berth Holders Car Park by parents, and should reduce congestion around the school by encouraging non car modes of transport.	Comment noted.	No change

Other Appendices - Appendix 16

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
AP-1	408	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Support for the requirement for the submission of a biodiversity survey, although it should include a data search from the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre (SxBRC) rather than the National Biodiversity Network (NBN) Gateway because the NBN Gateway does not hold up to date information compared to SxBRC.	Comment noted.	Add a footnote relating to Biodiversity Survey and Report to confirm that it should include data from the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre
AP-2	423	Mr John Wheeler (East Sussex County Council)	Reference to parking provision should be altered to parking provision (Car & Cycle) to ensure cycle parking is given	Agreed. Reference to cycle parking, transport statements/transport reports, and travel plan statements	Amend sixth bullet of list of mandatory documents to read: Parking provision (car and cycle).

Response ID	Rep ID	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommended Change
			<p>adequate consideration.</p> <p>Reference to Transport Assessment should be changed to Transport Assessment/Transport Statement/Transport Report to cover all the differing sizes of development in the SPD.</p> <p>Reference to Travel Plan should be changed to Travel Plan/Travel Plan Statement to cover the differing sizes of development in the SPD.</p>	will be included in Appendix 16	<p>Amend eleventh bullet of additional document to be submitted to read: 'Transport Assessment/Transport Statement/Transport Report'</p> <p>Amend twelfth bullet of additional document to be submitted to read: 'Travel Plan/Travel Plan Statement'</p>