

## SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

*Supplementary Report on correspondence received since the publication of the report relating to applications being considered at the meeting of the Planning Applications Committee on 24 October 2007.*

**LW/07/0692**

**Page 17**

**Ringmer**

**Comments received from Wealden District Council:** The application site abuts the boundary between Wealden District Council and that of Lewes District and indeed land within the applicants control also lies within the Wealden District. Any application on the site must be given the most careful and sensitive considerations, in part due to its rural location but principally in view of the major incident that occurred at the site in the past year.

Any proposal at the site needs to be determined with great caution, and that all health and public safety aspects of the proposal should be fully factored into account at all stages before any permission is granted. The views of the Health and Safety executive should be sought.

Notwithstanding existing lawful or authorised uses on site should be carefully considered in the context of such issues as: design, layout, cumulative impact, sustainability, highway safety and potential intensification. The Council would not wish to see very substantial storage or industrial activities established in this location not any significant retail activity.

**Officer Response:** Careful consideration has been given to the design and layout of the proposed buildings, having regard to the land use of the site and surrounding countryside location. Due consideration has also been given to public and wider health and safety issues. The views of the Health and Safety Explosives Executive have been sought, and no objections to the proposal raised. The views of East Sussex County Council Highway Authority have also been sought, and no objections have been raised.

**Two further letters of objection received:** Consideration should be given to the maximum possible explosive capability of a maximum size HGV that will unload at the site and a bund designed in relation to this. Therefore the application should include a bund capable of protecting the local area from the worst possible scenario; The loss of life at the site should be given the greatest consideration in relation to future activities at the site; Great consideration should be given to local residents who suffered as a result of the disaster on site; There are more suitable locations for fireworks storages, away from this site which could have greater exclusions zones around them; East Sussex is a rural County a site further away from residential properties should be sought.

**One further letter of support received from Chailey Bonfire Society:** The previous onsite activities continued for many years in a quiet, unobtrusive manner with the support of the local community; The location of the business, and expertise of the owners have enabled to the society to run events; The loss of life will be in peoples minds for many years and vital lessons will be learnt, notwithstanding this, it is not a valid reason to prevent the business relocating onsite.

**Further clarification from the HSE:**

“It is not our policy to object (or otherwise) to planning applications.....Should permission be given for the development to go ahead we would review the explosives licence for the site and this could result in changes being made to the quantities and/or types of explosives allowed on the site. The company were previously advised that the quantity of explosives allowed in Building 4 would need to be reduced prior to the incident on 3 December last year due to the proximity of neighbouring buildings and they had been operating under this restriction. The construction of Building 2 would mean that this restriction on the quantity of explosives allowed in Building 4 would be re-imposed.

At callover a couple of issues were raised in relation to the proposed bund and the proximity of building 5 to the footpath.

On the issue of the bund, this was not required to enhance safety of the site but to minimise any noise impact. It is intended to extend this existing bund south-east to provide additional acoustic screening to the properties to the north and east of the site. To that end the following additional condition is proposed:

*Before the development hereby approved is brought into use, details of the proposed extension to the existing earth bund including any planting, shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the LPA and shall be implemented in accordance with any approved before occupation.*

*Reason: In the interests of protecting the amenities of nearby residential occupiers having regard to Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan.*

With regard to the proximity of Building 5 to the footpath, the HSE have responded that ‘for separation purposes....if a footpath is used by no more than 20 people in every 24 hours then it is not considered for the purposes of applying the relevant distances. It is our understanding this is the case for the footpath at the back of the site furthest from the road’.

Letter received from the applicants agent, dated 23 October 2007, sent to Members. Copy attached to this report for information.

-----

**LW/07/1022**

**Page 26**

**Ringmer**

**Comments received from Wealden District Council:** The application site abuts the boundary between Wealden District Council and that of Lewes District and indeed land within the applicants control also lies within the Wealden District. Any application on the site must be given the most careful and sensitive considerations, in part due to its rural location but principally in view of the major incident that occurred at the site in the past year.

Any proposal at the site needs to be determined with great caution, and that all health and public safety aspects of the proposal should be fully factored into account at all stages before any permission is granted. The views of the Health and Safety executive should be sought.

The proposed retail should be on a very temporary basis for the remainder of the calendar year only, while more permanent replacement arrangements are complete. .

**Officer Response:** The proposed onsite sales, subject to this application will be limited until 31<sup>st</sup> December 2007, while opening days and times also restricted. Due consideration has also been given to public and wider health and safety issues. The views of the Health and Safety Explosives Executive have been sought, and no objections to the proposal raised. The views of East Sussex County Council Highway Authority have also been sought, and no objections have been raised.

**Two further letter of support received from:** The previous onsite activities continued for many years in a quiet, unobtrusive manner with the support of the local community; The location of the business, and expertise of the owners have enabled to the society to run events; The loss of live will be in peoples minds for many years and vital lessons will be learnt, notwithstanding this, it is not a valid reason to prevent the business relocating onsite; The site is well placed for a retail outlet for fireworks and is less populated than urban area, this makes it far safer if a fire were to break out; The applicants have good product knowledge and expertise in handling fireworks and it is better that fireworks are dealt with by experts than third parties.

Letter received from the applicants agent, dated 23 October 2007, sent to Members. Copy attached to this report for information.

-----  
**LW/07/1015 Page 38**  
**Telscombe**

One additional letter of objection has been received from the occupier 342 South Coast Road. In addition to those concerns already expressed the following comments have been made:

- Lack of parking.
- Loss of privacy.
- Noise and general disturbance.

A letter has also been received from the agent in response to the Officer's Committee report. The agent has commented that the Ordnance Survey plan is out of date because it does not show the rear extension at 338 which was constructed some time ago. The comment in the report which refers to the proposed extension not respecting the scale and proportions of the existing property does not take account of the larger extension approved at the adjacent property, 338 South Coast Road. 338 South Coast Road has also been converted to flats.

-----  
**LW/07/0900 Page 45**  
**Peacehaven**

The Highway Authority does not wish to restrict grant of consent.

**LW/07/0964**  
**Lewes**

**Page 50**

Objection received from the Chamber of Commerce: loss of this heavily used car park would be unacceptable; should also be refused because it is a gross underdevelopment of the site, any plans should include Springman House and the underused ambulance station (to provide police station, affordable housing and multi storey car park); folly to allow any erosion of the town's parking stock in the wake of the damage caused to the local economy by the controlled parking scheme.

-----

**LW/07/1081**  
**Peacehaven**

**Page 12**

Letters of objection have been received from the occupiers of a further four neighbouring properties.

In addition to those concerns already summarised, the following comments have been made:

- There would not be any capacity for additional waste/recycling generated by another household.
  - The provision of flats in the area is not in keeping with its existing character which comprises single family dwelling houses.
- 

**LW/07/1004**  
**Lewes**

**Page 81**

Letter of support received from LDC Cultural Services Manager. There is a demonstrable need for such a facility within the District to enhance the tourism offer and economic impact of the local visitor economy. During the summer, the Lewes Tourist Information Centre receives a constant stream of enquiries from visitors looking for camping facilities within close proximity of Lewes and the South Downs. The current provision within the District is woefully inadequate and frequently means that visitors to the area are forced to travel to other areas.