

**Supplementary Report to the Planning Applications Committee**  
**on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2017**

**Ringmer**  
**LW/17/0279**

**Page 5**

**Ringmer Parish Council comments:**

Members of Ringmer Parish Council were pleased that the 2 affordable houses have been retained. However, Members were disappointed to see the reduction of the size and feel they would serve well as 2 bedroom dwellings given that the proposed houses state 86 (m2) and should be 93 (m2). This would assist with remaining in accordance with The Department of Communities and Local Government Technical Housing Standards.

Members consider the amendments have lost the “Farmyard feel” originally proposed the amendments outlined are significantly different and therefore, should have been submitted as a new planning application and be subject to CIL. The changes are not in accordance of the Design Statement of the Neighbourhood Plan.

**In response to the Parish Council’s objection:** Landspeed (the only registered social landlord that has shown any interest in taking on these two units and who the applicants are currently working alongside in order to bring this scheme forward) have made the following comments:

- The units are an appropriate size for a 4 person family;
- The units could also accommodate two parents with 3 small children;
- The units are larger than comparable affordable units built by the volume house builders;
- In the history of the company, Landspeed have never sold a 3 bed unit to a family of 4;
- Making the units larger would severely impact affordability and the section of society who could apply to purchase the properties;
- Affordability issues reduces the likelihood of those who qualify for affordability housing being able to secure a mortgage.

These comments have been followed by a more detailed statement which is available to view on file but provide more detail in respect of the above points.

**ESCC Highways comments:**

This application is for a variation to the condition 25 (plans) of the existing planning approval under LW/14/0830. This application is very similar being still for 11 dwellings, however, a new access is proposed approximately 18 metres further to the south of the approved position which alters the internal access/parking areas. A speed survey has been undertaken to determine the visibility splay requirements which can be met.

I am satisfied that the impact of this development (11 dwellings) can be accommodated on the highway network at the proposed new access point provided the mitigation measures are carried out. I therefore recommend that the application be approved subject to highway conditions and that the section 106/278 agreements are varied to secure the highway works previously agreed with application LW/14/0830.

**Two additional conditions** requested by the Highways Authority not already listed in the committee report are proposed:

20. No part of the development shall be occupied until such time as the existing vehicular access onto the A26 (Uckfield Road) has been physically closed in accordance with plans and details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

21. No development shall commence until such time as temporary arrangements for access and turning for construction traffic has been provided in accordance with plans and details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To secure safe and satisfactory means of vehicular access to the site during construction.

**Update list of approved plans:** with the following additional documents:

Proposed Sections	3 May 2017	Sections
Proposed Layout Plan	3 May 2017	Access Plan Extract
Proposed Layout Plan	3 May 2017	Section 278 G

---

**Seaford/ Seaford Central**  
**LW/17/0090**

**Page 19**

**AMENDED DESCRIPTION:** Single storey rear extension and (Section 73A) retrospective application for a single storey side extension.

## **5. REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS**

A second letter together with photograph's, has been received from the occupants of the property adjoining the site (the other half of the semi-detached property) to the east at 56 Belgrave Road. They have made the following comments:

1. The height of the proposed rear extension is measured from the neighbour's patio, which is considerably higher than the levels of 56 Belgrave Road. If the extension is built the open aspect to the lounge, sun terrace and garden at 56 Belgrave Road will be lost. The occupants have stated that the openness of

these areas were major factors in their decision to buy their property 13 years ago.

2. The proposed extension will result in a loss of sun and natural light to the terrace area of No 56. This particular area is used extensively to relax in. The proposed extension is a large, over-bearing structure. The building of the rear extension will mean a loss of lifestyle in three areas of the property at No. 56, including the lounge, sun terrace and garden.
3. The occupants of 56 Belgrave Road are unhappy that the officer made the recommendation without visiting their property first and considering the impact of the proposed rear extension from their garden and lounge.
4. The objectors have suggested that an appropriate compromise would be to move the proposed rear extension away from the boundary shared with their property, and further west by 1.5m.

Officer comment

The objectors have since received a visit to their property by a Planning Officer and the application site has been viewed from their garden terrace and lounge. The position and recommendation for approval remains unchanged.

The objector has also expressed concern that their property will suffer a loss of value. This is not a material planning consideration.

---

**North Chailey  
LW/16/1006**

**Page 23**

As a point of clarification, the triangular piece of land opposite the application site, to the south of the A272, is Common Land, in accordance with the Common Land Register held by East Sussex County Council.

On 15 May 2017 the applicant submitted additional drawings to show the species and pattern of planting which has been put in place between the fence and the road. The scheme includes 35 plants with species ranging from hazel, hornbeam and laurel.

---

**Lewes  
SDNP/17/00499/FUL**

**Page 28**

**Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group (LCAAG)**  
No objection

**Additional informative to read:**

Your attention is drawn to the fact that temporary consent has only been granted on the basis that the site is to remain in a tidy state and that the area around the horse chestnut tree remains clear.