

Supplementary Report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 20th September 2017

LW/17/0045
Ringmer

Page 5

7 Additional representations received making the following additional comments

- Submission of various amended plans has made the consideration of the proposals very confusing and these have been inadequately consulted on.
- Still unclear what the extent of hedge removal will be – plans/surveys are not sufficiently clear/accurate.
- Unclear whether it has been established what will happen to the existing surface water that crosses the site.
- Appears to be uncertainty as to the need for a LEAP.
- Provision of an onsite LEAP is contrary to policy.
- Allowing a hedge to grow in close proximity of the rear of Orchard House will block light.
- Propose buffer to rear of Orchard House is insufficient. It should be a minimum of 10 metres from the boundary not the rear of the house. A 1.8m high close boarded fence must be provided to give adequate screening in the early years while the hedge is growing. The fence line should be amended to allow better protection to 5 Potters Field and extend the protection to Lionville. The fence should have a lockable gate to prevent access to the buffer zone except for maintenance. The buffer zone should be excluded from the public open space but its maintenance should be included in the document describing the management of the common areas.
- Relationship with 5 Potters Field, Orchard House, Pippins and Lionville is still not satisfactory.
- Bovis should be required to continue discussions and negotiation to resolve these issues and this can only improve the scheme.
- Electricity substation is still very close to our property (4 Norlington Court) with no sensible plan to screen it or improve the boundary. Would like a similar buffer as has been negotiated behind Orchard House.
- The impact on the drainage easement has not be satisfactorily addressed.
- Our objections in relation to neighbour amenity have not been addressed.
- Application should be withdrawn from the agenda until time has been given to consider the latest changes and the matter of the drainage easement is addressed adequately.

The following points have also been submitted in specific reference to the committee report:

- List of policies should include RNP 4.9 Green Corridors
- Policy SP6 relates to the Bishops Lane site – not Harbours Heights as stated in the report.
- There is an uncertain evidence trail leading to the conclusion that the proposed 50:50 tenure split is acceptable.

- Report should be more explicit in that removal of the northern section of the hedge is in direct conflict with condition 1 of the outline approval and policy 4.9 of the RNP.
- If LEAP is approved on site it will be open to use by anyone, with the applicants bearing the cost of maintenance. This seems unfair.
- The proposal doesn't fulfil the requirements of policy 9.7 of the RNP.
- The analysis of parking provision is wrong.
- The flats are actually short of 16 spaces not 8 as quoted.
- The surplus of spaces are within the ground of the larger dwellings and will not therefore be available to other residents

At the committee call over meeting clarification was sought regarding the housing split. The housing mix was agreed in June 2016 by the Housing Policy & Development Manager on the basis that the affordable housing proposed met the identified need and would be delivered as follows:-

- AR - 1 Bed Flat x 16
- AR - 2 Bed House x 4
- AR - 3 Bed House x 2
- SO - 2 Bed House x 22

(AR – Affordable Rented SO – Shared Ownership).

Add the following informative:

Should it be necessary during the course of the construction to divert the footpath either temporarily or permanently, you would be required to make a formal application to either ESCC or LDC depending on the nature of the diversion.

Amend condition 9 (landscaping) to read:

No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works, including particular details of tree/hedge planting and boundary treatment to the south east corner of the site (to the north of Orchard House and Pippins) and routing of the informal footpath around the north edge of the site, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting any tree, or any tree planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted destroyed or dies, another tree of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To enhance the general appearance of the development and to protect residential amenity having regard to Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan and to comply with National Policy Guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012

.....

Recommend amend condition 3, so that it more closely aligns with the likely wording of a Licence, which would be required under the Housing Act 2004:

“The maximum number of occupants (excluding that of the manager’s accommodation) shall be 14”.

.....

Condition 1 should be amended to include permeable surfacing materials.

It should read :

No development shall take place until full details of the landscaping to the southern side of the access road as shown on the approved block plan (April 2017) together with details of the surfacing materials which should be permeable, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority and the parking area shall not be brought into use until the landscaping works as approved have been implemented.

Reason; To enhance the general appearance of the development having regard to Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan and to comply with National Policy Guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.