

## **Agenda Item 9 - LW/24/0282 - Multi Storey Car Park, Dacre Road, Newhaven, BN9 9QX (Pages 9 - 18)**

### **1. New Lighting Impact**

The officer report explains that “light guards/cowls” could be put on the proposed new lights, using a condition if necessary.

Further to Councillor concerns, the applicant has confirmed that all perimeter new lights will have “light guards” attached.

Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that the new lights are in any case “directional and LED” designed to better light the car park but not spill into the surrounding darkness.

The car park is designed to be 24hr, with on the top floor, both

- a) Photo cell controls to switch off lights when no movement, and
- b) Timeclock – controlled facility if required.

Officers therefore recommend that no further conditions required and that the improved lighting will not unacceptably impact on neighbouring amenity.

## **Agenda Item 10 - LW/23/0360 - Southdown, Gote Lane, Ringmer (Pages 19 - 44)**

### **1. Density**

Additional slides have been added to the committee presentation to show the original scheme for 4 homes and a more substantial development, which was not supported by officers.

The site is 0.1 hect. Guidance density for villages is between 20-30 dwellings per hect.

One home on the plot = 10 dwellings per hectare

Three homes on the plot = 25-30 dwellings per hectare, which is supported by officers.

### **2. Overlooking**

**Supplementary report to the Planning Applications Committee**  
**on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2024**

Concern has been raised about potential unacceptable overlooking from the front dormer window of the proposed eastern 2 bed house into the rear garden and extension of neighbour at Home Cottage (to the east).

Officer Comment: There would be an oblique view and a distance of some 15mts. It is common for 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows to overlook gardens and rear extensions. Loss of privacy is not significant.

### **3. DM 30 Backland Development**

This policy seeks to prevent garden development having an unacceptable adverse impact on neighbouring amenity, (noise, light or other disturbances)

Seeks to prevent loss of privacy

Seeks to prevent loss of trees, shrubs, landscape features that contribute to local character/biodiversity.

Officer Comment: This matter is mainly dealt with in the officer report.

Backland development is not prevented, but it must not unacceptably harm neighbouring amenity and landscape character.

- The existing driveway would be retained
- There would be more vehicle movements and parking – but not excessively more and a landscaping buffer condition will support mitigation
- Loss of privacy would be prevented by the distances between properties
- Two landscaping conditions are proposed
- A pre commencement condition on a further bat assessment is also proposed.
- External lighting would be controlled by condition
- The character of the plot already includes development at the rear of the property.

### **4. Greenfield Development:**

Officer Comment: This site is not “greenfield”. It is “brownfield” and inside the settlement boundary.

### **5. Existing Frontage Landscaping**

Officer Comment: The access gap would need to be widened to 4.5mt, but the landscaping would be controlled by 2 conditions.

### **6. Car Parking Standards**

**Supplementary report to the Planning Applications Committee**  
**on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2024**

Overall Ringmer NP parking policy (8.3 in the Plan) would require 2 parking space each for the 2 bed; 2 for the 3 bed and a visitor space = 7

ESCC Highways would require 6+ spaces.

Officer Comment: The scheme offers 5 spaces, (including a visitor space) which Officers on balance support. This is because:

- The site is close to village amenities by walking and cycling
- There is little parking stress on neighbouring streets, particularly Springett Ave
- Further parking spaces on site would unacceptably increase loss of garden and the scheme design. As proposed the scheme represents a good example of “in settlement densification” which is an overall aim of both the Lewes and Ringmer local plans.

## **Agenda Item 11 - LW/23/0699 - 18a Firle Road, Seaford (Pages 45 - 56)**

### **1. Loss of Frontage Landscaping**

Officer Comment: There would be some loss of landscaping and small trees behind existing wall (para 8.5), to make way for the new access. A landscaping condition is proposed to compensate. The frontage grass verge would be reinstated.

The wall, currently in distress and poor repair, would be rebuilt with an appropriate design and materials

### **2. Seaford Town Council Further Objection**

*Summary: “The loss of the length of flint wall - serious adverse impact on Conservation Area*

*Important heritage asset and over 200 years old.*

*No evidence has been put forward to justify replacing - which would inevitably detract from the special character of the area”.*

Officer Comment: LPA Heritage Consultant has reviewed the proposal and supports the positive rebuilding, subject to appropriate design and materials. No significant impact on the setting of the Conservation Area.

In addition, incongruous stone planter to be removed and more in keeping grass verge replaced – this would enhance Conservation Area.

## **Agenda Item 12 - LW/23/0372 - Land adjacent to Tye Chalet, Tye Close, Saltdean (Pages 57 - 78)**

### **1. Proposed Additional 3 Conditions**

#### **a) Change to Condition 10.5 External Materials**

No external materials or finishes shall be applied until full details (including photographs) have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The material palette must be reflective of, and “sympathetic towards the surrounding landscape, and generally light materials”. Submitted details must be accompanied by a statement explaining why each material was selected and explaining how it would integrate with the surrounding landscape.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and sustainability in accordance with LLP1 policy CP11, LLP2 policy DM25, para. 135 of the NPPF.

#### **b) Public Access to South Down National Park**

Public access between Tye Close and the South Downs National Park, via the existing gate at the top of Tye Close to be retained and maintained.

Reason: In the interest of preserving access to quality natural environmental resources and sustainable travel, in accordance with LLP1 Core policies CP 10 (Environment) and CP 13 (Travel)

#### **c) Details of Retaining Walls**

Prior to any development on site, the design of retaining walls between the proposed house and the embankment fronting onto South Coast Road (A259) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of good design and maintaining a quality natural environment, in accordance with LLP1, CP 10 (Environment) and CP11 (Design) and LLP2 DM25 (Design)

**Supplementary report to the Planning Applications Committee**  
**on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2024**

Officer Comment: After consulting Lewes Building Control, it is clear that the Building Control Regulations, (should Cttee approve the scheme) would require a “ground investigation report” and “engineer designed foundations” in advance of construction. However, the lack of section plans submitted does not show retaining walls around the proposed patio and garden, or exactly how much the frontage embankment will be reduced, (estimated to be between 30-50%) – therefore this would justify such a condition.

This page is intentionally left blank