



# PEACEHAVEN TOWN COUNCIL

TOWN CLERK  
TELEPHONE: (01273) 585493 OPTION 6  
FAX: 01273 583560  
E-MAIL: [Townclerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Townclerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)

TOWN COUNCIL OFFICE  
MERIDIAN CENTRE  
MERIDIAN WAY  
PEACEHAVEN  
EAST SUSSEX  
BN10 8BB

## **Councillors on this Committee:**

**EX OFFICIO** Cllr I Sharkey (Chair of Council), Cllr G Hill (Vice Chair of Council)

Cllr A Milliner (Chair), Cllr D Seabrook (Vice-Chair), Cllr I Sharkey, Cllr G Hill, Cllr A Goble, Cllr S Griffiths,  
Cllr D Paul, Cllr R White

**18<sup>th</sup> August 2021**

**Dear Committee Member,**

You are summoned to a meeting of the **PLANNING & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE** which will be held in the Main Hall, Community House, Peacehaven on **Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> August 2021 at 7.30pm.**

**Tony Allen**  
Town Clerk

## **A G E N D A**

### **GENERAL BUSINESS**

#### **1 PH1130 CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### **2 PH1131 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There will be a 15 minute period when members of the public may ask questions (which have been submitted in writing to the Admin Officer and received by 12 noon on the day of the meeting) on any matters that affect the Town. **Please email the Town Clerk for access to this meeting.**

#### **3 PH1132 TO CONSIDER APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & SUBSTITUTIONS**

#### **4 PH1133 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

#### **5 PH1134 TO ADOPT THE MINUTES FROM THE 3<sup>rd</sup> AUGUST 2021**

#### **6 PH1135 UPDATE FROM CLLR GALLAGHER CHAIR OF THE STEERING GROUP FOR THE NDP**

#### **7 PH1136 TO NOTE AND REVIEW THE COMMITTEES BUDGETARY REPORT**

**Agenda of the Planning & Highways Committee – Tuesday 24th August 2021**

## **Agenda of the Planning & Highways Committee - Tuesday 24th August 2021**

### **8 TO CONSIDER Planning applications as follows:-**

<b>PH1137 LW/21/0632</b> 44 Capel Avenue Peacehaven  <b>Case Officer</b> Tom Bagshaw	Two-storey and single-storey rear extension  <a href="https://padocs.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/planning/planning-documents?ref_no=LW/21/0632">https://padocs.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/planning/planning-documents?ref_no=LW/21/0632</a>
<b>PH1138 LW/21/0553</b> 6 Heathdown Close Peacehaven  <b>Case Officer</b>	Erection to two storey rear extension and single storey side extension
<b>PH1139 LW/21/0540</b> 116 South Coast Road Peacehaven  <b>Case Officer</b> James Emery	single-storey side and rear extension, alterations to roof to include raising side hip to form gable and 1no rear dormer

### **9 TO NOTE the following planning applications:-**

<b>PH1140 TW/21/0051/TPO</b> 9 The Compts Peacehaven  <b>Case Officer</b> Nick Jones	To fell the Sycamore trees  <a href="https://padocs.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/planning/planning-documents?ref_no=TW/21/0051/TPO">https://padocs.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/planning/planning-documents?ref_no=TW/21/0051/TPO</a>
<b>PH1141 LW/21/0481</b> 138 South Coast Road Peacehaven  <b>Case Officer</b> Tom Bagshaw	Variation of condition 2 in relation to approval LW/18/0630 Removal of cladding (owing to fire risk) Replace material schedule with current letter/schedule  <a href="https://padocs.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/planning/planning-documents?ref_no=LW/21/0481">https://padocs.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/planning/planning-documents?ref_no=LW/21/0481</a>

**10 PH1142 TO REVIEW & UPDATE THE P&H ACTION PLAN**

**11 PH1143 TO APPROVE THE RESPONSE TO THE LDC LOCAL PLAN (ISSUES & OPTIONS) CONSULTATION**

**12 PH1144 TO APPROVE THE RESPONSE TO THE RAMPION 2 CONSULTATION**

**13 PH1145 TO RECEIVE CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING ROAD/PUBLIC SAFETY IN BRAMBER AVENUE**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING 21<sup>ST</sup> SEPTEMBER 2021 AT 7.30PM**

**Agenda of the Planning & Highways Committee - Tuesday 24th August 2021**



# **PEACEHAVEN TOWN COUNCIL**

TOWN CLERK  
TELEPHONE: (01273) 585493 OPTION 6  
FAX: 01273 583560  
E-MAIL: [Townclerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Townclerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)

TOWN COUNCIL OFFICE  
MERIDIAN CENTRE  
MERIDIAN WAY  
PEACEHAVEN  
EAST SUSSEX  
BN10 8BB

## **DRAFT Minutes of the meeting of the Planning & Highways Committee held at 7.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021**

**Present;** Cllr A Milliner (Chair), Cllr D Seabrook (Vice Chair), Cllr S Griffiths, Cllr Sharkey, Cllr D Paul, Cllr R White, Cllr C Gallagher.

**Officers;** A Allen, Town Clerk

**Public;** Three members of the public were present.

### **1 PH1106 CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Cllr Gallagher stated that she was making an audio recording of the meeting.

### **2 PH1107 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Mr Gatti asked the following question:-

*"Would it be possible for the committee to ask ESCC Highways what the widening of the southbound carriageway at the Sutton Avenue - A259 roundabout, by such a small amount supposed to achieve? There have always been two lanes at this section of the roundabout, one to turn left towards Newhaven, and one to turn right to Brighton. this minor adjustment will have little or no effect on traffic flows, and will make it more difficult for pedestrians to cross safely, especially those with prams etc. If this was paid for as I believe it was from CIL contributions, it appears to be money wasted that could be better spent elsewhere."*

In response, Cllr Seabrook made the following points:-

- The widening of this area of road has made the crossing point very dangerous for pedestrians.
- It was S.106 monies that were used to fund these works; funds which could have been put to better use.
- ESCC's intention was to increase the flow of vehicular traffic at this point, but it refused to add a pedestrian crossing to compensate for this.

Cllr Paul noted that this issue had been raised at the last ESCC SLR meeting, but accident statistics did not put this as a high priority.

Cllr White suggested obtaining statistics from other bodies, e.g. SECAMB.

The Clerk stated that he will write a letter of complaint to ESCC and also try to obtain accident statistics for this area.

Cllr Paul stated that she will raise this issue again at the next ESCC SLR meeting.

Mr Seed reported that ESCC has made an Order to add the pathway between Firle Road and Glynn Road to the Definitive Map of Public Pathways.

### **1 PH1108 TO CONSIDER APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr A Goble and Cllr G Hill. Cllr Gallagher substituted for Cllr Goble.

### **2 PH1109 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

There were no declarations of interests.

### **3 PH1110 TO ADOPT THE MINUTES FROM THE 6<sup>th</sup> JULY 2021**

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee Meeting – Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021**

## **Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee Meeting - Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021**

It was resolved to adopt the minutes as a true record.

### **4 PH1111 UPDATE FROM CLLR GALLAGHER CHAIR OF THE STEERING GROUP FOR THE NDP**

Cllr Gallagher reported on the following items:-

- Information gathering for the Green Spaces part of the NDP.
- Nearly all of the NDP Policies have now been drafted.
- The Housing Needs Assessment is expected shortly.
- Usefulness of a recent climate event held in Seaford.
- Sustainable/community energy scheme.

### **1 PH1112 TO NOTE AND REVIEW THE COMMITTEES BUDGETARY REPORT**

The report was received and noted.

### **2 PH1113 LOWER HODDERN FARM DEVELOPMENT**

The SPO's report was received and noted.

It was noted that the proposed development was not in Peacehaven, but in Piddinghoe, so PTC will not automatically be notified of any further developments/applications for this site; a close watch will have to be kept.

SDNPA had made it clear that such a development is unacceptable.

### **3 PH1114 MINUTES LOWER HODDERN FARM**

The notes of the recent LDC working group meeting were received and noted.

The Chairman noted that he would like to participate in these meetings and possibly one or two other Councillors would as well.

Cllr White noted the need for PTC to be able to influence the Active Travel Plan, especially the development of footpaths in the Big Park area.

### **4 PH1115 TO DISCUSS TRAINING FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

It was noted that the SPO is arranging a training session with LDC Planning Officers.

Clerk to send current criteria used for assessing planning applications to LDC for validation.

### **5 PH1116 RENEWAL OF THE BUS SHELTER (SUTTON AVENUE/KEMPTON HOUSE)**

The Parks Officer's report was noted and discussed.

It was agreed that three quotes should be obtained for the following specification:-

- Partly enclosed shelter, to allow some protection from the wind and rain.
- Shelter with an entrance and exit for safety.
- Green roof (type of drainage system used to be specified).
- Seating provided.

Once finalised, case to go directly to the Policy & Finance Committee.

### **1 PH1117 NEW HOUSES AT WEBS YARD entrance to Epinay Park**

Cllr Griffiths related the background to this item.

It was resolved that the Clerk will arrange a meeting with the developer to discuss its proposed access to Epinay Park, the enhancement of the PTC access and the maintenance of the chain link fence. Councillors Symonds, Griffiths and Paul were nominated to represent PTC.

### **2 PH1118 CONCRETE PATH (LOWER HODDERN/CENTENARY PARK)**

Cllr Griffith's paper was noted and discussed. It was resolved that:-

- The public consultation is relaunched.

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee Meeting - Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021**

- Clerk to make contact with the appropriate person at Barratts Homes regarding the potential gifting of the path in its ownership; for reporting at Council.

**1 TO CONSIDER Planning applications as follows:-**

<b>PH1119 LW/21/0410</b>  Land Adjoining 138 Bramber Avenue North Peacehaven	Erection of single storey one bedroom dwelling  It was resolved to <b>recommend refusal</b> on the following grounds:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over development – the proposed new dwelling is being squeezed into a tight space.</li> <li>• Loss of amenity – the amenity land and a walkway for the adjacent flats will be lost.</li> <li>• Loss of light – the windows of one flat will be blocked.</li> </ul>
<b>PH1120 LW/21/0555</b> 4 Anzac close Peacehaven	Single-storey side extension  It was resolved to <b>recommend refusal</b> on the following grounds:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over development – in relation to the size of the proposed extension in relation to the size of the existing dwelling.</li> </ul>
<b>PH1121 LW/21/0602</b> Flat 1 2 Dorothy Avenue Peacehaven	Single storey front extension  It was resolved to <b>recommend approval</b> .
<b>PH1122 LW/21/0569</b> 54 Glynn Road	Single-storey rear extension and associated internal alterations  It was resolved to <b>recommend approval</b> .
<b>PH1123 LW/21/0579</b> 63 Cairo Avenue Peacehaven	Demolish existing conservatory and erection of single-story extension with flat roof  It was resolved to <b>recommend approval</b> .

**15 The following Planning Application Decisions made under Delegated Powers were noted:-**

<b>PH1124 LW/21/0444</b> 1 Sunview Avenue Peacehaven East Sussex BN10 8PJ	Replacement of existing side facing rooflights with dormer The Town Clerk of Peacehaven Town Council recommended to <b>Approve</b> <b>Recommendation made by the Town Clerk under delegated powers.</b>
<b>PH1125 LW/21/0436</b> 6 Foxhill Avenue	Replacement of existing flat roof rear single-storey extension with single storey mono-pitch rear extension; replacement of double door on front elevation with window The Town Clerk of Peacehaven Town Council recommends <b>Refusal</b> <b>Recommendation made by the Town Clerk</b>

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee Meeting - Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021**

	<p><b>under delegated powers.</b></p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There will be loss of privacy and adverse impacts for immediate neighbours in respect of outlook and daylight – proposals will result in unacceptable over-looking and are too close to neighbouring boundaries</li><li>• There will be loss of light resulting from the proposals being so close to neighbouring properties.</li></ul>
--	--

**16 The following planning application decisions were noted :-**

<p><b>PH1126 LW/21/0429</b> 110 Cairo Avenue Peacehaven East Sussex</p>	<p>Certificate of lawfulness for proposed use of the property as children's home to provide 24hr care for no more than two children/young people between the ages of 9 and 17 years</p> <p><b>Decision Refused</b></p>
<p><b>PH1127 LW/21/0546</b> 114 Arundel Road Peacehaven</p>	<p>Single storey front extension</p> <p>A lawful development certificate.</p>
<p><b>PH1128 LW/21/0459</b> 22 Cairo Avenue</p>	<p>Loft conversion with one roof light to front elevation, two roof lights to left elevation, three roof lights to right elevation and one roof light to rear elevation</p> <p>A lawful development certificate.</p>

**17 PH1129 TO REVIEW & UPDATE THE P&H ACTION PLAN.**

The Action Plan was reviewed.

It was agreed to include the replacement of the Sutton Avenue bus shelter.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING 24<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2021 AT 7.30PM**

*There being no further business, the meeting closed at 20:30.*

## Detailed Income &amp; Expenditure by Budget Heading 10/08/2021

Month No: 5

## Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<u>200 Planning &amp; Highways</u>							
4851 Noticeboards	0	1,100	1,100		1,100	0.0%	
4852 Monument & War Memorial	0	600	600		600	0.0%	
4853 Street Furniture	0	600	600		600	0.0%	
Planning & Highways :- Direct Expenditure	<b>0</b>	<b>2,300</b>	<b>2,300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,300</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>
4101 Repair/Alteration of Premises	24	1,000	976		976	2.4%	
4111 Electricity	456	1,092	636		636	41.8%	91
4171 Grounds Maintenance Costs	198	500	302		302	39.7%	
4850 Grass Cutting Contract	8,687	8,687	0		0	100.0%	
Planning & Highways :- Indirect Expenditure	<b>9,366</b>	<b>11,279</b>	<b>1,913</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,913</b>	<b>83.0%</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>(9,366)</b>	<b>(13,579)</b>	<b>(4,213)</b>				
6000 plus Transfer from EMR	91						
<b>Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve</b>	<b>(9,275)</b>						
Grand Totals:- Income	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>0.0%</b>	
Expenditure	<b>9,366</b>	<b>13,579</b>	<b>4,213</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,213</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	
<b>Net Income over Expenditure</b>	<b>(9,366)</b>	<b>(13,579)</b>	<b>(4,213)</b>				
plus Transfer from EMR	91						
<b>Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve</b>	<b>(9,275)</b>						



		<b>Planning &amp; Highways Committee - Action Plan</b>		<b>updated 03/08/21</b>	
CASE NUMBER	MEETING DATE	TASK	ACTION	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	UPDATE
1	03.09.2019	PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY WORKING GROUP - CONCRETE PATH LOWER HODDERN FARM TO CENTENARY PARK	Cllr Griffiths requested help from other councillors filling in evidence forms (extend of usage prior to 2005)	Cllr Griffiths - ongoing	consultation progressing for the concrete path
2	10.11.2020	Traffic Regulation Orders - In the interim, it was agreed to raise the issues of anti-social parking with the owners of the premises concerned and to encourage the use of Operation Crackdown reporting by residents.	Raise the issues of anti-social parking with the owners of premises	Admin. Officer	* ongoing - admin officer responding to residents as and when needed. * Admin Officer will be submitting a report to P&F for Bollards.
3	04.01.2021	6 lamposts			The Parks Officer Kevin Bray has been in contact with Eric Ware (electrical supervisor East Sussex Highways) and a meeting will be held to discuss all of our outside lighting issues once the covid restrictions have eased.  * still waiting for Eric Ware to visit. 9/7/21
4	09.07.2021	two planters intended for Subway area	due to problems with Licences. The planters intended for outside subway, will be placed at The Dell or Howard Park		It was decided at the L&A Meeting to place the two planters at Howard Park
5	03.08.2021	replacement bus shelter at sutton Ave	To Policy & Finance Committee for final approval on the 17th August 2021.	Town Clerk	
6	03.08.2021	Widening of the southbound carriageway at t	The Clerk stated that he will write a letter of complaint to ESCC and also try to obtain accident statistics for this area.	Town Clerk	

## Lewes District Local Plan - Issues and Options



Please respond to the consultation by completing the questions below.

You are welcome to comment on every issue, or you can focus on the ones that specifically interest you.

### Your Details

*Data Protection and Privacy Notice*

*For further information about how the council uses your information and your rights, please read our privacy notice [here](#)*

Name:

Tony Allen, Town Clerk

Organisation (if relevant):

Peacehaven Town Council

Agent providing comments on behalf of (if relevant):

N/A

Email Address:

townclerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk

What type of stakeholder are you / who are you representing:

☐

Member of the public (Resident of Lewes District)

☐

Member of the public (Resident elsewhere)

☐

Local business/employer

☒

Neighbouring District/Parish Council

☐

Local group/organisation

☐

Residents Association

☐

National group/organisation

☐

Planning Consultant

☐

Landowner/Developer

☐

Infrastructure/service provider

☐

Other – please describe:

## Tackling Climate Change

- 1.1 How can the new Local Plan best promote energy efficiency in new development and the Council's ambition of net zero carbon? Should the new Local Plan work towards setting lower carbon emissions targets for new homes/buildings than those set out in Building Regulations?

The new LP should not be led or dependent on Government initiatives in relation to tackling climate change. These are lagging behind initiatives in the District, Towns and Parishes.

The LP should provide autonomy for LDC to lead the way in collaboration with the emerging climate change groups in the Towns and Parishes. For planning applications, the highest standard of materials etc. available at the time should be insisted upon.

- 1.2 Should the New Local Plan require all development proposals to:

- ☒ Provide evidence of circular economy principles and waste reduction - requiring retention of existing buildings unless evidence of need to demolish?
- ☒ Evidence reductions in carbon by prioritising the use of materials and construction techniques that have smaller ecological and carbon footprints?
- ☒ Consider the lifecycle of the building and whether it can be easily adapted to meet changing needs?

Please enter any additional comments

- 1.3 Should the new Local Plan require all new development to include small-scale renewable energy generation on site?

Yes.

- 1.4 Should the new Local Plan require all large-scale developments to consider community scale renewable energy generation?

Yes.

- 1.5 Should the new Local Plan allocate land for large scale renewable energy generation, such as wind and solar? If so what types? Or should the Council rely on Neighbourhood Plans to identify suitable sites for renewables to reflect local community aspirations?

Deferral to adopted or emerging Neighbourhood Plans.

1.6 Should the new Local Plan set out more specific requirements for tree planting in new development?

Yes.

1.7 Should the new Local Plan allocate land for tree planting and/or woodland expansion?

Yes.

1.8 Should the new Local Plan identify critical corridors, perhaps based upon water courses, for potential planting of trees and/or other types of rewilding such as heritage grassland, which would enable storage of water, carbon storage and improved wildlife movement and biodiversity resilience?

Yes - large and small scale corridors are essential.

1.9 Should the new Local Plan introduce a policy supporting food growing? Should the Local Plan require all major housing developments to provide food growing space?

Allotments should be a priority.

1.10 Should the new Local Plan support the Council's Climate Change and Sustainability Strategy more stringent (100l) target for water consumption in new buildings or go further?

Yes, as far as is deliverable.

1.11 To encourage modal shift, should the new Local Plan require EVCP at all new development and should that be at the level in the Councils EVCP TAN?

- 1.12 In order to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport should the new Local Plan set higher cycle parking requirements for new residential development than current East Sussex County Council standards?

Yes.

- 1.13 What else can be done through the new Local Plan to encourage a modal shift towards more sustainable modes of travel?

Mandatory provision of vehicle charging points.

- 1.14 Should a Coastal Change Management Area(s) be defined where the SMP has already identified physical changes to the shoreline?

- 1.15 Are there any other 'Tackling Climate Change' issues that should be considered?

There should be an LDC led coalition of Towns & Parishes, to support the development of local climate change improvement measures.

## Protecting and Enhancing the Quality of the Environment

2.1 Should we require a 20% biodiversity net gain in all major developments?

Yes.

2.2 Should the new Local Plan seek to identify/allocate sites to provide off-site biodiversity net gain?

Yes.

2.3 How can the new Local Plan best achieve an effective policy for a Nature Recovery Network?

By restricting development in areas where nature recovery can be enacted.

2.4 In the context of the new Local Plan what would enhance your town / village?

Protection and enhancement of all green spaces and coastal areas.

2.5 What would you consider to be 'beautiful' in terms of development?

Something liked by the majority of the public.

2.6 Should the Council prepare specific design codes that cover the whole plan area, specific parts of the plan area, or for individual sites?

For the whole Plan area, with deferral to design codes contained in adopted and emerging Neighbourhood Plans.

2.7 How can communities have a greater say in the design standards set for their area?

Via adopted or emerging Local Plans and being able to make a more detailed input to the emerging LDC Local Plan.

2.8 Are there additional areas that should be investigated for potential Conservation Areas?

Yes.

## Accommodating and Delivering Growth

3.1 Are there any options for accommodating development growth that the Council has missed?

Not in Peacehaven

3.2 What is your preferred option, or combination of options?

☐

Intensification of development within the coastal towns

☐

Further outward expansion of Newhaven and Peacehaven

☒

Urban extensions to Burgess Hill and Haywards Heath

☒

Focussing growth on the most sustainable villages in the Low Weald

☐

Dispersing growth across all villages in the Low Weald

☒

A new settlement within the Low Weald

Please explain why this is your preferred option

Peacehaven had been identified as a growth area, but this is challenged, not least because of the size of recent developments and the overstretched infrastructure in the Town. In fact, the focus for Peacehaven should be more about preserving and protecting what remains, especially green spaces, beach frontage, etc.

Peacehaven continues to be victim to creeping/piecemeal development. For example, it is estimated that the continuous demolition/conversion of bungalows has added around 500 additional homes in the town.

Added to this the Hoddern Farm and other developments account for around 1000 additional homes.



## Improving Access to Housing

- 4.1 Should the new Local Plan seek the maximum viable affordable housing target on sites of 10 or more dwellings?

Yes.  
Truly affordable housing is needed in Peacehaven. Recent developments are beyond the reach of most people.

- 4.2 Should the new Local Plan maintain the Council's preference for an affordable housing tenure split of 75% affordable rented homes and 25% intermediate homes, or should it pursue a different approach?

It should use a mixed approach that provides affordable housing for all who need it, dependant on the area in question and the related Housing Needs Assessment.

- 4.3 Should the new Local Plan have a locally specific approach to supporting the development of 'First Home exception sites' (as it currently has for rural exception sites) or should the Council rely on national planning policy?

A specific local approach is needed.

- 4.4 Are there any other issues that the new Local Plan should be considering?

- 4.5 Should the new Local Plan go beyond the mandatory building regulations to ensure that a proportion of new homes are accessible and adaptable? In what circumstances should this be applied?

Yes - a minimum of 10% should be set.

- 4.6 How can the new Local Plan be more responsive to the needs of younger households, older people and custom/self-builders?

By encouraging suitably related developments of smaller, properly affordable homes on an area by area basis.

- 4.7 Should the new Local Plan ensure that a proportion of new homes are one or two bedroom dwellings that are more affordable for first time buyers? In what circumstances should this be applied?

Yes.

This is clearly needed in Peacehaven. It can be determined on a local basis from the numerous statistics available, from the Housing Needs Assessment and by talking to the Town/Parish Councils.

- 4.8 Should the new Local Plan require all new homes to meet the nationally described space standard?

- 4.9 Should the Council be applying minimum density standards across the whole plan area, or only applying them in specific locations such as town centres, train stations, and routes with reliable and frequent bus services, e.g. A259?

- 4.10 Are there any other issues that the Council should be considering?

## Promoting a Prosperous Economy and Building Community Wealth

5.1 How much employment development is required to support a sustainable economy?

Enough to ensure that there is enough employment in or close to Towns to mitigate the need for commuting long distances.

5.2 What type of employment space should the new Local Plan prioritise?

Health Centres  
Community Hubs  
Health care – urgent need for additional GP and related/referral services within the Town  
Small business start ups

5.3 How can policies made flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated, particularly as economic implications of the Covid-19 pandemic are unknown?

Pre-existing conditions cannot keep being discounted. The A259 South Coast Road, the schools, doctors' surgery, in fact the whole infrastructure is at breaking point.

5.4 How can the new Local Plan best meet the needs of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises?

5.5 How much additional retail and space for town centre uses is required to support a sustainable economy?

The future of the centre of Peacehaven Town, in particular the Meridian Centre is still uncertain. This area must continue to be recognised as a significant District Town Centre in the new LDC Local Plan. There should be an abundance of retail outlets, otherwise it simply becomes a 'parade' of shops within a housing estate.

5.6 What type of space should the new Local Plan prioritise?

Public space for recreation and meeting.  
Space for outdoor markets, coffee stalls, eating, etc.  
Safe walkways and cycle routes.  
DDA compliancy.

5.7 How should the new Local Plan address the provision of small-scale retail uses, for example convenience shops, outside of designated town centres?

By ensuring that these are contiguous and not dispersed over a wide area.

5.8 How can the new Local Plan help enhance the visitor offer?

Peacehaven is the gateway to the South Downs National Park and it is the entry point in the UK for the Greenwich Meridian.  
Tapping the great potential for tourism, with the Peacehaven Town's location adjacent to the SDNPA and the coast is essential to the local economy.

5.9 Should the new Local Plan identify new development to facilitate tourism growth, and if so what and where?

Yes - everything from signage, walking maps, linked walkways and cycle ways, promotional and informational materials

5.10 Should the new Local Plan seek to protect facilities and attractions that could be critical to sustaining the visitor economy?

Yes, including historical buildings, monuments, etc.

5.11 What else can the new Local Plan specifically do to support the rural economy?

5.12 How can the new Local Plan help support Newhaven as a key strategic asset for the local economy and help promote the regeneration of the town?

By working with ESCC to greatly enhance traffic flow along the A259/South Coast Road.

5.13 Should the new Local Plan focus provision for new employment space within the towns or the countryside?

Towns - this is where it is most needed.

5.14 How can the new Local Plan support the vitality and viability of town and village centres in light of changes to permitted development rights?

5.15 How can the new Local Plan protect the employment space, and where should the focus of that protection be?

5.16 Should the approach to local labour be a blanket approach for the plan area, or should it focus on specific locations? We welcome comments from developers as to how.

## Creating Healthy Sustainable Communities with Infrastructure

6.1 On what types of infrastructure should the Council prioritise developer contributions? Should the Council require:

- ☐ a) a greater proportion of affordable housing but lower overall design and other infrastructure requirements?
- ☒ b) a lower proportion of affordable housing but higher overall design standards and other infrastructure requirements?

Please enter any additional comments

6.2 Whether you prefer Option (a) or (b), what do you think is more important out of the following:

- ☐ Enhanced carbon reduction design/renewable energy infrastructure?
- ☐ Accessible, adaptable or fully wheelchair accessible homes?
- ☒ Strategic infrastructure (school places, transport improvements, sports facilities, etc.)?

Please enter any additional comments

This is the most urgent need in Peacehaven.

6.3 Should the new Local Plan introduce specific benchmark standards for the provision of other open spaces, in addition to the existing standards for outdoor playing space? If so, which types of open space should be addressed?

In Peacehaven the number of outdoor sports fields and activities is well below average.

6.4 Should the new Local Plan require Health Impact Assessments for larger development proposals? How should the threshold be determined?

6.5 Should strategic housing site allocations (100+ dwellings) incorporate Active Design principles?

Yes, including safe walking, and safe cycling, linked walkways/cycleways, links between green spaces.

6.6 Should the 10-20 minute neighbourhood concept be adopted by the new Local Plan?

Yes - this is essential for the integration within the Town.

6.7 If so, should the 10-20 minute neighbourhood principles be applied differently in towns compared to villages within the plan area?

No.

6.8 Should the 10-20 minute neighbourhood principles be a requirement of all major new developments, or only on strategic housing site allocations?

The principles should apply to all.

6.9 Should new development be required make provision for a superfast broadband connection, or an equivalent alternative technology, installed on an open access basis?

Yes, this is a modern requirement.

6.10 If so, should this policy apply to only residential, or to both residential and non-residential, development?

All developments.

## General Questions

You may also like to consider the following general questions:

Has the Council identified the right issues?

The provisions of the emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan must be given due weight in all planning matters. This will go some way to controlling some of the above areas of concern.

The aspirations of the emerging new LDC Local Plan are worthy, but will remain as just a wish list unless there is an holistic approach to individual areas/towns, with joined up thinking between all authorities.

Peacehaven needs significant investment – now.

Has the Council missed anything?

Peacehaven is in fact the 'forgotten Town'. The following areas have been neglected for too long:-

- Adequate Town wide public transport.
- Road safety for pedestrians & cyclists.
- Traffic congestion.
- Traffic safety/speeding measures.
- Health care – urgent need for preventative measures. Not the lack of playing fields and sports clubs compared to the rest of District.
- Community Hub.
- Addressing the level of poverty.
- Addressing the low level of literacy and IT skills.
- Supporting education.

Will the information the Council is collecting tell us what we need to know?

Direct engagement with Town & Parish Councils is essential in order to obtain the most accurate picture.

What are your views on the Council's current strategic planning policies and the decisions they lead to?

Not enough consideration for the local situation and impacts.

What do you feel needs changing and what shouldn't change?

## Thank You!

Thank you for responding to the Issues and Options consultation.

Please return your response by uploading it via the on-line Consultation Portal ([www.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/LDLocalPlan](http://www.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/LDLocalPlan)) or by emailing it to [ldf@lewes.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@lewes.gov.uk)



# Rampion 2 Consultation Response Form

Page 1 of 5

Survey closes 16 Sep 2021

## Have your say Rampion 2 proposals

*Please complete this consultation response form to let us know your views on the offshore wind farm and onshore elements of the proposal.*

*The closing date for responses is Thursday 16 September 2021 at 11:59pm.*

*We welcome all comments and feedback on our proposals. This consultation response form includes space to provide your views on our offshore and onshore proposals, as well as specific questions to inform the next stage of refinements to our proposals. Questions which provide space for you to write in your responses are significantly longer than it appears on the page.*

*Responses to consultation may be made publicly available, but any personal information will be kept confidential and will be safeguarded and processed in accordance with the requirements of privacy and data protection legislation and in line with the [Rampion 2 Privacy Policy](#). Rampion Extension Development Limited ("RED") and our trusted third party suppliers will use your personal information for the purpose of administering this consultation and assessing the responses. Using your email address, we may contact you to let you know when the results of the consultation are published.*

### Offshore Proposals

**1. Our Non-technical Summary and the Preliminary Environmental Information Report summarise the findings of the preliminary assessment of key environmental issues which have shaped the current proposals. To what extent do you agree that we've identified and assessed the important issues relating to the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed offshore turbines, array cables, offshore substations, and export cables?**

- ☐ Strongly Agree ☒ **Agree** ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Not sure / prefer not to say

Peacehaven Town Council approves of the use of windfarm power generation and the area of Peacehaven is largely only affected by the view of the pylons/turbines.

There are many benefits to this project and a 2-3% contribution to local communities would seem a fair recompense for mitigating the impact on views, wind and seabed and land for cable and substations, etc.

Community benefits need to be transparent and tailored to the community. It is best if the local communities are involved in this aspect of the project, including the management and allocation of these funds.

It would be good to have access to the figures estimated for community contributions.

**2. Do you have any suggestions for additional impacts and issues we should consider and ways in which our offshore proposals could be improved to mitigate impacts to the environment and local community?**

It would be best if the new pylons/turbines are sited as far out from shore as possible, to mitigate the increased height compared to the existing pylons/turbines.

Minimal or no impact on the delicate marine ecosystems.

**3. Do you have any additional feedback about the offshore wind farm you'd like to share?**

---

## Onshore Proposals

**4. Our Non-technical Summary of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report summarises our preliminary assessment of the key environmental issues which have shaped the current proposals. To what extent do you agree that we've identified and assessed the important issues relating to the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed landfall, underground cable route, and onshore substation options?**

☐ Strongly Agree ☒ Agree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Not sure / prefer not to say

**5. Do you have any suggestions for additional impacts and issues we should consider and ways in which our onshore proposals could be improved to mitigate impacts to the environment and local community?**

Minimal or no impact on the delicate natural habitats that may be disturbed for the cable routing, sub-stations, etc.

**6. To help us develop a more detailed construction timetable for the underground cable route, are there any specific local / seasonal events or activities which occur that we should be aware of?**

Not affected by activities in Peacehaven.

**7. Do you have any additional feedback about the proposed landfall, underground cable route, or substation site options you'd like to share?**

---

## More about you

**8. We'd like to know a bit more about you. How would you characterise your use of or interest in the development area? (Select all that apply)**

- ☐ I live in the area ☐ I visit the area for recreational, holiday or leisure purposes  
☐ I work in the area ☐ I attend full- or part-time education in the area ☒ **Other**

Response sent on behalf of Peacehaven Town Council

**9. We have published a range of information on our consultation page [www.rampion2.com/consultation](http://www.rampion2.com/consultation). Do you have any specific concerns that have not been addressed in the consultation materials or any comments that you would like to make in regards to the consultation?**

No.

**10. If responding in an official capacity on behalf of an organisation, business, or campaign group, please provide us with the name of that organisation and your position within it.**

---

**Tony Allen**

**Town Clerk**

**Tel: 01273 585493**

Peacehaven Town Council

Community House

The Meridian Centre

Peacehaven

BN10 8BB

Office: 01273 585493 / Mobile: 07702958026

PLANNING & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

24<sup>th</sup> August 2021

PH1145

----- Original message -----

From: [REDACTED]  
Date: 14/08/2021 10:39 (GMT+00:00)  
To: Claude Cheta <[Cllr.ClaudeCheta@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.ClaudeCheta@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Lynda Duhigg <[Cllr.LyndaDuhigg@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.LyndaDuhigg@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Chris Collier <[Cllr.ChrisCollier@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.ChrisCollier@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Cathy Gallagher <[Cllr.CathyGallagher@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.CathyGallagher@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Isobel Sharkey <[Cllr.IsobelSharkey@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.IsobelSharkey@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, "Cllr. Job Harris" <[Cllr.JobHarris@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.JobHarris@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, "Cllr. Katie Sanderson" <[Cllr.KatieSanderson@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.KatieSanderson@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Alan Goble <[Cllr.AlanGoble@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.AlanGoble@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Gloria Hill <[Cllr.GloriaHill@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.GloriaHill@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, David Seabrook <[Cllr.DavidSeabrook@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.DavidSeabrook@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, "Cllr.Ron White" <[Cllr.RonWhite@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.RonWhite@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Alan Milliner <[Cllr.AlanMilliner@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.AlanMilliner@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Emilia Simmons <[Cllr.EmiliaSimmons@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.EmiliaSimmons@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Wendy Veck <[Cllr.WendyVeck@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.WendyVeck@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Cllr Lucy Jo Symonds <[Cllr.LucyJoSymonds@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.LucyJoSymonds@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Sue Griffiths <[Cllr.SueGriffiths@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.SueGriffiths@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, Dawn Paul <[Cllr.DawnPaul@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.DawnPaul@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk)>, [joe.miller@lewes.gov.uk](mailto:joe.miller@lewes.gov.uk), [nicola.papanicolaou@lewes.gov.uk](mailto:nicola.papanicolaou@lewes.gov.uk)  
Subject: A matter of public safety

Good morning Councillors,

I am emailing you today because there has been a recent increase in reckless driving at the bottom of my road (Bramber Avenue).

For the past few years, the occupant of [REDACTED] South Coast Road has been parking outside of his house, despite the fact that in order to do so he has to drive on a public footpath. Recently, this has become a massive issue of public safety as he will drive at pedestrians in order to park.

How do I know this?

Because it has happened to me, twice. On the second occasion, I was walking with my two-year-old nephew, whom the occupant of [REDACTED] drove straight at. I know I am not the only person he has driven towards, either. One of my neighbours has also been on the receiving end of his reckless driving and I would be more than happy to contact them if you would like to hear about their experience.

When the second incident occurred, I contacted the police (Ref No: 899114) who informed me that they would issue a warning to the driver. Whilst this did stop him from parking there, it only lasted a few short weeks before he resumed his reckless behaviour. I was informed that whilst consistently reporting him would leave a paper trail of incidents; when it comes to stopping his behaviour, the police would not be able to take action unless he physically made contact with a pedestrian.

Which sounds utterly crazy to me. Why should it take someone being physically hurt by his behaviour for someone to intervene? What he is doing is no different than when that man drove down the pavement of London Bridge, the only difference is that he has not hurt anyone so far.

What is also concerning is that you have accepted the planning permission to convert the previously commercial property, [REDACTED] South Coast Road, into a residential property. The building work for this started a few weeks ago and the builders have been parking outside the property, also putting at risk pedestrian's lives. What is to stop the future resident of 196 from following their neighbours behaviour?

This past week, the demolition of 194 South Coast Road begun. Whilst the workers of the demolition have been using the car park located at the bottom of Bramber Avenue so far, there is nothing to stop them from also driving on the public footpath to park. 194 South Coast Road is being demolished to make way for a block of flats. These flats have no attached parking spaces and, in the planning permission, it was stated that they should park across the road at the parking lot located on Steyning Avenue. But what is stopping them from following in the footsteps of [REDACTED] 196a?

I am asking you to do something to stop this behaviour. If you let this continue, it is only a matter of time before disaster strikes.

I've attached photographic evidence of the parking from various days for you to view. They are:

**Photo 1** - June 3rd, taken at 16:30, around 30 minutes after he drove at my 2-year-old nephew.

**Photo 2** - June 24, taken at 15:44 when I noticed that he had started parking there again after I made the police report on June 3rd.

**Photo 3** - July 8, taken at 07:47.

**Photo 4** - August 13, taken at 07:52.

**Photo 5** - August 13, take at 14:51.

I hope that by bringing this issue to your attention, you will be able to find a way to stop this from happening before someone gets hurt.

Yours Sincerely,

**Katie Sandifer**

A concerned resident of Bramber Avenue



