

George Dyson  
Town Clerk

☎ (01273) 585493  
✉ TownClerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk



Community House,  
Meridian Way,  
Peacehaven,  
East Sussex,  
BN10 8BB.

---

**DRAFT Minutes of the meeting of the Planning & Highways Committee meeting held in the Anzac Room, Community House on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2025 at 7:30pm.**

**Present:** Cllr Gordon-Garrett (Chair), Cllr Campbell (Vice Chair), Cllr Gallagher, Cllr Sharkey, Cllr Davies, Cllr Rosser

**Officers:** Zoe Polydorou (Meetings & Projects Officer), Vicky Onis (Committees and Assistant Projects Officer)

11 members of the public were in attendance.

**1. PH2238 CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair opened the meeting at 19:30, welcomed everyone, read out the Civility and Respect statement, ran through fire exit procedure, asked for phones to be switched off and announced that the meeting was being recorded.

The Chair then announced the following:-

- Bingo on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2pm – 4pm
- Quiz on 5<sup>th</sup> April at 7pm

**2. PH2239 PUBLIC QUESTIONS.**

There were 7 public questioners.

1. In reference to **PH2251 LW/25/0021 66 The Lookout** it was expressed there was misleading application information with regards to the infrastructure, concern over the detrimental impact to the view of, and access to, the National Park, a loss of local amenities due to the change of land use and being in breach of the Dark Skies policy. It was raised that the application conflicted with Lewes District Plan policies CT1 and RES6, and National Planning Advice PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas). Alongside this, concern was raised over access, there being no direct transport services, only one streetlight for The Lookout, no main drainage or gas supply, unsuitable electricity supply, and setting a precedent.
2. In reference to **PH2251 LW/25/0021 66 The Lookout** the public questioner wanted it to be brought to PTC's attention that LDC have confirmed the dining room extension would not come under permitted development, queried why the caravan was still in situ, and raised concern with how the site would be monitored once a decision was made.
3. In reference to **PH2253 LW/25/0010 136 Rowe Avenue North** and **PH2256 LW/25/0105 4 Telscombe Road**, the need to increase support for wildlife and biodiversity and for the usage of swift and bee bricks, that LDC support, was expressed.

With regards to **PH2256 LW/25/0105 4 Telscombe Road** concern was expressed over garages being too small, and that they should be measured to ensure suitability for current car sizes, and concern with the planned 15 car parking spaces and that the developer is known to changing plans.

There was further concern about the roundabout on Sutton Avenue (at the junction with Greenwich Way), where it was expressed as being dangerous for drivers, that it was being damaged, mainly by HGVs, and was suggested it be replaced with a painted line roundabout.

4. A public questioner raised an issue with transport connectivity to Peacehaven from/to Newhaven and Lewes, parking issues at schools, and had concern with the stagnant Morrison's development, including the lack of connectivity to other nearby supermarkets, raised that good suggestions had been made, and a collective push was needed to get services in place this year.
5. A member of BusWatch updated committee that, thanks to various lobbies, ESCC had agreed that disabled passengers could use buses 24/7, it would continue to fund service 14, and were looking at providing the number 23 extension and improving the night buses. With regards to bus stop clear ways, it was expressed that ESCC have agreed there were waiting restriction inconsistencies and had produced a prioritisation programme (i.e. outside of Your Daily Needs).

Cllr Campbell expressed that in connection with the disabled issue there were numerous people to thank, that this committee had sent off the original report, which had been taken up by the MP, and thanked the Meetings & Projects Officer for their work.

6. A public questioner expressed having received no communication from PTC, LDC or ESCC on the status of the Morrisons development, sought information on what was happening with the site, requested regular updates and questioned the status of the development.

Cllr Gallagher provided an update on progress from the MP Chris Ward and the Morrisons board, explained that the plans were going to be amended, and expressed concern that the resident was not being informed and asked for there to be an update in each e-news issue.

7. A public questioner queried whether, at the next Morrisons board meeting, it would be decided what would happen.

Cllr Gallagher expressed that it would be a high-level strategy meeting, and suggested that PTC share the MP's letter that was posted today on social media, and made the suggestion of following the MP or Peacehaven Focus on Facebook for information about the Morrisons development.

The Chair expressed that **PH2251 LW/25/0021 66 The Lookout** and **PH2256 LW/25/0105 4 Telscombe Road** would be brought forward.

#### **1. PH2240 TO CONSIDER APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & SUBSTITUTIONS**

There was 1 apology for absence from Cllr Studd.

*19:52 - 2 residents left the meeting*

#### **2. PH2241 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Cllr Gordon-Garrett declared an interest in **PH2251 LW/25/0021 66 The Lookout**

#### **3. PH2242 TO ADOPT THE MINUTES FROM THE 4<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2025**

Proposed by: Cllr Sharkey    Seconded by: Cllr Davies

The Committee **resolved** to **adopt** the minutes.

*19:54 – Cllr Gordon Garrett left the meeting, Cllr Campbell took the Chair*

#### **4. TO COMMENT on the following Planning applications as follows:-**

##### **PH2251 LW/25/0021 66 The Lookout**

Peacehaven Town Council **objects** to planning application on the following grounds:

- It contravenes the NPPF, Lewes District Local Plan, SDNPA Local Plan.
- That there is no sensitivity to the local landscape and road, the location is in a delicate areas that transitions the National Park.
- The lighting is not in conjunction with the SDNPA Dark Skies technical advice note.
- The proposal will reduce the visual amenity of part of the Telscombe Tye.

- The use of the bridleway is not for commercial traffic.
- No traffic assessment has been carried out.
- It will have a detriment effect on local wildlife.

The Application does not yield extra homes or CIL/S106 money while breaching Application requirements, most notably:

- 1) **Inadequate or misleading information in the Application documents:** No fire/ambulance risk assessment of site access (despite fire pits and the site being surrounded by grain fields/scrub/trees through long hot Sussex summers) and supervision ending before midnight. No assessment from utilities, notably South East Water and East Sussex CC Rights of Way (only publicly available land access for vehicles is via a bridleway). Application seeks approval for sewerage provision for a different and bigger development – planning consent could enable unauthorised extra development (and then demands for enforcement from local residents). Lewis Planning Consultants' statement re camping (that planning permission not needed for Applicants' 'fall-back position' of using the land for camping pitches) may be misleading because of the toilet provision rules (Condition BC.2(a)): planning consent for this small glamping Application including its 'regularisation' of toilet facilities (on the LDC part of the overall site) could open up the option of 50 new camping pitches (currently constrained by the absence of toilet facilities) without further LA consents; which would be relevant if the site changed ownership.
- 2) **SD7, SD8 and SD54** (tranquillity, dark skies, pollution). The site was green, not yellow, on the SDNP map at last measure. SD7,SD8 and SD54 already breached by Airbn usage of the house at 66 Lookout (as reported by local residents from Telscombe Village eastwards). Cumulative negative effect on people and the natural environment in breach of SD54 - any further development will magnify noise and light pollution, especially at night. More vehicular traffic.
- 3) **SD19** (Transport and Accessibility) In 2009, Applicant Mr. Barlow himself summarised the site's inaccessibility: 'Access to the property is bad, and very busy already. The road (single track) is basically a footpath,(the extension of Roderick ave north) not a public highway. Last winter the track was unusable for three days because of snow. The track is unsuitable for emergency vehicles....' (Consultation on Application LW/09/0478). The owner of the private land housing this footpath states that he will not allow Mr Barlow to use his land for the purpose of this Application (see Consultation Response from Mr Merchant to Application LA/25/0021).
- 4) **SD4.3** (Landscape character) SDNP has assessed this site (Site 058 in Local Plan Review) as 'excluded' because 'it does not relate well to any settlement boundary'. This Application (for what is a commercial development) breaches SD4 by undermining the settlement pattern, the individual identity of settlements and the integrity of predominantly open and undeveloped land; it would breach the buffer of rural land between the site and the Peacehaven settlement boundary.
- 5) **SD20** The official route to the site is a bridleway. Increasing vehicular traffic would damage equestrian uses (as testified by several consultees) and would make the bridleway even more unsafe for pedestrians, cycles and horses
- 6) **SD23 and SD34** The proposed glamping site would be in competition with two existing glamping/camping sites close by, both more easily accessible than Site LE058 from the South Downs Way and by car(Stud Farm and South Farm, both units in the SDNP Local Plan's 'key sector' of farming). With most access via Peacehaven, no eateries within reasonable walking distance of Site LE058, only one small shop, and a 15-minute walk to buses, it is difficult to see how consent for this Application would generate any new business or employment within the SDNP (and little even in Peacehaven).

In addition: -

- Misleading application information with regards to infrastructure, and there will be:-
- A detrimental impact to the view of, and access to, the National Park
- A loss of local amenities due to the change of land use
- In breach of the Dark Skies policy.
- conflicts with Lewes District Plan policies CT1 and RES6, and National Planning Advice PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas).
- Concern with access, there being no direct transport, only one streetlight, no main drainage or gas supply, unsuitable electricity supply, and setting a precedent.
- The entries on the main application document would create a right for 8 extra parking places within LDC land
- The application could damage existing employment sites at Stud Farm and South Farm and the site is not in an area zoned for new employment in LDC Local Plan.

- Breaches the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, especially Policies PT1 and PT4 (protecting the dark skies and tranquillity of SDNP).
- In breach of section 245 of the Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act (LURA) which amended the duty on relevant authorities regarding land in Protected Landscapes, (including National Parks), requiring they seek to further the statutory purposes of such areas. Guidance published in December 2024 is clear that this extends to functions undertaken outside of a National Park, but which affects its setting. Paragraph 189 of the Framework requires that development within the setting of a National Park should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts upon it.
- There being no comment from rights of way or bridle way authorities.

It was proposed to **object** to the application based on the comments above, and asks for LDC to enforce its previous refusal decisions.

Proposed by: Cllr Gallagher    Seconded by: Cllr Davies

All in **favour**

#### **PH2256 LW/25/0105 4 Telscombe Road**

It was proposed to **object** to the application on the following grounds:-

- Based on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and the Design Guide, the application is against PT1 (good design), and PT4 (protecting the dark skies and tranquillity of SDNP) because light will shine across the Ouse Valley SDNP to an even greater extent than the building recently rejected by Inspector at appeal on land adjacent to 4 Telscombe Rd. The Inspector stated that 'The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area' (the site is higher up than the adjacent land where an appeal was recently rejected, and the proposed houses are three storeys high with big windows on the east side)
- It is also against LDC's DM 25, and policy CP2 (housing mix and density), as it is out of keep with the surrounding area.
- In breach of PT18, and 19 (biodiversity), back-land development, and is not accessible.
- There is the issue of increased flood risk to lower laying land.
- Four-bedroomed houses do not meet the housing need
- It is in breach of section 245 of the Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act (LURA) which amended the duty on relevant authorities regarding land in Protected Landscapes, (including National Parks), requiring they seek to further the statutory purposes of such areas. Guidance published in December 2024 is clear that this extends to functions undertaken outside of a National Park, but which affects its setting. Paragraph 189 of the Framework requires that development within the setting of a National Park should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts upon it.

Proposed by: Cllr Campbell    Seconded: Cllr Gallagher

Committee resolved to **object** to the application.

#### **5. PH2243 TO NOTE AND REVIEW THE COMMITTEES BUDGETARY REPORT**

The report was **noted**.

*20:15 – 3 residents left the meeting.*

#### **6. PH2244 TO RECEIVE A VERBAL UPDATE FROM CLLR GALLAGHER CHAIR OF THE STEERING GROUP FOR THE NDP**

Cllr Gallagher updated committee that the Officer at LDC who was dealing with the NDP had left before sending the habitats regulation and other comments to the examiner. Cllr Gallagher expressed that Cllr O'Connor would liaise with the head of planning policy, and at the very least hoped it could be moved forward by other senior officers.

#### **7. PH2245 TO COMMENT GLADYS AVENUE VE DAY 80TH ANNIVERSARY STREET PARTY – NOTICE OF CLOSURE**

It was proposed to comment that there were no issues with the closure.

Proposed by: Cllr Sharkey    Seconded: Cllr Davies

All in **favour**.

1 abstention.

**8. PH2246 TO RECEIVE UPDATES FROM TASK & FINISH GROUPS (TFGs):**

**a. Public Safety Group**

The chair thanked the Committees and Assistant Projects Officer for her comprehensive report.

**9. PH2247 TO NOTE PROGRESS REPORT ON BUSINESS PLAN ITEMS**

The report was **noted**.

**10. PH2248 TO AGREE THE DETAILS OF THE NEW INFORMATION BOARD AT THE MERIDIAN MONUMENT**

It was proposed to agree to the draft content.

Proposed by: Cllr Shakey      Seconded by: Cllr Gallagher

Committee resolved to **agree** to the proposal.

It was proposed for the cost to be taken from the Repairs and Alteration of Premises budget.

Proposed by: Cllr Gallagher      Seconded by: Cllr Rosser

All in **favour**.

It was proposed to agree the location for the information board as described in the report.

Proposed by: Cllr Gallagher      Seconded by: Cllr Davies

All in **favour**.

Committee thanked the grounds team for the Meridian monument cleaning.

**11. PH2249 TO NOTE GRASS-CUTTING; FINAL DECISION ON PROPOSED DATES FROM ESCC AND PLANS FOR PUBLICITY**

Cllr Campbell asked that the programme with dates, and who to contact at ESCC if there is dissatisfaction, to be clearly advertised, and placed on bus stops etc.

Cllr Davies agreed, and requested clarification from ESCC of the grass cutting dates, and raised there were many complaints last year, particularly about paths.

**12. PH2250 TO NOTE THE DOCUMENT DETAILING PEACEHAVEN TOWN COUNCIL'S OBJECTION TO APPLICATION SDNP/25/00228/FUL (LAND ADJACENT TO 66, THE LOOKOUT, PEACEHAVEN**

The application was **noted**.

*20:30 – 3 members of the public left the meeting*

**13. TO COMMENT on the following Planning applications as follows:-**

**PH2252 LW/25/0087 64 Hoddern Avenue**

A member commented that the building could be let out since it would be an independent building.

It was proposed to **support** the application

Proposed by: Cllr Gallagher      Seconded: Cllr Sharkey

Committee resolved to **support** the application.

1 member abstained.

**PH2253 LW/25/0010 136 Rowe Avenue North**

Members commented that the application was now 2 dwelling houses instead of 3.

Members raised concern with the lack of greenery, the elimination of grass verges, and the reduction of biodiversity at the back of the property. Also, that there would be no distinction with the pavement and public scene.

It was raised that the site is a plotland, as per the Design Guide, and the application would remove all the on-site features

It was proposed to **support** the application with the following comments: there would be insufficient greenery, grass verges would be eliminated, there would be a reduction of biodiversity, the need to use swift and bee bricks, there were conflicts with PT17 and PT18, and LDC are to query the self-build designation as opposed to a market-house.

Proposed by: Cllr Campbell    Seconded: Cllr Davies

Committee resolved to **support** the application.

1 member abstained

*20:43 - 2 residents left the meeting*

**PH2254 LW/25/0097 138 South Coast Road**

It was proposed to **object** the application on the above grounds of being against LDC core policy 6 (change from retail to residential), for the same reasons as before, and the application has not fulfilled the change.

Proposed by: Cllr Gallagher    Seconded: Cllr Campbell

All in **favour**

**PH2255 LW/24/0517 Land Between 45&61 Downs Walk**

It was proposed to the **support** the amended design, subject to the officer requesting a CEMP (construction environment management plan) is carried out, similar to the next door site.

Proposed by: Cllr Gallagher    Seconded: Cllr Sharkey

All in **favour**

**PH2257 LW/25/0089 36 Cairo Avenue**

Members did not feel they had the expertise to comment but were aware of neighbour concerns.

Cllr Campbell requested that full correspondence be sent to the west ward district councillors – Cllr Fabry, and Chris Collier, which Cllr Davies supported, and for those councillors to contact the complainants and visit the site.

**PH2258 LW/25/0134 9 Downs View**

It was proposed to **support** the application, subject to satisfactory drainage issues.

Proposed by: Cllr Sharkey    Seconded: Cllr Campbell

All in **favour**

**PH2259 LW/25/0061 4 Firle Road**

No comment.

**14. TO NOTE the following Planning decisions**

**PH2260 LW/24/0821 144 The Promenade**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2261 LW/24/0105 Land adj 4 Telscombe Rd and Blakeney Avenue**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2262 LW/23/0655 Land to the East of Blakeney Avenue**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2263 LW/24/0789 5 Johns Close**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2264 LW/24/0766 Land Adjacent To 61 Downs Walk**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2265 LW/24/0768 1 Telscombe road**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2266 LW/24/0688 42 Bramber Avenue**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2267 LW/24/0642 30-36 Southdown Avenue**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2268 LW/24/0579 50 Cornwall Avenue**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2269 LW/24/0802 77 The Lookout**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**PH2270 LW/24/0637 2B Horsham Avenue**

The planning decision was **noted**.

**15. PH2271 TO NOTE PLANNING & HIGHWAYS COMPLAINTS**

It was requested for Streetlights to be reopened until members were satisfied it had been completed.

The complaints were **noted**.

**16. PH2272 TO REVIEW & UPDATE THE P&H ACTION PLAN AND AGREE ANY ACTIONS REQUIRED.**

It was discussed that updates were needed and that the Chair and Vice Chair would review and amend as appropriate before the next meeting.

The action plan was **noted**.

**17. PH2273 TO AGREE DATE FOR THE NEXT MEETING TUESDAY 15TH APRIL 2025 AT 6.15PM**

The date was **agreed**.

*There being no further business the meeting ended at 21:11*