



Draft Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee meeting held in the Anzac Room, Community House on 21st July at 7:30pm.

Present: Cllr Gordon-Garrett (Chair), Cllr Campbell (Vice Chair), Cllr Davies, Cllr Rosser, Cllr Wood.

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

9 members of the public were in attendance.

1 PH2622 CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair opened the meeting at 19:30, explained that the Morrisons Planning Application was on this agenda; ran through the Civility and Respect statement; explained the fire-procedure; reminded committee of the mobile phone protocol, the 3-minute role as per standing orders, and that the meeting was being recorded; and outlined the public session process.

2 PH2623 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were 6 public questions:-

- 1- In connection with item PH2632 TO AGREE RESPONSE TO PARKING CONSULTATION REVIEW 3 the questioner expressed disappointment with one of the applications that ESCC had turned down, and asked committee if they could do something about it.
- 2- In relation to an item not on the agenda - 66 The Lookout – the questioner expressed they understood the application to SDNP and ESCC had been refused, and questioned when enforcement would visit and how long they would have to wait with regards to what was currently on the property.

They also raised that a noise incident at an Airbnb on Saturday night was reported to the police but was disappointed that nothing had happened, and the Chair commented the matter would be raised with enforcement.

In reference to 66 The Lookout, Cllr Campbell explained that the ESCC application was conditional on the SDNP also being agreed. In reference to the noise incident, Cllr Rosser expressed it was a police matter, and Cllr Wood emphasised the importance of logging and recording exact details. The questioner confirmed they had a crime reference number and had been told to inform PTC & LDC. Cllr Rosser commented that LDC enforcement was limited and PTC had a duty of care.

In relation to item **PH2634 LW/23/0018** Meridian Centre Meridian Way:-

- 3- The third questioner expressed the application was part of the adopted P&T Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP), pages 78- 87, and was in many of the documents that supported the NDP, including the Basic Conditions Statement. They expressed the application was long awaited, agreed with new location for the entrance, and commented on the need to look carefully at the outline condition, specifically in relation to the NDP's sustainable living 20-minute neighbourhood, including safe pedestrian walkways and cycle paths. Their questions were:-
 - Whether committee would refer to the NDP pages in their response?
 - In the conditions for the Part B outline planning application, could committee refer to the items in the NDP, such as workspace & training facilities, integration with surrounding

schools & businesses, walking & cycling routes, and creating a vibrant town centre that doesn't go dead at night?

- 4- The fourth questioner raised that a drive through café would be useful for those who are disabled / wheelchair users, and that, with the current climate, open markets may be too. Cllr Davies expressed a drive through café was being proposed.
- 5- The fifth questioner requested that, as shops would not be built, a Section 106 condition pay for a bus service between North Peacehaven and the South Coast Road to Newhaven shops, and commented on there being a precedent in Brighton.

They further commented that, from the weekend, there would no longer be a bus service from East Peacehaven to the Royal Sussex Hospital, so had been lobbying for an extension to the new number 23 bus service and would raise it with the Peacehaven MP. Cllr Campbell added that, as there was no East Peacehaven bus service in the afternoon to reach the local doctors, for this to be raised as another reason for extending the number 23 bus route.

Cllr Wood asked the questioner to keep East Ward councillors up to date with bus service developments.

- 6- The sixth question was in relation to LDC funds for buses to Peacehaven, and the questioner was advised to speak with one of the other members of public who had in-depth knowledge of this, after the meeting.

3 PH2624 TO CONSIDER APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & SUBSTITUTIONS

There were no apologies.

4 PH2625 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

There was 1 declaration of interest from Cllr. Campbell in relation to **PH2634 LW/23/0018** Meridian Centre Meridian Way.

5 PH2626 TO ADOPT THE MINUTES FROM THE 30TH JUNE 2026

Proposed by: Cllr Wood **Seconded by:** Cllr Rosser
Committee **resolved** to **adopt** the minutes.

The Chair brought forward item **PH2634**

13 PH2634 LW/23/0018 Meridian Centre Meridian Way

Cllr Campbell expressed there had been a recent meeting between PTC Councillors and the LDC Planning Case Officer. Detailed comments, produced by the Chair and Vice Chair, were discussed, including, amongst other items, flood analysis; phasing in EV chargers; car park spaces allocations; there being no cycle plan; accessibility concerns with trolley & disabled bay locations; the lack of an electric supply assessment; site division; and installing a Peacehaven-related feature in the town square.

Concern over Morrison's commitment and reliability was raised, whereby it was expressed that strict planning rules would be in place once the development was up and running. Cllr Davies reminded committee of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), including a new Sussex Mayor in 2028; how it could bring development to the site, that the 2028 build start date would coincide with the new Unitary Authority (UA), and that discussions would have to be with PTC's new partners. They commented on wanting commitment that the library would be safe, confirmed it would be transferred as an asset to the new UA, and emphasised the need to keep momentum with the development, and the Chair pointed out there was MP support.

It was proposed to suspend Standing Orders
Proposed by: Cllr Wood **Seconded by:** Cllr Rosser
All in **favour**.

A member of public commented on there being senior management involvement in the application for the purpose of quick progress; requested PTC support the application; and raised concern over causing delays.

Members discussed not wanting the application to go backwards, the importance of approaching the application carefully, there being a need to ensure the application was correct in the first place, and all members were keen for there to be a supermarket.

It was proposed to reinstate Standing Orders
Proposed by: Cllr Wood **Seconded by:** Cllr Rosser
All in **favour**.

There was discussion around whether there would be an internal cafe; a suggestion to retain tree chippings for council land; and that comments on the portal were around a fifty-fifty split.

It was proposed to support the planning application as per the below points:-

- PTC supports the proposal to revise the application in order to expedite the provision of the town's urgently needed supermarket with associated parking on Site A
 - PTC strongly supports the amendment to the 2023 Application to retain the existing Library building and asks ESCC to support it [Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Policies PT5.1 and PT10; PT28; PT29]
 - But PTC asks for the following amendments and conditions to be applied (many are inter-related) [National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Para 90]
- a) There seems to be no cycle plan and the Application as currently framed would make it impossible to implement ESCC plans already at an advanced stage of development. This omission is in breach of NDP Policy PT11. See attached Plan A for options to ameliorate the omission, which could involve negotiation with ESCC along the boundary of Joff field (perhaps with the cycle path provided 50% by Morrisons and 50% from the ESCC Joff site) and redesign of the car parking at the north-east corner of the site. Without the proposed amendments, or others to fulfil the same function, the Application will be seriously in breach of NDP Policy PT11 [See also, NDP PT34; NPPF para 109e; NPPF Para 111d; NPPF para 113; NPPF para 117a]
- b) PTC supports residents' concerns about the trees, especially evergreen trees that would contribute to drainage resilience. PTC asks that any biodiversity net gain contributions should be conditioned to other Peacehaven sites if they cannot be accommodated on site and that wood for chippings should be made available to PTC Parks Officers. PTC suggests a tree trunk is retained as a totem pole [NDP Policies PT3.1-3.3; NDP PT15; NDP PT17; NDP PT18]
- c) There seems to be no overall accessibility and disability assessment, which means that accessibility problems such as steps could creep in unnoticed by building works inspectors. The EV charging provision needs to include more disabled bays. [NDP Policies PT1.1 and others NPPF 115b; NPPF para 117b]
- d) PTC is concerned that a big opportunity is being missed for mitigating the effects of climate change (and increasing Morrisons' return on investment) by the low level of e.g. solar panels apparently proposed in the Application, especially in view of the Sussex sun-rich site. PTC requests that the whole of the car park should be covered with solar panel roofing (see attachment B) and that battery storage (located well distant from homes, offices, shops or other areas where people spend time consecutively) be considered both for resilience against emergencies and to mitigate the climate change impact of the scheme. [NDP PT1; NDP PT20 especially NDP PT20.3, 20.4 and 20.6; NDP PT21; NPPF paras 161-182]
- e) There seems to be no risk and resilience plan [NDP PT33.3 'Undertake a risk and resilience plan...'; NPPF paras 161-182 'Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding....']
- f) In particular, there seems to be no assessment from Power Networks of electrical power availability on (and around) the site, including the possible need for a new/larger local electricity substation if the current substation proves inadequate (and battery storage is needed). The

sustainability statement (p.15) refers to 'available electrical network capacity' as a factor dictating the extent of vehicle charging to be provided. It is not clear that EV chargers could be accommodated to a necessary number to satisfy policies without such new investment in electrical infrastructure. PTC asks that site allocation for any new local electricity substation and battery storage is further from homes and offices (or other places where people spend time consecutively) than the minima laid down by law. [NDP PT 33.3 'future proofing and resilience']

- g) The communal areas that might include weekend outdoor markets or be decorated with Christmas lights need externally accessible electricity points [NDP PT 33.2 'farmers markets'; PT36]
- h) A condition should be applied that the vehicle access service yard south of Community House be kept open for Community House and protected by high dust-proof hoardings during the construction phase for Site A. Local residents have suggested that the hoardings could become a temporary community artwork
- i) A long-term management and maintenance plan should be provided to ensure the car parking, waste management and shared outside spaces are well-maintained over the long term [NDP Policy PT2.3; NDP 15.4; NDP 15.5; NDP PT 33.3]
- j) That the northern boundary of Site B area be moved southwards so that it runs as an eastern extension from the front wall of the store; and that the area south of Community House as far as this east-west line be added to the area to be determined now as part of Site Area A to include a vehicular service yard that maintains the current vehicular access, pedestrian queueing space and delivery parking close to the two double doors of the Community House Hall and provides space for e.g. fire and ambulance vehicles, the NHS blood donation/health checks trailers and other large vehicle community benefit users as at present [NDP PT34, especially PT34.4, PT34.5; NPPF para 117d]
- k) Conditions for Hybrid Planning Application Part B – PT34 (items 1–8) in the P&T NDP (page 86):-
 - (1) Promote the area as a mixed-use area comprising leisure, business, residential and community spaces.
 - (2) Seek to introduce "open workspace" and training facilities to support the local economy.
 - (3) Seek to improve the public realm and create open spaces which can be enjoyed by all people of all ages and abilities.
 - (4) Encourage integration with the nearby school, leisure centre, health centre and Hoyle Road Industrial estate.
 - (5) Will retain and enhance the community facility provision.
 - (6) Will seek to reduce car trips within the area and promote, walking, cycling and public transport use.
 - (7) Will demonstrate good placemaking principles and a landscape approach as set out in policies PT35 and PT36.
 - (8) Will promote the area as a vibrant and enjoyable experience for residents and visitors.

Proposed by: Cllr Campbell **Seconded by:** Cllr Rosser
Committee resolved to **support** the application.

*Between the time of 20:24 & 20:53 a total of 5 members of public left the meeting
(20:24 – 2 members of public left the meeting
20:30 – 1 member of public left the meeting
20:53 – 2 members of the public left the meeting)*

6 PH2627 TO NOTE AND REVIEW THE COMMITTEE'S BUDGETARY REPORT
The budgetary report was **noted**.

7 PH2628 TO AGREE A RESPONSE TO LDC CONSULTATION ON STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
It was proposed to agree the response as per the report.
Proposed by: Cllr Davies **Seconded by:** Cllr Gordon-Garrett
All in **favour**.

8 PH2629 TO REVIEW AND UPDATE THE REPAINTING OF ROAD MARKINGS TABLE

Cllr Davies queried when the confirmed updates would be made, and the M&P Officer agreed that the query would be raised with ESCC.

Cllr Wood raised that parking bays on the South Coast Road had been recently repainted, and Cllr Davies raised that, despite LGR, ESCC should still be carrying out the work, and expressed the need to keep up the momentum.

No updates were made.

9 PH2630 TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A LIAISON MEETING WITH TELSCOMBE TOWN COUNCIL TO DISCUSS PLANNING MATTERS

The Chair expressed that a meeting between PTC and TTC had previously taken place, and that TTC were happy to meet again.

It was proposed to support the request and for a meeting to take place in September.

Proposed by: Cllr Gordon-Garrett

Seconded by: Cllr Davies

All in **favour**.

10 PH2631 TO AGREE PROPOSALS FOR PROGRESS ON CYCLING ROUTES ACROSS PEACEHAVEN

The Chair raised it was an important consideration for the town, and was subject to funding. Cllr Campbell updated members that government funding had just been allocated, and that Peacehaven had not so far benefited from any East Sussex cycle-route-allocated CIL money, and raised concern as to whether, with LGR, PTC would receive it.

It was proposed to agree to all the recommendations in the report.

Proposed by: Cllr Rosser

Seconded by: Cllr Gordon-Garrett

All in **favour**.

11 PH2632 TO AGREE RESPONSE TO PARKING CONSULTATION REVIEW 3

Members discussed looking at how many were approved for other towns, and comparing 3 or 4 that were similar to unsuccessful PTC ones. Members agreed that would be a considerable amount of work, especially since the criteria against which the applications had been measured was still unknown.

It was proposed to ask ESCC to implement the Pelham Rise one only.

Proposed by: Cllr Campbell

Seconded by: Cllr Gordon-Garrett.

All in **favour**.

12 PH2633 TO RECEIVE UPDATES FROM TASK & FINISH GROUPS (TFGs):

a. Pedestrian Crossings & Islands TFG

The Meetings & Projects Officer updated committee that the public consultation had been live for 1 week and that around 60 responses had been received to date. Members commented positively on this.

b. Cycle Route TFG

As per earlier item PH2631

13 TO COMMENT on the following Planning application as follows:-

PH2635 LW/26/0320 4 The Promenade

It was proposed to **support** the application.

Proposed by: Cllr Gordon-Garrett

Seconded by: Cllr Campbell

Committee resolved to **support** the application.

14 PH2636 TO REVIEW & UPDATE THE PLANNING ACTION PLAN AND AGREE ANY ACTIONS REQUIRED

No updates were made.

- 15 **PH2637 TO AGREE DATE FOR THE NEXT MEETING AS TUESDAY 11TH
AUGUST 2026 (applications only) AT 6.15 PM**
The next meeting was **agreed**.

There being no further business, the meeting was closed at 21:23