

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 11th August 2026 at 6:15pm.

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

Officers: Vicky Onis (Committee & Assistant Projects Officer)

4 members of the public were in attendance.

1 PH2638 CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair ran through the Civility and Respect statement, explained the fire procedure, reminded committee of the mobile phone protocol and that the meeting was being recorded

2 PH2639 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Q1 Cllr Campbell, Committee member for the Planning Committee, spoke as a member of the public and as a member of Friends of Peacehaven and Telscombe Library (FOTPL). ESCC has now put in their comments on the Morrisons proposal and on behalf of FOTPL it is requested the comments are discussed, and that policies and responses are developed from them too.

The letter from ESCC is on the website under the Morrisons planning application. This needs to be expedited by Councillors and PTC officers to do something about this as urgently as possible.

Q2 **LW/26/0387** A member of the public spoke on behalf of his parents, who reside on Cairo Avenue.

- Planning concerns relate to the neighbouring property and have been ongoing since 2022. Concerns include inaccurate drawings submitted as part of the original planning application, as well as health and safety issues arising from the construction, including the lack of guttering. Several other concerns were also raised.
- Formal complaints have been made regarding these issues; however, there has been a perceived lack of communication from LDC throughout the process.

Q3 **LW/26/0366** A member of the committee provided an update on the Open Spaces application submitted to LDC in support of registering the land as a new green space under the Commons Act 2006. The application was submitted as part of the LDC Call for Sites consultation on 4 April 2024 and includes over 20 statements from local residents supporting the retention of the area as public green space, together with evidence of public use dating back to the early 1980s.

Concern was raised regarding further development along Downs Walk since 2022, which has resulted in the loss of mature hedgerows and TPO trees. The ecological and community value of the remaining green space was emphasised, particularly its importance for biodiversity and wildlife and its longstanding use by local residents.

It was requested that these factors be taken into consideration and that outline planning permission for the proposed six houses should not be granted.

3 PH2640 TO CONSIDER APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & SUBSTITUTIONS

All Committee members were present.

4 PH2641 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Cllr Gordon-Garrett LW/26/0366

Cllr Davies LW/26/0387

5 PH2642 TO ADOPT THE MINUTES FROM THE 21ST JULY 2026

Proposed Cllr Rosser

Seconded Cllr Wood

Committee resolved to adopt the minutes

6 TO COMMENT on the following Planning applications as follows:-

It was agreed to take LW/26/0387 followed by LW/26/0366

Cllr Davies left the room at 18.35

The Chair reported that she and the vice chair had spoken to the resident at Number 36 via the doorbell intercom (who appeared to be the Applicant) and informed Committee of their views in support of the Application.

PH2645 LW/26/0387 36 Cairo Avenue Peacehaven (Variation of condition)

It was proposed that this committee strongly opposes the variation on the grounds that it is both taller and wider than the original proposal and also notes that arrangements must be made whereby a satisfactory gutter and water drainage arrangement is installed so that the neighbours are not receiving any water flow.

Standing orders suspended at 18.50 so that Cllr Wood can ask a question

Cllr Wood asked the resident whether any officers from LDC had visited the site to carry out an inspection. The resident advised that, although they had indicated that they would do so, neither he nor his parents had been included in any site visits.

Standing orders reinstated at 18.55

It was agreed that a request should be made for an LDC officer to visit the site as a matter of urgency.

Proposed by: Cllr Campbell

Seconded by: Cllr Wood

All in favour

Cllr Davies returned to the meeting 18.56

The Chair left the room at 18.56 and the Vice Chair took the seat.

PH2645 LW/26/0366 Land to east of Downs Walk

It was proposed to object on the grounds that it damages assets of particular importance and the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits (NPPF Para 11). The grounds for objection are:

1. Application statements are inaccurate, inadequate or self contradictory, for example: (a) it does not fulfil the designation of self build or custom build homes since the level, detail and uniformity already prescribed for the homes make it impossible for the 'relevant authorities' to follow Government Guidance that they **must** be satisfied that the initial owner will have '**primary** input into final design and lay-out'; (b) it states both that there are no trees adjacent that could influence the local character (PP-15039947) but also refers to the importance of existing trees/hedge to protect the views from SNDP (D&A statement para 2.2); it describes the site as open land despite the impassable vegetation on either side of the Way that runs parallel to Downs Walk and line of c.30/40 year-old self-sown oak trees ('young' for an oak tree), etc; (c) it states that there will be no diversion/extinguishment of rights of way despite proposing to build over a 'Way' that has been used

for decades (hundreds of years?) by walkers and horseriders and therefore qualifies as a Right of Way *[proof via aerial photos in 2004/2025 circulated to Committee]*; (d) it states that it is not within, adjacent or nearby to biodiversity designated site despite being within the Brighton and Lewes UNESCO Reserve; (e) it states that it will create new vehicular access (PP-15039947, p5) whilst also stating that the development will not add any parking spaces (p7); (f) PP-15039947 states that sewage will be by package treatment plant and that whether it connects to the mains sewage is unknown whereas D&A (para 14.44) states that foul drainage will be into the

Downs Walk existing drainage system.

2. The site is well beyond the settlement boundary, breaching LDC Policy D1 that has been repeatedly given weight in recent years in the rejection of Applications for development on other comparable sites, including by Inspectors after Appeal (eg LW/25/0105, LW/24/0105 and LW/23/0655). Decisions on these three Applications are more relevant than the cases cited by the Applicant.

3. As with other comparable Applications that have been rejected (see eg LW/25/0105 Decision statement), this development will breach LURA 2023 (and Section 245) which require 'active promotion' of the purposes of the SDNP; not least, by cutting off the Way used by horses and walkers it would become more difficult for the public to access the SDNP,

4. The Application breaches a number of Peacehaven and Telscombe Neighbourhood Plan (P&TNP) Policies, including: PT1(2) by breaking long views to the SDNP from eg Telscombe Road with new-build houses, with views from SDNP protected only by hedges that could be cut down; PT3 by destroying existing landscape features and self-sown oak trees with their underground fungal links (not replaceable); PT4 by inevitably affecting tranquillity and dark skies since the new houses would be immediately as close to the SDNP as in Applications LW/25/0105, LW/24/0105 and would replace with more houses the transitional landscape between the earlier Downs Walk development and the SDNP; PT11(1) since the local school is already oversubscribed, there are no communal facilities within walking distance and public transport/Highways remain inadequate with the A259 frequently blocked; PT12(1), PT 12(5) which requires incorporation of new links and junctions for pedestrians, cyclists and horseriders and their encouragement – not discouragement by removing the existing and long-standing links; PT17 – deciduous trees are a priority habitat.

5. The Application breaches NPPF 2024 including: Para 11 since it damages assets of particular importance and the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits; Para 105-6, 125(a) since the site is demonstrably special to local residents who applied to LDC years ago for it to be designated as a Local Green Space, an application supported by PTC; Para 125(b) since this undeveloped land performs many functions; Para 171 and 125(b) since the cumulative effect of reducing the porosity of the site is likely to increase the sometimes already serious flooding from Valley Road across the C7 to the Ouse *[photos are available]*; Para 189 since development within [the setting of the SDNP] should be sensitively located – ie not right next door to the boundary.

6. As the construction process elsewhere in the Valley Road area has shown, the imposition of Conditions cannot be an effective means of mitigation because they are not enforced or enforceable in practice

Proposed by: Cllr Rosser **Seconded by:** Cllr Davies
All in favour

The Chair returned to the meeting at 19.27

All 4 members of the public left the meeting

PH2643 LW/26/0295 206 South Coast Road Peacehaven
It was proposed to support with a request to improve disabled access to the front entrance.
Proposed by: Cllr Campbell **Seconded by:** Cllr Davies
All in favour

PH2644 LW/26/0072 86 South Coast Road Peacehaven
This application was noted.

- 7 **PH2534 TO AGREE DATE FOR THE NEXT MEETING TUESDAY 1ST SEPTEMBER 2026 AT 7.30PM**
The next meeting was **agreed**

There being no further business, the meeting was closed at 19:37

Detailed Income & Expenditure by Budget Heading 19/08/2026

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</u>	<u>Planning</u>							
4854	Maps / Right of Way	0	500	500		500	0.0%	
	Planning :- Direct Expenditure	<u>0</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0</u>
	Net Expenditure	<u>0</u>	<u>(500)</u>	<u>(500)</u>				
Grand Totals:- Income		0	0	0			0.0%	
	Expenditure	0	500	500	0	500	0.0%	
	Net Income over Expenditure	<u>0</u>	<u>(500)</u>	<u>(500)</u>				
	Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>0</u>	<u>(500)</u>	<u>(500)</u>				

George Dyson
Town Clerk

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



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

Committee:	Planning	Agenda Item:	PH2654
Meeting date:	September 1 2026	Authors:	Chair and Vice-Chair
Subject:	Bus Stop Clearways		
Purpose:	To note		

Recommendation(s):

That Committee note the new clearways proposed by ESCC for Peacehaven.

1. Background

There are three levels of protection for bus stops from stopping/parking: (1) clearways where only buses and emergency vehicles are permitted to stop or park; (2) double yellow lines where, as per the [highway code](#), vehicles are allowed to stop to load or unload or while passengers board or alight, with the result that some park for longer than briefly; and (3) there are no restrictions. Enforcement of double yellow lines infringements is more difficult than for clearways because a photograph of a vehicle on a double yellow line does not necessarily constitute an infringement. The bus stops within PTC that currently have clearway status are: Bretts Field, Roderick Avenue North, Cripps Avenue, Glynn Road, Meridian Centre (bus only road) and, on the A259, Tudor Rose. None of the other bus stops on the A259 are designated as clearways. The eastbound stop at Roderick Avenue/A259 junction, often blocked with 'parked' vehicles at present, is currently under consideration for being moved to Edith Avenue junction, including a bus shelter.

The Highways Authority, East Sussex County Council until April 2028, has been consulting on installing two clearways at bus stops in Telscombe used by Number 4 and 23 buses with a view to installation this autumn.

East Sussex County Council produce two different types of notice for each clearway proposal. The first is a bus stop notice, which is displayed at the stop itself to inform passengers and other local people of the proposed changes. The second is a resident letter, which is distributed to nearby properties to make residents aware of the proposal and invite comments.

There are number of upgrades to clearway proposed for Peacehaven by ESCC (as per Appendix A).

2. Options for Council

To note

3. Reason for recommendation

To ensure that Committee and residents are informed

4. Expected benefits

Better information

Implications

5.1 Legal	
5.2 Risks	
5.3 Financial	
5.4 Time scales	
5.5 Stakeholders & Social Value	
5.6 Contracts	
5.7 Climate & Sustainability	
5.8 Crime & Disorder	
5.9 Health & Safety	
5.10 Biodiversity	
5.11 Privacy Impact	
5.12 Equality & Diversity	

5. Values & priorities alignment

Which of the Core Values does the recommendation demonstrate?	
6.1 Empowering and supporting the community	☒
6.2 Growing the economy sustainably	☐
6.3 Helping children and young people	☐
6.4 Improving the quality of life for residents and visitors to Peacehaven	☐
6.5 Supporting residents in need	☐
6.6 Valuing the environment	☐

6.7 Which business plan item(s) does the recommendation relate to?

None: duty to advocate for residents

6. Appendices

Appendix A – Bus Stop Clearways Proposed by ESCC

WFO Code	Maple Code	Bus Stop Location Name	Street	Direction	Forward/Backward	Visual Effects	Google Maps	Leftmost Restriction	How Required Clearway Lining	Bus Stop Clearway Markings	Clearway Timing Plates (Advanced Feature)
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Robinson Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway contains door	Google Maps , Google Street View	At Most Clearway (Forward Markings)	(Reflected BSR Clearway) Reflected Clearway Markings The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required Click BSR Clearway Reflector Program		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Robinson Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway against gate	Google Maps , Google Street View	At Most Clearway (Forward Markings)	(Reflected BSR Clearway Markings) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length Reason: Intersection and Paper 20 Meter MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required Click BSR Clearway Reflector Program		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	St. Patrick Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway door complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining at the end of the right-hand side lane The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0010	example2	Robinson Avenue	4200 South Court Road	S	Forward	Clearway gate complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	At Most Clearway (Paper Markings & Lining)	(Reflected BSR Clearway) Reflected Clearway Markings in Laying The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required Click BSR Clearway Reflector Program		
1005.0010	example2	Robinson Avenue	4200 South Court Road	S	Forward	Clearway gate complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) New Clearway Markings: Lining at Laying The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Markings beyond the second road cross mark The markings are to be 20 meters in length MSB & Clearway Timing Plate Required		
1005.0000	example1	Stevens Avenue	Antistone Avenue	S	Forward	Clearway existing complete	Google Maps , Google Street View	No Restrictions	(New BSR Clearway) Begin new Clearway Lining & Mark		

Line Number	Example	Location	Address	Direction	Configuration	Notes	Link	Notes	Image	Sign
1001.0010	example	Lansdale Avenue	4200 South Coast Road	W	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	No Restrictions		No stopping except local buses
1001.0022	example	Lansdale Avenue	4200 South Coast Road	E	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	No Restrictions		No stopping except local buses
1001.0011	example	Meridian Drive	Meridian Drive	E	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	No Restrictions		No stopping except local buses
1001.0001	example	Meridian Drive	Butler Avenue	E	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	Double Yellow Line		No stopping except local buses
1001.0002	example	Meridian Drive	Butler Avenue	E	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	21 Meter Chassis (Local Buses)		NOT REQUIRED
1001.0004	example	Reynolds Avenue	4200 South Coast Road	W	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	Double Yellow Line		No stopping except local buses
1001.0005	example	Reynolds Avenue	4200 South Coast Road	W	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	Double Yellow Line		No stopping except local buses
1001.0004	example	Thompson City Way	Thompson City Way	W	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	Double Yellow Line		No stopping except local buses
1001.0006	example	The Works	Kelly Street	E	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	No Restrictions		No stopping except local buses
1001.0007	example	The Works	Kelly Street	E	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	No Restrictions		No stopping except local buses
1001.0008	example	Tucker Road Park	4200 South Coast Road	W	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	No Restrictions		No stopping except local buses
1001.0001	example	Tucker Road Park	4200 South Coast Road	W	Freightliner	Freightliner vehicles stopped	View Photo	21 Meter Chassis (Local Buses)		No stopping except local buses

George Dyson
Town Clerk

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



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

Committee:	Planning	Agenda Item:	PH2655
Meeting date:	September 1 2026	Authors:	Chair and Vice-Chair
Subject:	Community and Business Plan Progress and Amendment		
Purpose:	To Agree		

Recommendation(s):

That Committee agree (1) the assessment of progress to date and (2) to put forward the amendments to the Community and Business Plan's projects for Planning Committee as detailed (3) the assessment of projects listed in the Neighbourhood Plan

1. Background

Planning Committee meets every three weeks. Most of its work since the Town Council elections has consisted of commenting on Planning Applications and responding to consultations by various authorities responsible for planning policy and infrastructure development: notably, Lewes District Council's (LDC) and South Downs National Park's new fifteen-year Local Plans as they passed through various stages. Also of particular importance for local residents was PTC's response to LDC's recent consultation on Local Green Spaces.¹

Additional projects for the Committee were agreed in 2024 when Peacehaven Town Council adopted a Community and Business Plan to help it progress improvements for residents in the remaining years of the current Council, ie 2024-2027. Planning Committee's² programme included the following: (1) Road Safety: 'Crossings and Islands'; (2) 'Improvements to A259 High Street Area (Kaner Olette Report)'; (3) 'Footpaths, bridleways and cycle/wheeling routes'; and (4) 'Assets of Nature, biodiversity and built environment' (for full statements, see Appendix A). Progress on these projects to date is as follows:

- **Road Safety: crossings and islands:** After widespread research and consultation with residents (especially the Peacehaven Residents' Association), Committee identified and mapped a number of possible improvements. A town-wide consultation is now in progress (ends September 20th 2026) to identify residents' experiences and opinions. **This will result in a Report detailing proposals to lodge**

¹The list put forward by PTC to LDC reflects historic protection for Local Green Spaces and differs from the much more limited Local Green Spaces identified for protection in the Peacehaven and Telscombe Neighbourhood Development Plan (P&TNDP) agreed at Referendum in May 2026. The difference results from the fact that PTC has had no power to amend the P&TNDP text since before 2023. Following completion of the 2021 'Pre-Submission Draft' of the P&TNDP, PTC deputed to a Steering Group (consisting of TTC and PTC councillors in equal numbers plus Town Clerks) total power to finalise the content of the text of the Plan (P&TNDP) before it went for approval to LDC, the Examiner and Referendum. In practice, this has meant that Peacehaven Town Council as a body and PTC councillors elected for the first time in 2023 (or co-opted since 2023) have been unable to influence the content of the Plan: their sole power was to reject or accept *as a whole* the P&TNDP Steering Group's proposed text. Following adoption of the P&TNDP at Referendum in May 2026, PTC is preparing amendments for discussion and, hopefully, agreement, with TTC. They would then have to be presented to LDC – amendments classified as major would have to be put to a second Referendum, hopefully in tandem with the elections due in May 2027 to save costs.

²Then called 'Planning and Highways Committee': the name change to remove the word 'Highways' from the Committee's title resulted from residents' confusion as to where the responsibilities for eg potholes rests (ESCC, not PTC) and save PTC officers from being publicly assumed to be responsible. The Committee's terms of reference make clear that, in line with usage in eg National Planning Policy Framework, the 'Planning' Committee's brief includes all types of infrastructure; insofar as Town Councils' duties and powers require or permit, and the role is not performed by other PTC Committees such as Environment and Sustainability (E&S) Committee and Leisure and Amenities (L&A) Committee.

with Local Highways Authorities (current and future) and to advocate for whenever possible on behalf of residents.

- **Improvements to A259 High Street (Kaner Olette Report):** A pilot study related to one of Kaner Olette Report's main proposals (pocket parks, which are mostly on former Highways and therefore ESCC-owned land) was initiated and worked on by a TFG in summer 2023³: it concerned conversion of grass verges into wildflower areas. Although a PTC consultation identified a few members of the public who expressed interest, and the first proposed site was identified, none of the identified members of the public were in practice prepared to become involved in developing wildflower verges. This suggested that any development of pocket parks would have to be done by PTC Parks Officers. Given the likely cost to council taxpayers via an increased precept, the pocket park initiative was not carried forward. Improved staffing levels (and PTC's actions to increase advertising revenue) have enabled a big improvement in flower planting of boxes, notably at the A259/Roderick Avenue junction. In 2024-5, a TFG and the Chair of Planning Committee individually attempted to progress the Kaner Olette Report by identifying viable proposals in it to be taken forward: these attempts failed. **As a result of the changes in Committee roles, responsibilities and terms of reference, the project on A259 improvements (Kaner Olette) has been transferred to L&A Committee.**
- **Footpaths, bridleways and cycle/wheeling routes:** Two stages of this have been completed: (1) An accurate up-to-date map of Peacehaven (and Telscombe Cliffs) has been created to replace the decades-old map at the information desk that omitted hundreds of roads, houses etc. Over time, PTC officers will complete an updateable and downloadable electronic version of this map, which will also contain links to 'safe spaces' and defibrillators. (2) Potential east-west wheeling and cycling routes have been researched and identified, along with action points for officers to enable completion, provided that agreement can be reached with Telscombe TC (see Minutes of Planning Committee, July 25 2026). Walkways and twittens still need to be identified and added to the map. The Chair and Vice-Chair of Committee have been working with the Rights of Way Working Group (answerable to Full Council) to progress and identify Rights of Way that need to be recorded before the national deadline (now changed).
- **Assets of Nature, Biodiversity and Built Environment:** Members of Committee progressed research to identify these assets: PTC Responses to LDC, SDNP and other consultations reflect this work. The most notable outcome from this research is identification of the high level of geological and habitat diversity, and particularly species biodiversity, that characterises the Valley Road area of Peacehaven. This has so far gone unrecognised by Local Authorities progressing the 2021 national legislation and policy on nature recovery and preservation of biodiversity. The Nature Recovery legislation came too late for the P&TNDP, which needs amendment to include its implications. **This project has now transferred to Environment and Sustainability (E&S) Committee and will be progressed further there.**

In May 2026, the Peacehaven and Telscombe Neighbourhood Development Plan (P&TNDP) achieved a big majority vote from residents at Referendum. The legal power of the vote concerns only Planning Applications – it requires Planning Authorities (including PTC Planning Committee in its advisory role) to take P&TNDP Policies into account when considering Planning Applications.

The P&TNDP authors also proposed 'projects' for PTC to consider. The P&TNDP was originally written many years ago and some of these proposed projects are now outdated. Those that are still relevant and could fall for consideration by Planning Committee are as follows, with comments:

P&TNDP Project 1 (p.25): Promoting sustainability – lead Committee for this should be E&S, but it also concerns Planning Committee

P&TNDP Project 2 (p.39): Housing – Not practicable at this time because of Local Government Reorganisation and time constraints for officers and councillors; arguably now outdated.

P&TNDP Project 3 (p.48): Travel planning – Research, policy and proposals on wheeling routes substantially complete, subject to TTC agreement: implementation phase to follow (see below).

³See eg Planning and Highways Committee Meeting minutes June 2023
Report to Peacehaven Town Council

P&TNDP Project 4: Greenspace Infrastructure Plan (GIP) (p.57) – Urban GIP is L&A Committee, subject to P&TNDP amendments to include more Local Green Spaces when finalised by LDC Review. Proposed updating to P&TNDP (Policy PT17) should also incorporate 2021-2026 implications of Local Nature Recovery Strategy legislation and planning implications of residents’ need for ‘wild nature’. Non-urban green infrastructure is now E&S Committee

P&TNDP Project 7: Renewable Energy (battery storage)(p.65) – Already in scope, to be added to Business Plan (see below)

P&TNDP Project 8: A259 improvement (p.8) Mainly L&A Committee, including signage policy to guide Planning Committee’s responses to particular Planning Applications in addition to PT31; signposting (including P&TNDP Policy PT12.4) falls to Planning Committee (see below)

In conclusion, Planning Committee’s Community and Business Plan Projects should be amended to consist of the following four projects:

Road Safety: crossings and Islands

Current text unchanged except for: ‘Current Position: nearly complete’; and ‘Measure of success: Completion of proposals for change and circulation to all relevant current or potential Highways Authorities.

Footpaths, bridleways and cycle/wheeling routes

Main text unchanged except: ‘Target completion 2027’; ‘Current Position: Up-to-date map of Peacehaven completed; walking routes and Rights of Way in progress; ESCC cycle loop at advanced design stage, other cycle proposals agreed, subject to TTC consultation’. ‘Resource Allocation: councillor time, cost of map publication, possible use of CIL

[ADD new Project]

Renewable Energy (battery storage)

Description Map power grid and Identify possible sites and new renewable sources of energy

Target Completion: 2027

Current Position: Feasibility study by BHESCO agreed; Morrisons asked to consider site allocation

Resource Allocation: Councillor and officer time

Measure of success: Identification of possible sites and likely sources of renewable power generation

[ADD new Project]

Signposting

Description Map signpost inadequacies and propose improvements

Target Completion: 2027

Current Position: Officers have secured some improvements

Resource Allocation: Officer and councillor time

Measure of Success: Completion of Mapping and request to relevant Highways Authority

2. Options for Council

- To agree (1) Progress Report
- (2) Amendments as detailed above
- (3) Assessment of P&TNDP ‘projects’

Reason for recommendation

The Town Clerk and Officers are in process of proposing amendments to the Community and Business Plan

3. Expected benefits

Improvements for residents

4. Implications

5.1 Legal	Various
5.2 Risks	n/a
5.3 Financial	Mainly councillor and officer time, possible call on CIL
5.4 Time scales	Six months
5.5 Stakeholders & Social Value	Various
5.6 Contracts	N/a at present
5.7 Climate & Sustainability	Varied improvements
5.8 Crime & Disorder	Ditto
5.9 Health & Safety	Ditto
5.10 Biodiversity	Move to E&S Committee
5.11 Privacy Impact	n/a
5.12 Equality & Diversity	Varied improvements

5. Values & priorities alignment

Which of the Core Values does the recommendation demonstrate?	
6.1 Empowering and supporting the community	X
6.2 Growing the economy sustainably	X
6.3 Helping children and young people	X
6.4 Improving the quality of life for residents and visitors to Peacehaven	X
6.5 Supporting residents in need	X
6.6 Valuing the environment	X

6.7 Which business plan item(s) does the recommendation relate to?

All

6. Appendices

Appendix A - Current Planning Committee Business Plan

Project	Road Safety: Crossings & Islands		
Description	Map existing crossings and islands, survey opinion on changes, and present proposals for change to ESCC in priority order and advocate for the proposed changes with identified finances		
Target Completion	2027	Current Position	Not started
Resource Allocation	Initial research and mapping by Councillors, cost of survey by Officers, and Officer time		
Measure of Success	Completion of proposals for change, persuade ESCC		

Project	Improvements to A259 High Street Area		
Description	Assess all Kaner Olette report proposals for A259 and accept/ reject/ prioritise, with a report back to Full Council		
Target Completion	March 2025	Current Position	Started
Resource Allocation	Depends on conclusions - CIL expenditure, some money in Earmarked Reserves		
Measure of Success	Completion on time		



Project	Footpaths, bridleways, and cycle/wheeling routes		
Description	Create a map of all footpaths and bridleways, including informal ones. Consider proposals to register any that are not already registered. Work with stakeholders to develop proposals for a possible East/West active travel route		
Target Completion	2026	Current Position	ESCC Cycle loop project begun
Resource Allocation	Councillor time, cost of map publication		
Measure of Success	Complete registration well in advance of 2030 deadline for LDC. Identify land for possible east-west routes for wheeling		

Project	Assets of nature, biodiversity, and built environment		
Description	Develop a strategic plan to measure, monitor, and improve assets of nature and biodiversity		
Target Completion	April 2027	Current Position	TPOs improved. Orchard, Community Garden
Resource Allocation	Councillor & Officer time, costs of plant and equipment to measure air/ sea quality		
Measure of Success	Protection and enhancement of green/ built assets with evidence.		



George Dyson
Town Clerk

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



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

Committee:	Planning	Agenda Item:	PH2656
Meeting date:	September 1 2026	Authors:	Chair of Committee
Subject:	Peacehaven and Telscombe Library and Morrisons Planning Application		
Purpose:	To agree		

Recommendation(s):

That Committee agrees (1) To oppose any delay in planning consent (2) To call for public library provision in a building no smaller than the current library (3) To examine current and potential uses for the Library Building (4) To ask County Councillors to take action within ESCC to support points (1) and (2)

1. Background

Early in 2026, Morrisons expressed its intention of retaining the existing building to house the Library that serves Peacehaven and Telscombe Cliffs (and also to some extent East Saltdean), a big change from the original plan to knock down the existing Library building and build an entirely new library. It is difficult to believe that ESCC Library service was not aware of this decision. ESCC apparently did not challenge it or do any preparation for it and now states that it will not commit without complex assessments that it could have asked for when Morrisons first proposed to keep the current building. It asks for the planning decision for the whole project to be deferred.

It also states that the current size of Library is too large:

‘The need for future library space does not mean the current building is automatically the right long-term solution. The existing library is substantially larger than required for modern library provision. Future accommodation should be appropriately sized, affordable, sustainable and capable of being delivered within existing budgets, including rent, business rates, service charges, repairs and maintenance. ‘ [See Appendix A for full ESCC Response]

Peacehaven’s current Library building is proportionate to the population it serves by comparison with other ESCC libraries such as Lewes Town. Data from the Friends of Peacehaven and Telscombe Library Committee shows that some ESCC Libraries are much bigger relative to population – such as Rye and Newhaven. Usage of Peacehaven’s public library is now much greater than when ESCC first developed its 300square metre limit – and comparable to other public libraries once opening hours are taken into account. Peacehaven’s socio-economic deprivation is higher than many other parts of East Sussex. There is no post-16 education or training and not all sixth formers have space or facilities at home. ESCC should develop a proactive policy to exploit the Library for eg homework and coding clubs and for after-school activities. Moreover, Peacehaven’s other communal facilities are smaller than in other towns – there is no communal space at all in north ward or northern Telscombe Cliffs, not even a cafe, church or pub. A bigger public library is needed in Peacehaven because there is so little other indoor public space.

2. Options for Council

To Agree the Recommendations

To Amend the Recommendations

To Reject the Recommendations

3. Reason for recommendation

To ensure smooth passage of the Morrisons Planning Application and appropriate Public Library provision along with maximum benefit for residents from the building

4. Expected benefits

Smooth passage of the Morrisons Planning Application and adequate continued public library provision

5. Implications

5.1 Legal	None directly
5.2 Risks	That Morrisons development gets delayed or PTC loses its Library
5.3 Financial	None directly
5.4 Time scales	Urgent
5.5 Stakeholders & Social Value	All Peacehaven residents
5.6 Contracts	None
5.7 Climate & Sustainability	Saving in CO2 from new construction
5.8 Crime & Disorder	The Library is a haven
5.9 Health & Safety	Ditto
5.10 Biodiversity	
5.11 Privacy Impact	Ditto
5.12 Equality & Diversity	Ditto

5. Values & priorities alignment

Which of the Core Values does the recommendation demonstrate?	
6.1 Empowering and supporting the community	X
6.2 Growing the economy sustainably	X
6.3 Helping children and young people	X
6.4 Improving the quality of life for residents and visitors to Peacehaven	X
6.5 Supporting residents in need	X
6.6 Valuing the environment	

6.7 Which business plan item(s) does the recommendation relate to?

All or them indirectly.

6. Appendices

Appendix A - PLANNING COMMENT FROM ESCC LIBRARY SERVICES (which can also be viewed here:

<https://padocs.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/civica/Resource/Civica/Handler.ashx/Doc/pagestream?cd=inline&pdf=true&docno=28661867>)

Hi

Please could the email below be added as a consultation response from ESCC Library Services.

Thanks

James

Please note the contents of this email are officer opinion and are not binding on any future decision of the Council or its committees.

From: Natalie Anderson <Natalie.Anderson@eastsussex.gov.uk>

Sent: 29 July 2026 13:52

To: James Smith <James.Smith@lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk>

Subject: LW/23/0018 - Meridian Centre Meridian Way Peacehaven East Sussex - East Sussex Libraries

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear James,

I am writing regarding the above application. I understand that the consultation period closes today, and I have attempted to submit comments via the website. However, there does not appear to be an appropriate category under which I can submit them.

I do not fall within the categories of member of the public, neighbour, town or parish councillor, or ward councillor. The comments are submitted on behalf of East Sussex County Council Libraries. They are neither in support of nor an objection to the application, but provide important neutral feedback given the library's role as a vital community asset in Peacehaven.

I have included the service comments below and would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of them.

LW/23/0018 - Meridian Centre Meridian Way Peacehaven East Sussex - East Sussex Libraries

East Sussex County Council submits the following comments in relation to the revised planning application for the redevelopment of the Meridian Centre in Peacehaven. The comments focus on the proposal to retain the existing Peacehaven Library building as part of the redevelopment.

Library provision in Peacehaven

East Sussex County Council remains committed to securing a modern, accessible and financially sustainable library building for Peacehaven residents. Continued provision within the town centre is important because the library supports literacy, learning, digital access, wellbeing and social connection for residents of all ages.

A Needs Assessment and Accessibility Analysis was undertaken as part of the development of East Sussex County Council's Libraries Strategic Commissioning Strategy. The evidence supported the need to maintain a network of 17 public library buildings, including library provision in Peacehaven. This remains the Council's position.

Condition of the existing library building

The Council welcomes the intention to retain the library in a central location and to keep services operating during redevelopment. However, the long-term use of the existing library building needs careful consideration because of its condition, affordability and suitability.

The library has experienced significant building-related issues in recent years, including roof leaks, water ingress, concerns about electrics and heating, and maintenance pressures linked to an ageing building. It is not yet clear how long the current building could provide a reliable, good quality library environment without further investment by the developer.

The Council would need a clear record of the building's condition before any handover or lease arrangement is agreed. This should include details of works completed by the developer, remaining liabilities, responsibility for future repairs and maintenance, and the proposed rent, service charges and other occupation costs. This information is needed before the Council can take an informed view on whether the retained building is a suitable long-term option.

Library space

There is a clear case for library provision to remain in Peacehaven, particularly in a central and accessible location.

However, the need for future library space does not mean the current building is automatically the right long-term solution. The existing library is substantially larger than required for modern library provision. Future accommodation should be appropriately sized, affordable, sustainable and capable of being delivered within existing budgets, including rent, business rates, service charges, repairs and maintenance.

Information required

Before any long-term commitment is made, East Sussex County Council would need a comprehensive condition survey and lifecycle cost assessment. This would give a clear

picture of the building's current condition, likely repairs and the cost of keeping it suitable for library use over the longer term.

Given the short consultation period for the revised application, it has not been possible for the Council to commission and complete this work before submitting these comments. However, East Sussex County Council has subsequently commissioned this work, which will be used to assess the long-term cost of the building. The Council has therefore not yet been able to fully assess the building's condition, likely repair costs or future liabilities.

Further clarity is also needed on the delivery arrangements for the revised proposal. This includes timescales, phasing of works, the scope of any building improvements, and long-term ownership, maintenance and repair responsibilities.

It will also be important to confirm how library services would continue safely and effectively during any wider redevelopment works, including access arrangements, parking, deliveries, public safety and any temporary disruption to the surrounding site.

East Sussex County Council welcomes the principle of retaining library provision in a central and accessible location in Peacehaven and recognises the wider benefits of regeneration at the Meridian Centre. However, further information is required before the Council can determine whether the existing building represents a suitable long-term solution. This information should include a condition survey, clear cost information and confirmation of the proposed handover, ownership, maintenance and repair arrangements. This information is essential to ensure any retained library provision is fit for purpose, affordable and sustainable for residents over the longer term.

The Council's position is that library provision should be secured through the planning process, but that the retained building must be shown to be fit for purpose, affordable and sustainable over the longer term. A comprehensive condition survey, clear cost information and confirmation of the developer's proposed approach to handover and repairs should therefore be treated as essential next steps before a final position is reached. The developer should also make a clear commitment to providing the library space as a genuine long-term solution, on appropriate terms and at the lowest reasonable cost, reflecting its role as a vital community asset. We therefore request that the District Council defer its decision on the application until the condition survey has been completed and there is a clear understanding of the long-term implications for the library building. Following the survey, we ask that a planning condition is included to secure the necessary improvements to the library building. If the survey finds that continued use of the existing building is not

sustainable, a Section 106 agreement should be put in place to secure suitable alternative library provision in Peacehaven.

Kind regards,
Natalie

Natalie Anderson

Head of Customer, Library and Registration Services

East Sussex County Council, Communities, Economy & Transport

Email: natalie.anderson@eastsussex.gov.uk

07523 944866

eastsussex.gov.uk



This message is intended for the use of the addressee only and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you have received it in error please notify the sender and destroy it. You may not use it or copy it to anyone else.

E-mail is not a secure communications medium. Please be aware of this when replying. All communications sent to or from the County Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Although East Sussex County Council has taken steps to ensure that this e-mail and any attachments are virus free, we can take no responsibility if a virus is actually present and you are advised to ensure that the appropriate checks are made.

You can visit our website at <https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk>

George Dyson
Town Clerk

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



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

Committee:	Planning	Agenda Item:	PH2657
Meeting date:	September 1 2026	Authors:	Chair and Vice-Chair
Subject:	Response to B&HCC Local Plan Scoping Consultation		
Purpose:	To agree responses ensuring Peacehaven's voice is represented to B&HCC		

Recommendation(s):

That Committee agree (a) the proposed responses to B&HCC's Scoping Consultation on its next Local Plan and (b) that PTC urges all councillors and residents to respond individually

1. Background

The Brighton and Hove City Council (B&HCC) response to the Government's 2026 consultation on Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) made commitments to Peacehaven as follows:

- It states that 'Peacehaven Town Council (PTC) ...[will] continue to play an important role in representing local people and advocating for local priorities....'
- It states that, where appropriate, PTC will 'take on stewardship of community assets and services that support strong and resilient local communities...'
- It states that B&HCC 'will respect community identity and ensure local voices continue to influence decisions about the future of their area'.
- It implicitly promises free swimming for children aged under 18 (which would presumably apply to swimming in Saltdean's outdoor Lido pool and Brighton pools – the wording suggests it would not extend to the pool most used by Peacehaven residents in Newhaven) and notes that B&HCC 'has invested in extending access to local library services'.

Peacehaven will not be incorporated into B&HCC until April 2028 and the B&HCC Scoping Consultation on its new Local Plan does not apply to Peacehaven. Conversely, the new Lewes District Local Plan 2042 has been drafted to include Peacehaven. However, three developments/uncertainties suggest that PTC should respond to the B&HCC Local Plan Consultation so that, insofar as it *may* include policies that *may eventually* affect Peacehaven, the policies in the BHCC Local Plan 2044 reflect B&HCC's commitments to Peacehaven pre-LGR:

- (a) Uncertainty about whether the Lewes District Council (LDC) Local Plan 2042 will continue to be the policies and site assessments applicable to Peacehaven after April 2028 (assuming the LDC Plan is approved by the Examiner during 2027) in the same way as it will be applicable to the other areas of the current Lewes District after LDC itself ceases to exist - given that Peacehaven will no longer be part of the new East Sussex Unitary from April 2028. National Government's decision specifically refers to making a 'stronger foundation for housing growth' in B&HC Unitary.

- (b) The possibility that Peacehaven will become part of the B&HCC Planning Authority at least as soon as Brighton's new Local Plan 2044 is approved by a national government 'Examiner', scheduled for March 2029 – it is currently at a much earlier stage than LDC's.
- (c) It even seems possible that some or all of the current B&HCC Local Plan may become [part of] the planning policies determining planning policy and planning applications decisions in Peacehaven immediately, ie from April 2028.

Whichever of these situations applies, it seems advisable for PTC to respond to the B&HCC Local Plan Consultation: if PTC does not respond, the policies, needs and interests of Peacehaven may be ignored in the B&HCC Local Plan 2044 that could apply to Peacehaven at some stage. B&HCC would have to take note of the Peacehaven & Telscombe Neighbourhood Development Plan (P&TNDP) even if PTC does not respond as proposed in this Report.¹

A further consideration arises from the effects in practice of Peacehaven being within the City of Brighton and Hove. Central Government's announcement that Peacehaven will be incorporated into Brighton and Hove City from April 1 2028 means that neither Peacehaven nor Telscombe will any longer be two among [approximate] equals – two of many towns with councillors representing each of them, along with other towns' councillors, in an umbrella Authority that also includes other roughly equal-sized towns and is not identified with any of them: as is currently the case in both Lewes District Council and East Sussex County Council. Rather it will be a part of Brighton and Hove City and, in practice, subject to decisions by Brighton councillors (as Hove, Rottingdean and West Saltdean are at present): the population of Brighton is about three times that of Hove and councillors from Brighton will continue to dominate the Unitary/City Council even after the addition of Peacehaven, Telscombe and East Saltdean. It seems that the new Unitary Authority will be coterminous with the City of Brighton and Hove, which Peacehaven and Telscombe will then be part of. At present, B&HCC is the equivalent of LDC **and** ESCC combined (it fulfils the function of both District and County Council), and it seems likely that individual B&H City councillors will also be B&HCC Unitary Authority councillors after April 2028. A cabinet structure of government is likely to apply, with the result that only the majority political party, likely to be the party preferred by Brighton residents, may be able to positively influence agendas or policies for each four-year term. If this is the case, it will be all the more important that the new B&HC Local Plan contains clauses reflecting the needs and aspirations of Peacehaven, including site allocations: this could ensure some planning stability regardless of changes in the political complexion of B&HCC.

Unlike Hove, Rottingdean still retains its own parish council as well as electing councillors to B&HCC. Rottingdean parish council does not include West Saltdean which is governed directly by B&HCC, but Rottingdean is part of the same ward as West Saltdean for the purposes of electing councillors to B&HCC. It seems Rottingdean Parish Council may be the model for the future status of both Peacehaven TC and Telscombe TC within B&HCC. The electoral ward boundaries for the new B&HCC are currently under discussion but would not affect planning policies or site allocations.

The B&HCC Local Plan Scoping document can be accessed at <https://yourvoice.brighton-hove.gov.uk/en-GB/folders/city-plan-scoping> It is presented as the first of three consultations under the upcoming 2026 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) rules for Local Plans which require a 30-month timescale with adoption scheduled for March 2029. Two more public consultations are planned, in July-September 2027 and June-August 2028.

2. Options for Council

¹The P&TNDP voted in at the 2026 Referendum is now years out of date. It covers the area of Telscombe Town Council as well as Peacehaven. The last time that PTC or Peacehaven residents were able to significantly influence its contents was in 2021: since then, the only choices available to PTC and its residents have been to accept or reject the substantially redrafted versions as a whole. At the PTC Full Council meeting (February 12 2026 that agreed to note the final revision of the P&TNDP put to Referendum), PTC noted it after an explanation by the LDC Cabinet Member for Planning on the limitations of one contentious Policy (PT 34). It also agreed to propose amendments immediately after the Referendum. The PTC Task and Finish Group proposing amendments is close to concluding its proposals. These will then be put to Telscombe Town Council to be agreed before submission to LDC.

- a) To agree the Responses proposed in Appendix A and urge councillors and residents to respond to the B&HCC Consultation
- b) To amend the responses
- c) To decide not to respond at all

3. Reason for recommendation

To ensure that the voice of Peacehaven and its residents influences the new B&H Local Plan if relevant

4. Expected benefits

If B&HCC abides by the commitments it made before taking over Peacehaven (see above), policy commitments will be included in the new Local Plan that will benefit Peacehaven and its residents (including wildlife under threat) even if they are not in the interests of B&HCC as a whole and/or the residents of Brighton.

5. Implications

5.1 Legal	B&HCC Commitments have hopefully been made in good faith/require B&HCC to take note of PTC
5.2 Risks	Risk of not responding is that B&HCC could, in ignorance, adopt policies that damage Peacehaven
5.3 Financial	No immediate implications
5.4 Time scales	September 7 deadline for effects lasting until 2044
5.5 Stakeholders & Social Value	Peacehaven voice in B&HCC will increase
5.6 Contracts	n/a
5.7 Climate & Sustainability	Peacehaven voice in B&HCC will increase climate/sustainability awareness
5.8 Crime & Disorder	Without Peacehaven local knowledge, B&HCC will not adopt policies that benefit Peacehaven
5.9 Health & Safety	Possibility of retaining current level of NHS choice/ improving eg road safety
5.10 Biodiversity	Possibility of protecting Valley Road area's unrivalled species biodiversity
5.11 Privacy Impact	n/a
5.12 Equality & Diversity	Peacehaven voice will increase

6. Values & priorities alignment

Which of the Core Values does the recommendation demonstrate?	
6.1 Empowering and supporting the community	X
6.2 Growing the economy sustainably	X
6.3 Helping children and young people	X
6.4 Improving the quality of life for residents and visitors to Peacehaven	X
6.5 Supporting residents in need	X
6.6 Valuing the environment	X

6.7 Which business plan item(s) does the recommendation relate to?

All. Main function is to advocate for Peacehaven and its residents (including wildlife under threat)

7. Appendix A: Questions asked by B&HCC and proposed PTC answers

Question 1: Do you have any further views on where significant new development should go?

The question does not apply at present to Peacehaven which is outside the City boundary until April 2028. PTC notes the following in case this situation changes. Peacehaven has already experienced fast housing development, both piecemeal and planned, over several decades, accompanied by totally inadequate improvements in infrastructure (except for parks, playgrounds and provision for most outdoor sports). Most of the new housing has not supported the needs of residents of the town, but rather has accommodated overflows to ease housing need elsewhere. If further housing is needed in Peacehaven before 'catch-up' improvements in infrastructure are introduced to satisfy needs from past housing development, **PTC policy has in practice sought to concentrate these as far south as possible within the settlement boundary, supporting planning applications for further densification in the southern part of town down to the A259 transport route.**² There are no communal facilities in north or central ward (no pub, no cafe, no church etc etc) and the only primary school in the north is well over-subscribed. The hill is too steep for many to walk, and there are no cycle routes. Road surfaces are atrocious in many places, especially in Ashington area and north-south residential roads. **PTC particularly opposes any further housing development in the steep-sided northern dry chalk valley (normally referred to as 'Valley Road Area' or 'South Downs Fringe'), not least because it is enclosed on three sides by the South Downs National Park (SDNP).** Currently outside the settlement boundary, PTC policy is that it be treated as a transitional green buffer zone between the town and the SDNP. Three planning applications in the area have recently been rejected, including one at Appeal. This thermal inversion area is characterised by high geological and habitat diversity (ranging from dew ponds in clay patches to chalk underlying, agricultural and natural grassland + scrub + deciduous woodland) and high species biodiversity (ranging from birds of prey such as sparrow hawks, red kites, buzzards and owls to many butterflies and other insects of national and international species significance recorded at the Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre). Further development will also risk even more flooding towards the Ouse, as climate changes. On employment zoning, **Peacehaven badly needs more local jobs** and the zone adjoining the Meridian centre allocated for business activity in the LDC Local Plan (and referred to as an 'industrial estate' in the P&TNDP p84 'Town Centre Weaknesses') is under-developed. Closely surrounded by residential streets, development there needs to maintain clean air, low noise and minimise vehicular movement: some have suggested developing it as a hub for digital industries.

Question 2: Please indicate in order of preference:

1. Increasing biodiversity: Peacehaven's biodiversity has been shamefully neglected in the past period of intensive housing development - including recent neglect by LDC & ESCC local Nature Recovery Strategy policy development - and the imbalance needs to be redressed. Even the records held at the Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre (SBRC) suggest that **species biodiversity** concentrated in the Valley Road area may be more significant than anywhere else of comparable size locally. And, of course, those records are limited by their dependence on the public making reports to the SBRC. With the sea and coastal towns to the south and the agricultural and grassy fields along the top of the Downs/Telscombe Tye at this point, the Valley Road area is a critical corridor for species diversity sustainability between the Ouse Valley and Falmer/Ditchling area.

2. Maximising affordable housing: far too little of Peacehaven's huge housing development has taken the form of social housing for local people, especially given the town's socio-economic deprivation (mostly in the third decile from bottom according to 2025 LOA analysis). Without the caravan site on Peacehaven Heights and the mobile homes at Tudor Rose, it seems likely that Peacehaven's local needs for social homes would be even greater.

3. Incorporating more measures to mitigate climate change: In 2019, PTC declared a Climate Emergency which pledged PTC to be carbon neutral by 2030. In 2022, 2024 and 2026 PTC held 'Towards Zero Carbon' or similar events with stalls engaging residents in talks about small changes that can make a difference to the environment³. PTC has urged policies to mitigate the effects of climate change (such as a solar panel roof for

²Most of the land south of the A259 is now classified as unsuitable for new development because the planned ending of coastal protection measures will threaten their viability within 60 years of them being built.

³See *Peacehaven and Telscombe Cliffs GBI Settlement Appraisal*, 2024, LDC, p5

the supermarket car park be incorporated into the Morrisons development). The options for power storage are currently under investigation at BHESCO. (see also P&TNDP Policies20 and 21)

4. Providing more open space where possible: With very little indoor communal space, Peacehaven's communal cohesion depends on outdoor communal spaces more than in other towns - areas where, for example, teenagers can 'hang out' close to their homes and families with children can walk and play without disturbance from vehicles. PTC has requested LDC to confirm (in its current Review) its past designations of Local Green Spaces, and to add one more in Downs Walk.⁴ Consultation for the P&TNDP suggested a need for communication of the beauty and value of wild spaces, to counter neat overly-maintained spaces, and to encourage 'green tourism' by promoting local rich biodiversity⁵ Although Peacehaven has a surplus of 'amenity' green space (parks – compensating for low levels of indoor community space, see above), it has a deficiency of Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace, in particular areas with trees and hedges.

5. Providing more parking: Peacehaven is a semi-rural town, not a city. Underground parking is not appropriate for Peacehaven. Free parking needs to be maintained for commuters close to A259 bus stops (on the four current LDC-owned car parks) and in the Morrisons Meridian car park, not least for access to Peacehaven's only GP surgery and other communal facilities. Otherwise local residential streets (key free parking areas for residents in local homes and their visitors) will simply be filled with commuter cars of those using the A259 12X bus service. Car parks, including at Meridian, need EV chargers (slow and fast).

6. Providing affordable workspace for small businesses in mix-use developments: A top priority for Peacehaven is to increase local employment opportunities. The town has a high level of home working.

7. Setting higher water efficiency targets: See LDC Draft Local Plan 2040, policies W2 and W3, and P&TNDP Policy PT5.

8. High quality design: Most notably, no buildings higher than four storeys should interrupt the views between the SDNP and the Clifftop. North of Southview/Balcombe Roads, buildings are almost all limited in practice to two storeys. See P&TNDP Policies Design Code (2021) except sections 4.5 and 4.6 (South Downs Fringe and Meridian Centre -they are outdated and subject to PTC proposals for amendment).

Question 3: Do you have any further views that should be addressed in the new City Plan? (a) The Valley Road area should be designated as a 'green' buffer zone, arguably after assessment as a protected site and species-rich biodiversity hotspot under Local Nature Recovery Strategy policies. Once lost, biodiversity and corridor value of this area will never be recovered. (b)The A259 in Peacehaven has reached daytime saturation point, particularly during 'rush hours' – B&HCC will need to move job opportunities from Brighton to Peacehaven rather than expecting more commuting from Peacehaven to Brighton (c) Many of Peacehaven's infrastructure needs are supplied from the east – Community food, doctors' surgeries and healthcare, swimming pool, retail, voluntary services such as Citizens Advice, sports facilities and clubs are all served to/from Newhaven or beyond and intertwined with Newhaven. Brighton is too far away for daily non-employment activities for many Peacehaven residents, along a road that is all too often slowed by traffic. Point (b) above means that the B&HCC Local Plan for Peacehaven, if applicable, would need to increase employment within Peacehaven; not just treat Peacehaven as a dormitory for Brighton workers and retail consumers. Point (c) above means the Plan should incorporate flexibility for Peacehaven residents to maintain longstanding Newhaven links – for example, provide free swimming in Newhaven pool for Peacehaven residents for whom Brighton swimming pools are too far away and extend more bus services to Newhaven. B&HCC needs to accept that the well-established retail, social, social care, health and voluntary organisation links with Newhaven and eastwards are too important to many residents to be upended without severe and emotional and mental damage that will increase health and social services costs.

⁴ Note that the P&TNDP does not include most of Peacehaven's Local Green Spaces as historically designated by LDC, or the new Local Green Space on Downs Walk formally applied for to LDC by local residents. This is an outdated aspect of the P&TNDP that PTC is seeking to amend.

⁵Peacehaven and Telscombe Cliffs GBI Settlement Appraisal, 2024, LDC. Note also local enthusiasm for expanding the nearby kelp forest restoration project, p5

Arrangements for cross-border grant funding will be needed if countless busy organisations like Citizens Advice are not to have to spend time they cannot afford rejigging their constitutions – or cutting off Peacehaven residents from their historic links so that they have to take the initiative to find equivalent services in Brighton that may not even exist.

Question 4: Are any locally specific design policies needed to ensure new development contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation?

Yes. The undeveloped Northern end acts as a sump to absorb rainwater that would otherwise flood the C7 road and provides a haven in hot weather when fields and the treeless rest of Peacehaven are sunburnt dry (as in summer 2026). Climate change effects that increase extremes will also increase the need for this northern area to be maintained in its current role. Peacehaven is a town perched high above the sea on a cliff edge, with sharp inclines up to rural edges bordering and impacting the SDNP (quite different from a City between the beach and the gently rising wide valley like Brighton). Many of its homes need continued protection from cliff erosion: continued shore protection policies are essential to protect even current homes (see Shoreline Management policies).

Question 5: Are there any other local issues the new City Plan should address to support the city's economy?

Yes. More jobs and services locally in Peacehaven – this will also help with climate change mitigation and adaptation by reducing commuter travel.

Question 6: Are there any particular local issues which would benefit from clear design expectations set out in the City Plan

Yes. (a) The Valley Road Area in the north should be classified as a green buffer zone, and therefore a no-go-area for housing development (see earlier responses). The preparation of P&TNDP's Policy and Design Codes for the area predated the 2021 Environment Act. The Valley Road area should be designated as a site for investment of Biodiversity Net Gain monies. (b) Whilst residential development should not be excluded from the Morrisons-owned Meridian site, at least on upper floors, the Design Code's MasterPlan (para 4.6) was rejected at public consultation. (Note: It would be helpful if B&HCC defined in the glossary exactly what it means by 'design' – it can have different implications in different contexts.)

Question 7: Do you have any further views on how housing supply could be increased by raising densities?

Yes. (a) Several grants of Planning Permission in Peacehaven have simply not been built by the Applicant. All too often, the owner of the land puts the site up for sale once Planning Consent has been granted. This has happened recently with two sites where nearly 50 dwellings are still not in prospect of being built (No 1 South Coast Road – old Motel site; and The Dewdrop site). (b) Whilst opposing housing development in the Valley Road area, PTC has proposed an alternative site for an extra 45 homes, not because Peacehaven should have any more housing development at all (it shouldn't, because past development has not been accompanied by sufficient infrastructure) but because it was the least bad site that PTC could find. (c) The Caravan Park at Peacehaven Heights and the mobile homes at Tudor Rose may well be essential in the absence of adequate social housing provision.

Question 8. Do you have any further views on how we can best support our visitor nighttime economy in B&H?

N/a

Question 9: Is there anything else you would like to tell us about planning for shops and leisure facilities

Yes. (a) The Morrisons saga has severely impacted Peacehaven and the future of the Meridian Centre is still unresolved. (b) Indoor leisure facilities such as pubs and communal halls are non-existent north of the Meridian Centre. (c) The steepness of the access from Meridian Centre northwards means much greater reliance on cars and buses than in flatter towns where walking is easier for the very young, the elderly and

the disabled. (d) Peacehaven's Town Hall ('Community House') is critical to the town's retail and leisure facilities – for local clubs, socialising at coffee mornings etc. (e) The Public Library is also critical for many different reasons and needs to be kept at its current size. The building is designed in such a way that numerous different activities can continue simultaneously – from nursery children singing to people working individually on computers. Peacehaven contains no local sixth form education facility, and high socio-income deprivation, so the Library provides important facilities – and could be better used for much needed initiatives to raise socio-economic standards eg via homework clubs, coding clubs, language tuition (EFL as well as other languages) etc etc

Question 10: Do you have any further thoughts on how the new City Plan [could] promote good health through the Planning system?

Yes. (a) Ensure that provision of youth and family support remains based in Peacehaven (which at present is the admin hub for such provision throughout southern Lewes District). And see answer (c) to Question 3 above. Mental and emotional health of some residents is already being impacted by LGR. Peacehaven residents rely for physical health treatment on sites to the east of the town's boundary (Newhaven GPs, Lewes Town Hospital, Newhaven Health hub, Eastbourne hospital etc.) and Peacehaven residents should not be forced into the long trip into Brighton for health provision. (b) Agree and implement proposals for new cycle routes (see PTC Planning Committee Papers July 21 2026); ensure that ESCC completes the 'loop' cycle route before transition in 2028 (ESCC received over £200,000 in 2013 for cycle routes but if this was not spent on the dangerous Arundel Road route, there is nothing on the ground to show for this CIL money). (c) Develop the Valley Road area's biodiversity and restored habitat' as a Green Tourism and transition zone into the SDNP. (d) Do not do anything that further clogs up Peacehaven's roads.

Question 11: Do you have any further thoughts on how we should address the provision and loss of open space and sports facilities in the new City Plan

N/a (see above for Peacehaven's Green Spaces)

Question 12: What are the important features of environmental value that the new City Plan needs to consider?

Valley Road area species biodiversity, thermal inversion and wildlife corridor significance; The Promenade clifftop walk - King Charles III England Coast Path past the Meridian Monument where the Greenwich Meridian leaves UK; Peacehaven Heights views of Coastline; tranquillity of undercliff; ammonites and other inter-tidal rock formations and 'blue' biodiversity; SSSI and Local Nature reserves; views to and from the SDNP; transition areas with trees and hedges between the town and the grass/agricultural South Downs; aquifer across the northern border.

Question 13: Are there any other means to support the conservation, enhancement and recovery of the natural environment?

Yes. In particular to increase the profile and importance of species biodiversity in LNRS assessments. So far, Local Nature Reserve Strategy documents in Sussex have assessed habitat diversity to a much greater degree than species diversity: not least because it is less difficult to map. Species diversity is more difficult given that Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre (SBRC) data depends largely on random and voluntary contributions by members of the public. But species diversity is also, arguably, even more important than habitat diversity: once species have been eliminated from a particular area it is very difficult, even impossible, to restore them. This issue particularly affects the Valley Road area of North Peacehaven, a small area which is exceptionally rich in species diversity including species of national and international significance (much of it is unrecorded at SBRC) and sited in such a way as to fulfil an important 'corridor' role between the Ouse Valley and Ditchling Heights. Some areas of Peacehaven that are recorded for protection (either as SSSIs or Local Nature Reserves) are degraded and need investment of time as well as money to bring them back to their earlier significance before it is too late.

14. Do you have any further comments on how the City Plan should address transport issues?

Yes: (1) Improve bus services from North Peacehaven to/from Newhaven so that there is direct access in both directions in the afternoon (see also Question 15 below). (2) Introduce the equivalent of an 'oyster card' that initially covers the whole of East Sussex and B&HCC bus network; it could be for buses only or include local trains from, say, Haywards Heath southwards and could apply a daily maximum charge of, say, £5 if restricted to buses and £10 if including trains (it could later be extended by the new Mayor to include West Sussex too); the existing spider's web of discounts etc is too complex to be useful to many. (3) Consult PTC **before** spending money on consultants' proposals for any B&HCC transport planning initiatives that include Peacehaven – the 2023-4 BSIP proposals from ESCC's consultants have almost all proved to be non-viable, as locals were given the opportunity to point out – but only **after** the consultants had made proposals.

15: What additional community and public service infrastructure facilities are required over the period to 2044?

Early in 2026, PTC's Response to the LDC Consultation on its draft Local Plan 2042 (including draft Site Allocations) contained information on the adequacy/inadequacy of infrastructure in Peacehaven. PTC concluded that the only areas that are adequate/good are parks and outdoor sports (although there is no swimming pool or tennis court). Provision for indoor sports is much-improved but too expensive for many families (students at Peacehaven Community School use Wave Leisure nextdoor for indoor sports). Youth services at the Joff (provided by ESCC, and acting as administrative centre for lower Ouse Valley) are excellent but underfunded and insufficient to meet the extensive local need. The Family Hub at the Meridian (which also serves as the administrative centre for the lower Ouse Valley area) provides much improved services for pre-school (and even primary ages); Peacehaven has a high level of childcare by related non-parents. All other infrastructure is inadequate to some degree, especially for residents in North and East Peacehaven. **Roads:** A259 is part of MRN but often blocked in Peacehaven leading to rat-running along Arundel Road (often at speed). Surfaces of many residential roads are antique and pitted with potholes etc; the vehicle routes to/from the north are ever slower to negotiate with buses as well as cars hampered by legally-parked vehicles on the important Pelham Rise through route – ESCC has refused even limited new double yellow line requests. **Pedestrians:** PTC is currently conducting a survey and consultation on pedestrian crossings and traffic islands which are often in the wrong places or non-existent. **Cycling and wheeling:** Options are limited by the hilly, sometimes steep, topography of the town; an ESCC draft proposal for a limited internal loop cycle route has reached the last Design stage; PTC has developed proposals to build on this proposed route which are due for consultation with TTC. **Public Transport:** Bus only, and much improved since the P&TNDP was drafted many years ago. But no afternoon bus transport to/from North Peacehaven to Newhaven inc swimming pool, retail etc (see accessibility below) and long walks to buses from eg Ashington Area. **Accessibility:** Inclines of varying steepness characterise all of Peacehaven north of the A259 and the surfaces of pavements and roads are often poor; since the GP surgeries close to A259 have closed, the elderly infirm/disabled south of A259 have to rely on vehicles to visit their doctor uphill at the Meridian Centre; access issues mean that many residents in East Peacehaven use health as well as education services in Newhaven. **Parking:** Free parking is inadequate close to the GP surgery (in one well-reported incident, a car is said to have broken the arm of a patient visiting the doctor!); because of the steep inclines, cycling and walking to and from North Peacehaven are constrained for everyone so that car ownership and free parking are more important than in many other towns; the free car parks along the A259 enable commuting via the 12X bus; residents rely on roads for free parking which has increasingly constrained the use of residential roads for car travel access. **Education:** Good or adequate primary school provision for residents in south and central areas; the primary school in the north is well over-subscribed following substantial house-building there; SEN provision much improved; secondary school at Peacehaven Community School over-subscribed so that many go elsewhere – post-16 provision is in Brighton and elsewhere. **Drains and sewage (Southern Water):** Parts of the sewerage network are over-stretched, with existing dwellings sometimes suffering when significant extra dwellings are added to the network, especially

in North Peacehaven; Public sewers are limited or non-existent beyond the Settlement Boundary – and a few homes within the Settlement Boundary are still not attached to the public sewer; Peacehaven houses the sewerage processing plant for Brighton in Centenary Park and smells/ breakdowns can afflict local residents; the life of the Portobello plant could be limited by sea-level change and a new site may have to be found.

Flooding: Historically, the biggest flooding has originated from the Valley Road area, but mainly affecting areas downstream. For urban areas, see P&TNDP p.20 **Water supply (South East Water):** Stressed as everywhere in the south east with frequent water leakages which are slow to be mended (one has recently flowed across Greenwich Way for weeks despite being reported); two reservoirs (one to the east on Links Avenue and the other north of The Valley Road area) are contained on S-E water land. **Social services:** (see above for children and youth) Numbers of care homes, with Adult social care ESCC services provided by home visits from centres outside Peacehaven (but closer than Brighton); above average pension age population. **Indoor communal space:** see comments above (question 9). As a young town, Peacehaven has no historic 'village hall' or library; most of the pubs have now closed; there is no indoor communal space private or public in North Ward: no church, no cafe, no pub, no publicly-owned communal space.

PLANNING ACTION PLAN

MEETING DATE/AGENDA ITEM	ITEM	ACTION	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUNDING SOURCE	TARGET DATE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	NOTES (Including reason if there is a blocker)	STATUS	COMPLETION DATE
26/02/2024	EV Chargers	Move forward	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	- 10/3/24 1st phase of installations in LDC have taken place with a company called Connected Kerbs. Peacehaven is likely to be in the 2nd Phase possibly the Lewes District car parks. Roderick Ave North. Piddinghoe Ave and Steyning ave. The LDC Officers want to evaluate the installation to make sure all satisfactory before proceeding with Phase 2 - 22/10 Cllr Sharkey updated committee on a meeting held with LDC about EV Chargers, who were looking at Steyning Avenue, and Piddinghoe Avenue as two possible locations. - 18.05.206 - The speed of the electric chargers in Steyning Avenue car park Peacehaven confirmed by Connected Kerb to be 7kW.	On going	
09/08/2022	Speed strip & Activated Sign	Investigate and report back to the P&H Committee.	TBC	TBC	TBC	Cllr Alexander	(Speed Strip - '-' It can be set up to record the speed of cars for a week 24/7.) * Need more volunteers to support speed checks, so that data can be collated for the purchase of a SID. Need volunteers and data in order to purchase a SID we need regular data to prove problem areas. PTC have advertised for volunteer's numerous times along with 2 speed watch presentations held by police traffic officer Steve O'Connell. Only 2/3 residents attended the sessions and didn't volunteer. Another option to speed along this process would be to purchase a speed strip which can be set up to record the speed of cars for a week 24/7. The approx. cost will be £500 - projects officer investigating * operation downsway - drones will be used to combat anti social bikes and used across fields and areas * Cllr Gordon-Garrett has been out speedwatching when enough volunteers to support. not enough volunteers. * 28/04 The public safety Group are looking at a Black Cat device. This is a mobile device which can track amount of road users and the speeds. Funding can be sort from JAG or the Policing fund. Other funding is being researched. 28/9 was reported at public safety that the speed watch have been regulary going out and have had some success. Please see Public Safety TFG notes. 28/9 Black Cat application is still in progress. please see Public safety notes.	In progress	