

Supplementary Report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 20 February 2019

LW/18/0351

Page 5

Newick

It is recommended that the Planning Applications Committee defer this application in view of the publication, on the 19 February 2019, of the Housing Delivery Test: 2018 measurement by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, which would indicate that Lewes District Council no longer has a 5 year housing land supply.

The deferral will allow officers to assess the published figures and to formalise the housing land supply position. Once this has been done the application will be submitted back to the committee for consideration and decision.

1 objection from owner of adjacent site on the grounds of conflict with Policies CT1 and H04.1 and that development would prejudice the delivery of the adjacent site for housing.

CPRE – object - extends beyond boundary of the site, twice as many homes, contrary to NPPF para 12 and 47, contrary to CT1 and DM1, no material considerations to recommend approval, precedents set with previous appeals with regards to CT1, being considered before expiry of departure advertisement, contrary to adopted and emerging policy.

Newick Society – object – The Society objected to this application eight months ago in May 2019. It is noted that the application has now been recognised as 'not according to the provisions of the development plan' and has accordingly been advertised as such, with a site notice and by statutory notice in the Sussex Express newspaper on 8th February 2019, inviting representations by 25th February 2019.

The original Village Society's objections still stand. The Society now wishes to amplify its objection, particularly in view of the changed circumstances since May 2019, including sight of the planning officers published report to committee. The amplification below relates to the principle of the development and a highways issue.

Principle

I understand that local planning authorities should only depart from an up-to-date Development Plan if material considerations indicate that the plan should not be followed. The planning officer clearly accepts that the proposed development does not accord with the Development Plan. Large parts of the

24-page officer's report are written in a manner which points towards a recommendation for refusal, but then, somewhat curiously, the conclusion, in sweeping generalised statements, recommends approval. The reasoning in the conclusion could hardly be recognised as being so material as to justify permission being granted contrary to the development plan policies.

All parties know that the Newick Neighbourhood Plan examiner said that the Neighbourhood Plan does not place a cap or a maximum limit on the number of dwellings to be built in Newick during the plan period. However, by recommending planning permission for this current application, this is clearly opening the door to further housing developments beyond the 100 envisaged in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is accepting a developer-led approach for Newick village rather than a plan-led approach and clearly could not be described as effective localism. For the officer's report to suggest that the development would not compromise or undermine community wants is entirely misguided.

There is evidence that Lewes District Council planning officers in the past and recently have recognised the problems of excessive expansion of Newick. Here are some quotes from District Council documents....

The District Council's 1981 appeal statement resisting a proposal for a private housing estate on the edge of Newick (application LW/81/0627) stated 'to all intents and purposes Newick has almost reached the limit of its natural growth...'. Those are words from the District Council planners stated over 30 years ago!

If that quote appears somewhat out-dated to be relevant today, then I refer you to one from 2013. The District Council's Sustainability Appraisal for the Joint Core Strategy, in referring to Newick, considered option A (planned growth of approx 100 homes) or option B (approx 154 homes). As you know, Option A for 100 was pursued. Option B for 154 homes was not pursued because it was...'...seen as having more considerable negative consequences to the community, travel and land efficiency objectives'. Furthermore, the tables in that Appraisal added that, if the village had 154 new homes (ie Option B) it 'may alter the character of the village, which may have a negative effect on community happiness'.

Why shouldn't we even have 200 more houses in Newick? The answer is in the Council's 2014 document 'Justification for the Housing Strategy' said (para 10.32) ...which says that 200 extra houses in Newick 'would result in substantial harm to the rural character and setting of the village'.

These are all District Council words referring to the problems and dangers of excessive expansion of Newick. Surely these quotes are now relevant to this current planning application, whereby, if permission is granted we will end up with more than 100 new homes in Newick. A planning permission will undoubtedly be referred to by developers as a precedent. You will of course understand the current severe pressures for development at Mitchelswood Farm and at 45 Allington Road.

I know that you now have to have regard to the latest National Planning Policy Framework and have regard to central government's continuous pressure for more housing but surely you recognise that continuous unlimited developer-led development in Newick is unacceptable. I invite you to recognise the merits of a village....it is a village because of its size...it is a large thriving village....it will suffer from continuous expansion...it will be urbanisedit will soon not have the character of a village. The Newick Village Society has consistently said over many years that new housing should be provided in the parts of the District where it could provide a benefit.

Highway Issue

The latest submitted revised plans show an extremely elaborate new road junction here... main road to be widened, a lengthy right turn lane, illuminated bollards and two bus shelters, all urbanising this spot on the edge of the village

Please note that the currently proposed right turn lane and its associated road markings are in front of the adjoining 'telephone exchange site' which will surely have a great influence on achieving a safe access to that site when it is developed as a Neighbourhood Plan housing site. We don't know yet what form of access the highway authority will require for that telephone exchange site to overcome this potential conflict of traffic movements...will it be another right turn lane with more bollards, more traffic islands, more road widening, will they require a roundabout to cope with all the traffic movements here to the two estates? The planning officer's have not considered the final environmental impact of highway works upon this spot This is not simply a highway engineers matter. It is a matter for the planning officers to consider in terms of the full impact upon this vulnerable spot at the entrance to the village.

Your Conservation Area Appraisal in 2006 referred to this spot, stating that 'this rural setting is an integral part of the character of the Conservation Area'. Also, in regard to this part of Goldbridge Road the District Council's Landscape Capacity Study in 2012 recognised the need to 'retain countryside entrance to village'.

It is clear that the total highway works here will have an urbanising impact at the very spot where it should have a rural village character.

Even though this highways matter was fully explained in the Village Society's May objection letter, it has been completely ignored in the officer's report, so the report is incomplete and therefore fails to present to the district councillors a fair and balanced case.

The Newick Village Society requests that these above comments are fully considered by your Planning Applications Committee, along with all other comments that you may receive up to the 25th February 2019. The Newick Village Society requests that planning permission should be refused for the development.

Amended recommendation - in view of the fact that the advertisement for the Departure expires on the 25 February 2019, the committee can resolve to grant or refuse planning permission on the basis that the decision of the committee is subject to the expiry of the additional consultation period which ends on the 25 February provided no new material planning considerations are raised that have not been previously covered by the report, representations received, or the committee in their discussion.

LW/18/0987 & 0988
Chailey

Pages 29 & 37

For information the following informative has been added to these applications –

As stated in the letter from Bedford Park dated 21 January 2019, the premises shall be marketed for a period of 6 months within the local geographical area before being marketed more widely.

LW/18/0808
Ringmer

Page 45

7 Further objections received –

Better suited to housing for the elderly/frail/disabled, increased traffic, impact on existing parking spaces at the surgery, overlooking and loss of privacy, mature height of trees taken into account, creation of fence gates for wildlife, lighting should be downlighters, development too dense, impact on infrastructure, issue of flooding not resolved, objections from Sport England/police, overdevelopment, residents not listened to, road junction inadequate, still above the number identified within the neighbourhood plan, privacy still compromised to Springett Av, boundary too close to the garage block, 30 units per hectare would be an appropriate density, further provision for parking or reduction in number of units, open space should not be reduced in size, questions effectiveness of flood alleviation, loss of green corridors, density pout of keeping with the area, not enough room for landscaping, lack of financial viability assessment,.

1 further comment – drainage and flooding issues in Mill Mead which are likely to increase during construction, development should include cycle storage/EV charging points/PV panels

LW/18/0901
Saltdean

Page 71

One additional objection received commenting that the proposal results in “over development of this site”.

Add condition on materials-

Before the development hereby approved is commenced on site, details/samples of all external materials including all facing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and carried out in accordance with that consent.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development in keeping with the locality having regard to Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan and to comply with National Policy Guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

SDNP/18/05647
Lewes

Page 91

Two additional representations received supporting the proposal commenting that “We’ve experienced the Unity Centre in Brighton and found it to be an exceptionally well-run centre. We’ve also experienced it to effectively serve a wide section of its community; I believe the proposed centre will equally well serve a wide section of our community. My support for this application includes support for the shed / studio. The studio is modest in size, naturally coloured (timber) and removable, and I understand is integral to the viability of this community business” and “I’m very happy to see that this project is going ahead, this is a place that will benefit the whole community, especially as it has full disabled access. something that is lacking in many community spaces and clinics in the local area.”

SDNP/18/05648
Lewes

Page 101

Lewes Town Council commented “Members consider that the ‘A’ boards would obstruct passage to an unacceptable degree and OBJECT to these although they consider the fixed signage to be ‘tasteful’.

It should be noted that the proposal for ‘A’ boards has been removed from the application following comments from the Planning Officer.

This page is intentionally left blank