

**Policy SDA44 Land at Beechwood Lane, Cooksbridge (previously LE090)**

Number of comments on policy: 47

## Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	4	1	8	6	27

## Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents noted that the policy might compromise the rural character through loss of dark skies, tranquillity, ancient hedgerows, veteran trees and agricultural land, with limited parking potentially affecting local events. They raised concerns that increased vehicle numbers could worsen congestion and road safety on both major routes and rural lanes, with calls for a full transport impact assessment. Environmental issues were also highlighted, including the risk of cumulative runoff and pollution degrading local biodiversity, key wildlife corridors and protected habitats. Additional feedback pointed to a strain on existing utilities and infrastructure such as water supplies, sewage, drainage and power, while emphasising the importance of considering the wider cumulative development context. Respondents recommended that planning should adopt a holistic, sustainable and landscape-led approach, ensuring that statutory conservation standards are met and that planning criteria and alternative community-led housing models are properly reviewed

## Key Themes raised:

- Community Amenities and Rural Character
- Traffic, Transport and Road Safety
- Biodiversity & Ecology
- Utilities and Infrastructure Capacity
- Cumulative Development
- Sustainable, Landscape-led Planning and Policy Compliance

## Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support the proposed allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

East Sussex County Council no objection from transport perspective.

Parish / Town Councils

East Chiltington Parish Council strongly object to the proposed allocation; access from Beechwood Lane is considered to be unsuitable.

## Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

- *Provide a summary of our response including an overview of how the policy has been amended*

*Copilot can help in creating an initial summary:*

1. *Navigate to relevant “Representations with responses” saved in each chapter folder of: [..\1. Reg 18 comments](#)*
  2. *Open the Excel file named ‘Representations with responses’*
  3. *Save a copy of this file onto your OneDrive*
  4. *In Excel, click the Copilot button in top ribbon*
  5. *Enter the following prompt: “summarize the key points made by the officer in column G”*
  6. *Copy the Copilot summary into this box*
  7. *Review and edit the summary for clarity and accuracy before finalizing*
- 
- *Add detail where any tricky reps might warrant a more detailed response.*
  - *Where specific wording suggestions have been accepted and included in the new policy detail these here.*

**Land at Seaford Golf Club, Firle Road, Seaford (LAA ref. LE109)**

Number of comments on policy: 50

## Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	1	2	11	20	15

## Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents expressed concerns that the policy could allow encroachment National Park land, risking the loss of natural buffers such as trees and hedgerows while compromising scenic views. They highlighted that the proposed development might damage a valued recreational and environmental area by affecting mature vegetation and wildlife habitats, and that increased traffic on a narrow, under-maintained road could further endanger pedestrian safety and emergency access. Additional comments noted that the development would put strain on already overstretched local infrastructure and services and reduce local amenity.

## Key Themes raised:

- National Park and Protected Area Concerns
- Environmental and Landscape Impacts
- Traffic and Road Safety
- Infrastructure and Service Provision Pressures
- Impact on Local Amenity and Recreational Uses
- Housing Appropriateness and Accessibility

## Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support subject to detailed landscape assessment. Site in within 1km of Seaford to Beachy Head SSSI, a site sensitive to recreational pressure. Policy criteria to respond accordingly. The Environment Agency notes that the site is within source protection zones 3, and suggests that the proposal should include wording to explicitly address groundwater protection considerations.

District / Borough / County Council

East Sussex County Council would expect to see improvements to footpath SEA/13/2 as part of any development.

Parish / Town Councils

Seaford Town Council object to the proposed allocation, citing harm to the landscape and local character. Concerns include loss of green space, increased traffic, inadequate transport, and overwhelmed healthcare services. Delivery of affordable housing is considered unlikely due to high land prices. Coordination between planning authorities is urged for a balanced approach.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan because it was not possible to establish a suitable access and parking arrangements and quantify potential impacts from loss of the existing facilities.

**Policy SDA4 Land at the rear of 49-55 St Anne’s Crescent (previously LE114)**

Number of comments on policy: 18

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	3	0	3	4	8

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raised concerns over access and traffic safety, noting that vehicular access is limited and risky—particularly via the eastern and Winterbourne Hollow routes—which could impact cyclists, pedestrians and emergency services. They pointed out that the policy does not align with established local and national planning policies or previous planning decisions, and indicated that the proposed development might negatively affect private gardens and residential amenity through the removal of mature trees and disturbance to nearby green space. Some responses suggested that a smaller-scale development would better preserve the existing gardens and address issues of limited vehicle access, while also calling for measures to protect the landscape, biodiversity, heritage features and overall sustainability. Limited consultation and transparency in the planning process were also noted, alongside additional recommendations for improving local infrastructure, pedestrian connectivity and traffic management.

Key Themes raised:

- Access and safety concerns
- Adherence to Planning Policy and Precedent
- Impact on Private Gardens and Residential Amenity
- Development Scale, Viability and Alternative Uses
- Design, Mitigation and Sustainability Requirements
- Biodiversity and Environmental Impact
- Heritage and Landscape Character

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** notes that the site is within source protection zones 1,2 and 3, and suggests that the proposal should include wording to explicitly address groundwater protection considerations.

District / Borough / County Council

**East Sussex County Council** state access onto Winterbourne Hollow is substandard, and additional traffic movements cannot be supported. Could only support this proposed allocation if it gains its access through the adjacent County Hall site and onto St Anne’s Crescent. They also recommend financial contributions to nearby footpaths.

Parish / Town Councils

**Lewes Town Council** objects to the proposed allocation, citing viability issues, biodiversity impact, and difficult vehicle access. Concerns include loss of green space, disruption to wildlife, and access complications near the cemetery. Alternative eco-friendly, car-free housing could mitigate some concerns, but overall, the Town Council opposes the development.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan because it was not possible to establish the availability of the site.

**The Shelleys Hotel, 136 High Street, Lewes (LAA ref. LE134)**

Number of comments on policy: 11

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	3	2	1	2	3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents emphasise that the building's historic character and tourism value should be preserved by retaining its hotel function through adaptive reuse, conservation and design standards, with conversion to housing considered only if rigorously justified. They note that local amenities must be maintained, including the club's event space, the continuity of the public garden, and the protection of groundwater resources. The building's role in supporting local employment, training and tourism is highlighted alongside the importance of retaining historic features such as Tudor frescos. Impacts on neighbouring properties is raised and calls for preserving significant trees.

Key Themes raised:

- Adaptive Reuse and Appropriate Use
- Neighbourhood and Amenity Impacts
- Local economy and Tourism Impact
- Heritage and Conservation
- Environmental and Landscape Considerations
- Structural Condition and Refurbishment Challenges
- Transport and Access Considerations

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** notes that the site is within source protection zones 2 and 3, and suggests that the proposal should include wording to explicitly address groundwater protection considerations.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

**Lewes Town Council** are neutral on the proposed allocation. They comment that the hotel is important to Lewes' tourism and economy, supporting jobs and training and hotel should be appropriately marketed for hotel use before justifying a change of use.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan because it can be brought forward via other policy provisions.

**Land rear 71 East End Lane, Ditchling (LAA ref. LE148)**

Number of comments on policy: 41

## Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	1	1	7	20	11

## Summary of issues and key themes raised

Most respondents contend the policy conflicts with national and local planning requirements and statutory duties, understates landscape sensitivity and fails to justify harm to valued landscapes or heritage assets. They argue housing and access would erode the Ditchling Conservation Area's character and the setting of listed buildings, and damage a sensitive ecological network supporting protected species. Many highlight that narrow rural roads and blind bends would face increased traffic, congestion and risks to pedestrians without proper footpaths. Warnings about overloaded sewerage, known drainage failures and regular flooding suggest capacity constraints that new development would worsen. Concerns also cover loss of rural tranquillity, dark-sky qualities and visual amenity, threats to biodiversity through habitat fragmentation, and doubts over genuine community benefits from executive homes given high costs and limited local services. Additional points question the accuracy of land-availability and sensitivity assessments, previous planning refusals and mapping errors, although a few respondents note that careful design, biodiversity net-gain measures or infrastructure upgrades could mitigate some impacts.

## Key Themes raised:

- Planning policy and legal compliance
- Heritage Assets and Conservation Area
- Ecology and Biodiversity
- Highways, Access and Pedestrian Safety
- Landscape Character and Visual Amenity
- Infrastructure Capacity and Local Services
- Flood Risk and Drainage

## Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit.

District / Borough / County Council

**East Sussex County Council** suggest a contribution would be required towards improvements to footpath DIT/33/6 which borders the site, or alternatively it is undertaken as part of the development.

Parish / Town Councils

**Ditchling Parish Council** objects to the proposed site primarily due to conflict with the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and Local Plan policies, detailing specific conservation and heritage concerns and traffic and infrastructure issues.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan because of impact on heritage assets.

**Policy SDA1 North Street Quarter, Former Bus Station and Adjacent Eastgate Area, Lewes (previously Policy SD57)**

Number of comments on policy: 19

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 5

Disagree: 4

Not Stated: 10

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents emphasise that the current bus station is a vital community asset which should be retained until a new, fully compliant interchange is secured, given that no safe alternative exists. They call for a comprehensive re-examination of public transport and road network design to ensure safe and free-flowing pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access, while insisting that transit facilities are well equipped and accessible. Feedback further stresses the need to protect local heritage and community amenities by maintaining appropriate urban scale and design that complements the town's character and conservation areas. In addition, respondents recommend an integrated masterplan with increased policy flexibility to address financial viability, risk management, infrastructure challenges, flood risk and housing on sensitive sites, alongside a call for clearer and more consistent policy language throughout.

Key Themes raised:

- Bus Station Redevelopment and Retention
- Public Transport Infrastructure and Road Network Re-design
- Protection of Local Heritage and Community Amenities
- Connectivity and Enhancement of the Public Realm
- Integrated Masterplanning and Policy Flexibility
- Financial Viability and Developer Risk Management
- Urban Form, Scale and Townscape Character

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

**Natural England** support, but comment that criteria 4 m) and 4 n) should be retained.

**Southern Water** ask that criterion l) of current Local Plan is retained.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

**Lewes Town Council** do not agree with the proposed amendments to this allocation.

Comments are made in reference to the Conservation Area, retention of the bus station, traffic and pedestrian routes, design of Eastgate Wharf, preserving waterfront heritage, and limiting building height to five storeys.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

**Naming and Area Clarification:** The name 'North Street Quarter' has historically referred to the whole site, not just the area around North Street. The policy title has been updated and Area A renamed as Phoenix Area to avoid confusion.

**Viability Challenges:** It is acknowledged that the viability of the Phoenix development is challenging and likely to require additional funding.

**Policy Consistency and Flexibility:** The policy must reflect the Authority's previous decisions for consistency, including those made for the former bus station and Phoenix developments. However, this does not prevent alternative proposals from coming forward from different or multiple landowners/developers.

**Consideration of New Evidence:** new evidence supporting an alternative mix or quantum of development would be a material planning consideration, which may outweigh the provisions of the policy.

**Former Allotments, Alfriston (previously Policy SD58)**

Number of comments on policy: 4

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 1

Disagree: 0

Not Stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Four comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

**Housing Supply:** It is argued that the two Alfriston housing sites carried forward from the 2019 Local Plan should be reassessed for higher-density development, noting that the latest Land Availability Assessment does not clearly show that their potential for increased housing supply has been reviewed.

**Natural England** supports with wording amendments. The **Environment Agency** welcomes the requirement for housing to be located in Flood Zone 1 and proposes adding a policy that any development or land raising in Flood Zone 3 must include level-for-level, volume-for-volume flood compensation storage that accounts for future climate change. **Southern Water** advises that the precise location of its strategic rising main near the site boundary must be confirmed before any development, with layout designs ensuring access for maintenance and avoiding building over this critical asset.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan because a key part of the site is not available.

**Policy SDA33 Kings Ride, Alfriston (previously Policy SD59)**

Number of comments on policy: 2

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 2

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Two comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

**Housing Supply:** It is argued that two Alfriston housing sites carried forward from the 2019 Local Plan appear not to have been reassessed in the latest LAA, and should be reviewed for higher-density development to boost housing supply in the National Park.

The **Environment Agency** welcomes the requirement for housing to be placed in Flood Zone 1 and proposes strengthening policy 1.k by adding a clear obligation for level-for-level, volume-for-volume flood compensation storage for any development or land raising in Flood Zone 3, accounting for future climate change.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Both Alfriston sites were reassessed in the LAA. For Kings Ride, planning permission for 7 dwellings (SDNP23/03986/FUL) already has a resolution to grant, subject to a Section 106 agreement on affordable housing. Because of this status, it would not be reasonable to add further requirements or further capacity to the site allocation policy.

**Land at Castelmer Fruit Farm, Kingston Near Lewes (previously Policy SD74)**

Number of comments on policy: 4

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Four comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

**Kingston Hollow Local Wildlife Site:** The policy should include an explicit requirement to safeguard and, where possible, enhance the adjacent Kingston Hollow Local Wildlife Site.

**Visual Impact:** Further questions arose surrounding the scheme's landscape impact, noting that the proposal protrudes into a sensitive, open area of the South Downs without natural containment.

The **Environment Agency** requests that, because the site lies partly within Source Protection Zones 2 and 3, the policy should include wording requiring evidence that the development will cause no significant harm to groundwater resources. **Natural England** supports the policy but recommends replacing the phrase "worthy of retention" in SD58.1b with a direct reference to policy SD11.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This development is being implemented under the extant planning permission, so it is not necessary to carry it forward into the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

**Policy SDA2 Land at Old Malling Farm, Lewes (previously Policy SD76)**

Number of comments on policy: 8

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 2

Disagree: 2

Not stated: 4

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Eight comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

**Access:** They raise concern over increased traffic, and inadequate active-travel provision, calling for stronger requirements for pedestrian and cycling links, improved public transport, and considering additional infrastructure such as a foot or cycle bridge over the Ouse.

**Landscape:** Concerns are raised that development would cause irreversible harm to the landscape, biodiversity, and the character of the adjacent Conservation Area.

**Housing:** It is suggested to revisit housing numbers, exploring higher-density or alternative forms of development,

The **Environment Agency** confirms that its input on the site's planning applications is fully and accurately reflected in the policy. **Natural England** supports the policy but recommends adding a requirement to assess and mitigate any potential impacts on Offham Marshes SSSI, including measures such as SuDS or a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This development was found acceptable through the examination of the last Local Plan and has an extant planning permission under SDNP/18/06103/OUT and SDNP/23/04659/REM. The principle of the development has therefore been established, and it would not be appropriate to add further requirements into the policy at this stage.

The figure of 226 reflects the extant planning permission on the site and is an indicative capacity. The introduction to the allocations section makes it clear that indicative capacities can be exceeded (or under-delivered) if there is evidence to support that.

The relevant criterion (now 4) has been amended to refer to a 'suitably designed ramped access'.

**Policy SDA3 Malling Brooks, Lewes (previously Policy SD77)**

Number of comments on policy: 6

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 2

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 4

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Six comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

**Employment:** support is received for the well-designed employment space that prioritises low-rent incubator units, flexible future-proofed buildings, and strong landscape management, particularly around Malling Brook.

**Design:** Any development must balance light industrial uses with nature-sensitive design, maximise green roofs, and carefully manage noise and traffic, especially around the constrained Tesco roundabout.

**Safeguarding:** Protecting the watercourse, preventing polluted run-off, and ensuring uses align with updated planning classes are essential to safeguarding biodiversity, flood resilience, and local amenity.

**Southern Water** notes their underground infrastructure runs through the site, requiring a clear easement of at least 6 m and careful layout planning to maintain access and avoid costly diversions. The **Environment Agency** highlights that the site lies in Flood Zone 3, so support the policy's requirement for a comprehensive, site-specific flood risk assessment to guide any development.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

There is an extant planning permission for this development under SDNP/22/03451/FUL so it would not be reasonable to add requirements to the policy at this stage.

**Policy SDA64 Offham Barns, Offham (previously Policy SD83)**

Number of comments on policy: 3

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 1

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 2

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Three comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

**Access:** Residents should have a continuous, safe pavement route from the site to the petrol station for pedestrian access.

**Natural England** shows support with no further comments. The **Environment Agency** notes developers must follow the national hierarchy for drainage, prioritising connection to the public sewer and securing the appropriate permits if alternatives are used and should plan early for how foul water will be managed on the site.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

There is an existing pavement running along the A273 in front of the site which connects to Cooksbridge to the north and Offham to the south, including the service station.

The advice from the Environment Agency has been included in the supporting text.

**Policy SDA4 County Hall, St Anne's Crescent, Lewes (previously LE039)**

Number of comments on policy: 26

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	2	2	2	4	15

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents highlighted the need to maintain the car park and to manage access by concentrating construction traffic at the County Hall entrance while considering park-and-ride schemes and sustainable travel. They raised concerns that the proposed 240 dwellings may be excessive given the site's steep topography, environmental constraints and proximity to the Conservation Area proximity. Requests were made for alternative development typology that accounts for affordable housing need and possible adaptive reuse of existing structures. Continuous green corridors, protection of local woodland and ecological networks were deemed important, along with a unified Masterplan that links County Hall and adjacent allocations to ensure coordinated vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access. Additional issues included the need for enhanced flood risk management with improved drainage and natural water mitigation measures and clearer design guidance.

Key Themes raised:

- Transport, Access & Parking strategies
- Housing Density, Affordability & Development Typology
- Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure
- Integrated Master Planning & Site Connectivity
- Reuse versus Demolition of Existing Structures
- Heritage, Townscape & Visual Impact
- Community Consultation & Social Infrastructure
- Flood Risk & Water Management

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** note that the site is within source protection zones 1,2 and 3, and suggest that the proposal should include wording to explicitly address groundwater protection considerations. **Natural England** highlights the development is within 500m of Lewes Brooks SSSI.

District / Borough / County Council

**East Sussex County Council** do not object to the allocation, but notes the need for review of the access options.

Parish / Town Councils

**Lewes Town Council** have no objection in principle but note the need for a detailed design brief given the complexities of the site and likely timescales of local government restructuring. The opportunity to support Western Road as a local neighbourhood service centre is also noted.

#### Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- The policy includes the requirement to produce a comprehensive site-wide masterplan, in consultation with the community and all stakeholders.
- The policy specifically recognises the long-term nature of the opportunity within the site, and the potential for phased development over an extended period.
- The policy contains ten design principle requirements covering issues relating to the scale of the building, heritage assets, green infrastructure and drainage, pedestrian, vehicular and cyclist access and through routes, parking requirements.
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- The supporting text provides a background setting out the additional complexities relating to local government reorganisation, and the opportunities and challenges related to comprehensive redevelopment and adjacent NDP allocations.
- The policy specifically requires that embodied carbon implications of redevelopment should be fully considered throughout.
- The allocation will require the preparation of a Health Impact Assessment
- The policy contains ten design principle requirements covering issues relating to the scale of the building, heritage assets, green infrastructure and drainage, pedestrian, vehicular and cyclist access and through routes, parking requirements.

**Policy SDA5 East Sussex College, Mountfield Road, Lewes (previously LE141)**

Number of comments on policy: 25

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	2	0	7	6	10

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents highlight that increased traffic on Mountfield Road could further stress an already congested network, calling for improved pedestrian infrastructure, alternative access routes, and a comprehensive traffic management plan. They stress the importance of safeguarding the site's role as an educational facility and community asset. Feedback also underlines that any development must include robust sustainability measures such as thorough flood risk assessment and effective drainage measures. Concerns about the proposed housing scale focus on its potential to overwhelm existing infrastructure, including parking and local roads, while calls for a balanced, masterplanned approach seek to integrate commercial, educational, and residential uses alongside heritage conservation and support for local sports and community facilities.

Key Themes raised:

- Traffic and Access Management
- Educational Provision and Community Asset Preservation
- Sustainability and Environmental Mitigation
- Housing Scale and Infrastructure Capacity
- Flood Risk and Drainage Provisions
- Need for Comprehensive Masterplanning
- Heritage and Conservation of Historic Assets

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** supports f) and notes this site is within Source Protection Zones 1,2 and 3, no significant harm to be caused to groundwater resources. **Natural England** notes the site is within 500m of, and potentially hydrologically linked to, Lewes Brooks SSSI. Impacts to the SSSI to be assessed and appropriately mitigated.

District / Borough / County Council

**East Sussex County Council** - no objection to the principle provided suitable access provision for both Non-Motorised Users (NMU) and vehicles. The existing access has one-way movement through the college; the eastern access can only support exit of vehicles and adjacent resident parking and not NMUs. Good lighting provision essential for safe school route to Priory Secondary School. ESCC also seek want improvements to Ham Lane LEW/12/1 as part of the development.

Parish / Town Councils

**Lewes Town Council** object to the proposed allocation, citing concerns regarding future expansion potential of the college, traffic, impacts on access to local facilities and the historic environment.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy requires the provision of a comprehensive site-wide masterplan, produced in consultation with the community and all stakeholders.
- Changes to the allocation boundary to include the three developable areas, the retained college campus and a section of Mountfield Road and requirement to prepare a holistic transport plan to include details relating to; car parking strategy, active travel routes, bike storage facilities, improvement to Mountfield Road and a travel plan.
- Provision of supporting text setting out the expectations for detailed design to support active travel by both future residents and those visiting the site.
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Adjustment to the transport strategy requirements and supporting text to clarify that parking requirements cover new development, the remaining educational use on the site, and any appropriate provision for adjacent sporting facilities.

**Policy SDA6 Springman House, 8 North Street, Lewes (previously LE133)**

Number of comments on policy: 9

## Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	2	2	0	1	3

## Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents highlighted that the redevelopment may lead to the loss of essential public amenities such as ambulance, police, and fire services unless suitable replacement facilities are provided and funded. They noted that the current building does not fit with the conservation area and suggested a lower, more domestic design with specific height limits to improve integration with neighbouring properties. The central location was appreciated for its potential to support sustainable transport and active travel. Clear policy guidelines on housing mix, affordability, and energy-efficient design were also called for, while heritage features, including the naval prison wall, and the removal of Springman House were emphasised as important conservation considerations. Additional comments called for clarity on access requirements.

## Key Themes raised:

- Public Amenities and Community Facilities
- Built Form and Integration
- Sustainable Transport and Active Travel
- Emergency and Public Safety Service Relocation
- Policy Framework and Development Guidelines
- Heritage Preservation and Conservation
- Affordable and Social Housing Provision

## Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** notes that the site is within source protection zones 2 and 3, and suggests that the proposal should include wording to explicitly address groundwater protection considerations.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

**Lewes Town Council** supports the proposed allocation and encourages communal living, net-zero carbon standards, and active travel. Relocation of emergency services should be secured before redevelopment proceeds.

## Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy includes requirement for integrated and accessible cycle/pushchair/mobility scooter storage
- Supporting text emphasises the opportunity to make a positive contribution to the streetscape, noting the need for natural surveillance and opportunities for public art.
- Supporting text emphasises the importance of maintaining and increasing permeability for pedestrians.

**Policy SDA7 Land behind the White Hart, 55 High Street, Lewes (previously LE103)**

Number of comments on policy: 9

**Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	2	2	0	1	4

**Summary of issues and key themes raised**

Nine comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

**Viability:** The comments broadly support allocating the site for housing but stress that any development must protect the viability of the White Hart Hotel and ideally be car-free due to its central location.

**Access:** Significant concerns are raised about extremely constrained access, construction logistics, emergency access, and the risk that these challenges could undermine the delivery of affordable housing.

**Suitability:** Several respondents argue that only small-scale, sensitively designed homes would be appropriate, noting that the site's current planning application and difficult access may limit its suitability for allocation.

The **Environment Agency** suggests adding wording to ensure that development within Source Protection Zones 2 and 3 must demonstrate that it will not cause significant harm to groundwater resources. **Natural England** shows support with no further comments.

**Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan**

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy includes wording which requires that careful consideration should be made to the design, massing and layout including the provision of private outdoor spaces and ensuring positive interrelationships with adjacent residential properties.

**Policy SDA34 Alfriston Court, Sloe Lane, Alfriston (previously WE014)**

Number of comments on policy: 14

## Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	3	0	2	7	2

## Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raised concerns that the allocation might harm a sensitive landscape by detracting from its character and historic features through overdevelopment. They noted that reliance on a single-track access road could lead to traffic congestion, compromised safety, and alternative routes would require disruptive excavation. Respondents also commented that the expansion—adding extra care home units—is disproportionate to the existing structure and conflicts with established planning advice as well as Local Plan policies on affordable housing and dark night skies. Additional feedback highlighted worries over reduced on-site parking and broader infrastructure challenges that may affect neighbourhood amenity and community access.

## Key Themes raised:

- Visual and Landscape Impact
- Traffic and Access Challenges
- Neighbourhood Amenity and Community Impact
- Scale and Compatibility with Existing Structures

## Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

**Natural England** support the proposed allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

**East Sussex County Council** no objection in principle but a traffic assessment is recommended on the basis that the rural nature of the location and roads may affect the safe passage of users along the bridleway and adjoining highway. They also suggest a contribution towards White Bridge maintenance (B8029), part of South Downs Way National Trail and bridleway ALF/2/3.

**Wealden District Council** note the proposed allocation would provide the opportunity for a sympathetic and well-integrated extension to an existing care home located on the northern edge of Alfriston, that respects its sensitive and prominent setting within the National Park, particularly visibility from the Cuckmere River corridor.

Parish / Town Councils

n/a.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan
<p>Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy and supporting text set out design requirement relating to its prominent position within the Cuckmere River Corridor and within views of Alfriston.</li></ul> <p>Changes made in response to comments from the public;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy includes requirements to retain the character of Sloe Lane, improve its functionality, and minimise conflict with its use to the north of the site as a bridleway.</li><li>• Supporting text notes the need for a robust construction management plan, particularly noting arrangements in relation to access and impacts on adjacent residential properties.</li></ul>

**Policy SDA56 Land at Beaumont, Wellgreen Lane, Kingston (previously LE118)**

Number of comments on policy: 14

## Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	0	1	3	3	7

## Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raised concerns that converting agricultural land or open space into housing could irreversibly damage the landscape by compromising safeguarded view corridors and diminishing natural features such as trees and hedgerows, particularly when development occurs outside established settlement boundaries. Comments also focused on the site's designation and location, with issues raised about weakened demarcations between settlements and the loss of open countryside. Additional concerns regarding traffic and access were raised—including altered entry routes, potential congestion near a primary school, and inadequate parking. There are also mixed views on the development's design, scale and integration within the National Park setting.

## Key Themes raised:

- Landscape Character and Visual Amenity
- Biodiversity and Habitat Conservation
- Settlement Boundary and Land Designation
- Traffic and Access Concerns
- Local Policy and National Park Objectives
- Development Design, Scale, and Infill Potential
- Hydrological Impact and Flood Risk

**Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:**National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** notes that the site is within source protection zones 2 and 3, and suggests that the proposal should include wording to explicitly address groundwater protection considerations. **Natural England** support subject to detailed landscape assessment. They also note the site is within 1km of, and potentially hydrologically linked to, Lewes Brooks SSSI, and recommend policy criteria that responds accordingly.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

**Kingston Parish Council** objects to the proposed site allocation, citing inflated land values, loss of green space, and threats to the village's character. There is a need for smaller, affordable homes, but this site risks blurring Kingston-Lewes boundaries.

Concerns include pedestrian access, flooding risks, and maintaining local housing for longstanding residents.

#### Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Development is focused in the western portion of the site, with a requirement to provide public open space at the eastern end of the site.

**Policy SDA57 Audiburn Farm, Ashcombe Lane, Kingston (previously LE124)**

Number of comments on policy: 10

## Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	1	1	2	0	5

## Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raised concerns that the open eastern boundary could negatively affect views unless detailed landscape assessments and effective screening measures are implemented. They noted that extending the settlement boundary may blur the distinction between settlement and countryside contrary to Policy SD25. There are uncertainties over site access and suggestions to enhance local bridleways and footpaths. Calls for thorough community engagement, clearer deliverability and economic viability, and stricter policy compliance with policies SD25 and SD4 were also evident, along with views that the proposed housing typology might not meet local demand for smaller-scale homes and could encourage ribbon development.

## Key Themes raised:

- Landscape Character and Visual Amenity
- Settlement Boundary and Countryside Character
- Access and Connectivity Infrastructure
- Community Engagement and Development Approach
- Deliverability and Economic Viability
- Policy Compliance and Precedent Concerns
- Housing Typology and Local Demand Alignment

## Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

**Natural England** support the allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

**East Sussex County Council** highlight opportunities for improvements to the local Public Rights of Way network.

Parish / Town Councils

**Kingston Parish Council** object to the proposed allocation, citing inflated land values, loss of green space, and threats to the village's character. There is a need for smaller, affordable homes, but these sites risk blurring Kingston-Lewes boundaries. Concerns include pedestrian access, flooding risks, and maintaining local housing for longstanding residents.

**Lewes Town Council** object to the proposed allocation, stating the proposed development lies outside the settlement boundary and lacks alignment with Policy SD25. Any permission granted should require sustainability measures like cycle

routes or community-led planning. Approving it risks expanding ribbon development between Kingston and Lewes, conflicting with Policy SD4, which aims to preserve undeveloped land between settlements.

#### Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Scheme must incorporate the Public Right of Way footpath that crosses the site
- Scheme must incorporate opportunities to support management of the Cockshut stream

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Allocation boundary reduced and developable area identified.