

# Lewes Neighbourhood Development Plan

## Answers from Lewes Town Council to Examiner's Clarification Note (1)

3<sup>rd</sup> October 2018

### ***Policy wording***

The Plan uses overlapping wording in several policies. Where it takes a positive approach to development it uses either 'permitted, supported or encouraged'. Where it takes a more negative approach to development it uses 'resisted or not be permitted'.

This is potentially confusing to all concerned and to the SDNPA in particular as it would implement a 'made' Plan up to 2033. Whilst I can see that the Plan may wish to encourage certain developments to take place, the use of the word 'encourage' has very limited policy status.

As such I am proposing to modify all affected policies so that they include either 'support' or 'not support' as appropriate. Your comments would be appreciated at this stage.

*Answer: We are comfortable with this change to make language more consistent although recognise that the document may become more repetitive as a result.*

### ***Policy HC1 (6)***

I can see the supporting text at 7.8. However, is the policy more a statement of fact or intent rather than a policy? If this is not the case by what planning means will the Hospital be retained?

*Answer: We would wish to see this section of the plan retained as far as possible. However, the word "will" may be too strong for inclusion in a neighbourhood plan.*

*It should be noted that retention of the Victoria Hospital is a strongly held local view, especially in light of the proposed centralisation of the town's three medical practices into one Medical Hub to be located in the new North Street Quarter development. We therefore consider retention of Victoria Hospital to be essential during the life of the Lewes Neighbourhood Plan and this view was very well supported in our public consultation. We therefore suggest a rewording that supports the same outcomes but allows it to remain within the policy text.*

**Policy HC2**

The approach is well-reasoned. However, what is meant by ‘in line with the purposes of the SDNP’?

How could this be applied consistently within the Plan period?

How would a user of the Plan know if and when those purposes are changed or updated?

What is the proposal referenced in 7.12? How does that site refer to this policy?

*Answer: The phrase “in line with the purposes of the SDNP” means the statutory duties of a national park as prescribed in the relevant acts and regulations. We would be comfortable with this being explained more fully in the plan text, if considered necessary. Inclusion of a footnote here may be an appropriate response.*

**Policy HC3 b (5)**

I do not disagree with the approach. However, it reads more as a procedural matter rather than a policy. Would any harm be caused by repositioning it into the supporting text?

*Answer: We consider that the use of local knowledge to help understand the significance of heritage assets to be important and wish this section to retain prominence in the plan as far as possible. It adds local detail to the strategic heritage policies.*

**Policy HC4 1**

Are the existing uses and premises defined on a map base?

If not, could they be so defined?

If not, how would any developer understand the coverage of this policy in general, and on a site by site basis in particular?

*Answer: To identify all employment land uses on a map would be impractical so suggest that reference to the Use Class Order (employment land use classes) may be helpful here to provide a consistent and standardised definition.*

**Policy HC4 (3)**

I do not disagree with the approach. However, is there any indication of the 'proportion' required?

*Answer: We would consider the application of a proportion for studios and workshops, for example expressed in percentage terms, to be unhelpful as conditions and demand will be fluid over the plan period. A fixed percentage could be unnecessarily rigid and not allow response to changing demands. We feel the vision and objectives set out in clear terms the aims and ambitions for this mix and any planning application could be effectively assessed against these sections of the plan, even in the absence of a percentage figure within the policy text.*

**Policy HC5 (3)**

Again, I do not disagree with the approach.  
However, is this a land use policy? In any event who will carry out the signposting?

*Answer: We would wish to retain this as part of the policy text, if this is possible. Agencies responsible for wayfinding, signage and similar would implement the policy.*

**Policy PL1 (10)**

I do not disagree with the approach. However, it reads more as a procedural matter rather than a policy. Would any harm be caused by repositioning it into the supporting text?

*Answer: We would wish to retain this as part of the policy text, if this is possible. This requirement was included in the plan to highlight our concern about what is often reported as happening in other parts of the country. It is difficult enough to get an appropriate proportion of affordable housing. So, we would prefer it to stay as is as part of the policy text.*

**Allocated Housing Sites**

As I read the Plan it allocates a series of housing sites. Each site has a separate policy. Am I correct in my assumption that the various details in each policy are in effect criteria for the development of the site concerned?

If so, I am minded to recommend the inclusion of an overarching policy which allocates the batch of sites. Each site would then be the subject of its own component policy minus the first criterion in each policy. Your comments would be appreciated on my thinking at this stage.

It is likely that I will have site-specific questions after I have visited the neighbourhood area

*Answer: We are comfortable with this approach.*

**Policy PL2 (6/7)**

How do these policies relate to the Written Ministerial Statement of March 2015?

*Answer: We are happy to have the wording clarified with regard to this section.*

**Policy AM1 (1)**

The use of 'All' is potentially confusing. Applied literally the policy would affect minor domestic applications and applications for shop fronts.

Did you intend the policy to apply to larger developments and/or those promoting particular types of development? If so what types?

*Answer: Perhaps remove "all" and replace with "where they affect"?*

**Policy AM1 (2)**

This reads more as a practical intention for works to take place rather than as a policy. I am intending to recommend a modification so that it takes on a supporting policy format for the identified works. Do you have any comments?

*Answer: Perhaps add "... where opportunities arise within land use proposals" could be inserted here to clarify that changes to streets, spaces and highway can still be delivered through land use policies?*

**Policies AM2/AM3**

Both of these policies read as aspirations rather than policies. This is reinforced by paragraphs 9.12/9.13/9.14.

How would SDNPA determine whether a development contributes to the delivery of a project that helped implement either or both of the strategies?

When or how will those strategies be prepared?

*Answer: They need to work together, and this section of the plan has been strongly supported through community responses. The thinking here is that contributions from and/or CIL and s106 would apply here.*

**Policy SS2 (2)**

I understand the approach in the Plan. However, it reads as a policy to support the development of another Plan (the Public Realm Framework).

Are the specific set of policies that follow the policy on pages 121-129 the full extent of policies in the Public Realm Framework?

How will the neighbourhood plan respond to any update to the Public Realm Framework?

*Answer: The neighbourhood plan is keen to embed the laudable ideas, concepts, aims and objectives of the 2013 Public Realm Framework into policy to give it additional statutory weight and support its ongoing delivery.*

*The sections on pages 121-129 are the main action points of the Public Realm Framework, so are effectively the full extent of the ideas, but these are not policies in the 2013 document. The Lewes NDP wishes to translate the 2013 ideas into policy to assist implementation.*

*In response to potential updates to the 2013 document, perhaps the Lewes NDP “decouples” from the current plan by not including the 2013 date within the policy text? Instead, words about the “current plan and/or successor or updated plans” could be including in the supporting text?*

**Policy SS3 (1)**

I have seen the LGS table and Appendix 6.

Please can I see the background paper mentioned in Appendix 6.

Please can I be advised of the size of the following proposed LGS:  
10/15/20/21/31/32/41/62

*Answer: The background paper has already been provided.*

The areas of the LGS requested are:

Site_ref_2	Site	Area HA
Lewes_NDP_SS3_10	Landport Flood Plain	16.76
Lewes_NDP_SS3_15	Pells Floodplain & Riverside Walk	12.29
Lewes_NDP_SS3_20	Malling Recreation Ground	6.53
Lewes_NDP_SS3_21	Malling Old Railway Line	2.15
Lewes_NDP_SS3_31	Malling to Earwig Corner Boundary	1.73
Lewes_NDP_SS3_32	Railway Land	20.23
Lewes_NDP_SS3_41	Stanley Turner Recreation Ground	8.22
Lewes_NDP_SS3_62	Lewes Battle Historic Site	27.02

**Policy SS3 5**

What are the iconic views?

Are they some or all of those set out in Appendix 5?

*Answer: Yes, the iconic views are the ones scheduled in Appendix 5. We would prefer to drop the word "iconic" and use "key" to ensure consistency between the text in SS3 and Appendix 5 title.*

***Representations made to the Plan***

Does the Town Council wish to make observations on any of the representations made to the Plan?

In particular does it have any comments on the representations made by the various statutory bodies and local authorities?

*Answer: Lewes Town Council does not wish to comment on the representations made by the public but will comment on the representations made by the various statutory bodies and local authorities. These will be sent as a separate document.*