

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	17	Section 5- Representations	<p>Letter received from applicants agent responding to representations received during the application process making the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall number of objections is low and principally comes from a small but dedicated core of objectors whose apparent sole aim is to see the cessation of Boomtown. That is of course their right but it is contended that they do not speak for the substantial majority who have no issue with Boomtown or actively support it, the numbers of which exceed the objectors by a ratio of at least two to one.</li> <li>• Of the objections received, three individuals have made two objections each, one has made three and one has submitted no less than five, all of which might add to the false impression of widespread opposition (<i>Officer note: when providing details in the report as to the number of letters of support and objection, where there was more than one objection from the same person, this was counted as only one objection</i>).</li> <li>• Boomtown has actively sought to engage with the local community. Boomtown held one of their community meetings in Cheriton this year. Not one single objector from the village attended that meeting.</li> <li>• Applicants agent provided within letter a link to a social media platform providing details of a flavour of what Boomtown is seeking to achieve.</li> </ul>	Update
8	101	Section 4 - Consultations	<p>Comments received from East Sussex Fire and Rescue, which are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a vehicle access for a pumping appliance to within 45 metres of all points within each dwelling (house or flat);</li> <li>• If this cannot be provided then a fire main should be provided and access for a pumping appliance should be provided within 18 metres of each fire inlet connection point;</li> <li>• Weight of fire appliances used within East Sussex exceed the minimum carrying capacity for vehicle access routes (as set out in the Building Regulations) – therefore the minimum carrying capacities should be increased to 17 tonnes for pumping appliances and 20 tonnes for high reach appliances (with 27 tonnes for bridges and similar structures), and</li> </ul> <p>Would recommend the installation of sprinklers systems into all types of premises, including residential.</p>	Update
8	103	5.2	<p>A further letter of objection has been received from the Friends of South Downs (the South Downs Society) stating that the Sustainability Assessment should be significantly improved, the main reasons for objection are summarised below:</p>	Update

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are insufficient measures included within the development to cope with climate change – there should be full provision for renewable energy power supplies. This should be a ‘flagship’ renewable energy, zero carbon development;</li> <li>• The submitted Sustainability Statement takes insufficient account of the future needs to limit the use of fossil fuels, and</li> <li>• Insufficient importance has been given to provision of bus infrastructure in relation to the road layout and access to the site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Planning Officer Note:</b> These comments re-iterate the concerns already included in the report. The context of this application is explained in Section 2 and paragraphs 8.1-8.2 and issues of sustainability and highways are addressed within Section 8 of the report. The recommendation is unchanged.</p>	
8	103	5.2	<p>A letter of support has been received from the Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group (LCAAG). A summary of the comments from LCAAG are provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed layout is compatible with the existing grain of the town. The hierarchy of roads, pedestrian, and cycle routes gives appropriate weight to the needs of all road users, creates a civilised environment and connects well to the existing road layout. Building design is acceptable, lifted by quality materials and good detailing.</li> <li>• The scale, form and proposed architecture treatment are acceptable with areas of tree planting that will help break up the mass of the housing, particularly on the river frontage.</li> <li>• The Group particularly likes the different house types and setbacks which will help to avoid blandness. Public spaces have been carefully considered and well designed, utilising quality materials and generous tree planting.</li> <li>• This proposal will provide much needed housing and a range of community and commercial accommodation in this run down quarter of Lewes.</li> </ul>	Update
8	113	10.1	<p>Amendment to Condition 3</p> <p>No dwelling (<b>houses or flats</b>) within <b>Phase 2 or Phase 3 (or any subsequent sub-phase)</b> <del>any Phase</del> of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until written documentary evidence has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that the dwellings (<del>houses and flats</del>) within that Phase (<b>or sub-phase</b>) of development <b>have</b> <del>has</del> achieved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a minimum 19% improvement over the 2013 Building Regulations Part L Dwelling Emission Rate (DER)/Target Emission Rate (TER);</li> <li>• a further reduction in Co<sup>2</sup> emissions through the use of renewable energy sources, and</li> <li>• a 110 litres/person/day internal water use,</li> </ul>	Further clarification

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<p>The documentary evidence shall be in the form of a final SAP calculations and water efficiency calculator and other evidence confirming that the water appliances/fittings have been installed as specified, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the development has minimised its overall demand for resources, in accordance with Policy SD48 of the South Downs Local Plan.</p>	
8	116	Appendix 2 – list of approved plans and documents	<p>Correction to Plan reference:</p> <p>PI-2-3 89 Rev <b>01</b> <del>00</del> Site Wide Elevations Quay Street</p>	Correction
9	129	5.1	<p><b><u>Further Neighbour Representation:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing water may be found close to the southern boundary of the site following rain events and does not flow away.</li> <li>• The risk of flood to the property to the south would increase as a result of development.</li> <li>• The ‘Preliminary Ground Contamination Risk assessment Report’ from Ashdown Site Investigation Limited, states, at para 3.1.7, “that the risk of groundwater flooding at the site is ‘high.’”</li> <li>• Mitigation measures are required to ensure the free flow of water away from the southern boundary.</li> </ul>	Further representation
9	128	4.3	<p><b><u>Further Comments from Horsham DC Drainage:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further comments to make, other than that the advice already provided in the original consultation response should be followed, and that any approval should secure via condition details of surface water disposal and provision of a sustainable drainage verification report.</li> </ul>	Further comments
9	127	4.1	<p><b><u>Further Comments received from Amberley Parish Council:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amberley Parish Council is pleased to see that the issue of affordable housing appears to have been resolved to the satisfaction of all parties. We are concerned, however, to see that landscape design has now risen to become a reason for refusal, an issue which did not feature prominently at our recent meetings. We wish to reiterate that the site is identified in our Neighbourhood Plan (NP), which was developed with the help and support of SDNPA. It is important to mention that it was SDNPA that allocated a minimum of 6 houses in Amberley for inclusion in our NP. As part of the NP process the Parish Council engaged fully with residents, and explored several potential sites. The site at Strawberry Villas was chosen overwhelmingly by our residents, and we believe that it minimises the visual and landscape impact that now seems to be a reason for the recommendation to refuse. We took into account the views from the Downs and other locations because it is crucial that visual impacts be assessed not only from the immediate area of Strawberry Villas, but should also include the views from the South Downs Way and Amberley Mount.</li> </ul>	Further representation

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Furthermore, both before and subsequent to the adoption of the NP the current plans have been developed with input from the community through a series of consultations. There was a desire for housing to be provided at reasonable cost that younger couples might be able to afford and to which the elderly could downsize without having to leave the village. Hence, we rejected both the idea of more executive homes and also that of putting smaller houses on large plots of land which would increase their cost. We doubt that there will be any appetite at this stage for tearing up the plans and starting again through a series of workshops. This means that we will fail to deliver one of the main objectives of our NP, which is deeply disappointing for us and our parishioners.</li> </ul>	
10	153	I.I	The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013 (HMWP) was prepared by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) in partnership with the Hampshire Authorities (Hampshire County Council, New Forest National Park Authority, Portsmouth City Council, <del>Portsmouth</del> and Southampton City Council).	Typo
13	234	Policy Fitt9	<p>The following text to be added to the SDNPA representation to the Fittleworth Submission Neighbourhood Plan found at Appendix 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include housing site allocation references on supporting policy map shown at Fitt9</li> </ul>	Policy Fitt9 sets out 2 housing site allocations, however there is no clear indication on the policy map as to which site is Limbourne Lane and which site is Fleet Cottage
13	234	Policy Fitt9	<p>The following text to be added to the SDNPA representation to the Fittleworth Submission Neighbourhood Plan found at Appendix 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy map shown at Fitt9 to be produced as a separate policy map to support the NDP</li> </ul>	The current FNDP does not include a separate policies map