

EASTBOURNE BOROUGH COUNCIL**EASTBOURNE PLAN CORE STRATEGY DPD EXAMINATION****HIGHWAYS AGENCY WRITTEN STATEMENT: MATTER 4 –HOUSING****MAY 2012 EXAMINATION**

MATTER 4 – HOUSING**4.1: Is the level of housing proposed deliverable and is the evidence that supports the housing trajectory robust?**

1. The Core Strategy proposes the development of 5,022 homes between 2006 and 2027. To be deliverable with respect to the Strategic Road Network (SRN), the Plan is required to demonstrate what transport infrastructure is required and how the necessary infrastructure will be brought forward to facilitate the proposed development.
2. Eastbourne does not have any SRN within its administrative boundary but development traffic will have an impact on the A27 and A259 in neighbouring Wealden and as such, a joint assessment has been undertaken. The South Wealden and Eastbourne Transport Study (SWETS) forms the transport evidence base for both Eastbourne's and Wealden's respective Core Strategies and cumulatively assesses the impact on the highway network.
3. SWETS concludes that to deliver the proposed level of development in Wealden and Eastbourne the following improvements would be required:
 - a) Signalisation of the A27 Cophall roundabout;
 - b) Implementation of the Quality Bus Corridor between Eastbourne and Hailsham which will require the retiming of signals at the A27/A2270 junction;
 - c) Signalisation of the A27/A22 roundabout; and
 - d) Signalisation of the A22/Dittons Road roundabout (non HA)
4. The improvements have been identified as critical within Wealden's Core Strategy and as such Wealden District Council is progressing with the interventions. At present it is unclear on the exact design of the improvements, when the improvements will be required by, how much they will cost and who will deliver them. As a consequence, the deliverability of the improvements is uncertain although further work is being commissioned to understand this.
5. With respect to Eastbourne's housing, we are satisfied that the proposed level of development is deliverable subject to the satisfactory resolution of the above issues currently being progressed by Wealden.

4.2: Policy D5 states that proposals for housing must take account of need identified in SHMA with regard to size/ type/ tenure? How will this policy operate? How can it be applied to conversions and windfall sites?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.3: The heavy reliance on windfall sites to provide approximately 37% of the Borough's housing, from year 6 of the housing trajectory, is inconsistent with government advice in PPS3. Is there robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.4: The Plan defines windfall sites as "previously developed sites that have unexpectedly become available" (Appendix A). Is it logical for the plan to include precise figures for the number of units to be provided by "unexpected" sites?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.5: Is it appropriate for the Key Diagram to show windfall sites?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.6: In the light of heavy reliance on windfall sites, especially conversions, is the Plan capable of addressing the particular need for larger family accommodation and affordable housing referred to in paragraph 1.3.2 as a Key Issue for Eastbourne?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.7: Is there robust and up to date evidence to justify restricting future residential at Sovereign Harbour to 150 units?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.8: Is there compelling evidence to justify the decision to abandon each of the undeveloped local plan greenfield housing allocations?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.9: Are the affordable housing threshold and percentage contributions justified? Are they supported by affordable housing viability evidence?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.10: As the Plan expects a significant proportion of Eastbourne's housing supply to be delivered through windfall conversions, has the viability of securing contributions to affordable housing from such development been assessed?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.11: Is the subdivision of the Borough into market value areas based on robust evidence?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.12: Should Policy D6 specify the need which it seeks to meet? What is the justification for failing to provide for additional pitches in accordance with Policy H7 of the SE Plan?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue

4.13: Is D6 consistent with Circular 01/2006 and the DCLG Good Practice Guide?

The Highways Agency does not wish to comment on this issue