

**APPENDIX A**

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON DRAFT PLANNING BRIEF FOR THE COACH AND LORRY PARK, WARTLING ROAD**

<b>Name/Organisation</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>Officer Comment in Respect of Representation Received</b>
Southern Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In terms of foul sewerage, there is adequate capacity in the existing sewer in Wartling Road to serve the development.</li> </ul>	The comments are noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing pumping main crossing the site could be diverted at the developer's expense if an alternative route was preferred. The route of any diversion would be subject to the diverted main remaining in adopted highway or public open space,</li> </ul>	The comments are noted and paragraph 5.2 of the Brief has been amended in line with the advice given.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regard to surface water sewerage, Southern Water would support the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, where the effectiveness of such systems can be proven. No surface water should be discharged to the foul sewer. Mechanisms should also be put in place to ensure the long term maintenance of any surface water disposal systems.</li> </ul>	The comments are noted. Paragraph 5.7 of the Brief already provides some guidance on the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Agency considers that the draft Planning Brief suitably covers all of the concerns and issues that they have with the site.</li> </ul>	The support is welcomed.
The Trustees of the Chatsworth Settlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of the site was subject to a Compulsory Purchase Order from the Estate in 1955 and as such the Crichel Downs rules may apply.</li> </ul>	The advice of the Legal Services Manager will be sought on this matter and a verbal update given at the meeting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Estate will agree to a modification of the covenants to permit whatever development planning permission is granted for.</li> </ul>	The support to agree to modify the covenants is welcomed.
Director of Transport and Environment, East Sussex County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development contribution requirements have been largely informed by the recently adopted SPG and material status of SPG should be mentioned as it is to be published this month.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. Paragraph 9.12 of the Planning Brief has been amended to reflect the status of the County Council's SPG.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With one or two exceptions, the Appendix 9 calculations are broadly correct.</li> </ul>	Comment is welcomed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a large prominent site of strategic importance. The Brief is welcomed as setting out a positive vision for the future development of the site.</li> </ul>	Support for the Brief is welcomed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed residential development would contribute significantly towards the achievement of the Structure Plan housing requirements set out in Policy H1. Given its sustainable location, brownfield status and size, the potential of the site should be maximised in line with Policy H8 and the upper limit of 225 dwellings should be the aspirational target.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that the replacement of the lorry park is provided for in Policy TR15 of the Borough Plan. It is essential that continuity of provision of a town lorry facility is maintained.</li> </ul>	An alternative site for the lorry park is currently being investigated.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The retention of a community facility on site is welcomed. Relevant organisations requirements should be canvassed. A multi-purpose designed and flexible building capable of extension/adaptation which is sufficiently large to meet identified community requirements should be sought.</li> </ul>	Support is welcomed. The nursery currently operating from the Coach and Lorry Park has been consulted on the Planning Brief as has the local "Rainbows" group. No representations have been received from either group.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development should provide for the required sustainable accessibility in line with Structure Plan policies S1, S3 and TR3 in particular. The site lies within the corridor of Seaside (A259) and will add to bus use along this corridor. Therefore Policy TR4 requiring developer contributions towards Quality Bus Corridors is directly applicable.</li> </ul>	Policy TR4 of the Borough Plan has been added to the list of policies considered relevant to the Planning Brief. Developer contributions to off-site highway works have been identified in the Appendix to the Brief, although costings will depend on the specifics of the development.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is estimated that the accessibility contributions could be in the order of £260,000.</li> </ul>	Appendix 9 of the Planning Brief recommends a contribution of £268,320 should be sought towards local sustainability accessibility.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to the County Council's SPG on parking standards is welcomed.</li> </ul>	Support is noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development should be well connected to the existing urban fabric to encourage safe and convenient walking, cycling and use of public transport.</li> </ul>	Paragraph 9.11 of the Brief recommends that a walkway should be established alongside the Crumbles Sewer and that this could provide a pedestrian/cycle link through the site from Brede Close to Lottbridge Drive.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Account should be taken of government guidance and County Council guidance on highway/parking layouts, to achieve sustainable accessibility and high quality of urban design.</li> </ul>	Paragraph 7.6 of the Brief refers to the County Council's "Manual for Estate Roads".
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design and location of bus stops, pedestrian links to these, natural surveillance of these and adjacent roads need very careful consideration.</li> </ul>	This will be considered at the detailed planning application stage.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The built and landscaped form should encourage appropriately slow vehicle speeds within the development.</li> </ul>	This is not something the Council's Highway Engineers specifically requested as part of the consultation. The site will not have any through roads and this will help reduce traffic speeds.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 7.5 should refer to Transport Assessment and not Traffic Assessment.</li> </ul>	Paragraph 7.5 has been amended accordingly.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The importance of high quality urban design on this prominent, large and important site needs to be emphasised more.</li> </ul>	It is considered that the "Development Guidelines" section of the Brief emphasises the importance of seeking an exceptionally high standard of design for a development on site, which adds interest to the townscape and becomes a focal point in the landscape.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development should offer both good internal natural surveillance and external surveillance.</li> </ul>	This will be considered as part of a detailed residential layout for the site.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retained planting areas should be an integral element of design.</li> </ul>	Paragraphs 9.7-9.10 recognises that any proposed development should retain and enhance the established landscaping on site.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reference to sustainable design is welcomed but should be amplified by direct reference to Borough Plan Policies contained in the Natural Environment Chapter.</li> </ul>	Appendix 4 of the Brief lists all of the Policies considered relevant to the proposed development of the Coach and Lorry Park site for residential purposes and specifically includes Policies in the Natural Environment chapter which relate to sustainable development.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for SUDS is welcomed.</li> </ul>	Support is noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to the adopted SPG on developer contributions towards County Council infrastructure is welcomed.</li> </ul>	Support is noted.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Draft School Organisation Plan (SOP) 2003/4 identifies a continuing high demand for primary school places, including the Seaside area and additional capacity may be needed. Based on the proposed 225 dwellings contributions of £147,885 may be required towards primary school provision.</li> </ul>	Appendix 9 of the Planning Brief identifies that a contribution of £148,885 should be sought towards primary school places.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Draft SOP also refers to the need for additional secondary places identified in the Borough Plan. Based on the proposed 225 dwellings contributions of £150,339 may be required towards secondary school provision.</li> </ul>	Appendix 9 of the Planning Brief identifies the same financial contribution should be sought in respect of secondary school places.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a severe shortage of nursery education facilities in the town. Failure to replace the existing facility would exacerbate this deficiency. The provision of a community building no smaller than the current building and also capable of meeting the additional demand generated by the housing scheme (up to 7 nursery education places) is required. For viability reasons it should be capable of accommodating at least 24 nursery education spaces.</li> </ul>	Appendix 9 of the Planning Brief identifies that a contribution of £14,187 should be sought towards nursery school places. Consultation will take place with the relevant authorities at the detailed design stage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing household waste management facility at Roselands is operating at capacity. A new site is required and contributions of £13,275 may be required.</li> </ul>	Appendix 9 of the Planning Brief has been amended accordingly.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no specific social services needs identified. Potential use of the community building by social services should be allowed for in the design.</li> </ul>	Paragraph 9.19 of the Brief has been amended to state that Social Services will be consulted on the design of the new facility.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed community building should be designed to allow for use as a youth facility.</li> </ul>	This can be taken into account at the detailed design stage.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development will add to pressure on the urban fringe rights of way network. Contributions of £4,500 may be required.</li> </ul>	Appendix 9 of the Planning Brief identifies the same financial contribution should be sought towards pressure on rights of way.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The retention of sensitive environmental areas is welcomed. Full measures should be taken however, to provide for the long-term protection and enhancement of the ecological value of those areas.</li> </ul>	Appendix 9 of the Planning Brief recommends that a financial contribution of £22,000 should be sought towards maintenance of the proposed tree planting.
Eastbourne Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All members present at the last meeting of the Association completely reject the proposal to sell the Wartling Road site until a better or at least a comparable site is allocated for coach parking.</li> </ul>	Alternative sites for the parking of coaches and lorries are currently being investigated.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The idea of moving the site to Cavendish Place seems preposterous, considering the resulting increased congestion and pollution.</li> </ul>	Concern is noted. However Cavendish Place is identified in the Borough Plan for coach parking and this was supported at the Public Inquiry by the Inspector
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The present Coach Park could be better managed to keep more lorries away from the congested areas.</li> </ul>	Comment is noted. However the site now has an allocation for residential development in the adopted Eastbourne Borough Plan (2001-2011). Also the suitability of any new lorry park will be considered in the light of Policy TR5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With reference to the proposed 150 new houses, the members pointed out that Eastbourne has been providing a record number of houses over recent years, in order to “entice” new residents to live here.</li> </ul>	Comment is noted. However the site is allocated in the adopted Borough Plan as a housing allocation and Policy HO4 indicates that a minimum of 150 dwellings should be sought as part of any residential scheme for the site. This will go towards meeting the target for new residential units laid down in the current Structure Plan.