



## **MINUTES**

of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held on **Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> February 2021**, online *via* Zoom Meetings, Lewes at 6.30pm.

**Present:** Cllrs; S Catlin (*Chairman*); R Handy; I Makepeace; Dr W Maples; M Milner and S Sains

*In attendance:* S Brigden (*Town Clerk [TC]*) and Mrs E Tingley (*Committee Admin*)

**PC2020/8** **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Apologies were noted from Cllr J Lamb, who had a conflicting commitment, and Cllr Dr Baah had suffered a family bereavement.

**It was resolved that:**

**PC2020/008.1** Apologies for absence from this meeting are noted

**PC2020/9** **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:** There were none.

**PC2020/10** **QUESTION TIME:** There were none

**PC2020/11** **CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS:** There were none.

**PC2020/12** **Site of the FORMER PELLIS CE PRIMARY SCHOOL (SDNP/20/05799/FUL):**  
The meeting welcomed Ms Deborah Twitchen (*Chair, Landport Residents Association*) and Ms Annie Rowe, a local resident.

Ms Rowe explained that local publicity and information for the planning application had been extremely poor with only two notices on the school gates situated on Arundel Green. Residents on only one side of Stansfield Road had received notification of the application. Ms Twitchen informed the meeting that a complaint regarding the lack of publicity was to be published in the next edition of the Landport News.

Councillors considered details of the application and expressed views as:

### *General points*

- The Committee deplored the loss of the school; considered to demonstrate a particular lack of foresight given the prospects of development in Lewes and the present shortage of school spaces.
- The application was described as 'lazy' and did not demonstrate any understanding of the area.
- It was recognised that there were some positive elements on the application. It did not propose the maximum possible density and included thoughtful details such as Ground-source Heat Pump installations. Current residents in Landport would be happy to see extra housing.

### *Transport; parking etc*

- There were concerns regarding vehicle access onto the development site and pressure on Kingsley Road. All construction traffic would have to drive through Landport as the site is located the bottom of the estate, and there was a threat to mature trees if the recreation ground access was used.
- There were many tradesmen currently residing in Landport, therefore many trade vehicles taking up street parking provision. There were only 46 parking spaces allocated for the new development. Could a car share scheme be introduced or could new developments have a restriction on the number of cars permitted? It was considered that a share scheme so close to the town centre could be a

beacon project. New residents were considered likely to park in the recreation ground car park.

- In the transport assessment document ‘walking times’ from the site to key areas in the town were tabled. These were considered to be theoretical: completely unrealistic, and the product of a ‘desk-exercise’ based upon assumptions and without any local knowledge. This should be challenged and the transport document re-examined.
- Statements in the document regarding the previous school-generated traffic are considered fallacious. The school had generated a large pedestrian volume but not a large number of vehicles.
- Only 20% of the allocation parking on the development would have electric vehicle charging points, which is inadequate.
- Public transport should be encouraged.

*Housing provision and design*

- Councillors agreed comments recorded by the South Downs National Park Authority’s Senior Planning Policy Officer, regarding the proposed tenure; mix of sizes, and types of home, in that this site has potential to make a much needed contribution to meeting local housing need, in particular for affordable housing. However, the proposal has yet to demonstrate that it is responding to local community needs.
- Policies in the Lewes Neighbourhood Plan and the SDNP Local Plan had not been adequately recognized, and several key factors ignored. The currently published Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HEDNA) shows local need for smaller and medium sized dwellings and Lewes District Housing Register identified the greatest need (74% of registrants) is for 1 or 2 bedroomed homes, yet the plans do little to address this, and policies requiring recognition of the needs of older people had been ignored.

Members wished to encourage the prospective developer (Raven Housing Trust) to present their thinking to the committee. It was understood that there was sufficient time before determination of the application to allow for this. The Committee’s formal response to the application would be reserved until this could be arranged. TC would clarify the timescale and approach the applicant in this regard.

**PC2020/13**

**MISCELLANEOUS PLANNING ISSUES:**

There were none

There being no other business, the Chairman thanked everyone for their valued contributions and closed the meeting.

*The meeting ended at 7:45pm*

Signed: .....

Date: .....