

Eastbourne ELLP Examination Action Points

Sessions 1-3

Session 1a Legal & Procedural

Session 1b Strategy, Town Centre Allocations, and Monitoring

Session 2 Sovereign Harbour

Session 3 Other Employment Allocations and Alternative Sites

No.	Issue	Timescale
SESSION 1b STRATEGY, TOWN CENTRE ALLOCATIONS, AND MONITORING		
1	<p>Qn1.5 Office Development Viability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EBC Matters Statement for Session 1 refers at paragraph 1.5.1 to the sensitivity analysis at Table 9 of Document SD/25 and to the related conclusion at paragraph 5.13 that a viable development could be achieved as a result of higher rents or reduced construction costs. At the hearing it was apparent that the construction costs for town centre development used in the viability assessment at Table 3 of Document SD/28 (£1,700psm/£158psf GIA) are higher than those in Table 9 (Max £150psf). Sovereign Harbour Ltd suggested at the hearing that rents of at least £22psf would be needed for office development to be commercially viable. Would EBC please extend the Table 9 Sensitivity Analysis to establish what rent EBC considers would be needed for a commercially viable development at build costs of £160psf or £170psf. 	14/6/16
2	<p>Qn1.7 Office Development Job Density</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledging that newly established businesses may not yet have reached their full jobs complement, the Inspector requested information on the number of jobs provided so far at Pacific House related to occupied floorspace. Mr Shaw for Sea Change Sussex told the hearing that 50 jobs had been provided in respect of the 27% of floorspace that had so far been occupied. Would EBC confirm with Sea Change Sussex the Inspector's understanding that this equates to 644 sqm of let space (NIA) and that equates to a jobs density of 12.88 sqm per job? If not, what should the figure be? 	14/6/16
3	<p>Qn1.16 Policy EL2 Industrial Estates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EBC agreed to delete the superfluous phrase '<i>to the satisfaction of the Council</i>' as this may suggest that EBC would apply criteria other than those stated in the policy. Bulletpoint 1 refers to an '<i>appropriate use</i>' for an industrial 	14/6/16

	<p>estate but does not clearly define the term. That could result in ambiguity and argument. MH stated that it relates <u>only</u> to employment-generating non-B uses that cannot be located elsewhere because of their unneighbourliness. EBC is asked to suggest revised wording for the bulletpoint.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Policy wording also needs to include clarification that the target is for net additional floorspace (i.e. after deduction of on-site business floorspace that is to be demolished or retained). Would EBC please suggest an amendment. 	
4	<p>Qn1.17 Industrial Estates Floorspace Forecasts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It became apparent at the hearing that there was an error in EBC's Matters Statement for Session 3 at Paragraph 3.1.6 and Table 2. The net additional industrial and warehouse floorspace figures at 1 April 2016 for commitments (1,102sqm) should be <u>added</u> to the completions figure (6,900sqm) and not subtracted as shown. The total of completions <u>plus</u> commitments is 8,002sqm. If this is subtracted from the Policy EL2 20,000sqm allocation the residual requirement is only 11,998sqm and not 14,202sqm. The average annual delivery had been calculated at 1,725sqm. If this continued for the remaining 11 years then 18,795sqm would be delivered (but less the outstanding commitment figure of 1,102sqm which would be part of that delivery). Alternatively the residual requirement for net additional floorspace on the industrial estates would require annual delivery of only a net additional average 1,191sqm each year to achieve the overall 20,000sqm target. That is well below the recent average figure for delivery. Having regard to these figures, and should the further testing of viability show limited scope for office development in the town centre, the Inspector asks EBC to consider whether there would be scope to accommodate an identified allocation of B1a/b office floorspace on the industrial estates – (for example the 1,500sqm NIA that EBC seeks to deduct from the Policy EL4 allocation at Sovereign Harbour in order to accommodate the community centre?) 	14/6/16
5	<p>Qn1.17 Industrial Estates Redevelopment Capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Inspector asked EBC to identify the potential sites on the industrial estates that could be suitable for redevelopment and intensification. EBC provided such plans on the second day of the hearings. 	No further action required
6	<p>Qn1.18 Policy EL2 and Office Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that policies should be clear if they are to be effective. Policy EL2 as worded does not allow for B1a/b office or 	14/6/16

	<p>research development on the designated industrial estates. However the viability evidence has indicated potential difficulties with office development in the town centre and elsewhere. Nevertheless there appear to be examples of the successful inclusion of office space in recent redevelopments on industrial estates as part of mixed developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this context the EBC hearing statement indicated that, notwithstanding the policy wording, EBC would support office proposals in industrial estates. • As this creates uncertainty could EBC suggest amended wording that would allow for some office development on industrial estates together with any criteria for such proposals that the Council may consider necessary to avoid prejudice to the overall supply of land for B1c, B2 or B8 development and to the sequential preference to accommodate offices first in town centres? 	
7	<p>Qn1.21 Policy EL3 Town Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the policy as worded B1 office provision is only optional. The only reference to mandatory provision is at paragraph 4.26 and that only applies to the last site to be developed. At the hearing EBC agreed to consider rewording the policy to include a mandatory requirement. Consideration would be given as to how the allocation could be distributed across development opportunity sites 2 and 3. • EBC would replace use of the word 'should' in the policy with 'shall' to make implementation more certain. • The Policy EL3 allocation should be amended to allow the inclusion of B1b research floorspace in addition to B1a office floorspace. • The Inspector acknowledged that EBC has looked at the site capacity but further testing is required to establish what will work in terms of unit size, overall viability and timescales. The Inspector has written to the Council about the need for that testing to demonstrate how the allocation could be delivered. • Subject to that viability testing the office floorspace allocation may need to be amended to include consideration of the replacement of the 1,500sqm (NIA) that is to be deducted from the Sovereign Harbour allocation in Policy EL4. 	14/6/16
8	<p>Qn1.42 Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After discussion at the first hearing, EBC proposed amendments to the Plan's Monitoring Framework which are set out in Document EBC-ELLP-09. These are minor modifications for the purposes of clarification including the use of more readily identifiable indicators. • As the EELLP is due to be replaced by the emerging Eastbourne Local Plan there would be no purpose in 	No further action required.

	triggering an interim review of the EELLP itself that depended on the outcome of monitoring. The Local Plan could serve that function.	
SESSION 2 SOVEREIGN HARBOUR (POLICY EL4)		
9	<p>Qn2.2 Marketing History at Sovereign Harbour</p> <p>At the hearing Sovereign Harbour Ltd (SHL) stated that they have prepared evidence in the form of a summary sheet of marketing for B1 uses. Whilst that sheet was not circulated at the hearing, the Inspector would appreciate the submission of that document and the comments from other parties at the hearing on its contents.</p>	Submission by 7/6/16 Comments by 21/6/16
10	<p>Qn2.5-2.16 Floorspace Allocations - Sites 4, 6 and 7a</p> <p><u>Overall Floorspace Allocation</u></p> <p>Following discussion at the hearing and with regard to the Inspector's separate letter concerning the Sovereign Harbour allocations, EBC is requested to give consideration to amending Policy EL4 and the explanatory text along the following lines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Amend the text of Policy EL4 by deleting use of the word 'should' and replacing it with reference to a target figure similar to that in Policy EL2. b) Clarify in Policy EL4 how the floorspace figure is to be assessed (i.e. Net Internal Area or Gross External Area). c) For consistency and certainty as to the anticipated volume of built development, to consider converting the target figure to a <u>gross</u> floorspace figure in line with Policy EL2. This could be based on the indicative layouts at REP/10/02 and REP/10/03 but using Gross External Area rather than Gross Internal Area as shown (and including the actual GEA of Pacific House). d) Would EBC and SCS please seek to agree what the GEA floorspace figure would be using the SCS indicative layouts for Sites 6 and 7a. e) Amend the Policy EL4 floorspace allocation to account for the proposed inclusion of the community centre on Site 7a to include reference to the amount of land that is required. f) Explain in the policy or text that Site 7a is also to accommodate a community centre. g) Consider whether the Policy or the explanatory text should refer to any provision of parking for the Community Centre including whether there would be a need to share parking with development on other parts of the site, as suggested at the hearing. h) In order to avoid prejudicing the early delivery of the mixed development on Site 4, the Inspector suggests that 	14/6/16

	<p>reference to Site 4 is deleted from Policy EL4 but that the explanatory text at 4.47 is retained - with the addition of a reference to the optional office development that is included in the extant outline planning permission.</p> <p>i) Clarify in Policy EL4 that B1a and B1b development is proposed across both Sites 6 and 7a but that the inclusion of B1c development is only proposed on Site 6.</p> <p>j) The final sentence of Policy EL4 requires amendment of the floorspace figure in line with other changes and to replace the reference to Site 7 with a reference to Site 7a.</p>	
11	<p>Other Matters</p> <p><u>Greenfield vs Brownfield</u></p> <p>The Sovereign Harbour sites are part of former mineral workings.</p> <p>Richard Maile has disputed that the site qualifies as previously developed land.</p> <p>Having regard to the definition of previously developed land in the Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework, would EBC please confirm that the land does <u>not</u> qualify as: '<i>Land that has previously been developed for minerals extraction ... where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures.</i>'</p>	14/6/16
SESSION 3 - OTHER EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS AND ALTERNATIVE SITES		
12	<p>Land North of Hammonds Drive</p> <p>Would EBC please advise the Inspector of when Richard Maile's land was first included within the boundary of Eastbourne Park for the purposes of the development plan.</p>	14/6/16