

Lewes District Local Plan Part 1

Joint Core Strategy Proposed Modifications

Suggested minor alterations proposed in representations to the Proposed Modifications that are acceptable to LDC and SDNPA – a note for information for the resumed hearings.

December 2015



Lewes District Council



South Downs

National Park Authority

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) was submitted for examination in September 2014. Examination hearings took place in January 2015, followed by the publication of the Inspector's Initial Findings letter in February 2015. In spring 2015 LDC and SDNPA drafted Proposed Main and Additional Modifications in response to both the Inspector's Initial Findings and the discussions at the examination hearings. The proposed modifications were agreed for publication and consultation by both authorities in July 2015. They were then published on 7 August 2015 and the ensuing consultation ran for 8 weeks to 2 October 2015.
- 1.2 Over 300 representations were received relating to the Proposed Modifications to the JCS. Some representations suggested minor additions, alterations or clarifications to the Proposed Modifications and some of these are acceptable in principle to the LDC and SDNPA. Where this is the case, the suggested addition, alteration or clarification is set out in the table below.
- 1.3 We have prepared the table in order that it might assist the Inspector and hearing participants and potentially remove the need for discussion on these agreed points at the resumed hearings in December 2015.
- 1.4 We understand that the Inspector would not normally accept additional submissions to the examination at this stage, however we offer this note, which may assist the resumed hearing sessions, and respectfully request that the Inspector considers the incorporation of these minor changes to the Proposed Modifications in his final report.
- 1.5 All representations received are available to view via the Examination webpage <http://padocs.lewes.gov.uk/AniteIM.WebSearch/Results.aspx> together with a summary of representations received http://www.lewes.gov.uk/Files/plan_Addendum_Consultation_Statement_Oct_2015.pdf

2. Suggested additions, alterations and clarifications relating to representations received that LDC and SDNPA consider acceptable.

Proposed Modification reference	Representation reference	Suggested change(s)	Agreed with key stakeholder(s)?
MM02	Brighton and Hove City Council REP/001	<p>BHCC suggested some amended policy wording in their representation. While we agree that some enhancement to the wording is acceptable to ensure that BHCC as adjacent highway authority is included in the process of working towards an agreed mitigation strategy. However, we have not included BHCC's suggested alteration in full since it would not be appropriate for the delivery of development to be ultimately contingent upon BHCC's agreement.</p> <p>That the policy wording is amended as follows:</p> <p>... to the satisfaction of the local highway authority, in consultation with the adjacent highway authority, and delivering and funding, a co-ordinated package of multi-model transport measures required to mitigate the impacts of development on the A259.</p>	ESCC
MM02	Newhaven Town Council REP/016	<p>Clarity is required over the number of new homes to be planned for in Newhaven as SP2 states 'minimum 400 net additional units' whereas Table 5 [MM03] shows 424. Clarity is required for the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>The figure in Table 5 is the correct figure. For consistency with the approach taken otherwise in SP2 (rounding up or down to the nearest multiple of 5) the drafting error to SP2 part (2) in MM02 should be corrected to read as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Newhaven – a minimum of <u>425</u> net additional units 	Newhaven Town Council
MM02		<p>In order to correct the format/totalling error in section (3) of Spatial policy 2, this should be amended to read:</p> <p>(3) 207-215 net additional units in locations to be determined.</p>	

MM10	Sussex Wildlife Trust REP/473 Ringmer Parish Council REP/020	Enhance criterion iii to read: iii) The development will wherever possible allow for the retention and enhancement of 'important' and existing hedgerows. <u>Mitigation will be required in the event that the removal of a hedgerow, or parts, is needed to facilitate development.</u>	Revised wording supported by Sussex Wildlife Trust.
MM13	Sussex Wildlife Trust REP/473	Enhance criterion x to read: x) Development is subject to an ecological impact assessment and appropriate measures are undertaken to mitigate adverse impacts on biodiversity. <u>Development will also allow for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity;</u> and Concurrently enhance supporting paragraph 6.105 to read: 6.105 The site is adjacent to the Brighton to Newhaven Cliffs SSSI and there are SNCIs to the east and west. There are also multiple records of protected and notable species from the local area. As a result an ecological impact assessment will be required together with appropriate mitigation, where necessary, <u>and opportunities to enhance biodiversity,</u> as informed by the ecological impact assessment.	Revised wording supported by Sussex Wildlife Trust.
MM14	Brighton and Hove City Council REP/001	Section iv) of SP8 should be amended as follows: The identification, delivery <u>and funding</u> of a co-ordinated package of multi-modal transport measures to mitigate the impacts of development on the A259 coast road to the satisfaction of the local highway authority <u>in consultation with the adjacent highway authority.</u>	ESCC
MM14	Southern Water REP/006	Recommend an additional criterion to SP8: <u>x) The provision of a comprehensive noise and odour assessment (in consultation with the utility provider) which demonstrates acceptable noise and odour standards can be met within the proposed homes and amenity areas.</u>	Suggested by Southern Water.

HRA SA/SEA	Natural England REP/005	Natural England has re-confirmed that it is satisfied with the conclusions of the 2015 HRA Addendum, as reflected in its earlier comments, i.e. that the plan may proceed on the basis of no likely significant effects on the Lewes Downs SAC. This overcomes the confusion raised by the phrasing of a comment in the SA/SEA Table 5: Old Malling Farm, Lewes (p56).	Natural England
---------------	----------------------------	--	--------------------