

## Lewes District Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies

### Issues & Options Topic Paper 5 – November 2013

## Development Management Policies – Lewes District outside the National Park

### Background

- 1.1 The Introductory Topic Paper provides the context and background to the preparation of the Lewes District Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document. Once adopted, the Local Plan Part 2 will form part of the statutory development plan for the area and will be used as a basis for determining planning applications in that part of the District outside of the National Park.
- 1.2 The aim of this consultation is to set out the emerging work on the Local Plan Part 2 and to seek the views of the public and key stakeholders before any firm decisions are taken by the Council. The consultation will last **8 weeks**, running from **22 November 2013** to **17 January 2014**. Within this topic paper, there are a number of questions that we are keen for individuals and organisations to respond to. Further details on how to comment can be found at the end of this paper.

### Purpose of this Topic Paper

- 1.3 This Topic Paper sets out some initial ideas about the scope and content of the development management policies that are required to help achieve the objectives and spatial vision of the Joint Core Strategy.<sup>1</sup>
- 1.4 Unlike the Joint Core Strategy, the planning policies under consideration for inclusion in the Local Plan Part 2 will only apply to the parts of Lewes District outside of the South Downs National Park. The reason for this is explained more fully in the Introductory Topic Paper, which also shows the extent of Lewes District outside of the National Park.
- 1.5 Most of the policies in the Joint Core Strategy will have a key role in the development management process and will directly influence planning decisions. The Local Plan Part 2 will contain additional, more detailed policies that are considered necessary to provide a proper basis for development management within its area. These policies should not

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.lewes.gov.uk/corestrategy/index.asp](http://www.lewes.gov.uk/corestrategy/index.asp)

repeat the strategic planning policies of the Joint Core Strategy, or national policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), but must be consistent with them.

- 1.6 Once the Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted, all the remaining policies of the 2003 Local Plan, as listed in the Appendix, will be superseded and no longer effective. All of the Council's statutory development plan policies will then be contained in the following documents:
  - Lewes District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy
  - Lewes District Local Plan Part 2 – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document
  - Any Neighbourhood Plans that have been adopted by the District Council
  - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan
- 1.7 It is therefore important that the Council identifies all the issues that need to be covered in the Local Plan Part 2 and establishes the level of detail needed to ensure that any new or retained planning policies adequately address these issues and can be implemented effectively.
- 1.8 The Council will be working closely with those towns and parish councils currently preparing Neighbourhood Plans, who may include development management policies in their own plans. Once a Neighbourhood Plan has been brought into force, the policies it contains take precedence over existing non-strategic policies in the Local Plan for that neighbourhood (paragraph 185 of the NPPF).
- 1.9 At the time of publication, neighbourhood areas have been designated in the following towns and parishes:
  - Ditchling
  - Hamsey
  - Newhaven
  - Newick
  - Peacehaven & Telscombe (joint)
  - Ringmer
  - Wivelsfield
- 1.10 The Topic Paper is divided into sections which reflect the key themes and strategic policies of the Proposed Submission Joint Core Strategy.

### **The Spatial Strategy**

- 1.11 The Joint Core Strategy identifies the towns and villages that will accommodate the District's proposed housing and employment growth

over the period to 2030. Each of these settlements currently has a 'planning boundary' as defined in the 2003 Local Plan.<sup>2</sup> These boundaries make a clear distinction between town and village areas where further development is generally acceptable, and the countryside where more restrictive policies apply in order to help conserve the character of the rural area.

- 1.12 The definition of settlement planning boundaries is a well established planning policy tool, which currently finds expression in Policy CT1 of the 2003 Local Plan but which is also reflected in Spatial Policy 2 and Core Policies 1 and 7 of the Joint Core Strategy. This policy approach reflects the different functions and character of different areas and supports a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport in accordance with national planning priorities and policies.
- 1.13 The specific site allocations and amendments to the existing planning boundaries required to deliver the housing and employment growth proposed in the Joint Core Strategy are discussed in Topic Papers 2, 3 and 4. However, the wording of Policy CT1 itself will need amending to ensure that it is consistent with the strategic policies of the Core Strategy and the more permissive approach to development in rural areas set out in the NPPF.
- 1.14 In particular, Policy CT1 refers to other policies in the 2003 Local Plan that are no longer in accordance with national planning policy, specifically Policies RES6 (Residential development in the countryside), RES7 (Residential conversions in the countryside) and E9 (Re-use of rural buildings). The NPPF supports new dwellings in the countryside in certain circumstances, including:
- the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside
  - where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting<sup>3</sup>
- 1.15 However, it provides no further guidance on how to assess whether such proposals are acceptable, either in terms of justifying "the essential need" in the case of a new rural dwelling or in terms of what constitutes "an enhancement to the immediate setting" in the case of the conversion of a redundant building.
- 1.16 The NPPF also supports the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, not just through the conversion of existing buildings but also through well-designed new buildings. It states that the sequential test (i.e. town centre locations,

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.lewes.gov.uk/planning/localplan.asp](http://www.lewes.gov.uk/planning/localplan.asp)

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf#page=20](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf#page=20)

followed by edge of centre locations, and then out of centre locations only if suitable sites are not available elsewhere) should not be applied to applications for small-scale rural offices or other small-scale rural development, including retail, leisure or tourism developments.<sup>4</sup>

- 1.17 Some uses require a rural location, e.g. certain types of sporting or recreational activities, and it is therefore considered appropriate to carry forward Policy RE8 (Equestrian and related activities) of the 2003 Local Plan into the new Local Plan with updated wording to reflect current circumstances.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Should the Council continue to define planning boundaries to ensure the sustainable growth of existing settlements and to help protect the character and beauty of the countryside?*

*Do you think there a need for any new or replacement policies to manage new development in the countryside (i.e. outside of the planning boundaries)?*

*Do we need to define what 'small-scale' means in the context of appropriate rural development in Lewes District, or should we rely upon the default threshold of 2,500 sq m or less provided by the NPPF?*

*Should we develop criteria based policies for the design of new buildings and residential conversions in rural areas to ensure that they respect the character of the countryside, or should we rely on generic design policies to assess such proposals?*

*If you consider that criteria based policies should be developed, are there any particular criteria that you consider will need to be met and therefore clearly defined in the policy?*

*Should we develop a criteria based policy to help determine whether or not there is an "essential need" for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work, or should we rely upon the individual judgements of planning officers?*

*If you consider that criteria based policies should be developed, are there any particular criteria that you consider will need to be met and therefore clearly defined in the policy?*

*Are there any other issues which need to be addressed?*

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf#page=14](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf#page=14)

## **Affordable Housing**

- 1.18 Core Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overall approach to the provision of affordable housing in the district. It also carries forward Policy RES10 of the 2003 Local Plan which exceptionally permits the development of affordable housing outside the settlement planning boundaries, provided that certain specific criteria are met. At this stage, no additional development management policies have been identified as being necessary to provide more detailed guidance on this issue.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you think Core Policy 1 and Policy RES10 of the 2003 Local Plan fully address all the issues associated with the provision of affordable housing?*

*If not, what additional criteria would do you consider should be incorporated in Policy RES10?*

## **Housing Type, Density and Mix**

- 1.19 Core Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy seeks to deliver an appropriate range of homes and accommodation to meet the identified needs of the district, addressing the issues of housing type, mix and density. This subject attracted a significant level of response during the consultation stages of the Core Strategy.
- 1.20 In the rural areas, concern has been expressed that the stock of smaller, less expensive homes are being lost as a result of extensions that significantly increase the size of the original dwelling and the replacement of existing houses by much larger buildings. Many people consider that this trend is not only adding to the 'affordability' problem but also eroding the intrinsic character of the countryside through the loss of traditional, small-scale cottages.
- 1.21 In the towns, there are concerns about the impact of the sub-division of existing houses to flats and the conversion of existing properties to houses in multiple occupation. These types of development make an important contribution to increased housing choice but need to be carefully controlled to prevent problems in respect of parking, refuse arrangements, and the amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 1.22 A further issue is how to accommodate the demand for specialist accommodation, such as supported and extra-care housing, nursing homes and retirement homes within the district. Core Policy 2 states that, where appropriate, sites and local requirements for special needs housing will be identified in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD, so this is an issue which needs careful consideration.

- 1.23 Policies RES8 and RES14 of the 2003 Local Plan currently address proposals for replacement dwellings and extensions to existing dwellings within the countryside. The Council considers that it is appropriate to carry these policies forward into the new Local Plan, with the wording updated to reflect current circumstances. There is no existing policy which addresses proposals for the sub-division of existing houses within the settlement planning boundaries or proposals for special needs housing such as nursing homes.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you agree that the Council should continue to have policies on the scale and design of replacements dwellings or extensions in the countryside (i.e. outside of the planning boundaries)?*

*Do you think that the existing policies in the 2003 Local Plan need amending to more effectively address local concerns over the loss of small dwellings in the countryside?*

*Should we develop a criteria based policy for proposals for the sub-division of existing house to flats or conversion of existing properties to multiple occupation?*

*Should we develop location or criteria based policies for proposals for specialist housing for older people? If so, what locations and criteria should be considered?*

*Are there any other forms of housing which need special consideration?*

### **Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**

- 1.24 Core Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the strategic approach to the provision of gypsy and traveller accommodation. The identification of specific site allocations to meet the need for additional permanent pitches is discussed in Topic Paper 2. At this stage, no additional development management policies have been identified as being necessary to provide more detailed guidance.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you think Core Policy 3, along with the site specific policies discussed in Topic Paper 2, fully addresses all the issues associated with the provision of gypsy and traveller accommodation?*

## **Encouraging Economic Development and Regeneration**

- 1.25 Core Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overarching approach to promoting sustainable growth and regeneration in the district, including support for farm diversification and suitable business uses in rural areas. The identification of specific site allocations needed to deliver the employment growth proposed in the Joint Core Strategy is discussed in Topic Paper 3.
- 1.26 Support for the rural economy is a key strategic objective of the Joint Core Strategy. However, it can be difficult to satisfactorily locate new business development in the open countryside due to the potential impact on the landscape and the introduction of commercial activity, including traffic movements, which can detract from the character of the rural environment. Similarly, the expansion or intensification of existing business sites in the countryside can sometimes create problems in terms of local environmental, amenity, traffic and access considerations.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Should we develop criteria based policies for proposals for new business development in the countryside (i.e. outside the planning boundaries) to ensure that the character of the rural environment is protected or should we rely on generic landscape and design policies?*

*If you consider that there is a need to develop criteria based policies, what criteria should be considered for inclusion?*

*Should we develop criteria based policies for proposals for the expansion, redevelopment or intensification of existing business sites in the countryside (i.e. outside the planning boundaries) to ensure that the character of the rural environment is protected or should we rely on generic landscape and design policies?*

*If you consider that there is a need to develop criteria based policies, what criteria should be considered for inclusion?*

*Are there any other issues related to economic development that need to be addressed?*

### **The Visitor Economy**

- 1.27 Core Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overarching approach to supporting the sustainable development of the visitor economy. It also carries forward Policies E14, E15 and E17 of the 2003 Local Plan, which address the provision of hostel accommodation and caravan and camping sites in the countryside (N.B. the wording of these policies will be up-dated to reflect current circumstances).

- 1.28 The Council takes a positive stance towards the development of the visitor economy in recognition of the significant economic, social and environmental benefits it brings to the area. However, tourism can also have environmental costs as well as benefits. For example, visitor traffic, if not carefully managed, can cause congestion and damage at popular locations. The quality of the district's environment is its greatest asset and it is essential to ensure that the growth of tourism does not erode the very character and appearance of areas that visitors come to see and enjoy.
- 1.29 In this context it is considered that new large-scale tourist facilities would normally be inappropriate in rural areas. Instead the promotion of further tourist facilities in the countryside should primarily be aimed at small scale enterprises that draw on the character of the countryside itself, its natural beauty, culture, history and wildlife. Sustainable tourist facilities will be encouraged where they assist the purposes of conservation and recreation, for example, by bringing appropriate new uses to historic buildings or opening up new opportunities for access to the countryside by foot or cycle.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Are the criteria set out in existing Policy E17 of the 2003 Local Plan for new camping and touring caravan sites still appropriate? Should the same criteria apply to proposal for new static caravan sites?*

*Should we develop criteria based policies for proposals for new or expanded visitor facilities in the countryside (i.e. outside the planning boundaries) to ensure that they are of a scale, type and appearance which respects the character of their rural location, or should we rely on generic landscape and design policies?*

*If you consider that there is a need to develop criteria based policies, what criteria should be considered for inclusion?*

*Are there any other issues related to the visitor economy that the Council should consider?*

### **Retail and Sustainable Town and Local Centres**

- 1.30 Core Policy 6 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overall approach to maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of town centres, district centres and local centres as hubs for shopping, business, entertainment, cultural and community life, and to supporting neighbourhood shops and other community facilities. At this stage, no additional development management policies have been identified as being necessary to provide more detailed guidance.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you think Core Policy 6 fully addresses all the issues associated with retail development and promoting sustainable town, district and local centres?*

### **Infrastructure**

- 1.31 Core Policy 7 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the approach to improving accessibility to key community facilities and delivering the necessary infrastructure improvements to support housing and employment growth in the district. The identification of specific site allocations needed to deliver key infrastructure requirements is discussed in Topic Paper 4. At this stage, no additional development management policies have been identified as being necessary to provide more detailed guidance.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you think Core Policy 7 fully addresses all the issues associated with community facilities and the provision of new or improved infrastructure to support growth?*

### **Green Infrastructure**

- 1.32 Core Policy 7 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overall approach to protecting and enhancing the quantity, quality and accessibility of open spaces throughout the District. The identification of specific locations where there is potential to enhance existing green infrastructure or opportunities to provide new green space is discussed in Topic Paper 4.
- 1.33 Whilst access to green infrastructure in the district is generally good, there are a number of localities where there are deficiencies in provision compared with identified needs. All the towns and some of the villages, for example, are deficient in terms of outdoor sports facilities and children's play space when measured against the Council's existing standards, which are based on the National Playing Field Association (now re-named Fields in Trust) recommended levels of provision.
- 1.34 This standard is set out in Policy RE1 of the 2003 Local Plan and requires the provision of 1.7 ha per 1000 population for outdoor sports and 0.7 ha per 1000 population for children's play space. Policy RES19 of the 2003 Local Plan currently requires planning applications for all new residential developments to make provision for outdoor playing space in accordance with these standards, either through on-site provision or through developer contributions towards the provision/enhancement of playing space elsewhere in the locality.

- 1.35 In 2008, Fields in Trust revised and updated its benchmark standards to 1.6 ha per 1000 population for outdoor sports provision and 0.8 ha per 1000 population for children's play space provision. It is considered appropriate to reflect these revised standards in the Council's own standards and policies for the provision of outdoor playing space.
- 1.36 It may also be useful to identify thresholds above which developers will be required to provide on-site children's play space and playing pitches. Below such thresholds, where the resultant play space would be too small to be practicable or to meet a local need, the Council would continue to seek commuted payments towards off-site provision within the same town or parish. Another consideration is whether it remains appropriate to exclude one bedroom dwellings and retirement accommodation from the requirement for outdoor sports provision to meet the needs arising from the development.
- 1.37 In addition to the provision of outdoor playing space, informal open space has a valuable role in terms of its recreational, amenity and biodiversity benefits. Landscaping should be an integral part of the design process in order to maximise the potential of informal open space within new development and it is therefore intended to carry forward Policy ST11 (Landscaping of Development) of the 2003 Local Plan into the new Local Plan, re-worded to reflect changed circumstances.
- 1.38 Green corridors can also make an important contribution to the district's green infrastructure network and it therefore intended to carry forward Policies RE6 (Lewes/Sheffield Park Railway Line) and RE7 (Recreation and Rivers) of the 2003 Local Plan into the new Local Plan. It may also be appropriate to identify other green corridors that should be maintained or enhanced for their recreation or biodiversity potential.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you think the Council's adopted standards for the provision of outdoor playing space should reflect the revised Fields in Trust benchmark standards?*

*Should we be seeking developer contributions towards other types of green infrastructure provision and, if so, what standards should be applied?*

*Are there any other issues related to green infrastructure that the Council should consider?*

### **Air Quality**

- 1.39 Core Policy 9 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overall approach to improving air quality in the district. This is a significant issue due to nitrogen dioxide emissions in certain areas, notably Lewes town centre

and South Way, Newhaven. At this stage, no additional development management policies have been identified as being necessary to provide more detailed guidance on air quality. However, the text of the Core Strategy also suggests that Policy ST30 (Protection of Air and Land Quality) of the 2003 Local Plan is carried forward into the new Local Plan in order to address contaminated land issues.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you think Core Policy 9 fully addresses all the issues associated with protecting air quality?*

*Do you agree that an additional policy is needed in respect of contaminated land?*

### **Natural Environment and Landscape Character**

1.40 Core Policy 10 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overall approach to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, including biodiversity. Since the introduction of the NPPF and the removal of much of the detailed national planning policy guidance on nature conservation, it is apparent that there is a policy 'gap' in relation to the different weight that should be given to international, national and locally designated sites in assessing development proposals which may affect them. An additional development management policy is therefore proposed that will set out how the Council will protect such sites in a manner commensurate with their status, giving appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks.

1.41 It is not intended to carry forward Policy ST14 (Water Supply) of the 2003 Local Plan as this has been superseded by Policy WMP28b (Water Resources and Water Quality) of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan, adopted in 2013.<sup>5</sup>

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you agree that the Council should develop a policy reflecting the different levels of protection that should be applied to international, national and locally designated sites? If so, do you have any suggestions for the approach such a policy should take?*

*Are there any other issues related to the natural environment and landscape character that the Council should consider?*

---

<sup>5</sup> [www.eastsussex.gov.uk/environment/planning/development/mineralsandwaste/default.htm](http://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/environment/planning/development/mineralsandwaste/default.htm)

## **Built and Historic Environment and High Quality Design**

- 1.42 Core Policy 11 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overall approach to securing high quality design in new development and protecting historic assets, including buildings, monuments, sites, places and areas.
- 1.43 In terms securing high quality design, it is considered appropriate to carry forward Policies ST3 and ST4 (Design, Form and Setting of Development), RES13 (Extensions), RES18 (Garages) and H12 (Areas of Established Character) of the 2003 Local Plan into the new Local Plan, with updated wording to reflect any changes in circumstances. It may also be helpful to have additional detailed policies which address:
- local character and distinctiveness
  - satisfactory amenity e.g. natural light, privacy, outlook, noise, outdoor space, refuse storage
- 1.44 The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, now incorporated into the Design Council, has produced a 'Building for Life' standard that sets out 20 criteria for achieving good design in new residential neighbourhoods.<sup>6</sup> This provides a useful guide for developers on the standards that are now expected and what factors are considered when assessing design. It may be appropriate to incorporate these criteria in a new design policy.
- 1.45 It is not intended to carry forward Policies ST20 and ST21(Recycling)) of the 2003 Local Plan as these have been superseded by Policy WMP3e (Waste Management in New Development) of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan, adopted in 2013. However, it is an option to have an additional policy which sets out the considerations that will be taken into account in terms of the location and design of recycling and refuse storage provision in new development.
- 1.46 In terms of safeguarding and enhancing the historic environment, it is considered appropriate to carry forward Policies H2 (Listed Buildings), H3 (Buildings of Local, Visual or Historic Interest), H5 (Development within or affecting Conservation Areas), H7 (Traffic in Conservation Areas), H13 (Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest), H14 (Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest), ST25 (Overhead lines) and ST29 (Advertisements) of the 2003 Local Plan into the new Local Plan, with updated wording to reflect any changes in circumstances.
- 1.47 However, since the introduction of the NPPF and the removal of much of the detailed national planning policy guidance on historic assets, it is apparent that there is a policy 'gap' in relation to the protection of

---

<sup>6</sup> [www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/CABE/Our-big-projects/Building-for-Life/](http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/CABE/Our-big-projects/Building-for-Life/)

Scheduled Ancient Monuments and archaeological remains. An additional development management policy is therefore proposed in order to address development proposals which may affect such assets.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you agree with the proposal to carry forward Policies H2, H3, H5, H7, H13, H14, ST25 and ST29 of the 2003 Local Plan into the new Local Plan?*

*Should the Council develop additional policies which address the issues of local distinctiveness, amenity or the location and design of recycling and refuse storage provision?*

*Would the national 'Building for Life' standards be appropriate for considering development proposals in Lewes District?*

*Are there any other issues related to design or the historic environment that the Council should consider?*

### **Flood Risk, Coastal Erosion and Sustainable Drainage**

1.48 Core Policy 12 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overall approach to reducing the impact of flooding and coastal erosion. At this stage, no additional development management policies have been identified as being necessary to provide more detailed guidance on flood risk.

1.49 The majority of the coastline outside of the National Park is defended against erosion, except for the undeveloped cliff tops at Telscombe and between Newhaven and Peacehaven Heights. However, the Government expects local planning authorities to identify as a 'Coastal Change Management Area' any area likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast and be clear about what development will be appropriate in such areas and in what circumstances. It may therefore be necessary to develop an additional policy to provide further detailed guidance in this respect.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you think Core Policy 12 fully addresses all the issues associated with flood risk?*

*Should we designate 'Coastal Change Management Area' and develop a criteria based policy for development proposals within it? If so, what areas should these be and what criteria should be applied?*

## **Sustainable Transport**

1.50 Core Policy 13 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overall approach to reducing the need to travel and promoting a sustainable transport system in accordance with the priorities of the East Sussex Local Transport Plan. It replaces all the transport policies in Chapter 10 of the 2003 Local Plan, with the exception of Policies T3 (Station Parking) and T4 (Lewes to Uckfield railway) which are considered appropriate for retention in the new Local Plan. At this stage, no additional development management policies have been identified as being necessary to provide more detailed guidance on this issue.

### ***Consultation Questions***

*Do you agree that Policies T3 and T4 of the 2003 Local Plan should be retained?*

*Are there any other issues related to transport that the Council should consider?*

## **Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and Sustainable Use of Resources**

1.51 Core Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the overall approach to the development of renewable and low carbon energy. The Government has also published new guidance on this issue, which can be a material consideration in planning decisions (*Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy* DCLG July 2013). At this stage, no additional development management policies have been identified as being necessary to provide more detailed guidance in this respect.

### ***Consultation Questions***

*Do you think Core Policy 14 fully addresses all the issues associated with renewable and low carbon energy and the sustainable use of resources?*

## **Newhaven**

1.52 Policy NH13 of the 2003 Local Plan seeks to maintain the rear access to properties in Newhaven High Street in order to reduce the impact of vehicular traffic in the pedestrian precinct, whilst Policies NH14 -16 seek to retain and enhance the recreational amenities of Castle Hill, Newhaven Fort and The Promenade. Policy NH22 seeks to ensure that satisfactory links will be provided to the rail network for both freight and passengers in any new development at the Port. These existing policies support Strategic Objectives 2, 5, 7 and 9 of the Joint Core Strategy and the vision it sets out for Newhaven. The policies are

therefore considered appropriate for retention in the new Local Plan, with updated wording to reflect any changes in circumstances.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you agree that Policies NH13, 14, 15, 16 and 22 of the 2003 Local Plan should be retained?*

*Are there any other issues related to Newhaven that the Council should consider?*

### **Peacehaven**

1.53 Policies PT9 - 10 of the 2003 Local Plan seek to protect the access, permeability and amenities of the Meridian Centre, whilst Policies PT12 - 13 seek to protect the public amenity value of the cliff top and foreshore to the south of the built-up area of the town. Policies PT19 - 20 seek to protect the semi-rural character of walking and riding routes through the valley area, whilst recognising that opportunities for equestrian activities and other leisure and recreational uses can be accommodated in this location. These existing policies support Strategic Objectives 2 and 5 of the Joint Core Strategy and are therefore considered appropriate for retention in the new Local Plan, with updated wording to reflect any changes in circumstances.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you agree that Policies PT9, 10, 12, 13, 19 and 20 the 2003 Local Plan should be retained?*

*Are there any other issues related to Peacehaven that the Council should consider?*

### **Seaford**

1.54 Policy SF9 of the 2003 Local Plan protects a significant pedestrian link from future development in order maintain the permeability of Seaford town centre, whilst Policies SF14 -16 seek to protect the existing character of Seaford seafront. These existing policies support Strategic Objectives 2 and 6 of the Joint Core Strategy and it the vision it sets out for Seaford. The policies are therefore considered appropriate for retention in the new Local Plan.

### **Consultation Questions**

*Do you agree that Policies SF9, 14, 15, and 16 of the 2003 Local Plan should be retained?*

*Are there any other issues related to Seaford that the Council should consider?*

### **Any additional policy areas?**

1.55 This Topic Paper has identified the particular issues that will be addressed through detailed development management policies. Perhaps you consider there is a need for additional issues to be addressed through such policies. If this is the case, then this is your opportunity to highlight the policy areas that you think should be developed by the Council.

### **How to respond to this Topic Paper?**

1.56 This is your opportunity to shape your local area and influence how the District develops over the next 15 years. The Council would appreciate and value any comments you have on this Topic Paper, particularly in relation to the questions asked in the individual sections. You need only reply to those questions that are of interest to you, or you may introduce other ideas.

### **Comments may be sent to the Council by:**

Email to: [ldf@lewes.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@lewes.gov.uk)

Fax to: 01273 484452

Post to: Lewes District Council  
Planning Policy Team  
Southover House  
Southover Road  
Lewes  
BN7 1AB

***All comments must be received by midnight 17 January 2014***

## **APPENDIX: 'Saved' policies of the Lewes District Local Plan 2003 which have not been replaced by the Joint Core Strategy**

### Chapter 4 Environmental Principles

- Design, Form and Setting of Development (ST3, ST4)
- Water Supply (ST14)
- Recycling and Re-use of Materials (ST20, ST21)
- Pylons and Overhead Lines (ST25)
- Advertisements (ST28,ST29)
- Protection of Air and Land Quality (ST30)

### Chapter 5 Residential Development

- Residential Development in the Countryside (RES6)
- Residential Conversions in the Countryside (RES7)
- Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside (RES8)
- Affordable Homes Exception Sites (ie outside Planning Boundary) (RES10)
- Extensions (RES13)
- Extensions in the Countryside (RES14)
- Garages and other Buildings Ancillary to Existing Dwellings (RES18)
- Provision of Outdoor Playing Space (RES19)

### Chapter 6 Economic Activity

- Re-Use of Rural Buildings (E9)
- Bunk House Accommodation (E14)
- Existing Camping/Touring Caravan Sites (E15)
- New Camping/Touring Caravan Sites (E17)
- Static Holiday Caravan Sites (E19)

### Chapter 7 The Coast & Countryside Environment

- Planning Boundary and Key Countryside (CT1)
- Institutional Sites (CT5)

## Chapter 8 The Historic Environment

- Listed Buildings (H2)
- Buildings of Local, Visual or Historic Interest (H3)
- Conservation Areas (H4)
- Development within or affecting Conservation Areas (H5)
- Traffic in Conservation Areas (H7,)
- Areas of Established Character (H12)
- Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (H13)
- Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest (H14)

## Chapter 9 Recreation & Community Services

- Provision of Sport, Recreation and Play (RE1)
- Lewes/Sheffield Park Railway Line (RE6)
- Recreation and the Rivers (RE7)
- Equestrian and Related Activities (RE8)

## Chapter 10 Transport & Communications

- Rail (T3)
- The Lewes/Uckfield Railway (T4)
- Telecommunications (T16)

## Chapter 12 Newhaven & South Highton

- Pedestrian Precinct (NH13)
- Castle Hill, Promenade/West Beach (NH14-16)
- Transport Links to the Port (NH22)

## Chapter 13 Peacehaven & Telscombe

- Meridian Centre (PT9 , PT10)
- The Coasts, Cliff Top and Foreshore (PT12, PT13)
- Valley Road (PT19, PT20)

## Chapter 14 Seaford

- Footpath to Church Lane (SF9)
- The Seafont (SF14 - 16)