

## **ANNEX F**

### **Partners Responses - Views Expressed and Suggestions**

## Annex F

### Partners Responses - Views Expressed and Suggestions

NCDA	
Comment	
1.	<p>Overall, members of the Board fully welcomed the Vision. It was felt that indecision and the lack of a 'plan' have been key factors in the decline of Newhaven and that there was a need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the key actions and a plan which the vision supplies;</li> <li>a fully holistic approach which considers jobs, infrastructure (including the road system and schools) and sustainability.</li> </ul> <p>It was felt that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the provision of jobs, securing of employment and addressing unemployment was a crucial first step for current and future residents;</li> <li>the introduction could spell out clearly and articulate what Newhaven wants to be;</li> <li>agreement that doing nothing or responding to developer led proposals was not an option;</li> <li>whilst it was necessary to focus on what was achievable in current economic climate, the vision should not be constrained and only focus on what was immediately achievable;</li> <li>it was agreed that there would need to be prioritising according to available resources but this should not constrain the Vision over the next 25 years;</li> <li>For this reason it would be necessary to look to Harbour Heights for immediate development whilst consideration made of addressing the flood risk issues on Eastside;</li> <li>It was agreed that flood defences on Eastside would need in part to be financed by housing development</li> <li>the scale of the ideas and options was welcomed;</li> <li>Before more houses developed there needs to be adequate infrastructure agreed especially road access;</li> <li>The development of a 6<sup>th</sup> Form was seen as a means of addressing educational underachievement but would need additional work and research to develop and create links with Universities as well as links with the 3 schools and SDC;</li> <li>There was a clear need to get the 'heart' back into Newhaven – and the character into the town centre;</li> <li>There is a need for a centralised point for young people's activities;</li> <li>Need to remove the collar of the ring road without displacing traffic and ensuing that the changes do not cut off the town centre;</li> <li>Need to address the needs of young people and facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Some trustees expressed concerns about:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The potential for development on the Western bank not to be seen as a reason or excuse not to undertake essential work on the eastern bank where the majority of the employment is located.</li> </ul>

ESCC	
Comment	
2.	<p>Pg 42, 2.154</p> <p>Generally, this report is to be welcomed from an open space point of view as it raises the profile of the work done by the County Landscape Group in developing the Newhaven Open Space Strategy which it widely quotes.</p> <p>Welcome comments on Newhaven as a gateway to the new NP, developing the Seahaven Coastal Trail, and improving access to Bollen's Bush.</p>

**ESCC****Section 5**

3.	This recommendation has not been shared with the LA Standards & Learning Effectiveness Service, it is not aligned with LA strategy for post-16 as set out in the 14-19 plan or our local statement of priorities.
4.	If there is unmet need in the area then the recommendation should be to further develop collaborative provision between SDC, Plumpton College and the skills centre - this would be a more viable and sustainable option.
5.	The recommendations highlight the support of the head teacher at Tideway for a sixth form college, it is surprising that this has not been explored in the local partnership and it would not necessarily be a shared view.
6.	Pg 106, 6.20 It is agreed that there needs to be a coordinated approach for this key opportunity area. It is important that the focus of delivering additional employment opportunities is not lost and that sites do not come forward for development in isolation. Therefore, the requirement for a Development Framework for East Bank is welcomed.
7.	Pg 108, 6.24 There is very little evidence / justification for the suggestions for uses on East Bank. For example a 60 room hotel – but we know at the moment there is no demand for a hotel (Temmerman has tried unsuccessfully to get interest from any hotels). A food store is not justified (see comment on 2.135 above). As much retailing as possible should stay in the Town Centre. A factory outlet in the town centre (2.1.42) is an interesting idea but it difficult to generate interest in Newhaven by such operators.
8.	Pg 108, 6.24 Using East Quarter for cafes, restaurants, bars and leisure would be a natural way to extend the town centre to the river. If these are visible from the A259 they will become a stop-off or destination in itself with the river setting.
9.	Pgs 129-130 The main steer of the Action Plan appears to be to produce four more plans / frameworks. In this new economic climate of public finances funding only one development framework will be unlikely, four will be impossible.
10.	It [the proposed new bridge linking the town centre with the east bank of the river] would definitely not provide an alternative route for public transport when the swing bridge is open as stated in section 7.42.
11.	Though an additional crossing may be desirable how important is it? Or how viable is it considering other more critical infrastructure which needs to be funded?
12.	Response – (covers all comments suggesting no funding at present or projects undeliverable in current economic climate) As this is a 25 year vision for Newhaven, it is recognised that there may not be funding available at the present time to realise the entire vision, however it is likely that with strong leadership it will be secured gradually over time. The key is for partners to agree to work together to support the vision, which will involve undertaking a series of short, medium and longer term actions and identifying funding opportunities over the lifetime of the vision.
13.	Annex C, Pg 9 Port Access Road  There would be a landscape benefit to removing the need for the high bridge and embankments associated with the NPAR crossing of the Mill Creek and railway. However the alternative alignment indicated in the Vision document would be indirect and I would be concerned that it may be difficult to design a satisfactory road alignment and associated landscape mitigation works.
<b>General Comments</b>	
14.	We welcome the aspirations of the vision. It identifies key issues facing Newhaven.
15.	It is appreciated that the vision needs to be inspirational and that it is correct in identifying that there needs to be a major step change to achieve the core objectives. However, there are concerns about the feasibility and the deliverability of many of the key projects and opportunity areas.
16.	The organisation of the Vision document is complicated probably as a consequence of the amount of information. Has putting the background vision and actions in the same sections for the main issues / areas covered been considered? This would cut down on repetition and in some cases contradiction – the read across is not easy.
17.	Careful consideration needs to be given to whether there should be public consultation on the Vision as a whole. It is felt that it may unduly raise expectations if the current Vision and action plan were released.

ESCC	
	Much of the Vision is dependent on non-existent funding sources as well as the use of port land which, as the port masterplanning exercise has not yet been completed, is very uncertain.
18.	We suggest that the Vision be used as a technical document and evidence support for the developing LDF, and consultation is done through the LDF process with proper testing of the options. This will include not only impacts on transport but all types of infrastructure. Options will also need to be considered in the context of the wider Lewes District.
19.	Many of the decisions and technical work needed to deliver and test the Vision including flood risk management, infrastructure, retail capacity and housing and employment sites will need to be undertaken as part of the LDF process.
20.	The LDF will need to ensure that sites allocated for housing and employment are deliverable. It will also need to produce an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will identify all necessary infrastructure required to support the LDF.

NTC	
Comment	
General Comments	
21.	The town council would have some difficulty in 'signing up' to the document in its present form. Whilst it is recognised that there is a need for significant amounts of detail, it is thought that there needs to be (at some stage) some considerable editing to make the document more realistic in terms of achievability.
22.	The town council is concerned about the delivery of the recommendations in light of the current economic situation and the budgets available to the local authorities.
23.	In view of the comments made above, the town council would like to hear the comments of ESCC and LDC regarding the resources they may have available to be the main drivers for a number of the report's recommendations.

LDC (specific comments incl those from Track Changes Document)	
Comment	
Executive Summary	
24.	Pg iv, Action Plan and Delivery, bullet 7 – "provision of additional education facilities" - Development of a Sixth Form College - this is likely to raise objections from ESCC.
Section 2	
25.	Pg 37, below 2.143, Town Centre Action "Consider the feasibility of the Newhaven Space Bank concept further" The feeling is that this idea is not considered in any real level of detail upon which the Newhaven Space Bank could be considered further.
26.	Pg 42, 2.156 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) West Quay</li> <li>2) Bay Vue</li> <li>3) Neil's Close</li> <li>4) Hillcrest Court</li> <li>5) Denton Island – possibility for circular route.</li> </ol> <p>Are there any examples of 'possible improvements' for these spaces?</p>
Section 3:	
27.	Pg 51, 3.6 Is Offshore Wind Site Development Competition at risk when considering new government spending cuts?
Section 4	
28.	Pg 66, 4.64 "SEEDA is also restructuring its investment priorities" May have to amend this given the abolition by March 2012.

LDC (specific comments incl those from Track Changes Document)	
29.	Pg 70, 4.83 As per previous comment, the beach topic is very sensitive.
30.	Pg 70, 4.85 "Industrial tourism" – There is also a water treatment centre in Peacehaven that could be included.
31.	Pg 74, 4.103 "the fishing industry and the opportunity for a fresh fish restaurant" – Could a restaurant of this nature operate and succeed in Newhaven? Could they also make sufficient profits to invest in a local boat?
<b>Section 6</b>	
32.	Pg 103, 6.11 "From a physical perspective, the town will therefore need to deliver on a comprehensive basis"  How easy will this physical expansion be to facilitate in the face of competition from other coastal towns such as Eastbourne and Brighton?
33.	Pg 113, 6.26 "The other main component considered at this stage is the opportunity for a new convenience retail store as part of this comprehensive development proposal. As discussed earlier in this report, there have been several expressions of interest from operators in the sector for further development sites in Newhaven for this purpose, and a number of sites put forward".  This is not a retail argument.
34.	PG 114, 6.34 "This could involve harnessing the energy produced by the Energy from Waste facility and the proposed off-shore wind farm to supply new and existing homes and workplaces with heat and power."  Potential that ESCC/Veolia would object.
35.	Pg 114, 6.38 "the mix and quantum of housing to be provided" – This level of diversity assumes a housing study which cannot currently be funded
36.	Pg 117, 6.56 <i>The Town Centre "SpaceBank"</i> Again, funding ideas for this would be welcomed.
37.	Pg 118, 6.61 "The costs of employing such an individual would initially need to come from either the public sector, or a combination of public sector and town centre traders. " No funding likely in the present economic climate.
38.	Pg 119, 6.68 "This [the green / open space between Newhaven and Peacehaven] is seen as an important buffer between the two towns. "  Yes, preventing the coalescence of built up areas and maintaining the separate identities of Newhaven and Peacehaven.
39.	Pg 128, 6.97 "the scale of population growth proposed" – Probably beyond LDF requirements.
40.	Pg 128, 6.98 "the priority infrastructure components to open up delivery options" – Funding?
<b>Section 7:</b>	
41.	Pg 135, 7.16, final bullet "urgent design & feasibility work for town centre premises refurbishment required ..." Timescale is extremely ambitious, is it realistic?
42.	Pg 145, 7.50, 3rd bullet " earmark a "champion" to <b>drive</b> forward change and improvements on the estate champion" - Is this achievable?

LDC (specific comments incl those from Track Changes Document)	
43.	<p>Pg 145, 7.51  “sixth form college” –  The need for this crucially important facility has already been raised by the new Headmaster of the Tideway school to serve the wider Newhaven, Seaford and Peacehaven area, and will need to complement the Sussex Downs curriculum. In spatial terms, this needs to be in an accessible location to all three settlements, and therefore options within East Bank, adjacent to the Railway Station, would seem to be an attractive opportunity.</p>
44.	<p>Pg 146, 7.54  “initial phase of transport interchange - this work has not been able to attract funding to date” -    ESCC have said that £120k is available from S106 agreement for Lidl site and Sainsbury’s extension.</p>
45.	<p>Pg 150, 7.65, 5<sup>th</sup> bullet and sub-bullets  “the key Newhaven projects / priorities should be included in the LIP” –  The LIP has been submitted</p>
46.	<p>Pg 154, 7.94  “There may also be other opportunities developed within the port over this period and a close and regular working arrangement with the port authority needs to be established in order to maintain the dialogue on these issues” -    LDC already works closely with NPP. Francois Jean (Port Manager) now sits on the NSN (Newhaven Strategic Network).</p>
<b>Section 8:</b>	
47.	<p>Pg 155, 8.2, final bullet:  “it will also be important to establish a short term Action Plan - which sets out over a relatively limited period, say 2-3 years, the key priorities and how these are going to be delivered and who is going to take responsibility for delivery. These should be subject to regular review and refreshed to ensure that objectives are up-to-date and deliverable” -    Agreed, this needs to be practical and realistic and would be very useful.</p>
48.	<p>Pg 157,8.8, Corporate Entity (e.g. City/Economic Development Companies), 4th Bullet  “Capital and land could transfer to the Economic Development Company (EDC) and they attract revenue funding from central Government”    Needs elaboration</p>
49.	<p>Pg 158, 8.8, Community Development Trusts (CDTs)    Is there capacity for a CDT in Newhaven?</p>
50.	<p>Pg 158, 8.11  “the Project Lead needs to be a highly skilled person “    This would require at least £50k/a</p>
51.	<p>Pg 160,8.29  “the need to pursue infrastructure tariff / Sec 106 arrangements” -    The coalition government are to make announcements re: Planning Incentive Grants in Autumn 2010</p>
52.	<p>Pg 161,8.31  “financial mechanisms “  Regional Growth Fund £1bn announced August 2010 - £500m p/a for next two years.</p>
<b>General comments:</b>	
53.	<p>The report is a comprehensive and imaginative look at how Newhaven might develop to provide a better quality of life for local people over the next twenty years or so. It contains a large number of creative proposals and ideas on how they could be delivered.    I feel however that the report and its conclusions need some significant editing to address the important points below in order to make it a more practical document with a greater prospect of implementation. I am keen to avoid a report which just ends up gathering dust on a shelf.</p>

54.	<p>Drawing all the above points together, I think we need to consider where this leaves us in terms of the overall Vision for the future regeneration of Newhaven, the priority actions we need to take over the next 2-3 years and the resources necessary to carry out that work.</p> <p>This needs to be set in the context of the new Local Economic Partnership for East Sussex and whatever delivery vehicle emerges from that to take forward specific projects in Newhaven. In other words, we need a hard headed look at section 7 of the report on where we should go and what is possible, in the difficult economic climate which is likely to continue for at least the next five years.</p>
-----	---

Graham Amy, Mayor of Newhaven, on behalf of Court Farm Residents Association	
Comment	
55.	<p>Re development at Western Heights:</p> <p>The agricultural/rural land between Newhaven and Peacehaven, acts as a green buffer – and is rich in wildlife. This must be retained and this approach has always supported by NTC and LDC</p> <p>The sea cliff has no man made protection and is subject to natural erosion – which has increased markedly in recent years and is likely to continue to accelerate with global warming.</p> <p>One of the suggested main access routes into Western Heights is along the route of Court Farm Road, to link on to the A259 at Rushey Hill, Peacehaven. This is currently a two lane road and is heavily used for vehicle parking by local residents, residents &amp; commercial parking from the park home site, and visitors to the adjacent Newhaven Recreation Ground. It is considered that this problem will be further exacerbated with new development in this area</p> <p>More sensible solutions may be to –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• allow limited quality housing parallel to the coastline (along the line of the recent development adjacent to Tideway School) – and permit the land nearer the cliff to be used for informal and formal recreation (which would assist redress the very limited green space in the town centre and the deficit in sports pitches throughout the town)</li> <li>• make Gibbon Road (a three lane road) the main “through road” with a link from Court Farm Road through to Southdown Road – and then link up with Upper Valley Road and the A259. This would require minimum additional site acquisition and demolition – and would provide easier and safer access to Tideway School</li> </ul>