



Seaford Town Council

To members of the Planning & Highways Committee

A meeting of the **Planning & Highways Committee** will be held **via Zoom\*** on **Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> September 2020 commencing at 7.00 pm** which you are summoned to attend.

Isabelle Mouland  
Assistant Town Clerk  
10<sup>th</sup> September 2020

**\*see overleaf for important information to join virtual meeting and accessing password**

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS MEETING WILL BE VIDEO RECORDED**

## Agenda

**1. Apologies for Absence and Declaration of Substitute Members**

**2. Disclosure of Interests**

To deal with any disclosure by Members of any disclosable pecuniary interests and interests other than pecuniary interests, as defined under the Seaford Town Council Code of Conduct and the Localism Act 2011, in relation to matters on the agenda.

**3. Public Participation**

To deal with any questions, or brief representations, from members of the public in accordance with Standing Order 3 and Seaford Town Council Policy.

**4. Planning Applications**

Applications received week commencing 16<sup>th</sup> August 2020

**LW/20/0145 - 14 Bramber Road – Part retrospective application to retain safety rails to flat roof and reconfigure roof construction to create gable ends in lieu of hips.**

**LW/20/0472 - 3 Cliff Tops Cliff Road – Demolition of existing front conservatory and erection of single storey extension.**

**LW/20/0456- 36 Steyne Road – Erection of side extension and remodelling of existing conservatory.**

**LW/20/0478 - 18 College Road – Conversion of existing care home to semi-detached 3 bedroom houses and detached house to 3 flats (1 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) for Mr and Mrs Lord.**

Planning Applications received in week commencing 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2020

**LW/20/0479 - 17 Rookery Way – Erection of single storey extension for Mr Wallis.**

Planning Applications received in week commencing 30<sup>th</sup> August 2020

**LW/20/0534 – 4 Dymchurch Close – Conversion of loft space with hip to gable side extension, dormer to rear and front rooflights, and alterations to fenestration on ground floor for Mr L Hamon.**

**LW/20/0535 – 4 Dymchurch Close – Demolition of existing lean-to extension and replacement with a single storey rear extension for Mr L Hamon.**

**LW/20/0533 – 155 Chyngton Cottages Chyngton Lane – Listed Building Consent for installation of gas central heating and external meter for Caroline Rugman.**

Planning Applications received in week commencing 30<sup>th</sup> August 2020

**LW/20/0440 - 28 Carlton Road – Single storey rear extension and front garden wall alterations for Mr G King.**

South Downs National Park Application (deferred from the last meeting)

**SDNP/20/02124/FUL – Seven Sisters Country Park Exceat – Phase 1 of redevelopment – Additional toilet facilities. Improvements to pedestrian and vehicular access. Minor alterations to Visitor Centre and Dairy Building to provide additional office accommodation.**

**Improvements to the public realm to enhance the farmstead character of Exceat; Foxhole Camping Barn-Extension of facilities block.**

**1-3 Foxhole Cottages-Erection of extensions and sub-division of cottages to provide one unit of warden accommodation and 3 holiday lets... for Liz Gent on behalf of the SDNPA.**

Tree Works Applications

**TW/20/0066 - 10 Harrow Close– Re 7 trees in TPO no. 14 – Mix of Ash and Sycamore-10% crown reduction and removal of dead wood for Mrs M Rudge.**

**TW/20/0068 - Newlands School Eastbourne Road – Sycamore T1 and Beech T2 and 3- reduce all overhanging branches by at least 3m to prevent encroachment across garden for Barbara Jedras.**

**5. [Changes to the Current Planning System- Public Consultation](#)**

To consider report 41/20 of the Planning Officer seeking the Committee's response to the public consultation on the changes to the current planning system (pages 4 to 7).

Please note that although it was resolved at the meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> August to defer consideration of this report to the meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October a response is required at this meeting as the deadline for the receipt of comments falls on 1<sup>st</sup> October.

**6. [Planning for the Future – Public Consultation](#)**

To receive report 54/20 of the Planning Officer for full consideration and response at the meeting on Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020 (pages 8 to 12).

7. **Proposed Road Closures- Seaford Christmas Magic**

To consider report 55/20 of the Planning Officer seeking comments on the road closure application for Seaford Christmas Magic (page 13).

8. **Update Report**

To consider report 56/20 of the Planning Officer on recent decisions made by Lewes District Council on applications previously considered by this Committee (pages 14 to 15).

**For further information about items appearing on this Agenda please contact:**

Isabelle Moulard, Assistant Town Clerk, 37 Church Street, Seaford, East Sussex, BN25 1HG

Email: [admin@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:admin@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01323 894 870 (*please note that due to working from home, this phone line is not currently manned, so please leave a voice message and this will be picked up and forwarded to the relevant member of staff to deal with*)

---

**Zoom Meetings**

In line with the Coronavirus Act 2020 and subsequent regulations governing local authorities meetings, the Council will be holding this meeting via the online video conference facility, Zoom.

**To join the Zoom meeting follow this link:** <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86236837199>

**Meeting ID:** 862 3683 7199

**Password:** (to ensure online security it is recommended that meeting passwords are not publicised and are given directly to those intending to attend the meeting. Please therefore email [admin@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:admin@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk) for the password at least 24 hours before the scheduled meeting date)

**Telephone number to join by audio only:** 0203 051 2874 (you will be prompted to enter the meeting ID and password before joining the meeting)

**Zoom Joining Instructions** are available to download following the links below:

[Zoom Joining Instructions \(Word\)](#)

[Zoom Joining Instructions \(PDF\)](#)



## Seaford Town Council

## Report 41/20

<b>Agenda Item No:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Highways</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>17<sup>th</sup> September 2020</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Changes to the Current Planning System – White Paper Consultation</b>
<b>By:</b>	<b>Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer</b>
<b>Purpose of Report:</b>	<b>To consider the Committee’s response to the public consultation on the changes to the current planning system.</b>

---

### Recommendations

#### The Committee is recommended:

- 1. To agree a response to the public consultation of the changes to the current planning system.**
- 

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** As members may already be aware through the national press and media the Government has recently issued two White Papers outlining significant changes to the current planning system and the setting up of a new system specifically for fast tracking the allocation of land and the granting of permission for new housing.
- 1.2** This report deals with the first White Paper ‘Changes to the Current Planning System’. Comments have been requested by the National Association of Local Councils (NALC) on this document by 17<sup>th</sup> September. The bulkier document ‘Planning for the Future’ has a consultation deadline of 15<sup>th</sup> October and will be reported to the 17<sup>th</sup> September meeting.
- 1.3** There is an inevitable overlap between the two documents but the consultations are being carried out separately.
- 1.4** The first document has four main sections. The first section outlines technical changes in the standard method of assessing housing need which is of primary interest only to Strategic Planners.

## 2. FIRST HOMES

- 2.1** The second section deals with ‘Delivering First Homes’. ‘First Homes’ is a new government initiative, first consulted on in February this year, a successor to Right to Buy and Help to Buy, aimed at boosting home ownership especially for first-time buyers.
- 2.2** The Government describes the scheme as follows:-

- 2.3** What are First Homes? • First Homes are flats and houses built on developments up and down the country. They will be no different from other properties except they will be sold with a discount of at least 30 percent. • They will be sold to local people who want to stay in the community where they live or work but are struggling to purchase a home at market prices. • They will be prioritised for first-time buyers, serving members and veterans of the Armed Forces, and key workers, such as nurses, police and teachers. • The discount will be passed on to future buyers when First Homes are resold so more people can be helped onto the ladder.
- 2.4** The Government intends to add the provision of First Homes to the general requirement for developers to provide affordable housing. Currently affordable housing only covers housing for rent or under a shared ownership arrangement, typically 50% owned via a mortgage and 50% rented.
- 2.5** Regulations will specify the required percentages in any development for the three classes of affordable housing. A minimum of 25% of all affordable housing provided by developer contributions will be First Homes. Initially this provision will be enforced through s.106 Agreements; subsequently through a new Infrastructure Levy.
- 2.6** First Homes will be exempt from the normal Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which is currently payable on each new dwelling. A new Infrastructure Levy is being proposed to replace CIL and s.106 Obligations and this will be also be geared to favour the provision of First Homes and affordable housing generally.
- 2.7** There will be a new policy on Exception Sites. These are small sites outside the Local Plan suitable for 100% affordable housing where there is a pressing local need. The priority for an exception site would be the provision of First Homes but a mix of First Homes and homes for rent could be considered if there is an identified need for that type of accommodation. Some open market properties could also be included in the mix if cross-subsidy was required to achieve viability

### **3. COMMENTS**

- 3.1** The Government is prioritising the promotion of ownership through the First Homes scheme at the expense of the provision of homes for rent /shared ownership. It harks back to the Right to Buy scheme introduced in the early 1970s in the use of a percentage discount off the market value. There are possible drawbacks. Schemes which provide generous discounts or other forms of financial assistance to facilitate ownership rather than the simple provision of a house or flat are open to abuse. Reports confirm that a significant proportion of purchasers under the former Help to Buy scheme could have afforded to buy the property without any assistance. Either they had sufficient savings or were assisted by parents or family members, or both.
- 3.2** How many couples or families on local waiting lists will be able to benefit from the First Homes scheme? Admittedly many families currently renting in the private sector could benefit from the scheme but the overall effect will be a reduction in new housing for rent and shared ownership for people on lower incomes at a time when not nearly enough units are being provided to meet the need.

### **4. SUPPORTING SMALL and MEDIUM-SIZED DEVELOPERS**

- 4.1** The third of the four sections covers measures to support small and medium-sized builders (called SMEs in the White Paper).
- 4.2** SMEs are responsible for the development of a large number of smaller housing sites and apartments but were hit hard by the last recession in 2008/9 and more recently by the Covid-19 restrictions.

- 4.3** The Government proposes initially to assist SMEs by allowing them to defer CIL payments or other payments required under s.106 Agreements. This would ease any cashflow problems while ensuring the important infrastructure payments were still secured.
- 4.4** Developer contributions for small sites are also being revised. Most Local Plans require affordable housing to be provided or financial contributions paid in lieu on developments of 10 dwellings or over. 10 dwellings or more is also the level at which an application is classed as a ‘major application’.
- 4.5** Under the new proposals, sites providing less than 40 (or perhaps 50) dwellings will be exempt from affordable housing provision and contributions initially for a period of 18 months. The Government’s reasoning is :-
- 4.6** To stimulate economic recovery with a particular focus on SMEs, the threshold for affordable housing contributions could be raised. This would reduce the burden of developer contributions, as smaller sites are more likely to be built out by SMEs.
- 4.7** We understand the trade-off between introducing measures to increase the number of developable small sites and the importance of securing section 106 planning obligations to deliver affordable housing including First Homes. For example, for a threshold of up to 40 units we would expect to see a reduction of between 7% and 14% of section 106 affordable housing delivery over a single year, assuming overall housing delivery remained constant. For a threshold of up to 50 units, this would be between 10% and 20%. However, we anticipate that raising the threshold would make more sites viable for SME developers and would increase the pace of their delivery as the need for negotiation would be removed. On balance, the proposed approach would allow more small sites to come forward and help minimise the economic pressure that SMEs are under.
- 4.8** There will be measures introduced to ensure that developers of large sites do not programme development in phases of under 40-50 dwellings in order to benefit from the exemptions.

## **5. COMMENTS**

- 5.1** These proposals are bound to lead to a further reduction in the provision of housing for rent and shared ownership. The intention is to help small and medium sized builders through the current recession but do the proposals strike the right balance between assisting the ‘trade’ and ensuring the need for affordable housing for local residents is satisfied?
- 5.2** In some areas, such as the South-East, where available land is restricted by population density and AONB/National Park designations, the site threshold of 40-50 dwellings could cover a large percentage of sites coming forward and make the Government’s forecast of a 7-20% reduction in affordable housing delivery overly optimistic. It is also a ‘non-specific’ exemption based on site areas rather than specific need. Many larger developers who are robust enough to withstand the recent downturn could benefit from it.
- 5.3** Most of the country’s business community has suffered since the lockdown but has also benefitted from the Government’s schemes for financial assistance, furloughing etc.
- 5.4** Families and others requiring housing and on local housing lists would also have suffered in the lockdown. Some renting in the private sector would have benefitted from measures to defer rent payments and restrict evictions but these have now been

lifted and indications are that housing need, already acute, will become a major problem moving into the recession.

- 5.5** Even without the smaller sites exemption to assist SMEs there would be a reduction in new affordable housing for rent /shared ownership arising from the need to accommodate the First Homes scheme. In terms of public benefit, the harmful impact of these two measures could therefore outweigh the benefit provided to SMEs.

## **6. PLANNING PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE**

- 6.1** Permission in Principle was introduced in 2017 as a new, faster way of obtaining planning permission for housing development, which reduced the need for developers to incur significant costs to establish the principle of development for housing. This was done by giving authorities the power to grant Permission in Principle to suitable sites allocated on registers of brownfield land. Subsequently, Permission in Principle by application was introduced in 2018, for minor development (i.e. small sites that support fewer than 10 dwellings).
- 6.2** The Government proposes to extend Permission in Principle to major development. This will enable applications for Permission in Principle to be made for a far wider range of sites, enabling more landowners and developers to use this route to secure permission for housing development. Currently, 84% of planning applications for residential development are for schemes of 10-150 homes, which deliver 46% of new housing development each year.
- 6.3** There will be no changes to the current regulations which specify a 5-week determination period for 'In Principle' applications and a 14-day consultation period.

## **7. COMMENTS**

- 7.1** These changes, for, in effect, a pared down outline application procedure, are closely related to the fast tracking of Local Plans to facilitate the allocation and development of housing sites. This forms the basis of the proposals in the other White Paper- Planning for the Future.
- 7.2** They could have wide ranging significance in that a 5-week determination period and 14- day consultation for a scheme of up to 150 houses would appear to be woefully inadequate for LPAs and Local Councils. Most developers, while not philanthropists, are honest and reasonable but this change could be a particular advantage to the small number of opportunist landowners and developers who feature in every town and district.

## **8. RECOMMENDATION**

Members are requested for their views of the changes outlined above.

## **9. FINANCIAL APPRAISAL**

There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

## **10. CONTACT OFFICER**

The Contact Officer for this report is Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer.

Planning Officer





## Seaford Town Council

**Report 54/20**

<b>Agenda Item No:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Highways</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>17<sup>th</sup> September 2020</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Planning for the Future – White Paper Consultation</b>
<b>By:</b>	<b>Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer</b>
<b>Purpose of Report:</b>	<b>To consider the Committee’s response to the public consultation on ‘Planning for the Future’ white paper.</b>

---

### Recommendations

#### The Committee is recommended:

- 1. To note the contents of the report and that a response will be sought from the Committee at its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020.**
- 

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** As members may already be aware through the national press and media, the Government has recently issued two white papers outlining significant changes to the current planning system and the setting up of a new system specifically for fast tracking the allocation of land and the granting of permission for new housing.
- 1.2** Two planning white papers were published by the Ministry for Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) on 6<sup>th</sup> August. The first covered changes to the current system mostly relating to the provision of affordable housing and the First Homes initiative and was circulated with the agenda for the meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> August.
- 1.3** The second white paper ‘Planning for the Future’ covers more complex and wide-ranging changes which will require primary legislation.
- 1.4** The white paper is in three sections which it calls ‘pillars’ and runs to 84 pages, although more space is taken up with photos than actual text. The three pillars are entitled; Planning for Development, Planning for Beautiful and Sustainable Places and Planning for Infrastructure and Connected Places.
- 1.5** The main reasoning behind the white paper is set out in its introduction. The general view is that England (the paper only relates to England) needs more housing and the reason why we don’t have the supply to match the demand is that planning decisions are currently discretionary rather than rules based with nearly all decisions are taken on a case by case basis.



- 1.6 Also, the technology used by local planning authorities to deal with local plans and applications is based on 20<sup>th</sup> Century processes and too much documentation (e.g. S.106 Obligations) which cause unnecessary delay and stifles development.
- 1.7 The Government intends to deal with these issues partly by shifting the democratic/public input from the application stage to the plan-making stage and speeding up the procedures for making local plans leaving us with a process far closer to the zoning system common in other countries.

## 2. PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1 Local plan making will be simplified by focusing on identifying land under three categories - **Growth** areas suitable for substantial development, and where outline approval for development would be automatically secured for forms and types of development specified in the plan; **Renewal** areas suitable for some development, such as gentle densification where there would be a general presumption in favour of development ; and **Protected** areas where – as the name suggests – development is restricted. This, it is claimed, could halve the time it takes to secure planning permission on larger sites identified in plans. Local planning authorities would also be able to identify sub-areas in their growth areas for self and custom-build homes, so that more people could build their homes.
- 2.2 The local plan process will be streamlined and reduced to a 30-month timescale. The plan itself will concentrate on setting out clear rules for development rather than general policies as at present. Plans will be reduced in size by two thirds and rather than setting out a long list of policies will contain a core set of standards and requirements for development (e.g. height and density).
- 2.3 There will be a ‘radical reinvention’ of the methods of publicising local plans and getting the public involved in the planning process generally. There will be less reliance on notices stuck to lamp posts and published in local papers and more on enabling people to get involved via social media and their smartphone. The Government wants to see ‘more democracy taking place more effectively at the plan making stage’ and to ‘put a new emphasis on engagement’ but there is no clear indication as to how this would be achieved apart from this ‘greater use of data and digital technology’ and a visual and map based format.
- 2.4 Whereas the current test applied to the plan by an inspector is based on ‘soundness’ the new test will be one of ‘sustainable development ‘and other duties such as co-operation between neighbouring authorities, will be abolished.
- 2.5 There will be clearly specified stages in the process where public input will be required. The proposed timetable will be:-
  - (a) STAGE 1 – (six months) A call for suggestions as to what should go where in the plan based on the three area categories of growth, renewal and protected. Also, suggestions as to how the main consultation should be carried out. This is the equivalent to the current ‘Options’ stage.
  - (b) STAGE 2 – (12 months) The production phase of the plan and the necessary supporting evidence.
  - (c) STAGE 3 – (six weeks) The main consultation stage. The draft plan and Statement of Reasons are published and sent to the Secretary of State. Public input is sought as to ‘how the plan should be changed and why’. Responses will have a word count limit.

- (d) STAGE 4 – (nine months) A planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State considers whether the three categories shown in the proposed local plan are “sustainable” as per the statutory test and accompanying national guidance and makes binding changes which are necessary to satisfy the test. The plan-making authority and all those who submitted comments would have the right to be “heard” by the inspector (whether face to face, by video, phone or in writing – all at the inspector’s discretion). The inspector’s report can simply state agreement with the whole or parts of the council’s Statement of Reasons, and/or comments submitted by the public.
- (e) STAGE 5 – (six weeks) The plan comes into force.

### **3. COMMENT**

- 3.1** The overall feeling is that these sweeping reforms to the local plan process will lead to a totally plan-led system with the plan being under the control of the Government through the Planning Inspectorate. In other words a centralized system of zonal planning where local planning authorities will be left to deal with the details or ‘reserved matters’ of applications on major applications and the only element of discretion involved will be over design issues under the Government’s ‘Beautiful; Places’ initiative (see below).
- 3.2** The current planning system which is still based largely on the original 1947 ‘model’ has become a soft target over the years for attacks both from Governments and the public while it has been the job of under-resourced Local Planning Authorities to keep the system going. Whether the public’s faith in the system will be restored by the reliance on data and digital technology and centralization on this scale has to be open to question.

### **4. INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS**

- 4.1** The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be abolished as will the current system of contributions through s.106 Obligations. They will be replaced by a national levy, variable or flat-rate, based on the uplift in the value of land allocated for development. The aim will be to get rid of the delay involved in negotiating s.106 agreements and the current ‘viability’ issues which frequently lead to reductions in affordable housing provision. The Government’s pledge is that infrastructure contributions will increase, and that affordable housing provision will, at worst, remain at current levels.
- 4.2** The trigger for the infrastructure payments will be first occupation so occupation can be prohibited until due payment is made. Also, the payments apply across all use classes so new retail, industrial and other commercial development will be covered.

### **5. COMMENT**

- 5.1** Currently, as mentioned above, infrastructure payments are made through CIL and s.106 Agreements. CIL payments have the advantage of being based simply on the number of units built irrespective of viability issues whereas additional contributions i.e. of affordable housing or payments in lieu are dependent on viability. The viability test laid down by the Government in the Policy Guidance allows for 20% profit for the developer. This and the ‘opaque’ nature of the test has led to widespread under-provision of affordable housing. The Newlands development is a good example. In this case outline consent was granted subject to the requirement in the local plan for 40% of the units to be affordable. The developers applied the approved viability test to

their development costs and in the reserved matters application arrived at the figure of 0% affordable housing but offered 8% provision as consolation. Following negotiations, it was agreed that the scheme could be amended to save part of the building costs and a compromise figure of 25% provision was concluded.

- 5.2** The Government anticipates that in general developers' profits on any scheme based on the uplift in land value provided by planning consent, are between 25 and 50% and that the proposed infrastructure payments system will secure a greater share of those profits for local authorities. The White Paper does however contain the proviso that any increase in payments 'would need to be balanced against the risks to development viability.'
- 5.3** Clearly any viability test applied under the proposed system will have to be more tightly drawn than the current test which has enabled developers to evade the due provision of affordable housing

## **6. DECISION MAKING**

- 6.1** There are many criticisms of the performance of local planning authorities (LPA) in the white paper particularly with regard to the speed of decision-making. The failure of local authorities to decide applications within the specified 8-week and 13-week periods is seen as one of the major drawbacks of the current system. The Government proposes to deal with this by introducing greater digitalisation together with more delegation to the officers of detailed applications where the principle of the development has been established.
- 6.2** There are also threats of sanctions against LPAs including the repayment of fees and even the automatic granting of consent where deadlines for the determination of applications has not been met.

## **7. COMMENT**

- 7.1** Seeing as the failure of LPAs to achieve these deadlines is at least partly down to the successive cuts in local authority funding and resources from 2010 to 2020 the sanctions could be seen as unduly harsh and not worth the potential problems caused by granting consent for unacceptable development

## **8. PLANNING FOR BEAUTIFUL AND SUSTAINABLE PLACES**

- 8.1** There is a marked emphasis on design in the white paper. The Government's objective is to make design expectations more visual and predictable, with design guidance and codes to be prepared locally with community involvement, ensuring that codes are more binding. Special bodies will be set up to support the delivery of locally sourced design codes and a Chief Officer in each LPA will have specific responsibility for design issues
- 8.2** The Government states that it is 'committed to taking a leadership role in the delivery of beautiful and well- designed homes and places, which embed high environmental standards. The Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission recommended that Homes England should attach sufficient value to design as well as price, and give greater weight to design quality in its work'.

## 9. COMMENT

- 9.1 It sees it as essential that the local community is fully involved in the drafting of Design Guides. The overwhelming feeling however is that this initiative is merely consolation for the fact that the centralization of the system envisaged by the White Paper will largely deprive local community of their say on the principle of development.

## 10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 This white paper is a lengthy document although it does contain a lot of repetition. Also, a lot of the detail is lacking. This will be supplied when the Bill is published for consideration in Parliament.
- 10.2 I have extracted the issues which are relevant to the Committee's work and not sought to cover all the topics in the paper. If members want to read the whole document before considering a response, the web accessible version (without the illustrations) is available on the following link :-

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/907956/Planning\\_for\\_the\\_Future\\_web\\_accessible\\_version.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907956/Planning_for_the_Future_web_accessible_version.pdf)

## 11. RECOMMENDATION

Members are requested for their views of the changes outlined above.

## 12. FINANCIAL APPRAISAL

There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

## 13. CONTACT OFFICER

The Contact Officer for this report is Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer.

Planning Officer





## Seaford Town Council

**Report 55/20**

**Agenda Item No:** 7  
**Committee:** Planning & Highways  
**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> September 2020  
**Title:** Proposed Road Closures – Seaford Christmas Magic  
**By:** Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer  
**Purpose of Report:** To consider the road closure application for Seaford Christmas Magic and forward any comments to Lewes District Council

---

### Recommendations

The Committee is recommended:

1. To consider the road closure application for Seaford Christmas Magic and any comments to be forwarded to Lewes District Council.
- 

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The Town Council's Events section has applied for various road closures for the setting up of Christmas Magic on Friday 4<sup>th</sup> December and the event itself on Saturday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2020.

The streets affected are the same for both days i.e.:

Broad Street from the junction with Clinton Place to junction with High Street; Saxon Lane from junction with High Street to junction with Steyne Road; Place Lane from junction with Church Street to junction with Broad Street; Church Street from junction with Dane Road to junction with Steyne Road; South Street from junction with Church Street to junction with High Street; High Street from junction with South Street to junction with East Street; Croft Lane from junction with Broad Street to junction with East Street; Sutton Road from junction with Broad Street to junction with East Street; Sutton Croft Lane from junction with Croft Lane to junction with Sutton Road; West Street (access only for parking and Police Station) from junction with Pelham Road to junction with Church Street.

**Period of Closure on Friday 4<sup>th</sup>** - 16.00 to 12.00 midnight

**Period of Closure on Saturday 5<sup>th</sup>** - 06.00 to 21.00

### 2. FINANCIAL APPRAISAL

There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

### 3. CONTACT OFFICER

The Contact Officer for this report is Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer.

Planning Officer



**Agenda Item No:** 8  
**Committee:** Planning & Highways  
**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> September 2020  
**Title:** Update Report  
**By:** Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer  
**Purpose of Report:** To inform the Committee of Lewes District Council decisions

---

### Recommendations

The Committee is recommended:

1. To note the contents of the report.
- 

### 1. Information

The Town Council (STC) has been notified of the following decisions made by Lewes District Council:

#### APPROVALS (Objection from STC)

**LW/20/0436 – 1 SOVEREIGN CLOSE** – Demolition of existing single storey rear extension & replacement with single storey rear and two storey side extension, erection of entrance porch to front elevation with associated hard/soft landscaping

**LW/20/0448 – 33 SHERWOOD ROAD** – Two storey rear extension

**LW/20/0416 – 26 HAWTH CRESCENT** – Single storey front extension

**LW/20/0431 – BEAUFOYS 45 FIRLE ROAD** - Erection of front boundary wall with railings

**LW/20/0426 – 12 KINGSMEAD** – Single storey rear extension

#### REFUSALS (Objection from STC)

**LW/20/0420 – 23 DOWNSVIEW ROAD** – Installation of two air conditioning units at rear.  
Reasons for Refusal- Potential noise problems and adverse impact on character of the area.

**LW/20/0377 – THE BRIARS 93 FIRLE ROAD** – Erection of 3-bed dwelling in rear garden.  
Reasons for Refusal - As for earlier refused application.

**LW/20/0332 – 3 SHERWOOD ROAD** – Part retrospective application for the retention of outbuilding. Reasons for Refusal - Overdevelopment and adverse impact on appearance and character of the area. Would also leave insufficient amenity space for the occupiers of the flats at the host property.

## **2. Financial Appraisal**

There are no financial implications to the Council as a result of this report.

## **3. Contact Officer**

The Contact Officer for this report is Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer.

Planning Officer

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'G Johnson', written over a horizontal line.