

Interim Planning Guidance Responses to Consultation

End of consultation: 28th November 2008

List of respondents:

East Sussex County Council
Environment Agency
Highways Agency
Natural England
Councillor Julie Searle (Deputy Leader, Adur District Council)
Shoreham Port Authority
SEERA
Southern Water
Southwick (Sussex) Society
Sussex Enterprise

Summary of Responses

East Sussex County Council

Strong concerns respecting the potential for development at Shoreham Harbour to compromise the ability of ESCC to meet its mineral import requirements in the short and long term. Strong concern that the IPG objective - to restrict non-port related development on the harbour - conflicts with the needs of ESCC's Waste Local Plan, Minerals Local Plan, and emerging WMDF. ESCC express a wish to be engaged in the JAAP process as early as possible.

Environment Agency

Some specific references to wording. Recommends less emphasis on 10,000 homes figure and B&H Core Strategy; clarification of the increasing authority of the JAAP over time; and clarification of what 'Sustainability Measures' are.

Highways Agency

No comments specific to the Draft IPG. Concern respecting A27 at capacity between the Sussex Pad junction and the A27/A293 junction. Bus transport should be in place as interim before the RTS. Masterplanning should take extra traffic into account.

Natural England

IPG should state that flooding will be planned for; and place greater emphasis on need for sustainable transport measures. Gives non-IPG related

recommendations for ecology, biodiversity and green infrastructure studies that should be carried out.

Councillor Julie Searle (Deputy Leader, Adur District Council)

10,000 homes should not be a fixed number but a stated maximum development size. Loss of Southwick Beach is a cause of local concern and may be obstructive to the community. A new beach may be too remote.

Shoreham Port Authority

Some specific references to wording. Generally concern over vagueness respecting which types of development will be supported, and over what time period as the JAAP comes forward. Concern that the Draft IPG is negative in tone and discourages local development in the short term.

South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA)

'The interim planning guidance could usefully set out the wider context of the Sussex Coast sub-region of the South East Plan, in particular links to the regional hub of Brighton and Hove, and how it will deliver the sub-regional objectives.' Also support of the ambitious timetable and for testing of deliverability of 10,000 dwellings.

Southern Water

Emphasise requirement for provision of infrastructure and the need for planning support for construction of improvements, for example sewerage and wastewater treatment plant. Development is not considered in current water resource plans. Support interim development contributions policy. Promote the phasing of development with infrastructure provision.

Sussex Enterprise

No comments specific to the Draft IPG. Response supports the general aims of the regeneration project. Items raised include the need to encourage inward investment and the creation of local jobs; support for a significant number of new dwellings; the need to address transport and flood defence infrastructure to achieve a sustainable development; and the need to improve the seafront for business visitors and tourists.

Southwick (Sussex) Society

Complaint that less than 28 days is insufficient response time. 'Meanings and implications of some matters mentioned in the document are not clear' restricting ability to comment to this complex matter, e.g. Para 6.3 'unlocked' and 'implemented'. Object there is no mention of heritage and conservation and require this is included in the Vision. Make several comments respecting the Objectives. Object to potential loss of beach.