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**INTRODUCTION**

**Overview**

This report sets out the work undertaken by the Environment and Countryside Focus Group, and our proposed next steps. It is divided into two distinct sections:

* **Part A** (Page 6) This sets out the work and proposals that we presented to a major community engagement event on November 30th and published on the Neighbourhood Plan website This section has **not** been amended since being published on the 30th November, but is deliberately included here to support the reader in understanding the development of our work.[[1]](#footnote-1)
* **Part B**(Page 19): This provides an overview of the additional work that has been undertaken since the last version of our report was shared for consultation on 30th November. Its sets out, for each proposal presented in Part A, what our policy recommendations are from this focus group, building on the engagement we have undertaken with many stakeholders and the community.

We have used the phrase “policy recommendations” deliberately as we recognise that as this Neighbourhood Development Plan progresses, some of our policy recommendations may best be considered outside of this Plan’s framework, but have included it here to ensure that the valuable input we have gathered is taken forward. Equally, some of our recommendations are supporting the existing policy framework, which will require no new additional policies but rather set out the need to adhere to the existing planning policy already in place.

**The Policies Recommended in this paper are listed on Page 29**

Overall the work of this focus group is now complete. We will now formally pass our work to both the Steering Group and the Housing Focus Group because:

1. This report will support the Plan’s Steering Group in assessing what formal policies can be put forward into the Plan specifically to support the environment and countryside;
2. For the Housing Focus Group this document will be a key evidence source for this Group as they continue to assess where, and what, is the most appropriate development for Seaford as part of this Plan. This is especially so given our work sets out where the Community wishes to designate certain sites as Local Green Spaces.

**Next steps:**

We are keen to emphasise that 1-2 above does not mean the end of consultation with stakeholders and the community. The key next steps are:

1. A number of members of this Focus Group will now work with the Housing Focus Group and the Steering Group to ensure the work of this Group is effectively communicated and understood as sites are consulted on for development and/ or local green space designation;
2. As we set out in Part B of this report, there are three specific actions that need to be undertaken. A small number of the Focus Group will undertake this work as a discreet project and ensure it is completed in tandem with the wider deliverables of this report. It will complete this work by May. Whilst important tasks, we do not envisage this will impact on the allocation of sites for either development or local green space designation. Having members of this Focus Group supporting the Housing Focus Group and the Steering Group will certainly help ensure this is the case. The three tasks are:
	1. To establish a list of heritage assets of local historical importance that do not qualify for inclusion on the National Heritage List for England but should be considered for designation as “Locally Listed Buildings”; and
	2. To provide a list to the East Sussex County Council Wildlife Verge Scheme of grass verges where sensitive species are present.
	3. To identify minor errors in the data in Annex D (updating names and typographical errors)and report these to Historic England.

Thank you to everyone who has contributed to our work.

**The Environment & Countryside Focus Group**

Keith Blackburn

Vanessa Lawrence
Sylvia Dunn
Margery Diamand
Linda Wallraven
Jim Howell
Anne Marr
Debbie Ward
George Taylor

**PART A:**

**Introduction**

The Town of Seaford is privileged to be located in one of the most beautiful locations in the UK, nestled between the English Channel and surrounded by the South Downs National Park. But with this privilege comes responsibility; we need to ensure that the natural beauty, iconic locations, wildlife, biodiversity and our heritage assets are enhanced and preserved for both future and current generations. This will bring multiple benefits, including the promotion of tourism and therefore employment, growth and jobs, but also to ensure that Seaford continues to have a pleasant environment to live in, where people want to move or remain in the Town, creating a strong environment for suitable housing, employment and recreation.

**Aim and Objectives of group**

***Background:*** The aims and objectives below are based upon:

* Answers to the relevant questions in the Neighbourhood Survey undertaken to support the Neighbourhood Plan Process;
* Input from the Workshops held regarding the Neighbourhood Plan;
* Input from local stakeholder groups;
* The input of the Focus Group and the Steering Group; and
* A range of data sources that we have researched.

A list of the key sources and events utilised to date is included in Annex A.

***Next Steps:*** The combination of the above 5 bullet points creates a strong foundation of evidence. The information included in this report will be presented on the 30th November at the major consultation evening to get even more input from Town Residents. After this event we will:

1. Seek input from a range of stakeholders to both discuss our ideas and get further evidence to inform our eventual recommendations. Annex B sets out a list of the key Stakeholders we will approach.
2. Continue our strong dialogue with residents through further consultation, including a questionnaire on any areas we wish to follow-up on; and
3. Continue our research into specific sites/ issues identified.

**Aim:** To preserve and enhance the environment and countryside, including the historic environment and assets, of the Town by setting out specific proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan that complement the existing national and district policies.

In delivering the above aim the Focus Group has the following objectives:

1. Enhancing and preserving the environment and countryside both within and around the Town by examining if any sites should be given Local Green Space designation, or other recommendations made;
2. Examine whether there are any heritage assets or heritage character (including conservation area) concerns that may require recommendations in the Neighbourhood Plan;
3. Seek to understand if there is any farmland that may require recommendations in the Neighbourhood Plan;
4. Promote and enhance biodiversity in the Town;
5. Consider allotments in the Town;
6. To think about the risks associated with climate change;
7. Examine whether light pollution is a key issue for the Town;
8. Examine whether air quality is of concern to the Town.

To inform and shape these objectives, we undertook a SWOT analysis:

**SWOT Analysis for Group**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths:*** Nestled between a stunning coastline and the South Downs National Park;
* Nationally and internationally recognised iconic sites including Cuckmere Haven and Seaford Head;
* Strong history with a number of scientific and archaeological sites of interest;
* Unspoilt seafront with excellent vistas and accessibility;
* Strong built heritage and conservation areas;
* Gateway to the South Downs National Park;
* Number of national cycle routes run through the Town.
 | **Weaknesses:*** No listed parks or gardens;
* Seafront has lacked investment – e.g. seating, lighting and toilets;
* Recreational space for the size of the population is low;
* Lack of “green assets” such as trees in the post-war developments of the town.
* Town vulnerable to urban encroachment with detrimental effect on the environment, wildlife and the Town as whole – especially where development negatively “impacts” the SDNP.
* Vulnerability of some archaeological remains.
 |
| **Opportunities:*** To ensure green spaces are enhanced and preserved to support the environment, biodiversity, tranquillity and/ or recreation for the citizens of the Town.
* To promote sustainable tourism given our environment and countryside are key assets;
* To promote sustainable development which supports our strong environment and countryside assets
 | **Threats:*** Risk of flooding, adequate drainage;
* Loss of footpaths owing to erosion – e.g. Splash Point footpath.
* Erosion impacts on rare plants – e.g. moon carrot at Hope Gap.
* Risk of invasive plants (e.g. russian vine, catoneaster);
* Urban sprawl without careful planning considerations.
* Seafront is both a leisure/ tourism asset and a flood defence system.
* Unique flint walls at risk of decay.
* Suitable access for those with limited mobility and/ or are registered disability.
 |

 **Summary of issues and concerns (backed with evidence)**

The remainder of this report now sets out evidence against each of the above 8 objectives, which combined will deliver the aim we have set for this Focus Group, but also the wider Neighbourhood Plan vision. The Focus Group has also been very aware of the fact that our role is to look at where we think the Neighbourhood Plan can make recommendations which **add** to the policy framework, which at this stage we refer to as our key proposals. As a result, we have undertaken a full review of what we see as the key current policy framework – this is set out fully in Annex C, but overall covers:

1. The National Planning Policy Framework[[2]](#footnote-2);
2. Lewes District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy[[3]](#footnote-3); and
3. Specific policies that Lewes District Council already have[[4]](#footnote-4)

As a result, the report also sets out where we think an issue is important, but where additional recommendations are not needed. A key example would be allotments, where Lewes District Council has a policy which we believe meets the concerns and wishes of the Town’s community.

***Objective 1: Enhancing and preserving the environment and countryside both within and around the Town by examining if any sites should be given Local Green Space designation or other recommendations made;***

**Core Strategy:** Seaford is fortunate to benefit from Lewes District Council having adopted its Core Strategy after substantial consultation. In particular, Cllr Tom Jones describes the Strategy in his foreword as “It promotes sustainable development and sets out the scale, type and location of key development proposed in the district to 2030.”

On further analysis of the Core Strategy, Paragraph 6.39 (page 54 of the Core Strategy) specifically states:

*“In the case of the District Centres within the plan area (Lewes, Newhaven, Peacehaven/Telscombe and Seaford), the National Park designation either covers the whole settlement, or immediately borders it in most locations. Given the need “to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park” (the first National Park purpose), opportunities to expand these settlements outwards into the National Park whilst ensuring this purpose is not compromised are limited. This has been particularly evident for Seaford, which is the largest town in the plan area, where any significant expansion of development into the surrounding countryside cannot be achieved without damage to the landscape value and scenic beauty of the National Park. This has been a key contributing factor in very limited planned growth being identified for the town.”*

This is extremely important for our Focus Group.

**Proposal 1:** We fully support upholding the approach set out in the Core Strategy.

**Local Green Space Assessment:** In delivering this objective we have undertaken a Local Green Space Assessment (LGSA) which accompanies this evidence report. In summary, the LGSA:

* Used all available data to create an initial list of 66 potential sites from a slightly longer list. The longer list included a small number of duplications and/ or errors.
* We did an initial assessment of all 66. Of these 22 seemed to have green space potential.
* We then did a more detailed assessment of these 22 sites, including site visits, because we thought they might meet the LGSA criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework set by Central Government.
* Of these 22, we have identified 8 which we believe meet the LGS criteria.

These 8 sites all include substantial evidence of meeting the LGS criteria, and it is these sites that we wish to discuss with stakeholders as we continue to consult as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process.

We are keen to emphasise that where a site has not meet the LGS assessment it is not that we assume it can be used for development, nor does it ear-mark land for development. What it means is that given the work we have undertaken we do not think they will meet the strict criteria and there is not sufficient evidence to support a LGS designation. The findings of our work will of course be used, and inform, the work of other Focus Groups to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan looks at a range of local needs and issues.

Our work on the LGSA has informed a lot of our thinking, much of which is included in the remainder of this report under other objectives.

**Proposal 2:** That the Focus Group take forward to wider consultation the 8 sites for Local Green Space Designation

**Non Local Green Space recommendations as part of objective 1:**

Seaford Seafront

Seaford’s Seafront is a key asset both in terms of flood defence, recreation, tourism and natural beauty. Thankfully, the Town already has a strong policy framework through Lewes District Council’s policies SF14, SF15 and SF16.

In effect, there is already policy in place to ensure that the beautiful vistas and unspoilt seafront is preserved as a natural asset of the Town. This should be upheld fully.

However, the Focus Group also recognises that there is the need to consider how best this natural asset can be enhanced, and much work has been done by the Seaford Community Partnership to establish the public’s views on the Seafront – we will share the findings with the focus group looking at the economy and facilities. But they are equally relevant to this Focus Group. Our recommendations for this are set out below.

**Proposal 3:** Whilst recognising the existing policy in place to enhance and preserve the Seafront, if funding becomes available we would urge:

* Better maintenance of the paths and walls along the Seafront, as well as sensitive enhancement of the man-made features, such as benches, toilets, sea defence Groyne and shelters; and
* Lighting to be reviewed to ensure it as effective as possible, and at the same time reducing wherever possible any light pollution.

The Focus Group also recognised that looking ahead there is no reason not to consider the refurbishment of the existing housing stock, including creating multiple dwellings from larger buildings, sympathetically designed development or indeed the provision of additional visitor accommodation such as a hotel. It was recognised this could potentially enhance the environment of the Seafront, so long as it:

* Was sensitively developed;
* Was done fully in compliance with the existing policies;
* Does not detract from the natural, open, un-commercialised environment of the Seafront; and
* Did not impact on the spatial or visual openness or attractiveness of the Seafront and its unspoilt vistas.

In our view, this would help support the Vision for Seaford set out on page 35 of the Lewes District Council Core Strategy Part 1 and the existing policy framework.

Provision of Sport, Recreation and Play and Existing Recreational Open Space

The Focus Group reviewed a number of schools and playing fields as we see these as integral to the Town. However, we are also aware that the role of the Neighbourhood Plan is to add to the policy framework, not to duplicate it. We are aware that Lewes District Council has retained policies RE1, RE2 and SF12. RE1 and RE2 state:

***RE1 - Provision of Sport, Recreation and Play***

***• The Council will seek (through positive planning and provision, and through the control of development) to achieve provision of outdoor public and private playing space, which are as a matter of practise and policy available for public use, to at least the following minimum standards:***

***o 1.7 ha per 1,000 population for outdoor sports, including pitches, courts and greens, and***

***o 0.7 ha per 1000 population for children’s play, of which about 0.2 – 0.3ha will comprise equipped areas and 0.4 – 0.5ha will be of a more casual or informal nature.***

***RE2 - Existing Recreational Open Space***

* ***Planning permission will not be granted for development proposals which would result in the loss of existing outdoor playing space, or other space with recreational or amenity values regardless of their current or past availability to the public, unless it can be demonstrated that:***

***(a) sports and recreation facilities can be best retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site, or***

***(b) alternative provision of at least equivalent community benefit is made available.***

The supporting text to SF12 states that, at the time it was written, that there is a recognised shortfall of recreation space in the Town. This is a very strong policy backdrop and an area where, in our view, no additional policy recommendations are required.

**Proposal 4:** That RE1 and RE2 considerations continue to be given full weight and consideration as part of the planning process.

***Objective 2: examine whether there are any heritage assets or heritage character (including conservation area) concerns that may require recommendations in the Neighbourhood Plan;***

Seaford is fortunate to have a significant number of heritage assets and sites, almost all of which are currently designated with some form of status/ designation. Annex D provides an overview of the registered sites, and based on current information and analysis we believe that almost all have been adequately accounted for already. There were, however, three identified that we thought needed further clarification:

1. **Sutton Road War Memorial:** We had rightly considered adding the Sutton Road War Memorial as a key heritage asset to the Town, but are pleased to confirm that designation had already been given prior to this report being published. As such, no further action is required.
2. **Drinking Fountain Monument:** This is located at the junction of South Street and Steyne Road in Seaford. The inscription reads as follows: *"Erected by public subscription to commemorate the completion of fifty years of the reign of her most gracious Majesty Queen Victoria. A.D. 1887."* We are unaware of any designation for this, and propose that this important heritage site is added to the list for the Town of Seaford and afforded due designations.

The Focus Group also recognises that many of our heritage sites are not only important to our environment, but also to tourism. We would therefore urge sites that promote tourism to be maintained as much as possible. This could be through a mix of:

1. Where available, funding being provided for their maintenance;
2. The Town Council acting as a “convenor” and “communicator” to support any community led action to help maintain and preserve our heritage sites.

**Proposal 5:** Add the Steyne Road drinking fountain to the list of Town heritage designated sites.

**Proposal 6:** That through funding (if available) or community action that our heritage and conservation sites, are better prioritised for maintenance wherever possible.

***Objective 3: seek to understand if there is any farmland that may require recommendations in the Neighbourhood Plan;***

This was considered as part of our work on Local Green Spaces. Please see the separate report. Our considerations would be farmland outside of the South Downs National Park that may require special consideration. In practice, our Focus Group recognised that it was extremely important to enhance, preserve and promote good quality agricultural land, especially given the limited amount outside of the National Park designation. The Focus Group also noted that this was set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), such as paragraph 112, which again provides our Town, therefore, a robust policy framework.[[5]](#footnote-5)

***Objective 4: promote and enhance biodiversity in the Town;***

The Focus Group rightly identified that promoting and enhancing biodiversity is absolutely essential. The Group was therefore particularly pleased to see the focus on both biodiversity and green infrastructure in the Lewes District Council Core Strategy, in particular:

* Page 33: “Enhancements to the biodiversity of the district, including the further creation of a high quality network of habitats”
* Page 111 – Core Policy 8 sets out an approach to Green Infrastructure, and includes how biodiversity (amongst many other issues) can be both enhanced and preserved. Paragraph 7.80 in particular states:

***Green infrastructure refers to a multi-functional linked network of green spaces that provide opportunities for biodiversity and recreation. It includes:***

* + ***parks and gardens***
	+ ***natural and semi-natural urban greenspaces – including woodlands, scrub, grasslands, wetlands, open and running water, cliff tops and foreshore, disused quarries and pits.***
	+ ***green corridors – including river banks and rights of way***
	+ ***outdoor sports facilities (with natural or artificial surfaces, either publicly or privately owned) and cycleways***
	+ ***amenity greenspace (most commonly, but not exclusively, in housing***
	+ ***areas)***
	+ ***provision for children and teenagers***
	+ ***allotments and community gardens***
	+ ***cemeteries and churchyards***
	+ ***accessible countryside in urban fringe areas***
	+ ***river corridors***
	+ ***green roofs and walls***

The Focus Group recognises that the NPPF (paragraphs 7 and 118 in particular), the Core Strategy, and wider District Policies, create a very good framework to both enhance and to promote biodiversity within the development and planning process. As a result, there was only one area where the Focus Group wants to make recommendations based on the work we have done to date:

**Grass verges:** The Town is fortunate to have a significant number of grass verges that are integral to the Town because:

* 1. They naturally absorb rain and therefore support the natural flood defences of the Town;
	2. Many act as “green corridors” for a range of wildlife;
	3. They add to both the visual aesthetics and natural beauty of the Town;
	4. Many are home to trees and flora which support the environment and natural habitats of the Town.

Whilst we recognise that at some point in the future some verges may be deemed suitable for development, additional thought to preserving and enhancing verges is important. There are two areas where we think policy recommendations may be necessary:

**Proposal 7: That we take forward a policy on Grass Verges that likely includes:**

1. If, in the future, development is proposed on what is, in effect, a very wide grass verge, then due consideration should be given to their role in the aesthetics of the built environment as well as their role in enhancing and preserving the natural environment and habitats of the Town;
2. Where possible, the quality of verges is enhanced and preserved through, for example, the planting of trees and/ or plants. To facilitate this, when utility firms seek to place new, or maintain, infrastructure underground, the impact on tree planting on verges should be given consideration to help ensure as many trees as possible can be planted to enhance our environment; and
3. Where possible, mowing should be undertaken in such a way as to minimise the impact on sensitive species which may be present in grass verges.

We set out in Annex E some background on the benefit that trees can play in enhancing the environment of the Town. This supports both this objective, as well as others. We clearly recognise that trees cannot be planted everywhere, but where a tree(s) planted on a verge positively contributes to the natural environment, and doesn’t impact on the visual or spatial appearance in an adverse way, could benefit the local community.

***Objective 5: Consider allotments in the Town;***

The Focus Group identified one allotment in Seaford at Sutton Drove[[6]](#footnote-6). The Focus Group considered if there was any further work to be done on this and specifically looked at Lewes District Council’s policy RE9, which states:

***RE9 - Allotments***

* ***Planning permission will not be granted for proposals resulting in the loss of allotments unless:***

***(a) the plots have no special townscape value as urban open space, and***

***(b) the plots have no potential for future beneficial use under allotment cultivation.***

This policy is extremely clear and ask such we did not think additional wording was required in the Neighbourhood Plan.

**Proposal 8:** Policy RE9 as written is sufficient.

***Objective 6: To think about the risks associated with climate change***

The Focus Group again looked at the existing policy framework and fully supports the vision for the District set on page 33 of the Core Strategy which states:

***District wide***

***By 2030 the district and its residents will have made every effort to respond to the challenges of climate change, through a reduction in the district’s carbon footprint and by adapting to the consequences of climate change. This will have been done through a variety of means, such as sustainable construction techniques, utilising alternative travel options to the private car (including a reinstated Lewes to Uckfield railway line) and increased production of green energy. As a consequence of these approaches, air quality levels in the towns will have improved. Measures to reduce risk to the district from the increased frequency and severity of flood events will have been introduced, particularly in the urban areas. Despite the risk of flooding posed by the rivers, the recreational opportunities presented by these key environmental features will have been realised.***

Strategic objectives 10 & 11 of the Strategy also state:

***10.To ensure that the district reduces causes of climate change and is proactive regarding climate change initiatives.***

***This objective will involve the District Council, National Park Authority and other responsible agencies seeking to reduce the current carbon emissions from the existing development stock and encourage the sustainable use of resources, as well as promoting low carbon emissions, resource efficiency measures and renewable energy in new development. Key to the achievement of this objective will be the successful achievement of the sustainable transport objective.***

***11.To reduce the district’s vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, particularly by seeking to reduce the number of properties, community assets and infrastructure that are at an unacceptable risk of flooding, or coastal erosion.***

***The District Council and National Park Authority will work closely with the Environment Agency and East Sussex County Council (the lead local flood authority) on current and future river and sea flooding issues. An important element of this objective will be seeking to ensure that climate change impacts on biodiversity habitats and species are minimised.***

Our Focus Group fully supports this approach to climate change. Specifically, for a seaside Town, flood defences, ensuring development does not create an enhanced risk of flooding and managing the impacts of erosion are crucial. We also recognise the benefits of promoting renewable energy and would support this.

Importantly coastal erosion, including footpaths and bridleways as well as the preservation of styles are clearly responsibilities of a mix of Lewes District Council, the SDNPA and ESCC. We strongly encourage them to undertake a review of the assets within the Town. The Focus Group is still examining if specific policy is needed within the Neighbourhood Plan.

**Proposal 9:** Following stakeholder and public consultation the Focus Group will consider if further policy is needed in relation flooding, costal erosion and footpaths.

***Objective 7: Examine whether light pollution is a key issue for the Town;***

The Focus Group was unaware of any evidence being brought forward that posed a concern to the Town for the Neighbourhood Plan. It was acknowledged that this was likely due to the proximity to the sea, the National Park and the current planning boundary. Equally, it was recognised that light pollution was an issue that would be considered in relation to specific developments.

**Proposal 10:** The Focus Group will consider, after stakeholder and public consultation if any evidence comes forward that changes our current position.

***Objective 8: Examine whether air quality is of concern to the Town.***

The Focus Group was unaware of any evidence being brought forward that posed a concern to the Town for the Neighbourhood Plan. It was acknowledged that more concentrated development without regard to air quality could pose a risk in the future, but that air quality was already an issue that was covered by existing local authority policy.

**Proposal 11:** The Focus Group will consider, after stakeholder and public consultation if any evidence comes forward that changes our current position.

**Focus Group general recommendation/solutions for future development (to address identified issues above)**

The Focus Group positively encourages development in the Town and believes this can be done at the same time as enhancing and preserving the environment and countryside of the Town.

Throughout this report we have set out our proposals, but in summary:

* **Proposal 1:** We fully support upholding the approach set out in the Core Strategy to planning and development, and recognise this is a firm foundation to enhancing and preserving the environment and countryside of our Town.
* **Proposal 2:** That the Focus Group has identified 8 sites to take forward to wider consultation for Local Green Space Designation. Please see the separate detailed report on this.
* **Proposal 3:** Whilst recognising the existing policy in place to enhance and preserve the Seafront, if funding becomes available we would urge:
	+ Better maintenance of the paths and walls along the Seafront, as well as sensitive enhancement of the man-made features, such as benches, toilets, sea defence Groyne and shelters; and
	+ Lighting to be reviewed to ensure it as effective as possible, and at the same time reducing wherever possible any light pollution.
* It was recognised Seafront development could potentially enhance the environment of the Seafront, so long as it:
	+ Was sensitively developed;
	+ Was done fully in compliance with the existing policies;
	+ Does not detract from the natural, open, un-commercialised environment of the Seafront; and
	+ Did not impact on the spatial or visual openness or attractiveness of the Seafront and its unspoilt vistas.
* **Proposal 4:** To ensure sufficient play, recreation and sport, that policies RE1 and RE2 continue to be given full weight and consideration as part of the planning process.
* **Proposal 5:** That the Steyne Road drinking fountain is added to the list of Town heritage designated sites.
* **Proposal 6:** That through funding (if available), or community action, that our heritage and conservation sites, are better prioritised for maintenance wherever possible.
* **Proposal 7:** We develop a policy and undertake further investigation of grass verges. Our suggested approach to grass verges is currently:
	+ If, in the future, development is proposed on what is, in effect, a very-wide grass verge, then due consideration should be given to their role in the aesthetics of the built environment as well as their role in enhancing and preserving the natural environment and habitats of the Town;
	+ Where possible, the quality of verges is enhanced and preserved through, for example, the planting of trees and/ or plants. To facilitate this, when utility firms seek to place new, or maintain, infrastructure underground, the impact on tree planting on verges should be given consideration to help ensure as many trees as possible can be planted to enhance our environment; and
	+ Where possible, mowing should be undertaken in such a way as to minimise the impact on sensitive species which may be present in grass verges.
* **Proposal 8:** With respect to allotments, Policy RE9 as written is sufficient.
* **Proposal 9:** Following stakeholder and public consultation the Focus Group will consider if further policy is needed in relation to flooding, costal erosion and footpaths.
* **Proposal 10:** The Focus Group will consider, after stakeholder and public consultation, if any evidence comes forward to suggest that light pollution is an issue for the Town and therefore this Focus Group.
* **Proposal 11:** The Focus Group will consider, after stakeholder and public consultation, if any evidence comes forward to suggest that air pollution is an issue for the Town and therefore this Focus Group.

As set out at the beginning of this report, we look forward to engaging with our fellow residents and stakeholders to take our work forward.

**Focus Group Members:**

* Keith Blackburn
* Margery Diamond
* Sylvia Dunn
* Ted Hart
* Jim Howell
* Vanessa Lawrence
* Anne Marr
* Linda Wallraven
* Debbie Ward

**PART B: FOCUS GROUP POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Introduction**

This section sets out the additional work we have undertaken against each of the 11 proposals set out in Part A. We show below each of these proposals as “November Proposals”. Based on our additional analysis and engagement we have then “converted” our proposals into policy recommendations or concluded no further action is required. Our overall approach is set out right at the beginning of this document. We are also pleased that our engagement has also meant that private landowners/ private landowner representatives have made contact, in addition to discussions with staff within Public Authorities, wider stakeholders and the Community. The very clear Community input we have received via this Focus Group’s questionnaire is set out in full in Annex F and the stakeholders we have engaged with is set out in Annex B. In every area the responses indicated that our original thinking was well supported by the Community.

***November Proposal 1 We fully support upholding the approach set out in the Core Strategy to planning and development, and recognise this is a firm foundation to enhancing and preserving the environment and countryside of our Town.***

None of the work we have undertaken has suggested that we should not proceed with “converting” this proposal into a policy recommendation, quite the opposite. Seaford is surrounded by the SDNPA and the Sea. This means that we need to enhance and preserve the natural beauty of this iconic part of the UK – this is especially so given, for example, the Heritage Coast and the Dark Skies Night Reserve that are both within and/or next to the Town.

**Policy Recommendation 1:** We fully support upholding the approach set out in the Core Strategy.

***November Proposal 2: That the Focus Group has identified 8 sites to take forward to wider consultation for Local Green Space Designation.*** Our additional analysis and consultation has either strengthened or re-affirmed the approach that we outlined in Part A of this document. This Focus Group’s survey feedback was also extremely supportive with 91% in favour of taking forward the 8 proposed sites for green space designation. This Focus Group’s survey set out our high-level thinking and is available at: <http://www.seafordnp.uk/images/SNPLAN/6-30thNovQuestionnaireClosed.pdf>

At this stage of the development of the Neighbourhood Plan, the detailed work of this Focus Group has been passed to the Housing Focus Group to be included in their study of all sites that are potential: green spaces, housing or commercial developments. The Housing Focus Group will be conducting a thorough analysis of all such sites within the development of a Sustainability Appraisal (which looks at the economic, social and environmental impact of potential development). At the same time as this is published, a detailed report known as a Local Green Space Report will also be published.

**Policy Recommendation 2:** The Focus Group recommends that the 8 identified sites should continue to be assessed, through the Sustainability Appraisal process.

**November Proposal 3: *Whilst recognising the existing policy in place to enhance and preserve the Seafront, if funding becomes available we would urge:***

* + ***Better maintenance of the paths and walls along the Seafront, as well as sensitive enhancement of the man-made features, such as benches, toilets, sea defence Groyne and shelters; and***
	+ ***Lighting to be reviewed to ensure it as effective as possible, and at the same time reducing wherever possible any light pollution.***
* ***It was recognised Seafront development could potentially enhance the environment of the Seafront, so long as it:***
	+ ***Was sensitively developed;***
	+ ***Was done fully in compliance with the existing policies;***
	+ ***Does not detract from the natural, open, un-commercialised environment of the Seafront; and***
	+ ***Did not impact on the spatial or visual openness or attractiveness of the Seafront and its unspoilt vistas.***

Our continued analysis suggests that our original proposal is well supported, with 79% agreeing with the proposal in the Survey feedback, but rightly the term “Seafront” needs to include the extremities of the Seafront, namely Splash Point and Tide Mills. Indeed, all form part of the Seafront, with, for example, the Cliffs by Splash Point including the Kittiwake colony, and the promenade being regularly used by, for example, ornithologists observing seabirds.

However, this Focus Group also recognises that there is the need to consider how best this natural asset can be enhanced, and much work has been done by the Seaford Community Partnership to establish the public’s views on the Seafront. We are sharing our findings with the Economy and Facilities Focus Group who we know see the Seafront as the “Unique Selling Factor” to attract visitors to spend more time and money in the town. It should also be noted that 85% of people responding to our Neighbourhood Plan Survey agreed that tourism is vital to the local economy to ensure local businesses remain viable and therefore open for all to use. We understand that the Economy and Facilities Focus Group has also identified a shortfall of visitor accommodation in the town which is constraining the enhancement of the local economy.

**Policy Recommendation 3:** Whilst recognising the existing policy in place to enhance and preserve the Seafront, we would urge:

* + Wherever possible, the avoidance of any disturbance to wildlife and natural vegetation
	+ Better maintenance of the paths and walls along the Seafront, as well as sensitive enhancement of the man-made features, such as benches, toilets, sea defence Groyne and shelters; and
	+ Lighting to be reviewed to ensure it as effective as possible, and at the same time reducing wherever possible any light pollution, especially given the nearby SDNPA Dark Sky Night Reserve.
* It was recognised Seafront development could potentially enhance the environment of the Seafront, so long as it:
	+ Was sensitively developed;
	+ Was done fully in compliance with the existing policies;
	+ Did not detract from the natural, open, un-commercialised environment of the Seafront;
	+ Did not impact on the spatial or visual openness or attractiveness of the Seafront and its unspoilt vistas;
	+ Enhanced and preserved the biodiversity and amenity use of the entire Seafront – from Tide Mills through to Splash Point

.

***November Proposal 4: To ensure sufficient play, recreation and sport, that policies RE1 and RE2 continue to be given full weight and consideration as part of the planning process.***

Again, nothing has come to light to suggest this proposal requires amendment. Quite the opposite as in the Survey feedback, 99% of respondents agreed that open spaces for play and sports should be retained. To support our thinking, we set out a detailed analysis of the current provision to assess the relative contribution of areas of open space towards the achievement of the LDC retained policies above

Lewes DC’s Policy for Sports and Play Facilities RE1, when calculated against the 2015 Census projection for the 5 enumeration districts for Seaford, produces a Target requirement of 58.411 Hectares (Ha). We have calculated (see Summary Table and the spreadsheet in Annex G) the provision in the Seaford NP area as 51.568 Ha, or 83% of the requirement. This produces a deficit of 6.843 Ha (12%).

There are two elements to Policy RE1. They are:

* **Outdoor Sports requirement and provision**: Target Requirement is 41.375Ha (see Annex G) Seaford has a significant deficit of 7.166Ha (that is, 17%) against this target. However, when it is noted that schools’ sports fields make up 51% of this specialised provision and that none of these facilities are available for use by the general public or sports clubs, this deficit becomes critical (59%). There is therefore much scope for school’s playing fields to be open for community use. However, it is acknowledged that there are practical difficulties in doing so.
* **Children’s play - equipped and casual - requirement and provision** Target Requirement is 17.037 Ha. Seaford has about enough dedicated surface area (2% surplus) to meet this requirement. However, it should be noted that 1.25 Ha. of this space is beside busy roads (AlfristonRd/ Lansdsdown Road strip, Etherton Way, Edinburgh Road verge, Windsor Close strip) and, therefore, these are not safe spaces for even casual play, but rather are there to provide an air of openness to the urban fabric.

It should be noted that the full analysis in the spreadsheet (Table B Annex G) shows that there are sports facilities in Lewes District Councils’ Seaford South, Central, and Eastern Wards, but no such provision in North and West Wards. This is a matter of concern and steps should be taken to provide outdoor sports facilities on the present amenity open spaces or possibly on green field sites.

The Spreadsheet (in Table B, Annex G) identifies three sites, which are undeveloped at present, where, we believe, amenity open space is the desired response to this deficiency. However, all three are in private ownership, all three exclude public access, and all three have owners keen to develop them for housing. They are therefore listed for information, but do not currently alleviate the above-described deficiency. In fact, any proposals to build on these privately owned sites would make the deficiency worse by increasing the population without increasing the amount of space for sports.

In summary, there is an overall deficiency of provision of outdoor sports facilities and children’s play space. Within the totals, there is a large deficiency in sports facilities space and a very small surplus in children’s play spaces.

**Policy Recommendation 4:** That Lewes District Council’s policies on sport recreation and play space continue to be given full weight and consideration as part of the planning process.

***November Proposal 5: That the Steyne Road drinking fountain is added to the list of Town heritage designated sites.***

***AND***

***November Proposal 6: That through funding (if available), or community action, that our heritage and conservation sites, are better prioritised for maintenance wherever possible.***

We have reviewed the original list of heritage sites set out in Annex D and, based on current information and analysis, we believe that almost all have been adequately accounted for already. However, it was noted that the names of some of the sites are not up-to-date, and some have typographical errors. We therefore will work with the Seaford Museum and Heritage Society and Historic England to refresh the list where necessary.

**Sutton Park Road War Memorial:** We identified in Part A that we had rightly regarded this as a key Town asset, but had been advised that Seaford Town Council had already made an application for the site to be included on the National Heritage List for England. Following feedback from the Seaford Museum and Heritage Society, we propose to seek clarification that this includes the inscribed Victoria Cross memorial which was placed there in 2005. Subject to clarification, no further action is required.

**Steyne Road Drinking Fountain:** We have established that this should formally be called the “Drinking Fountain Monument and Jubilee Gardens”. This is indeed located at the junction of South St and Steyne Road, Seaford. We believe that the site in its entirety should be added to the list of designated heritage sites for the Town following feedback from the Seaford Museum and Heritage Society. It is understood that the site is believed to have been the location of the ancient Cinque Port. The actual drinking fountain, we believe, was originally part of a gun mount at the Seaford Fort on the Esplanade. It was placed within the Jubilee Gardens in 2002, where it was transformed into a sun-dial to commemorate the Golden Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. We will therefore propose that both sites be added as heritage assets to the National Heritage List for England.

We also recognise, following discussions with Lewes District Council and the Seaford Museum and Heritage Society, that there are a number of sites within the Town that may not meet the criteria for addition to the National Heritage List for England but could be deemed as being “Locally Listed Buildings” and that this list should be used to inform planning decisions.

**Policy Recommendation 5:**

* An application is made to add the Drinking Fountain Monument and Jubilee Gardens site to the National Heritage List for England;
* Minor errors on the list in Annex D are corrected;
* Heritage assets of local historical importance but not qualifying for inclusion on the National Heritage List for England are designated as ‘Locally Listed Buildings’; and
* That through community action, or if public funds become available, to seek to prioritise the preservation and/ or enhancement of our heritage sites.

***November Proposal 7: We develop a policy and undertake further investigation of grass verges. Our suggested approach to grass verges is currently:***

* + ***If, in the future, development is proposed on what is, in effect, a very-wide grass verge, then due consideration should be given to their role in the aesthetics of the built environment as well as their role in enhancing and preserving the natural environment and habitats of the Town;***
	+ ***Where possible, the quality of verges is enhanced and preserved through, for example, the planting of trees and/ or plants. To facilitate this, when utility firms seek to place new, or maintain, infrastructure underground, the impact on tree planting on verges should be given consideration to help ensure as many trees as possible can be planted to enhance our environment; and***
	+ ***Where possible, mowing should be undertaken in such a way as to minimise the impact on sensitive species which may be present in grass verges.***

Our further work on verges has led us to delete the reference above to wide verges. However, grass verges, and the appropriate planting of trees, are recognised as being beneficial to the natural environment and the local community. In addition, we are aware that East Sussex County Council operates a Wildlife Verge Scheme. Some verges, such as the one on Edinburgh Road, Seaford, are already included in the scheme. Regrettably, we understand that some that are in the scheme have been incorrectly mown which has potentially damaged their wildlife value. In addition to our original proposals we recommend understanding which verges in Seaford are in the scheme, or should be proposed for addition to the scheme, to ensure they are appropriately enhanced and preserved.

Additionally, ESCC is to trial a reduction in verge cutting in some areas in order to increase biodiversity. If the trial proves successful, we hope verges in Seaford could be put forward for reduced verge cutting going forward to promote biodiversity.

**Policy Recommendation 6:**

* Where possible, the quality of verges is enhanced and preserved through, for example, the planting of trees and the protection of wild plants.
* To facilitate tree planting, when utility firms seek to place new, or maintain, infrastructure underground, the impact on tree planting on verges should be given consideration to help ensure as many trees as possible can be planted to enhance our environment; and
* That further investigation is made into how verges with sensitive species present can be best enhanced and preserved through the existing ESCC Wildlife Verge Scheme

***November Proposal 8: With respect to allotments, Policy RE9 as written is sufficient.***

Feedback from stakeholders and the Community has indicted that the popularity of allotment holding in Seaford is increasing, with younger people and families increasingly becoming more involved. Indeed, there is always a waiting list for allotments. In this Focus Group’s survey, 83% agreed with Lewes District Council’s policy on allotments. Whilst not an issue today given the high demand, we do think that paragraph (a) of the existing policy RE9 whilst sufficient should be considered for clarification next time a policy review is undertaken.

**Policy Recommendation 7:** Whilst we believe existing policy on Allotments is likely to be sufficient, we believe paragraph (a) of policy RE9 could benefit from further clarification when the next policy review is undertaken, to reflect the strong desire in Seaford to enhance and preserve allotment space.

***November Proposal 9: Following stakeholder and public consultation the Focus Group will consider if further policy is needed in relation to flooding, coastal erosion and footpaths.***

Potential flooding is the key element of climate change that is likely to impact on Seaford. There are two elements of potential flood risk: coastal flooding and surface drainage flooding.

Coastal flooding has been an issue for centuries and, before the major Flood Defence work in 1987, the town frequently suffered from flooding. Rather than building high intrusive seawalls along the edge of the promenade, large rocks were placed on the beach and covered by shingle. The natural forces of wind and waves throughout the year move the shingle on the beach at the centre of the bay to the eastern end of the bay (Splash Point Groyne) and the western end (adjacent to Tide Mills). Twice a year, large earth-moving equipment moves the shingle back to the centre of the bay from the two extremities.

The Environment Agency has a long term Sea Defence Strategy which is reviewed periodically. The most recent review was in 2012/13. A Seaford Beach User Group,(led by Seaford Town Council and including Councillors, Newhaven Port staff and local residents) discussed the strategy with the Strategy Team as Options for the flood defences were developed and costed (including ideas put forward by the Beach User Group which included an off-shore reef and breakwaters of various designs). The Consultant’s work showed clearly that the present approach of shifting shingle within the Bay was by far the most cost effective approach and the least visually intrusive.

The increased frequency of storms and the expected rise in sea level emphasise the importance of the EA’s careful monitoring of the situation and responding quickly to the increased risk of flooding when storms continue over several weeks.

As a result of close working with the EA and the Local Authority Emergency Planning Officer, a Flood Action Group was set up in 2015 to minimise the potential impact of coastal and surface water flooding on the town. There have been no recent reports of any coastal flooding in the town.

**Policy Recommendation 8:** The Beach User Group should continue to meet regularly with the Environment Agency and be consulted on future flood defence strategy as well as on more day to day issues.

Surface water flooding has been an important aspect of the Action Group’s work and constructive discussions have been held with Southern Water. Brooklyn Road has had severe flooding (necessitating the removal of occupants of some houses and remedial work being carried out) on a number of occasions in the last few years. There has been, less serious flash flooding in Broad Street, Steyne Road, College Road/Martello Fields and in some other places. Flash Flooding is becoming increasingly frequent. The problem is the inability of drains to take sufficient water during and after heavy rainfall. This is acerbated by new developments being linked in to old sewers that are already under pressure during heavy rainfall.

Planning applications for large developments are required to prepare a Sustainable Urban Drainage System plan for the site. This will be of increasing importance in future.

**Policy Recommendation 9:** That potential surface flooding because of new developments is considered very carefully when applications are made (including the cumulative impact on areas beyond the immediate area of the development).

***November Proposal 10: The Focus Group will consider, after stakeholder and public consultation, if any evidence comes forward to suggest that light pollution is an issue for the Town and therefore this Focus Group.***

In May 2016 the South Downs National Park was designated an International Dark Sky Reserve and Birling Gap is one of the best observation sites within the National Park (as it is possible to see the Milky Way with the naked eye from there).

The National Park has a Strategic Policy (SD8) to preserve and enhance the intrinsic quality of dark night skies across the National Park.

The reserve is divided into five zones (including a buffer zone) which depend upon the present quality of the night skies. The zones determine the level of protection of dark night skies.

The urban area of Seaford itself is in Zones Three or Four (the lowest level of protection) and Residential developments within the town are unlikely to be a problem. Sites adjacent to the National Park are Zone 1 (buffer or Rural Transition Zone) where there are various technical requirements (for example, the brightness of outside lights and the direction the lights are facing).

The control mechanism is for LDC Planners to scrutinise applications for permission to develop a site and then to seek the advice, as necessary, from an expert within the National Park Authority.

We recognise that the Housing Focus Group will have to have due regard to this as it deliberates potential sites for development.

**Policy Recommendation 10:** That planning policy within the Town should take full regard to the SDNPA’s designation as a Dark Skies Night Reserve area.

***November Proposal 11: The Focus Group will consider, after stakeholder and public consultation, if any evidence comes forward to suggest that air pollution is an issue for the Town and therefore this Focus Group.***

Air quality is monitored carefully by Lewes District Council by means of automatic monitoring in areas where a problem may arise. The nearest automatic monitoring device to Seaford is in Newhaven. There were, up to 2014, two roadside “manual monitoring” sites in Seaford: A259 near to St Crispians and A259 Near to Chyngton Gardens. The Crispians site is no longer monitored as, over a number of years, levels of pollutants were very low. The site near Chyngton Gardens has relatively low readings of pollutants which indicate there is not a problem at the moment but monitoring will continue.

**Policy recommendations 11:** That applications for developments continue to be considered carefully regarding potential air pollution.

**FOCUS GROUP’S POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

We set out below for ease of reference a list of the 11 policy recommendations referenced throughout Part B of this report:

**Policy Recommendation 1:** We fully support upholding the approach set out in the Core Strategy.

**Policy Recommendation 2:** The Focus Group recommends that the 8 identified sites should continue to be assessed, through the Sustainability Appraisal process.

**Policy Recommendation 3:** Whilst recognising the existing policy in place to enhance and preserve the Seafront, we would urge:

* + Wherever possible, the avoidance of any disturbance to wildlife and natural vegetation;
	+ Better maintenance of the paths and walls along the Seafront, as well as sensitive enhancement of the man-made features, such as benches, toilets, sea defence Groyne and shelters; and
	+ Lighting to be reviewed to ensure it as effective as possible, and at the same time reducing wherever possible any light pollution, especially given the nearby SDNPA Dark Sky Night Reserve.
* It was recognised Seafront development could potentially enhance the environment of the Seafront, so long as it:
	+ Was sensitively developed;
	+ Was done fully in compliance with the existing policies;
	+ Did not detract from the natural, open, un-commercialised environment of the Seafront;
	+ Did not impact on the spatial or visual openness or attractiveness of the Seafront and its unspoilt vistas;
	+ Enhanced and preserved the biodiversity and amenity use of the entire Seafront – from Tide Mills through to Splash Point

**Policy Recommendation 4:** That Lewes District Council’s policies on sport recreation and play space continue to be given full weight and consideration as part of the planning process.

**Policy Recommendation 5:**

* An application is made to add the Drinking Fountain Monument and Jubilee Gardens site to the National Heritage List for England;
* Minor errors on the list in Annex D are corrected;
* Heritage assets of local historical importance but not qualifying for inclusion on the National Heritage List for England are designated as ‘Locally Listed Buildings’; and
* That through community action, or if public funds become available, to seek to prioritise the preservation and/ or enhancement of our heritage sites.

**Policy Recommendation 6:**

* Where possible, the quality of verges is enhanced and preserved through, for example, the planting of trees and the protection of wild plants;
* To facilitate tree planting, when utility firms seek to place new, or maintain, infrastructure underground, the impact on tree planting on verges should be given consideration to help ensure as many trees as possible can be planted to enhance our environment; and
* That further investigation is made into how verges with sensitive species present can be best enhanced and preserved through the existing ESCC Wildlife Verge Scheme

**Policy Recommendation 7:** Whilst we believe existing policy on Allotments is likely to be sufficient, we believe paragraph (a) of policy RE9 could benefit from further clarification when the next policy review is undertaken, to reflect the strong desire in Seaford to enhance and preserve allotment space.

**Policy Recommendation 8:** The Beach User Group should continue to meet regularly with the Environment Agency and be consulted on future flood defence strategy as well as on more day to day issues.

**Policy Recommendation 9;** That potential surface flooding because of new developments is considered very carefully when applications are made (including the cumulative impact on areas beyond the immediate area of the development).

**Policy Recommendation 10:** That planning policy within the Town should take full regard to the SDNPA’s designation as a Dark Skies Night Reserve area.

**Policy recommendations 11**: that applications for developments continue to be considered carefully regarding potential air pollution.

**Annex A: List of Key Evidence Used (Surveys, workshops, public events, existing information, census, etc)**

1. The National Planning Policy Framework[[7]](#footnote-7);
2. Lewes District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy[[8]](#footnote-8);
3. Specific policies that Lewes District Council already have[[9]](#footnote-9)
4. Responses to the Neighbourhood Plan survey circulated to households in the Town;
5. Data available on land from the government Magic data-set;[[10]](#footnote-10)
6. Designated sites registered with Natural England;[[11]](#footnote-11)
7. Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI’s) registered with government;[[12]](#footnote-12)
8. Lewes District Council/ Sussex Wildlife Trust Sites of Nature Conservation Importance;
9. Input from the Workshops held regarding the Neighbourhood Plan;
10. The input of the Focus Group and the Steering Group;
11. English Heritage record of heritage assets;
12. Seaford Town Council War Memorials listings;[[13]](#footnote-13)
13. Seaford Town Council allotment listings.
14. Seaford Community Partnership’s work to establish the public’s views on the seafront.
15. Annex F, which sets out the responses to our questionnaire issued on the 30th November 2016.

# **Annex B: List of key stakeholders we approached after 30th November**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Who** | **Why** |
| Lewes District Council | The main LA |
| East Sussex County Council | Statutory Consultee |
| South Downs National Park Authority | Statutory Consultee |
| Heritage England | Statutory Consultee |
| Seaford Community Partnership | Stakeholder |
| South Downs Society | Stakeholder |
| Sussex Wildlife Trust | Stakeholder |
| RSPB | Stakeholder |
| National Trust | Stakeholder |
| Seaford and Newhaven Access Committee | Stakeholder |
| Friends of Tide Mills | Stakeholder |
| The Seaford Museum and Heritage Society | Stakeholder |
| Friends of the Old Brickfield | Stakeholder |
| East Blatchington Pond Conservation Society | Stakeholder |
| Allotment Society | Stakeholder |
| Horticultural & Gardening Society | Stakeholder |
| Flood Action Group | Stakeholder |
| Natural History Society | Stakeholder |
| Friends of Seaford Head | Stakeholder |

* Please note: Statutory consultees, Adjoining Parish’s and Lewes District Council will be formally engaged as part of the overall Plan level. Some staff members of these bodies may have provided input which we will have referenced in the main report.

**Annex C – Existing Policy**

**Note; some of the policy references quoted in the text of this report have changed. The up to date references are shown below.**

There are 3 major policies for us to be aware of:

1. The National Planning Policy Framework[[14]](#footnote-14);
2. Lewes District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy[[15]](#footnote-15); and
3. Specific policies that Lewes District Council already have[[16]](#footnote-16) – for us the key ones are:
	1. ST3 – Design, Form and Settling of Development
	2. ST4 Planning applications for back land and tandem developments will be refused unless proposals provide for:
	3. ST30 – Protection of Air and Land Quality
	4. RES6 [– now covered by other regulations ]Residential Development in the Countryside;
	5. RES19 – Provision of Outdoor Playing Space;
	6. CT1 - Planning Boundary and Key Countryside Policy;
	7. CT2 [now CP10]– Landscaping Conservation and Enhancement;
	8. H2 – Listed Buildings
	9. H3 – Buildings of Local, Visual or Historic Interest
	10. H4 – Conservation Areas
	11. H5 – Development within or affecting Conservation Areas
	12. H7 – Traffic in Conservation Areas
	13. H12 -Areas of Established Character
	14. RE1 - Provision of Sport, Recreation and Play
	15. RE2[now CP 7] - Existing Recreational Open Space
	16. RE7 - Recreation and the Rivers
	17. RE9 [CP 8]– Allotments
	18. SF1 [replaced by policy of the Joint Core Strategy]– Land North of Cradle Hill
	19. SF5 -Land at Blatchington Road
	20. SF8 – Cradle Hill Industrial Estate
	21. SF9 – Footpath to Church Lane
	22. SF10 [replaced by policy of Joint Core Strategy– Car Parking
	23. SF11 – Bishopstone Conservation Area (SF11)
	24. SF12 – Land North of Alfriston Road
	25. SF14 – SF16: The Seafront

**Appendix D:**

**Heritage Sites in Seaford**

**Part A (as recorded on the National Heritage List** for England (historicengland.org.uk) as of 1st March 2017, 70 results):

18, SOUTH STREET

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 18, SOUTH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

2 3 AND 4, CROUCH LANE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 2 3 AND 4, CROUCH LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

FIZGERALD HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 FIZGERALD HOUSE, 1-14, CROFT LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

CAUSEWAY HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 CAUSEWAY HOUSE, 37, STEYNE ROAD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

SEAFORD RAILWAY STATION

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 SEAFORD RAILWAY STATION, SEAFORD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

THE PARISH CHURCH OF ST PETER

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II\*

Location:

 THE PARISH CHURCH OF ST PETER, BLATCHINGTON HILL, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

THE GABLES

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 THE GABLES, BLATCHINGTON HILL, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

THE STABLES (BELONGING TO 'THE GABLES')

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 THE STABLES (BELONGING TO 'THE GABLES'), BLATCHINGTON HILL, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

MONKS ORCHARD

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 MONKS ORCHARD, BLATCHINGTON HILL, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

CHURCHYARD WALL

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 CHURCHYARD WALL, CHURCH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

ALMA HOUSE

PHOENIX CORNER HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 ALMA HOUSE, 4, CHURCH STREET,

 PHOENIX CORNER HOUSE, CHURCH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

SEAFORD COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 SEAFORD COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, COLLEGE ROAD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

STONE HOUSE (IMMEDIATELY BEHIND SEAFORD HOUSE)

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 STONE HOUSE (IMMEDIATELY BEHIND SEAFORD HOUSE), CROUCH LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

SUTTON PLACE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 SUTTON PLACE, EASTBOURNE ROAD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

THE STAR HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 THE STAR HOUSE, HOMEFIELD ROAD, EAST BLATCHINGTON, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

ALBION HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 ALBION HOUSE, 2, HIGH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

5-9, HIGH STREET

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 5-9, HIGH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

THE OLD HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 THE OLD HOUSE, 15 AND 17, HIGH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

BARN OPPOSITE DORCAS COTTAGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 BARN OPPOSITE DORCAS COTTAGE, SAXON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

5 AND 5A, STEYNE ROAD, 7 AND 9, STEYNE ROAD

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 5 AND 5A, STEYNE ROAD,

 7 AND 9, STEYNE ROAD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

1-4, STEYNE ROAD, 1-4, MARINE TERRACE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 1-4, STEYNE ROAD,

 1-4, MARINE TERRACE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

151 AND 152, CHYNGTON LANE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 151 AND 152, CHYNGTON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

OUTBUILDING IMMEDIATELY EAST OF DOVECOTE AT CHYNGTON HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 OUTBUILDING IMMEDIATELY EAST OF DOVECOTE AT CHYNGTON HOUSE, CHYNGTON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

OUTBUILDING SOUTH OF CHYNGTON HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 OUTBUILDING SOUTH OF CHYNGTON HOUSE, CHYNGTON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

CHYNGTON COTTAGES

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 CHYNGTON COTTAGES, 155 AND 156, CHYNGTON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

FIELD COTTAGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 FIELD COTTAGE, BELGRAVE ROAD, EAST BLATCHINGTON, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

CHURCH OF ST ANDREW

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: I

Location:

 CHURCH OF ST ANDREW, BISHOPSTONE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

WALL OF CHURCHYARD AND ENCLOSURE TO THE EAST

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 WALL OF CHURCHYARD AND ENCLOSURE TO THE EAST, BISHOPSTONE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

ARCHWAY LEADING INTO CROUCH GARDEN

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 ARCHWAY LEADING INTO CROUCH GARDEN, EAST STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

MARTELLO TOWER

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 MARTELLO TOWER, THE ESPLANADE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

GARDEN WALL AT NO 2

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 GARDEN WALL AT NO 2, HIGH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

GARDEN WALL TO THE NORTH AND SOUTH OF PEAR TREE COTTAGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 GARDEN WALL TO THE NORTH AND SOUTH OF PEAR TREE COTTAGE, SAXON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

GARDEN WALL AT SAXON LODGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 GARDEN WALL AT SAXON LODGE, SAXON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

43 AND 45, STEYNE ROAD

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 43 AND 45, STEYNE ROAD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

CHYNGTON HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 CHYNGTON HOUSE, CHYNGTON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

OUTBUILDING IMMEDIATELY WEST TO DOVECOTE AT CHYNGTON HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 OUTBUILDING IMMEDIATELY WEST TO DOVECOTE AT CHYNGTON HOUSE, CHYNGTON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

THE OLD TOWN HALL

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 THE OLD TOWN HALL, SOUTH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

44 46 48 AND 50, HIGH STREET

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 44 46 48 AND 50, HIGH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

BISHOPSTONE RAILWAY STATION

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 BISHOPSTONE RAILWAY STATION, STATION ROAD, BISHOPSTONE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

TWYN COTTAGE AND TWYN HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 TWYN COTTAGE, 3, BLATCHINGTON ROAD,

 TWYN HOUSE, 5, BLATCHINGTON ROAD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

COWSHEDS EAST OF CHYNGTON HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 COWSHEDS EAST OF CHYNGTON HOUSE, CHYNGTON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

GARDEN WALL IN FRONT OF NOS 1 TO 4 (CONSECUTIVE)

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 GARDEN WALL IN FRONT OF NOS 1 TO 4 (CONSECUTIVE), STEYNE ROAD MARINE TERRACE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

THE REGENCY LOUNGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 THE REGENCY LOUNGE, 20, HIGH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

SMUGLERS COTTAGE

WEST HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 SMUGLERS COTTAGE, PELHAM ROAD,

 WEST HOUSE, PELHAM ROAD,

 15, PELHAM ROAD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

GARDEN WALL AT FIELD COTTAGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 GARDEN WALL AT FIELD COTTAGE, BELGRAVE ROAD, EAST BLATCHINGTON, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

ALMSHOUSES (NOW 2 DWELLINGS)

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 ALMSHOUSES (NOW 2 DWELLINGS), BISHOPSTONE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

THE MANOR HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 THE MANOR HOUSE, BISHOPSTONE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

BARN OPPOSITE CHURCH AND TO THE SOUTH OF MARKSDOWN

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 BARN OPPOSITE CHURCH AND TO THE SOUTH OF MARKSDOWN, BISHOPSTONE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

CHURCHYARD WALL

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 CHURCHYARD WALL, BLATCHINGTON HILL, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

DREW COTTAGE

RECTORY COTTAGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 DREW COTTAGE, 28, BLATCHINGTON HILL,

 RECTORY COTTAGE, 26, BLATCHINGTON HILL, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

THE PARISH CHURCH OF ST LEONARD

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: I

Location:

 THE PARISH CHURCH OF ST LEONARD, CHURCH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

12-16, HIGH STREET

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 12-16, HIGH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

PEAR TREE COTTAGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 PEAR TREE COTTAGE, SAXON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

SAXON LODGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 SAXON LODGE, SAXON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

51, STEYNE ROAD, 1, ST MARTINS

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 51, STEYNE ROAD,

 1, ST MARTINS, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

DOVECOTE SOUTH EAST OF CHYNGTON HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 DOVECOTE SOUTH EAST OF CHYNGTON HOUSE, CHYNGTON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

BARN NORTH EAST OF CHYNGTON HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 BARN NORTH EAST OF CHYNGTON HOUSE, CHYNGTON LANE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

NEW BARN

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 NEW BARN, BISHOPSTONE, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

STEYNE HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 STEYNE HOUSE, 35, STEYNE ROAD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

ABERDEEN HOUSE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 ABERDEEN HOUSE, 41, STEYNE ROAD, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

HONEYSUCKLE COTTAGE

SAXON COTTAGE

Heritage Category: Listing

Grade: II

Location:

 HONEYSUCKLE COTTAGE, 1, SOUTH STREET,

 SAXON COTTAGE, 3, SOUTH STREET, Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

Medieval crypt, Church Street

Heritage Category: Scheduling

Grade:

Location:

 Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

Bowl barrow on High and Over, Seaford

Heritage Category: Scheduling

Grade:

Location:

 Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

Two bowl barrows, the south easternmost pair of a group of six bowl barrows, forming part of a linear round barrow cemetery on Rookery Hill

Heritage Category: Scheduling

Grade:

Location:

 Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

A pair of bowl barrows forming part of a linear round barrow cemetery, and a hlaew on Rookery Hill

Heritage Category: Scheduling

Grade:

Location:

 Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

Bowl barrow forming part of a linear round barrow cemetery on Rookery Hill

Heritage Category: Scheduling

Grade:

Location:

 Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

Bowl barrow, the north westernmost barrow of a group of six bowl barrows, forming part of a linear round barrow cemetery on Rookery Hill

Heritage Category: Scheduling

Grade:

Location:

 Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

Hillfort and a bowl barrow on Seaford Head

Heritage Category: Scheduling

Grade:

Location:

 Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

Martello tower no 74 on Seaford Esplanade

Heritage Category: Scheduling

Grade:

Location:

 Seaford, Lewes, East Sussex

**Part B Sites to be added to the Heritage List for England**

1. **Sutton Park Road War Memorial:**

It is understood that Seaford Town Council has already made an application for the site to be included on the National Heritage List for England. Following feedback from the Seaford Museum and Heritage Society, it is proposed to seek clarification that this includes the inscribed Victoria Cross memorial which was placed there in 2005. Subject to clarification, no further action is required.

1. **Steyne Drinking Fountain and Jubilee Gardens:** This is located at the junction of South Street and Steyne Road in Seaford. The inscription reads as follows: "Erected by public subscription to commemorate the completion of fifty years of the reign of her most gracious Majesty Queen Victoria. A.D. 1887." Following feedback from the Seaford Museum and Heritage Society it is understood that the site is the location of the ancient Cinque Port. The actual drinking fountain is believed to be originally part of a gun mount at the Seaford Fort on the Esplanade. It was placed within the Jubilee Gardens in 2002, where it was transformed into a sun-dial to commemorate the Golden Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. It is proposed that an application is made for both sites be added as heritage assets to the National Heritage List for England.

**Annex E – An assessment of the benefits of trees**

**1. Clean air and Health benefits**

Air pollution is a serious health threat to many people living in cities, causing asthma, coughing, headaches, respiratory heart disease, and cancer. Air pollution is caused by elevated levels of ozone (O3), dust and other small particulate matter (PM10) as well as other toxic gases. Urban tree planting provides multiple air quality benefits, including, but not limited to:

1. Absorbing gaseous pollutants (e.g., O3, nitrogen dioxide [NO2], and sulphur dioxide [SO2]) through leaf surfaces
2. Intercepting PM10 (e.g., dust, ash, pollen, smoke)
3. Releasing oxygen through photosynthesis1
* *Children are exposed to 15 times the average level of airborne pollutants; children with asthma miss 3.7 more school days than those without. Children living in areas with more street trees have lower asthma prevalence2.*
* *A study estimates that doubling the number of trees in the West Midlands would reduce excess deaths due to particulate pollution by up to 140 per year5.*
* *Patients with views of trees have been found to recover significantly faster than those who cannot see any natural features3.*

**2. Economic benefits:**

A number of studies have demonstrated the benefits of urban tree planting, including, but not limited to:

1. Encouraging investment: the attractiveness of an environment is an important factor in attracting inward investment; both consumers and businesses have been found to favour districts with high tree cover3
2. Tourism and recreational expenditure: An attractive natural environment and urban green infrastructure is a significant attractor of tourist and recreation expenditure3
3. Property values: Several studies in the USA have found that values of properties in tree lined areas may be up to 6% greater than in similar areas without trees6. London’s house prices increase with the amount of green space in a ward, roughly equating to a 0.4% increase in price for each 1% increase in the amount of green space4.

**3. Environmental benefits:**

Significant research has demonstrated the environmental benefits of urban tree planting, including, but not limited to:

1. Heating and cooling: Trees provide shelter and reduce windspeed, thus reducing heat loss from buildings during winter. They also provide shade in the summer, whilst the evapo-transpiration of water from the leaf surface has a general cooling effect on surrounding air7. Concrete and other hard surfaces retain heat much more than trees, plants and grass. It has been estimated that a 10% increase in green space in a city like Manchester could prevent a temperature rise of more than 3C4.
2. Noise reduction: Trees and other vegetation can play an important role in attenuating noise through reflecting and absorbing sound energy. One estimate suggests that 7db noise reduction is achieved for every 33m of forest7 whilst other reported field tests show apparent loudness reduced by 50% by wide belts of trees and soft ground8
3. Reduction in ground water runoff:Trees have a number of hydrological effects. These include reducing erosion and improving water quality through interception of pollution. Perhaps the most important effect in Britain at present, given the trend for increasing winter flooding, is the reduction in ground water runoff. One study has estimated that for every 5% increase in tree cover area, run-off is reduced by 2%7
4. Wildlife benefits: Trees are an important wildlife habitat. They provide nesting sites for birds and support a wide range of insects that are an important food source for birds and other wildlife. Trees that bear berries are also a direct source of food for many bird species. In an urban setting, linear corridors of habitat are among the most important, connecting otherwise isolated areas to each other and out to the rural surroundings. Trees and other vegetation along highways, waterways and railways are particularly important to wildlife in the respect.3
* Annually a mature tree absorbs the carbon of 26,000 car miles and Produces enough oxygen to support 2 Humans9

**4. Road surfaces and traffic safety**

Managers of both trees and highways are well aware of the detrimental effects that trees can have on the surface of footways and carriageways through direct damage by roots. Less well known is the fact that the shade cast be trees can significantly increase the life of road surfaces by reducing the temperatures which the surface reaches during hot weather.3
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**Annex F: Overview of responses to our questionnaire launched on 30/11/16**

Over 300 Seaford Residents’ attended the major consultation event on 30th November 2016. The table below sets out the responses from the 126 responses collected.[[17]](#footnote-17)

As can be seen, there was strong support for our approach, and has been an important evidence source to support our policy recommendations as set out in

Part B of this report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Survey Question** | **Agree (%)** | **Not sure (%)** | **Disagree (%)** |
| **1. Do you agree that the 8 sites on the map should be local green spaces?**  | 91 | 4 | 5 |
| **2. Should the seafront be enhanced by allowing very limited, sensitively designed, developments which: a) Do not take away the overall natural, open, un-commercialised environment; and b) Retain the attractiveness of the Seafront with its fantastic views.**  | 91 | 4 | 5 |
| **3. Should open spaces for play and sport be retained?**  | 99 | 0 | 1 |
| **4. Should the Steyne Road drinking fountain be designated as a heritage site?**  | 66 | 31 | 3 |
| **5. Should heritage sites be better maintained?**  | 82 | 17 | 1 |
| **6. Should we develop a policy, and undertake further investigation, of grass verges?**  | 87 | 7 | 6 |
| **7. Lewes District Council’s policy is that allotments shouldn’t be built on (unless they won’t be used in the future, or have no special townscape value as an urban open space). Do you agree?**  | 83 | 11 | 6 |
| **8. Should the Focus Group consider, after consultation, if further policy is needed in relation to flooding, coastal erosion and footpaths?**  | 76 | 20 | 4 |
| **9. Should the Focus Group consider (after consultation,) if new policy is required because light or air pollution is an issue for the Town?**  | 60 | 29 | 11 |

**Annex G**

Summary Table A

**Sports and Play facilities in Seaford**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Provision****Ha.**(from Spreadsheet on next page) | **%** | **Target Requirement Ha.** (fromSpreadsheet on next page)  | **Deficiency****/Surplus** | **%****- /+** |
|  **1.OUTDOOR SPORT**1. **School Playing Fields**

 **(Note 1)**1. **Sports facilities (Crouch, Walmer Road, etc)**
 | **17.426****16.783** | **51%****49%** |  |  |  |
|  Sub total | 34.209 | 100% | 41.375 | -7.166 | -17% |
|  **2.CHILDERENS’**  **EQUIPPED AND**  **INFORMAL PLAY** **AREAS**  | **17.359** |  | **17.037** | **+0.322** | **+2%** |
|  **Grand Total** | **51.568** | **----** | **58.411** |  **- 6.843** | **- 12%** |

**Notes**

1. The RE1 Definition is “Outdoor Public and Private Playing Space which are, as a matter of practise and policy, **available for public use”** so, strictly speaking, theseschool playing fields are not available for public use and therefore should not be included in the provision relevant to this target. If the schools’ provision (17.426Ha.) were excluded then the Deficit against Target Provision would be increased to 24.592 Ha.(i.e.7.166+17.426) which is 59% below target

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Site name** | **LDC Ward** | **Category** | **Seaford NP site list No.** |  **size (ha)** | **sub total** | **Category sub total** | **total** | **percentage of total** |
| Bowden House School (SEN boarding school) | SN | Schools |   | 3.025 |   |   |   |  |
| St John's School, (SEN Boarding School) | SN | Schools |   | 2.281 |   |   |   |  |
| Cradle Hill Primary School (LEA School) | SN | Schools |   | 1.454 | 6.76 |   |   |  |
| Chyngton Primary School (LEA School) | SE | Schools |   | 0.835 |   |   |   |  |
| Cuckmere House (SEN Boarding School) | SE | Schools |   | 0.301 |   |   |   |  |
| Newlands School (est Sports facilities area) | SE | Schools | SE3 | 1.75 | 2.886 |   |   |  |
| Seaford Head upper & playing fields (LEA Sch.) | SS | Schools |   | 1.617 |   |   |   |  |
| Seaford Head Lower School (LEA School) | SS | Schools |   | 3.893 |   |   |   |  |
| Annecy Primary School (RC School) | SS | Schools |   | 1.021 | 6.531 |   |   |  |
| Seaford Primary School (LEA School) | SC | Schools |   | 1.249 | 1.249 | 17.426 |   | **33.8%** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| The Crouch Gardens | SS | Sports Facilities | SS15 | 2.78 |   |   |   |  |
| Downs Leisure Centre | SS | Sports Facilities | SS4 | 2.016 | 4.796 |   |   |  |
| The Salts | SC | Sports Facilities | SC23 | 8.813 |   |   |   |  |
| Blatchington Bowls Club | SC | Sports Facilities |   | 0.228 |   |   |   |  |
| Seaford Tennis Club | SC | Sports Facilities |   | 0.502 | 9.543 |   |   |  |
| Walmer Road  | SE | Sports Facilities |   | 2.444 | 2.444 | 16.783 |   | **32.5%** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| Alfriston Road/ Lansdown Road strip | SN | Public AOS |   | 0.58 |   |   |   |  |
| Bowden Rise AOS | SN | Public AOS |   | 0.221 |   |   |   |  |
| Chalvington Fields play area | SN | Public AOS | SN4 | 1.896 |   |   |   |  |
| Coxwell Close playground | SN | Public AOS |   | 0.092 |   |   |   |  |
| Normansal Park Avenue | SN | Public AOS | SN3 | 1.693 |   |   |   |  |
| The Ridings, Lexden Road | SN | Public AOS | SN2 | 0.291 |   |   |   |  |
| Vale Close AOS | SN | Public AOS |   | 0.067 |   |   |   |  |
| Argent Close/The Peverells Playground | SN | Public AOS |   | 0.285 | 5.125 |   |   |  |
| Bodiam Close | SE | Public AOS |   | 0.137 |   |   |   |  |
| Sandore/Millfield AOS | SE | Public AOS |   | 0.195 |   |   |   |  |
| Seafield Close | SE | Public AOS |   | 0.127 | 0.459 |   |   |  |
| Micklefield Way AOS | SS | Public AOS |   | 0.709 |   |   |   |  |
| Aquila Park playground | SS | Public AOS |   | 0.071 |   |   |   |  |
| Bramber Lane/Crooked Lane AOS | SS | Public AOS |   | 0.038 |   |   |   |  |
| Etherton Way AOS | SS | Public AOS |   | 0.11 |   |   |   |  |
| Martello Fields Centre | SS | Public AOS | SS11 | 1.952 |   |   |   |  |
| Martello Fields East | SS | Public AOS | SS10 | 0.389 |   |   |   |  |
| The Boundary | SS | Public AOS | SS8 | 0.334 | 3.603 |   |   |  |
| Blatchington Pond | SC | Public AOS | SC11 | 0.371 |   |   |   |  |
| Esplanade Gardens | SC | Public AOS | SC18, SC22 | 0.383 |   |   |   |  |
| Martello Fields West | SC | Public AOS | SC20 | 1.204 |   |   |   |  |
| The Covers | SC | Public AOS | SC19 | 0.218 |   |   |   |  |
| St Crispians AOS | SC | Public AOS |   | 0.179 |   |   |   |  |
| Steyne Road Drinking Fountain garden | SC | Public AOS |   | 0.025 |   |   |   |  |
| Foster Close AOS | SC | Public AOS | SC24 | 0.383 |   |   |   |  |
| Firle Close AOS | SC | Public AOS | SC15 | 0.212 | 2.975 |   |   |  |
| Bishopstone Village green | SW | Public AOS |   | 0.54 |   |   |   |  |
| St Andrew's Drive  | SW | Public AOS |   | 0.069 |   |   |   |  |
| Windsor Close strip | SW | Public AOS |   | 0.047 |   |   |   |  |
| Edinburgh Road verge | SW | Public AOS |   | 0.447 |   |   |   |  |
| Katherine Way 2 sites, 1 incl. play equipment | SW | Public AOS | SW4 | 0.632 |   |   |   |  |
| Princess Drive | SW | Public AOS | SW11 | 1.293 |   |   |   |  |
| The Brickfield | SW | Public AOS | SW1 | 2.169 | 5.197 | 17.359 | **51.568** | **33.7%** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|  |  |  |  | **51.568** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private sites of 'open land, with NP aspiration as AOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chyngton Way field | SE | Private OS | SE2 | 2.75 | 2.75 |   |   |  |
| Land adj. Hillhead, Firle Road | SW | Private OS | SW9 | 0.68 |   |   |   |  |
| land adj 47 Surrey Road | SW | Private OS | SW12 | 1.012 | 1.692 | 4.442 | **4.442** | **100.0%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **4.442** |  |
|   |   | **Requirement (Ha)** | **Provision (Ha) \*** | **Difference (Ha)** |  |  |  |  |
| **Requirement per LDC Policy RE1** |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| outdoor sports, inc' pitches courts& greens |   | 41.375 | 34.209 | -7.166 |  |  |  |  |
| children's play equipped & casual |   | 17.037 | 17.359 | 0.322 |  |  |  |  |
| **total** |   | **58.411** | **51.568** | -6.843 |  |  |  |  |
| Seaford pop. (2015 census projection) |   | 24,338 |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \* note Private OS excluded as not available. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| schools do not include buildings or car parks or access roads. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Seaford Population 2015**  | **Households** | **Population** | **Average** | **No 0-15 yr olds** | **% 0-15** | No. 65+ | % 65+ |  |
| Seaford Central | 2446 | 5,016 | 2.1 | 642 | 12.8 | 1,499 | 29.9 | 42.7 |
| Seaford East | 2131 | 4,805 | 2.3 | 681 | 14.2 | 1,756 | 36.5 | 50.7 |
| Seaford North | 2194 | 5,315 | 2.4 | 977 | 18.4 | 1,514 | 28.5 | 46.9 |
| Seaford South | 1916 | 4,517 | 2.4 | 623 | 13.8 | 1,510 | 33.4 | 47.2 |
| Seaford West | 2107 | 4,685 | 2.2 | 507 | 10.8 | 1,807 | 38.6 | 49.4 |
| total | 10794 | 24,338 | 2.3 | 3,430 | 14.1 | 8,086 | 33.2 | 47.3 |

1. Please note that Annex B has been updated to reflect stakeholder engagement since November and Annex F has been added to provide an overview of responses to the Focus Group’s questionnaire launched on 30th November 2017. Annex G has been added to do an analysis of overall “green space” in Seaford. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. http://www.lewes.gov.uk/Files/plan\_Adopted\_JCS\_with\_front\_cover.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. http://www.lewes.gov.uk/coun/planning/lewes\_local\_plan/contents\_written.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. http://www.seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk/Allotments.aspx [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. http://www.lewes.gov.uk/Files/plan\_Adopted\_JCS\_with\_front\_cover.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. http://www.lewes.gov.uk/coun/planning/lewes\_local\_plan/contents\_written.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. www.magic.gov.uk [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/ [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-areas-sites-of-special-scientific-interest [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. http://www.seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk/War-Memorials.aspx [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. http://www.lewes.gov.uk/Files/plan\_Adopted\_JCS\_with\_front\_cover.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. http://www.lewes.gov.uk/coun/planning/lewes\_local\_plan/contents\_written.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The original questionnaire can be viewed at <http://www.seafordnp.uk/images/SNPLAN/6-30thNovQuestionnaireFinal.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-17)