Lewes District Council
www.lewes.gov.uk

Lewes District Local Development Framework

Core Strategy
Preferred Options

Sustainability of Settlements in the Lewes District

Background Reports

September 2006

LDF
Local Development Framework

Introduction

Context of the Paper

The Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework will set out the spatial planning framework for the Lewes District. A crucial part of the Core Strategy is to establish the most sustainable broad locations for development in accordance with both present and emerging national and regional policies.

Who is carrying out the work on the Paper?

The planning officers, responsible for the delivery of the Local Development Framework carried out the work on the assessment.

Why prepare this document?

Each local authority in the region has a requirement to provide an amount of land for residential development as well as other land-uses. In accordance with the emerging South East plan for this area (www.southeast-ra.gov.uk), Lewes District has to provide 4400 dwellings between 2006 – 2026. Approximately, 3400 of this is to be found within the Sussex Coast sub-region in the District, with the remainder in the rest of the District.

National and regional policies make it clear that the new development should be located in the most sustainable locations. In particular central government guidance in the form of Planning Policy Statement 1(Delivering Sustainable Development) highlights the government's commitment to creating sustainable communities. Planning Policy Guidance 3 (Housing) clearly sets out the requirement to follow a sequential approach to housing provision i.e. starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within the urban area, then urban extensions and finally nodes around good public transport corridors. However, the more recent draft Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing) does not specifically refer to the search sequence. It does emphasise the need to make the most efficient use of previously used sites.

What are the key objectives?

The main objective of the Paper is to assess the sustainability of each settlement in a transparent and robust manner. However, this process is only a "building block" to start to look in more detail at the most sustainable settlements for development.

Methodology

All the towns and settlements within each parish were assessed (30 in total, including the edge of Burgess Hill).

The starting point for the Paper was a parish/town appraisal for each settlement. These appraisals brought together an extensive amount of factual information about the particular town/parish on a wide range of issues. The parish /town councils within the District were consulted on these to help ensure accuracy.

A matrix was then developed to form a comprehensive analysis of information facilities important in providing a sustainable settlement. However, a settlement, on

the whole may "score" well in terms of the matrix, but when looking in more detail of there may not be any appropriate sites for development in or adjoining the settlement. Therefore, there maybe a settlement that ranks well in this exercise but, at the site specific assessment stage, no suitable sites may be found.

In addition the weightings are not necessarily equal i.e. the score of 3 for railway line (2 lines) may not be considered equal to the score of 3 in relation to a library (i.e. adequate capacity). However, most of the criteria are objective and based on factual information.

The matrix was then broken down into three components, namely;

A. Essential infrastructure
B. Important infrastructure that should be provided by development if there is a need generated by the development
C. Major environmental designations

The criteria for the various elements of the components are shown in Appendix 1.

Each separate component was ranked and the results were then ranked again for example one settlement may rank 1st for A) essential infrastructure, 3rd for B) important and 8th for other issues (including environmental designations). Therefore, its final result would be sum of the three component rankings.

Results

The final sustainability matrix can be seen in Appendix 2 and the top 5 ranked settlements can be seen in table 1.

The four main towns within the District are ranked as within the top five settlements in terms of sustainability (with the edge of Burgess Hill scoring the fourth best). This is primarily due to the range of services and facilities within these settlements but also particularly in the case of Lewes because of the range of major infrastructure including good rail and road links. The larger villages with a range of facilities also scored relatively well e.g. Ringmer was 6th in the ranking and Cooksbridge 7th.

It should be noted however that Peacehaven ranked quite low for major infrastructure (9th) whereas Falmer, Cooksbridge and Glynde ranked 2nd 4th and 5th respectively.

The smaller settlements such as East Chiltington and Hamsey, not surprisingly, scored low as they have very limited facilities and do not have good access to major infrastructure.

Table 1: Top 5 settlements

Rank	**Major Infrastructure**	Rank	**Overall** (Major infrastructure, other infrastructure, other issues)
1	Lewes	1	Lewes
2	Newhaven	2	Newhaven
2	Falmer	3	Edge of Burgess Hill
4	Cooksbridge	4	Seaford
5	Glynde	5	Peacehaven

Conclusion

This Background Paper on Sustainable Settlements provides a useful tool to look at the sustainability of the settlements in District and to provide a strategic overview for the Core Strategy. However, it cannot provide the definitive location of sites appropriate for development. This will need to be done at a much more detailed level, in the Development Opportunities Development Plan Document, when specific areas of land are assessed for their development potential. For example a site may rank well in the overall matrix when judged against the general criteria as seen in Appendix 2, however, when looking at specific sites i.e. on edge of the main towns, there may not be any suitable sites as they are relatively remote from the main services.

Despite the recognised limitations of the rankings as shown in Appendix 2, they are an indication of the facilities/infrastructure within each settlement and provide an objective base for the development of the Core Strategy in terms of its approach to the location of future housing development. The conclusion therefore is that in general sustainability terms Lewes town scores the highest followed by Newhaven and Seaford.

Appendix 1: Major infrastructure

Infrastructure	Reason	Weighting (where 1 is the lowest and 4 is highest
Railway station	Major infrastructure which would need a vary considerable amount of development to enable the provision of a new station to be viable	0= no line 2 = 1line 3 = 2 lines 4 = 3 or more lines
Road network	The development of new roads (other than estate roads) is not in any spending programmes and the need is unlikely to be generated by the amount of housing proposed.	1= 'C' Road 2= adjacent to `B` road 3= Adjacent to `A` road 4 = Adjacent to `A` road and within 4 km of trunk road 5 = adjacent to trunk road

Important infrastructure (that should be provided by development if there is a need generated by the development)

Infrastructure	Reason	Weighting (where 1 is the lowest and 4 is highest
Bus infrastructure	Bus services can be provided where there is a demand providing the road infrastructure is in place.	1= certain days only 2 = less than 1 bus per hour 3 = more than 1 bus per

	The population should be within 400m of the service[1]	hour
Primary school	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 2500-4500 people[2] within 600m of school.[1]	0– no primary school 1= primary school with no capacity 2= Primary school with capacity
Secondary school	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 7000-15000 within 1500m of school.	0= no secondary school 1= Secondary school with no spare capacity 2 = Secondary school with capacity
GP Surgery	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 2500 – 3000[2]	0= no GP surgery 1= GP surgery with no spare capacity 2= GP surgery with capacity
Minor injuries unit/health centre	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 9 -12000[2] within 1000m of facility.[1]	0= no minor injuries/heath centre 1= centre with no spare capacity 2= Centre with capacity
Library	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 12 - 30000[2]	0= no library 1 = mobile library 2 = library with no spare capacity 3 = library with capacity
Food Outlet	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 2-5000[2] (corner shop), 5-10000[2] (local shopping centre) or 25-30000[2] (superstore/ District centre) within 800m of food outlet	0= no food outlet 1= food outlet insufficient for population 2= food outlet with capacity
Public house	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 5-7000[2] within 800m of pub	0= no public house in settlement 1= pub in settlement
Post office	Need could be generated	0= no post office

[1] Table 5.6(d) Local Facilities in urban areas – Sustainable Settlements –A guide for planners, designers and developers (University of the West of England)

[2] The population figure is indicative only and catchments may vary from place to place and over time. Sources: Coombes, Farthing and Winter (1992 -1994) Greater London Council (1965) Milton Keynes Development Corporation (1992)

	if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 5-10000[2]	1 = Post office in settlement
Place of worship	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 9000[2] (minimum)	0= no church in settlement 1 = church in settlement
Community centre	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 7 - 15000[2]	0= no community centre 1 = inadequate community centre 2 = adequate community centre
Leisure centre	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 25-40000[2]	0= no leisure centre 1 = leisure centre inadequate 2 = leisure centre inadequate
Sports pitches (Formal)	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development need in accordance with PMP study[3] within 10000[2] of facilities.[1]	0= no sports pitches 1= inadequate sports pitches 2= adequate sports pitches
Informal Play space	Need could be generated if existing provision is inadequate or the development generates a population of 1000 living 300m from open space[4].	0= no sites of Open space. 1= 1-4 open spaces 2= 5-10 open spaces 3= 11+ open spaces
Job opportunity ratio	This is based on the number of jobs available as a ratio of the economically active population. It is important to have job opportunities available in proximity to residential areas.	(0.75 is 0.75 per economically active person. – more jobs than people.) 0.75 is subtracted from total of the three columns.

Major Environmental Designations

Designation	Weighting (where 1 is the lowest and 3 is highest
Outside AONB	1 = within AONB 2 = adjacent to AONB 3 = Outside AONB

[3] PMP – Lewes District Outdoor Playing Space Review
[4] Lewes District Council Recreational Space Study, p. 11- English Nature Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance, 1996.

Floodplain/coastal zone	1 = within floodplain with no option for mitigation 2 = within floodplain but defence measures in place. 3 = outside floodplain

Appendix 2 Sustainability Matrix

	Major Infrastructure				Important infrastructure that should be provided in association with developer if a need is generated by the development															Other Issues							
Settlement	**Railway, No. of Lines****	**Road Network** (a)	**Total**	**ranking**	**Bus Infrastructure** (b)	**Primary School** c	**Secondary School,** c	**GP Surgery** (d)	**Minor Injuries Unit** (d)	**Library** (b, c)	**Food Outlet** (b)	**Church** (b)	**Public House** (b)	**Post Office** (b)	**Leisure Centre** (b)	**Formal Outdoor space** (e)	**Informal Outdoor Space** (j)	**Village/Community Hall** (b)	**Total**	**rank**	**Job Opportunity Ratio (People/job)** (f, g)	**Outside AONB** (h)	**Floodplain** (i)	**Total**	**Rank**		**Final total**	**Final Ranking**
Lewes	4	5	**9**	1	3	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	**26**	1	0.75	2	2	**3.25**	21		**38.25**	**1**
Newhaven	3	5	**8**	2	3	2	2	1	0	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	**24**	2	1.2	2	1	**1.8**	22		**33.8**	**2**
Seaford	1	4	**5**	6	3	2	2	1	0	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	**24**	2	2.4	2	2	**1.6**	24		**30.6**	**4**
Peacehaven	0	4	**4**	9	3	2	2	1	0	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	**24**	2	4.5	2	3	**0.5**	28		**28.5**	**5**
Barcombe Cross	0	1	**1**	22	2	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	2	1	2	**15**	9	1.7	3	3	**4.3**	7		**20.3**	**13**
Barcombe	0	0	**0**	27	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	**6**	24	1.7	3	3	**4.3**	7		**10.3**	**26**
Glynde	3	3	**6**	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	1	1	2	**16**	8	0.3	1	1	**1.7**	24		**23.7**	**8**
Chailey - North	0	3	**3**	12	2	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	**12**	15	1.3	3	3	**4.7**	2		**19.7**	**14**
Chailey - South	0	3	**3**	12	2	0	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	**17**	7	1.3	3	3	**4.7**	2		**24.7**	**8**
Chailey Green	0	3	**3**	12	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	**7**	21	1.3	3	3	**4.7**	2		**14.7**	**19**
South Street	0	3	**3**	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	**9**	18	1.3	3	3	**4.7**	2		**16.7**	**18**
Ditchling	0	2	**2**	18	2	1	0	?	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	3	2	**15**	9	1.25	2	3	**3.75**	12		**20.75**	**11**
East Chiltington	0	0	**0**	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	**6**	24	0.9	3	3	**5.1**	1		**11.1**	**25**
Falmer	3	5	**8**	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	**6**	24	0.2	1	3	**3.8**	10		**17.8**	**16**
Firle	0	5	**5**	6	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	**13**	13	0.3	1	3	**3.7**	13		**21.7**	**10**
Cooksbridge	3	4	**7**	4	3	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	**17**	7	1.6	2	3	**3.4**	17		**27.4**	**6**
Hamsey	0	0	**0**	27	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	**7**	21	1.6	0	1	**-0.6**	30		**6.4**	**30**
Iford	0	2	**2**	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	**7**	21	0.2	1	3	**3.8**	10		**12.8**	**21**

Kingston	0	3	**3**	12	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	**11**	17	0.7	1	3	**3.3**	20		**17.3**	**17**
Newick	0	2	**2**	18	3	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	**14**	12	2.3	3	3	**3.7**	13		**19.7**	**14**
Piddinghoe	0	1	**1**	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	**9**	18	0.2	1	1	**1.8**	22		**11.8**	**22**
Plumpton Green	3	1	**4**	9	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	**13**	13	2.6	3	3	**3.4**	17		**20.4**	**12**
Ringmer	0	3	**3**	12	3	2	1	0	0	3	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	0	**20**	6	2	3	3	**4**	9		**27**	**7**
Rodmell	0	1	**1**	22	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	**9**	16	0.4	1	1	**1.6**	25		**11.6**	**24**
Southease	0	1	**1**	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	**5**	27	0.4	1	1	**1.6**	25		**7.6**	**29**
Streat	0	0	**0**	27	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	**4**	28	0.3	2	3	**4.7**	2		**8.7**	**27**
Tarring Neville	0	5	**5**	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	**3**	29	0.3	1	3	**3.7**	13		**11.7**	**23**
Westmeston	0	1	**1**	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	**3**	29	0.3	1	3	**3.7**	13		**7.7**	**28**
Wivelsfield and Wivelsfield Green	0	2	**2**	18	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	**14**	12	2.5	0	3	**0.5**	28		**16.5**	**20**
Edge of Burgess Hill*	3	1	**4**	9	3	2	2	1	0	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	**24**	2	2.6	3	3	**3.4**	17		**31.4**	**3**

***** *Only effects eastern fringes of Burgess Hill*

*** *The number of lines were chosen instead of platform as lines give a better indication of the capacity of the settlements for trains.*

(a) OS Maps
(b) Location Appraisals
(c) ESCC
(d) Sussex and Weald PCT
(e) PMP study
(f) Census Inside – Economically Active
(g) Neighbourhood Statistics – Employee jobs (collected from figures and parish level, rather than ward level, when settlements were not large enough to have their own 'employee jobs' dataset.)
(h) Lewes District Council Map Explorer
(i) Environment Agency
(j) Informal Recreational Space Study 2005 (Cemeteries not included in this dataset)