

Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document (UDF SPD)

Summary of comments/suggestions received and part of Draft UDF SPD consultation (2020) and how the council responded to these when producing the final version of the UDF SPD.

Abbreviations

BHCC	Brighton & Hove City Council
LPA	Local Planning Authority (i.e. the council)
NCN	National Cycle Network
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
SDNP	South Downs National Park
SDNPA	South Downs National Park Authority
UDF SPD	Brighton & Hove's Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document

You said	We responded
Contents and About this SPD	
Suggestions to make structure clearer, improve illustrations/diagrams and/or provide local good practice examples	Suggestions to help to identify more clearly the sections and sub-sections were incorporated into the guidance. A few additional local good practice examples were added.
Introduce section on climate emergency and/or set out clearer targets to address climate challenge	No change. Targets for addressing the climate emergency are set at policy level. The SPD shows how an integrated approach to design can help to deliver across a range of sustainable development targets including energy and water efficiency, biodiversity gains and reduction in emissions, flood risk and air pollution.
Emphasise the need for carbon neutrality and to consider air quality and its impact of local pollution upon health	
Aspects of the Draft SPD are overly prescriptive and would impact on deliverability and viability.	Paragraph clarifying status of and recommendations set out in the NPPF paragraph 126 for SPDs (i.e. not mandatory) has been added to the <i>About this SPD</i> section.
Clarify that considerations are not mandatory.	
Make guidance mandatory.	

You said	We responded
	Wording changed in parts of the SPD to clarify recommendations should be treated flexibly including first sentence of advice set out in green boxes in <i>Section A Local priorities</i> .

SECTION A Local priorities

Overall criteria	
Ensure new housing looks like existing buildings, in particular in Conservation Areas and/or Urban Fringe sites	No change. This approach would be too restrictive going against NPPF support for innovative, contemporary design. <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 1 Context</i> seeks to strike a balance across a range of considerations that include heritage settings and fringe sites.
Introduce cap on and/or do not promote high-density development given impact upon traffic congestion and ability to meet biodiversity targets	No change. Minimum housing densities are set at policy level. The SPD focuses on how well-designed high-density development can help to deliver housing targets while at contributing to reduction in carbon emissions and delivery of biodiversity gains.
Strengthen need for access to local services within 20- and/or 15-minute walking distance and/or cycling	The 15-minute walking distance may not be viable or achievable for non-residential uses in some locations in less dense areas of the city. Wording has been revised in <i>Section A Local Priorities sub-section 2.4 Mix of uses and active frontages</i> to suggest residents' needs be met locally where possible.
Explain how densities need to be sufficiently high for local amenities to deliver 15/20-minute neighbourhoods and how this approach may not be achievable in lower-density, suburban areas of the city	
Sussex Police and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Sussex asked that reference be added to need to consider crime prevention, access for emergency services and protection of crowded places.	Crime prevention through environmental design is covered by City Plan Part 1 Policies CP12 Urban Design, CP13 Streets and Open Spaces and SA6 Sustainable Neighbourhoods. The LPA already consults Sussex Policy on all major applications. The UDF SPD illustrates how good design can help to address priorities around crime prevention, access for emergency services and protection of crowded spaces.

You said	We responded
	<p>Wording has been added to signpost Secure by Design and Crowded Places guidance in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.4 Mix of uses and active frontages</i>.</p> <p>Given the nature and scale of tall building proposals, reference added to sub-section <i>13 Tall Building Statement guidelines</i>, to include criteria around access for emergency services as part of sub-section <i>13.1. Infrastructure</i>; and crime prevention and protection of crowded spaces measures in sub-section <i>13.2 Public realm and open space</i>.</p>
Not enough reference made to importance of the city's heritage	<p>No change. The importance of the city's heritage is reflected at policy level in policies CP15 of City Plan Part 1 and policies DM26-DM31 in the Proposed Submission City Plan Part 2. The SPD is guidance on how to implement policy. <i>Section A Local Priorities sub-section 1 Context</i> of the SPD makes clear that development should respond positively to the local context of the site.</p>
Not enough reference in this section to the importance of community involvement at the early stages of the design process	<p>In <i>Section C Planning Process</i>, a new <i>sub-section 8.1 Community Engagement</i> has been added to signpost opportunities for applicants to engage with community and stakeholders before submission of a planning application.</p> <p>Further opportunities for local communities to engage in the earlier stages of the design and planning process are being considered as part of emerging national planning reforms and the preparation of local design codes.</p>
1. Context	
Strengthen measures to deliver biodiversity net gains, particularly tree planting.	<p>Reference to and examples of opportunities for achieving biodiversity net gains including via tree planting in made throughout the document, in particular <i>Section A Local Priorities sub-section 2.3 Landscaping, biodiversity and water</i>. Some of the</p>

You said	We responded
	wording in this sub-section was amended to highlight opportunities to achieve net gain via the implementation of nature conservation features. Reference to SPD11 and Special Guidance A was also added to this section.
Introduce new trees in carriageway space rather than pavements to ensure roots do not adversely impact upon equal access.	Wording added to <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 3.4 Greening</i> to ensure tree pits are adequately sized to avoid creating trip hazards/adversely impacting upon equal access.
Consider adopting a tree levy on all new developments	No change. The Draft UDF SPD illustrates how tree planting can help to deliver more successful places while delivering additional benefits like biodiversity net gain and active travel. Developer Contributions are addressed through Section 106 obligations (see CPP1 CP7 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions) and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) respectively. An updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being prepared by the council which will form the basis for CIL-funded projects.
Promote low-speed, low traffic streets that maximise active travel, equal access and children play and minimise rat runs and car parking.	No change. <i>Section A sub-section 2.1 Active and inclusive travel</i> illustrates how flexibly-designed streets and open spaces can help to slow down traffic and take account of the different needs of all users. <i>Sub-section 1.3. Composition of street scene</i> refers to the need to avoid letting car parking dominate the street scene and optimise provision of electric charging points.
Strengthen need to consider equal/disabled access journeys into and through spaces and buildings	
Reduce dominance of cars and hardstanding surfaces and maximise infrastructure provision for electric vehicles.	
Refer to need to conserve and enhance key views and views of key landmarks within the SDNP	Some of the strategic views and landmarks are within or adjacent to the SDNP. The SDNPA asked that all viewpoints within or on the edge of the SDNP are clearly identified but did not suggest any additional viewpoints.
Avoid placing habitable spaces where traffic may be congested and launch (i.e. hill climb or start).	Bullet point added to <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 3.3 Housing types and mix of uses</i> to address these issues.
Avoid placing active ground floor uses, outdoor seating, amenity and balconies in locations where harmful emissions are high	

You said	We responded
Assess impact of wind conditions in all uses of public routes.	This would be too prescriptive. This currently applies to major developments including tall buildings and new street layouts. It would be disproportionate to require this for all developments as matter of course.
Set criteria to assess departures from established neighbourhood character.	This would be too prescriptive. Each application would be expected to respond positively to its context as set out in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 1.2 Neighbourhood character</i> .
Refer to importance of parameter plan summarising townscape and landscape considerations, proposals and guiding principles for future development.	Reference to how the council would look to assess considerations of green infrastructure and ecological site conditions have been added to <i>Section C Planning process sub-section 7.1 Vision and site strategy</i> .
Consider ecological information from the onset and use it to inform the masterplanning process and strategic green network biodiversity net gains.	
<i>Good practice examples</i>	
Provide examples for 1.2 Neighbourhood character and 1.4 Views and landmarks.	No change. Both these sub-sections are explained in greater detail in <i>Section D Appendices</i> .
Using examples of creative/innovative incorporation of non-petrol-fuelled vehicles and community consultation.	Example of allocated electric vehicle parking spaces has been added to <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 1.3 Composition of street scene</i> . <i>Sub-section 8.1 Community engagement</i> added to <i>Section C Planning Process</i> signposts opportunities to consult local communities and other stakeholders at the various stages of the planning/design process.
<i>Neighbourhood characterisation</i>	
Requests for review 'urban' and 'suburban' classification of particular areas.	It is acknowledged that in Brighton & Hove the transition from urban to suburban development character is often transitional and does not neatly correspond with neighbourhood boundaries. This is why neighbourhoods have been assessed as 'predominantly' urban or 'predominantly' suburban. A consistent approach has

You said	We responded
	been taken so that, as far as possible, similar neighbourhoods are classified in the same way.
Concerns that emphasis on preserving and piecemeal enhancement for most areas limits scope for high-density, high-quality, contemporary design.	Design issues that are relevant for each neighbourhood type have been set out which identify where there will be the most likely opportunities for increased density. The UDF SPD as a whole encourages high quality, contemporary design that responds positively to its specific local context.
Make Categorisation map clearer by using greater contrast to differentiate colours	Colours in this map has been amended to provide greater contrasts between areas.
Concerns about the impact neighbourhood gentrification could have upon affordability (i.e. housing tenure and rent levels) in poorer neighbourhoods which tend to be classed as being 'less sensitive to change'.	The SPD is concerned with matters of good design in order to support design policy. Matters such as affordable housing and housing type and mix are addressed in policies in City Plan Part 1 and Proposed Submission City Plan Part 2.
<i>Strategic views</i>	
Requests for additional views to be included from Clifton Hill, Peace Statue, Bevendean Down and Surrenden Road.	The view from Clifton Hill is considered to be an important local view within the conservation area but does not sufficiently meet the criteria to be considered a strategic view. The Peace Statue is to be added as a landmark but is not considered to be a strategic viewpoint. The views from Bevendean Down and Surrenden Road have been added.
Acknowledge importance of the setting and views to and from the SDNP and for applicants to get input from SDNPA prior to submitting an application to Brighton & Hove City Council.	Policies SA5 and CP12 of City Plan Part 1 make clear that new development must have regard to the setting of the National Park. Some of the strategic views and landmarks are within or adjacent to the SDNP. The section on Views and Landmarks has been amended to specifically refer to the National Park and the potential for identifying additional viewpoints in consultation with the SDNPA for specific development proposals.
Ensuring views do not hold back new development and/or that new development enhances views.	The aim of the UDF SPD is to ensure that strategic views are identified so that there is consistency when proposals are

You said	We responded
	assessed. The impact of a particular development proposal, and the opportunity to enhance a view, will be a matter for consideration on each application.
Ensure foreground features do not hide features in the background.	This will be one of the matters for consideration when assessing the specific impact of a development on views and landmarks. It would not be appropriate for the UDF SPD to seek to list all the ways in which development could potentially impact on views.
<i>Landmarks</i>	
Requests for Royal Crescent and other elements of Kemp Town, i360, Rampion Wind Farm and Peace Statue to be added to list of identified landmarks.	Royal Crescent and other such historic terraces in that area are not sufficiently large or prominent to be city-wide landmarks. The Rampion Wind Farm is outside of and very distant from the BHCC boundary. The i360 and the Peace Statue will be added as landmarks.
Consider view corridors to landmarks.	This will be a matter for developers to consider in discussion with the LPA when putting forward development proposals for specific sites.
<i>Approaches</i>	
Requests for coastal approaches by sea of East-West along the NCN and the England Coast Path and A259 to be added to list of identified approaches.	Fixed strategic viewpoints have been included from adjacent to the NCN, coastal path and A259.
2. Spaces between buildings	
Use of shared space should be exception and carefully considered as it can result in a threatening environment for less agile users.	<i>Section A Local priorities sub-sections 1.3. Composition of street scene</i> highlights the importance of designing accessible routes and shared spaces that deliver equal access and encourage sustainable modes of travel.
Encourage use of street design and/or walking and cycling infrastructure standards and the use of sustainable materials, segregated lanes.	<i>Sub-section 2.1 Active and inclusive travel</i> has been amended to include links to Local Transport Plan and Cycling and emerging

You said	We responded
Ensure compliance with the standards for cycling and walking infrastructure, particularly space and facilities provided for each mode of transport.	Walking Infrastructure Plan guidance and national guidance on street design and cycling infrastructure. Wording in this section also revised to make reference to national guidance on how active design is central to delivering better health outcomes.
Consider improving main routes into the city for cyclists, buses and pedestrians.	
Ensure developments are fully accessible with wide, continuous, safe and even routes, including connections to the SDNP/countryside	
Strengthen reference to health benefits associated with active travel principles and lower car use, in particular improved air quality.	
Set out evidence base needed to support assessment of outdoor amenity priorities/sports provision, biodiversity enhancement, impact of wind and/or levels of sunlight/daylight.	The evidence base is set in the supporting documents for City Plan Parts One and Two that are available on the council's website.
Emphasise how green infrastructure can help to optimise blue infrastructure and biodiversity net gains and minimise impact of lighting on landscape.	Reference to how well-designed landscape can make a positive contribution to the city's green 'and blue' infrastructure has been added to <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.3 Landscaping, biodiversity and water</i> . The additional policy objectives that can be met by incorporating green and blue infrastructure measures are highlighted already in this and other sub-sections of the guidance.
Highlight additional benefits of greening including carbon neutrality, water management and wildlife including measures to retrofit green infrastructure.	
Extend Greenway concept and improve wayfinding.	
In low- and/or car-free development optimise parking provision for Blue Badge holders.	No change. This is one of the design priorities identified in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.1 Active and inclusive travel</i> .
Identify opportunities for pooling resources to deliver large scale artistic element that can create a collective legacy for the city.	The Draft UDF SPD illustrates how artistic element can help to deliver more successful places. Developer Contributions are addressed through Section 106 obligations (see CPP1 CP7 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions) and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) respectively. An updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being prepared by the council which will form the basis for CIL-funded projects. Reference to further

You said	We responded
	guidance on commissioning of artistic element that will form part of city's emerging Public Art Strategy and Developer Contributions Technical Guidance has been added to <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.5 Artistic element</i> .
Encourage engagement with local communities when commissioning artistic element within schemes.	Encouragement to involve 'communities' rather than 'residents' in the development of artistic element has been added to design considerations <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.5 Artistic element</i> .
Highlight potential for sporting activities to attract multiple users and spectators and contribute to the vitality and viability of town centre areas.	Reference to 'sports' facilities added to priorities set in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.4 Mix of uses and active frontages</i> .
Prevent risk to public health of contaminated land.	The SPD is concerned with matters of good design in order to support design policy. Specific mitigation measures regarding contaminated land would be identified during consideration of an individual development proposal consistent with City Plan Part 1 and Policy DM40 Protection of Environment and Health – Pollution and Nuisance.
<i>Good practice examples</i>	
Diagram illustrating relationship between built form and public, accessible space.	No change. An example of a diagram is provided in <i>Section C Planning process sub-section 7.1 Vision and site strategy</i> . Examples in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.2 Outdoor amenity and 2.3 Landscaping, biodiversity and water</i> show how open space relate to built form.
Multi-function streets and facilities designed for electric and/or autonomous vehicles. Show how safe, multi-function local streets and open spaces can provide opportunities for children play, communal gardening and places to rest.	<i>Sub-section 1.3. Composition of street scene</i> provides an example of multi-function street with children's play and communal gardens and spaces in residential development. An example of provision of electric charging facilities in this development has been added.

You said	We responded
Food growing.	A local example of food growing facilities in the Brook Mead Extra Care development has replaced the London example provided in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.2 Outdoor amenity</i> .
3. Buildings	
Set out methods/assessment tools to calculate carbon emission reduction, carbon capture, embodied carbon and/or reduction in car use.	The SPD is concerned with matters of good design in order to support design policy. Information requirements related to carbon emissions reduction and building performance standards in residential and major developments are set out in paragraphs 4.85 and 4.86 of City Plan Part 1 Policy CP8 Sustainable Buildings. More information about energy statements are set out in paragraphs 2.359 and 2.260 of the Proposed Submission City Plan Part 2 Policy DM44 Energy efficiency and renewables.
Refer to the need to provide convenient, dry, secure indoor and outdoor cycle storage and parking facilities including non-standard cycles.	Reference to the need to consider provision of non-standard bike storage, parking and delivery facilities has been highlighted as in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-sections 2.1. Active and inclusive travel and 3.7 Deliveries and servicing facilities</i> .
Example of inclusive and commercial cycling.	
Strengthen need to tackle housing inequality/affordability for local people.	No change. The SPD is concerned with matters of good design in order to support design policy. Targets for affordable housing, housing type and mix and performance standards are addressed in policies in City Plan Part 1 and Proposed Submission City Plan Part 2.
Request highest/zero carbon standards of design and construction, in particular for affordable housing.	
Ensure transport corridors with road traffic emissions are not fully enclosed forming street canyons that result in poor air quality.	<i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.1 Active and inclusive travel</i> has been amended to include national guidance on street design. Wording in this section also revised to make reference to national guidance on how active design is central to delivering better health outcomes has been made clearer.
Refer to space requirements needed to deliver renewable heat generation and other energy saving measures.	Reference to taking account of space requirements needed to support delivery of energy efficient new development added to

452

You said	We responded
	<i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 3.1 Resource use and performance.</i>
Request statement setting out how the design and layout of the development meets the principles of active design.	No change. The SPD focuses on how well-designed new development can achieve a number of the policy objectives including active design Design principles that support active design are set out throughout Section C Planning Process.t.
Consider post-Covid space demand for home working.	No change. The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic are not yet clear and it would be inappropriate to build advice based on indicative trends. The SPD focuses on how good design can deliver more flexible homes that are able to accommodate change over time and activities like home working.
Consider use of underground waste storage and collection in large new build development.	Advice on how proposals that incorporate different types of waste systems should trigger consultation with the Cityclean team has been added to <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 3.6 Waste storage and collection.</i>
Emphasise importance of delivery and servicing facilities where there is higher dependence on home deliveries (i.e. car-free development).	Reference to considering 'drop-off and pick up provision including deliveries depending on development type' has been added to <i>Section A sub-section 3.7 Deliveries and service facilities.</i>
Consider the need to provide gender neutral toilet and changing room facilities.	Reference to considerations around the provision of gender-neutral public toilet facilities in shops and restaurants has been added to <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.4 Mix of uses and active frontages.</i>
<i>Good practice examples</i>	
Provide good practice examples of passive, active surveillance and accessible parking, dropped kerbs and covered, easy to access indoor and outdoor cycle storage, in particular in flatted development be provided.	Good practice examples of these are provided throughout the SPD. The SPD focuses on how well-designed new development can achieve a number of the policy objectives identified in these comments.
Use more examples of Passivhaus development.	

You said	We responded
Use local examples to illustrate application of circular economy principles.	An example has been added to <i>sub-section 3.1 Resource performance and use</i> .
Use less onerous, easier to achieve examples of green walls than that of the All England Club.	All England example has been replaced with example of green roof over bike shed in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 3.4 Greening</i> .
SECTION B Tall buildings	
Given the adverse impact of wind and overshadowing from tall buildings it is important, when assessing proposals, to ensure these do not create inhospitable open spaces for people and plant growing.	No change. Assessment of impact of tall building proposals on surrounding properties is part of the climatic impact considerations identified in <i>Section D Appendices sub-section 13 Tall Building Statement guidelines, 13.1 Context</i> .
Limited availability of space for new development in the city will mean that proposals for taller buildings need to be considered as an option.	The council's policy on tall buildings is set out in policy CP12 of City Plan Part 1, which acknowledges that taller buildings will form part of the city's approach to increasing development density. The SPD is guidance intended to provide further detail on tall building area boundaries and height ranges.
'Tall' and 'very tall' development is harmful and/or unacceptable and should only be considered in exceptional circumstances and/or when providing greater benefits like, for example, more affordable housing.	
Given the impact of air pollution upon tall building users, there is a need to ensure, when assessing proposals, continuous long-term user exposure, in growth and/or congested areas of the city is avoided.	Bullet point added to <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 3.3 Housing types and mix of uses</i> to address these issues.
Need for tall buildings to provide safe, secure, accessible cycle parking and storage with e-bike charging points in fire safe lockers and non-standard cycle facilities be emphasised.	No change. Reference to the need to consider provision of non-standard bike storage, parking and delivery facilities in all development, including tall buildings, has been highlighted as in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-sections 2.1. Active and inclusive travel and 3.7 Deliveries and servicing facilities</i> .
Tall buildings definition should be simplified and/or made clearer and that the Tall Buildings Statement guidelines set out in Section D be condensed and incorporated into the Tall Building Statement	Guidance has been provided for developers and agents assessing whether a specific proposal would meet that definition. The suggested alternative wording would be ambiguous and

You said	We responded
<p>section. They also asked for the recommendation that all buildings should not mask natural valley formations to be removed given it unduly restricts compositional approach and would be better assessed on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>would mean that, for example, a 4-storey building in a low-rise area could be regarded a tall building. The requirements of a Tall Building Statement are necessarily extensive and so have been included as an appendix to ensure that the main SPD is concise and readable. The downland topography is very important to the character of Brighton & Hove and it will be a matter for the applicant to demonstrate how a proposal appropriately sits within the landform.</p>
<p>Facilitate walking and cycling and identify cycling routes be strengthen and for funding opportunities available to deliver improvements to be added.</p>	<p>Ways to facilitate walking and cycling as part of the active travel agenda is set out in <i>Section A sub-section 2.1 Active and inclusive travel</i>. It would be inappropriate to refer to funding opportunities that change given that the SPD is a longer-term document.</p>
<p>Applicants to undertake a townscape and visual impact assessment and to agree inclusion of transport chapter as part of an EIA be included in the guidance.</p>	<p>Whether an EIA is required is a matter for the legislation and what an EIA should cover will be determined in each case at the scoping stage. The wording of these paragraphs has been amended to reflect the comments made.</p>
<p>5.1. Area 1: Brighton Marina</p>	
<p>Align indicative boundary with that set out in City Plan Part One Policy CP12 Urban Design.</p>	<p>Map amended to align with indicative boundary in City Plan Part One Policy CP12 Urban Design.</p>
<p>Emphasise the need to reduce the risk of flooding from the sea and surface water where possible.</p>	<p>Need to 'reduce' rather than 'minimise' the risk of flooding from the sea and surface water added to design considerations.</p>
<p>Avoid overdevelopment.</p>	<p>City Plan Policies provide a robust framework for protecting sites from overdevelopment on the basis of impact upon heritage, sustainability, open space, landscape and design. The UDF SPD aims to show how well-designed spaces and buildings can deliver high-quality, high-density development that deliver City Plan policy objectives.</p>
<p>5.2. Area 2: Brighton Station / New England</p>	

You said	We responded
Recently granted consents for tall building are too high or reduce maximum height range to mid-rise (6 to 8 storeys).	Assessment of tall building proposals depends on site-specific conditions and is carried out on a case by case basis. Granted consents are one aspect of the criteria used to set out <i>Section B Tall buildings</i> . Indicative heights are based on unpublished sections of the 2003 Tall Buildings Study and assessment of the areas as they have developed since then. These are indicative. Any proposal for tall buildings will be subject to assessment using the criteria set out in <i>sub-sections 6 Tall Building Statements</i> and explained in more detail in <i>Section D Appendices sub-section 13 Tall Building Statement guidelines</i> .
Recently granted consents for tall buildings should be considered when setting height range.	
Improve connections to facilitate walking and cycling and signpost funding opportunities.	It would be inappropriate to refer to funding opportunities that change given that the SPD is a longer-term document.
5.3. Area 3: Central Seafront	
Reduce maximum height range to mid-rise (6 to 8 storeys).	Indicative heights are based on unpublished sections of the 2003 Tall Buildings Study and assessment of opportunities in partnership with the DesignPLACE panel. These are indicative. Any proposal for tall buildings will be subject to assessment using the criteria set out in <i>sub-sections 6 Tall Building Statements</i> and explained in more detail in <i>Section D Appendices sub-section 13 Tall Building Statement guidelines</i> .
Design considerations are not flexible enough to enable for tall buildings to be located on the periphery of the Brighton Centre/Churchill Square site and/or to unlock the potential of view corridors, use mix and public realm network across this site.	Text has been added to the diagram illustrating design principles and priorities for this area to state that: "The shape, delineation and position of routes and tall buildings are indicative and will be guided by views, townscape studies, practical considerations of aspect, amenity and ground conditions among other considerations."
5.4. Area 4: Eastern Road / Edward Street	
Reduce maximum height range to mid-rise (6 to 8 storeys).	Indicative heights are based on unpublished sections of the 2003 Tall Buildings Study. These are indicative. Any proposal for tall

You said	We responded
5.5. Area 5: Hove Station	buildings will be subject to assessment using the criteria set out in <i>sub-section 6 Tall Building Statements</i> and explained in more detail in <i>Section D Appendices sub-section 13 Tall Building Statement guidelines</i> .
Reduce maximum height range to mid-rise (6 to 8 storeys).	
5.6. Area 6: Lewes Road	
Reduce maximum height range to mid-rise (6 to 8 storeys).	
5.7. Area 7: London Road / Preston Road	
Reduce maximum height range to mid-rise (6 to 8 storeys).	This tall Building Area benefits from boundaries, heights and design principles set at policy level as part of the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP). The area map and information in this section has been amended to refer to this. Reference to Shoreham Harbour as a working harbour has been added.
5.9. Area 9: Shoreham Harbour	
Add character areas and other relevant policy boundaries set out in the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP) to indicative boundary map.	
Describe heights in metres as well as in storeys and set maximum height range of up to 8 storeys (24 metres) above the level of Basin Road North (i.e. up to 6 storeys/18 metres above the level of Kingsway).	
Emphasise the need to minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of noise and air pollution.	
Combine design considerations with the relevant character areas and design policies in the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP).	SECTION C Planning Process
Support and develop the use of Shoreham Harbour as a port.	
SECTION C Planning Process	
<i>Vision and site strategy</i>	
Ensure comprehensive early consultation is carried out and feedback is sought from the local community prior to a planning application being submitted.	Wording has been updated to strengthen this recommendation, and the following 3 stages (<i>sub-sections 7.2 – 7.4</i>) recommend that applicants submit an updated community and stakeholder engagement report.

You said	We responded
<i>Conceptual design options</i>	
Requests for figure ground studies, plans, sections, elevations, 3D images and/or models is too excessive, onerous and items such as sections and elevations should not be expected.	<p>The guidance offers recommendations, not requirements. The level of detail recommended aligns with the RIBA Plan of Work 2020.</p> <p>The intention of these recommendations is that the LPA secure as full an understanding of design proposals as possible, so a wide-ranging variety of presentation methods (drawings, 3D visuals, models etc.) is encouraged.</p> <p>In response to the comment, recommendations have been updated to recommend that design information “may include” the list of different presentation methods.</p>
Ask applicants about impact upon local heritage assets.	This question has been included in the light green boxes in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 1. Context.</i>
<i>Preferred design concept</i>	
Request drawings in greater detail and a sustainability strategy is overly prescriptive for the pre-application stage. Instead, a more targeted approach to drawings and engagement with sustainability officers at an early stage to ensure policy requirements are considered as part of the emerging design proposals is needed.	<p>The guidance offers recommendations, not requirements. The level of detail recommended aligns with the RIBA Plan of Work 2020.</p> <p>The intention of these recommendations is that the LPA secure as full an understanding of design proposals as possible, so a wide-ranging variety of presentation methods (drawings, 3D visuals, models etc.) is encouraged.</p> <p>In response to the comment, recommendations have been updated to suggest that design information may still be in sketch form at this stage but should be as wide ranging and informative as possible.</p>
Request a design statement from applicants setting out minimum design information given that many applications, particularly the smaller ones, fail to explain how proposals relate to the surrounding urban context.	The first bullet point in the green box in this section has been updated to recommend that the preferred design concept is justified by a written design development statement.

You said	We responded
<i>Detailed design</i>	
<p>Ask applicants to submit a Design and Access Statement (DAS) or fully-realised and calculated sustainability strategies prior to submission of an application too onerous and should be made optional or replaced by information that can be shared iteratively during the pre-application stage.</p>	<p>The guidance offers recommendations, not requirements. The level of detail recommended aligns with the RIBA Plan of Work 2020 regarding Strategic Engineering Analysis, Cost Plans, Architectural Concept, Spatially Coordinated Design and Outline Specifications. The intention of this stage is that the preferred design concept is progressed to a level of detail sufficient to submit a planning application, and to minimise the amount of development work required between the last pre-application advice checkpoint and planning submission.</p> <p>In response to the comment, care has been taken to ensure that recommendations are not more onerous than the RIBA work stages or than can reasonably be expected at this stage.</p>
<p>Make distinction between ‘detailed design’ and that which refers to that produced after planning approval has been granted.</p>	<p>Changed the stage title to “Developed Design”.</p>
Pre-application process	
<p>Highlighted the importance of factoring in design priorities at the earliest stages of the design process (i.e. active design, ecological assessments, gender neutral facilities, food growing, daylight/sunlight).</p>	<p>The process diagram in Section 7 indicates how local design priorities identified in Section A of the UDF align with the design process and when these should be considered.</p>
<p>Standards and consistency in public consultations by the Local Authority and applicants could be raised by, for example, adding guidance on community consultation and/or promoting the use of consultation rooms where design proposals could be displayed and discussed with local communities.</p>	<p>Pre-application discussions are confidential. However, an additional <i>sub-section 8.1 Community and stakeholder engagement</i> guides developers on how to make the best of this engagement.</p>
<p>Ensure poor design is refused and/or suggest upgrading wording from ‘council recommends’ to ‘require’.</p>	<p>Guidance cannot make requirements but intends to show how national and local policy objectives can be met by means of high-quality urban design.</p>

You said	We responded
Stress the need for applicants to positively engage with local communities at the various stages of the design process (i.e. more often and meaningfully rather than as part of a tick-box exercise).	Wording has been updated to strengthen this recommendation, and the following 3 stages (sections 7.2 – 7.4) all recommend applicants submit an updated community and stakeholder engagement report. An additional <i>sub-section 8.1</i> addresses community and stakeholder engagement and includes hyperlinks to guidance by several specialist organisations.
Asked for greater clarity on the required number, type and arrangements of design consultations given that expectation of all applicants entering into 3 pre-app consultations and the ability of the LPA to cope with increased demand is unrealistic.	<i>Sub-section 7 Pre-application process</i> now advises that the appropriate pre-application advice services proportionate to the scale and complexity of a development proposal should be agreed with the LPA. The process diagram in this section now indicates how different development scales and application types may align with the four indicative stages and checkpoints.
Information about the nature and amount of information required at pre-application stage too prescriptive, failing to recognise the demand of different types of application (i.e. detailed, outline or hybrid) and the role of planning conditions in enabling details to be agreed at the later stages of the design process.	<i>Sub-section 7 Pre-application process</i> now advises that the appropriate pre-application advice services proportionate to the scale and complexity of a development proposal should be agreed with the LPA. The process diagram in this section now indicates how different development scales and application types may align with the four indicative stages and checkpoints. <i>Sub-sections 7.1 – 7.4</i> outline the level of detail recommended at each identified stage, proportionate to the complexity of development proposals.
Cross reference the design stages with the RIBA Plan of Work 2020.	Included the RIBA work stages in the Design Process diagram (Section 7) and referenced RIBA work stages in <i>sub-sections 7.1 to 7.4</i> .
Need for applicant and design team expectations to be matched by reciprocal expectations of BHCC departments in facilitating a smooth, linear assessment process.	<i>Section 7 Pre-application process</i> now advises that the appropriate pre-application advice services proportionate to the

You said	We responded
<p>Asked whether the approach set out in this section of the guidance is a preferred approach that can be applied flexibly according to the type of application and proportionately when it comes to the level of information to be provided as part of the Design & Access Statement.</p>	<p>scale and complexity of a development proposal should be agreed with the LPA.</p> <p><i>Section 7 Pre-application process</i> now advises that the appropriate pre-application advice services proportionate to the scale and complexity of a development proposal should be agreed with the LPA.</p> <p>The process diagram in this section now indicates how different development scales and application types may align with the four indicative stages and checkpoints.</p>
<p><i>Design Advice Services</i></p>	
<p>Signpost free design advice/review delivered by non-governmental organisations that are not part of council services (i.e. Conservation Advisory Group, Brighton & Hove amenity societies and Sustrans)</p>	<p>Wording has been updated to encourage applicants to approach other such organisations in conjunction with LPA design advice services if appropriate to their proposals.</p>
<p>Ensure design advice benefits from local knowledge.</p>	<p>Wording has been amended to say that design review is most successful when reviewers “benefit from an understanding of local context”. The Design Review Panel is comprised of returning panel members to ensure a continued knowledge of the city, and the council has recently appointed a permanent in-house Urban Design Officer who can provide local knowledge.</p>
<p>Signpost the Environment Agency’s charged for service to provide detailed and bespoke pre-application advice</p>	<p>Wording has been updated to encourage applicants to approach other such organisations in conjunction with LPA design advice services if appropriate to their proposals.</p>
<p>Encourage applicants to collaborate with the council’s Equalities co-ordinators, local trans groups and University of Brighton to create leading best practice in trans-inclusive design.</p>	<p><i>Sub-section 8.1 Community engagement</i> added to signpost opportunities to consult local communities and other stakeholders, including LGBTQ+ groups, at the various stages of the planning/design process.</p>
<p><i>Communicating design ideas well</i></p>	
<p>Provide guidance on the quality and size of supporting documents.</p>	<p>Wording of this section has been updated to reflect this comment.</p>

You said	We responded
Simplify the content and reduce the length of documents given that this can be a barrier to engaging local communities and non-experts.	Wording of this section has been updated to reflect this comment.
Refer to Design Council online guidance on how to write, read and use Design Statements.	A hyperlink to this guidance is now included in this section.
Promote use of 3D modelling as consultation tool.	Wording of this section has been updated to reflect this comment.
9.1. A day in the life	
Identify some assigned personas to guide assessment such as, for example, a disabled cyclist, a transgender and/or resident living in affordable housing accommodation	The wording of this section has been updated to reflect these comments and to promote 'day in the life' assessments as a method to ensure fairness and inclusivity in the design of buildings and spaces.
Include assessment of performance over the lifetime of the development in regard to, for example, maintenance, responses to climate change, changes in use, adaption and/or re-assembly.	Post-occupancy evaluation can be secured via planning conditions. The SPD focuses on how good design can deliver more sustainable spaces and buildings.
SECTION D Appendices	
<i>Extended list of policies and documents</i>	
Provide a detailed list of relevant Planning Advisory Notes (PAN) and/or available external guidance on active travel.	Detailed list of PANs added to this section. External guidance is signposted in the relevant sub-sections of the SPD. Additional external guidance on active travel was added to <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 2.1. Active and inclusive travel.</i>
<i>Neighbourhood sensitivity to change and priorities for enhancement</i>	
Set maximum densities, explaining what constitutes 'enhancement' of an area from a community's perspective, and/or referring to Listed Buildings and the need to review older Character Area Statements.	The SPD is guidance to support policy. Policy on development density is set out in CP14 of City Plan Part 1. The UDF SPD sets out how development can achieve high quality design to enhance areas. What is an enhancement in any particular case will vary and <i>sub-section 7 Pre-application process</i> recommends consulting with local communities prior to submission of an application to

You said	We responded
	identify local priorities. There are policies on heritage assets in City Plan Part 1 and Proposed Submission City Plan Part 2. The majority of listed buildings are concentrated in the central conservation areas but where these exist in clusters elsewhere, they have influenced neighbourhood sensitivity and the text had been amended to clarify this.
Gas Works site in the Blackrock Area description is recognised as distinct from the wider Roedean area likened to group 3A rather than 2A (i.e. as 'urban areas where positive and pro-active measures are required to secure major enhancement').	This is acknowledged and the text has been amended.
<i>Strategic viewpoints and landmarks</i>	
Remove reference to groups of buildings being staggered or stepped to respond to natural slope contours to allow for scale and massing to be determined through site-specific consideration.	The text has been amended to make the wording less prescriptive. The SPD provides guidance only and it will be a matter for the applicant to demonstrate how the proposal sits appropriately within the existing landform.
The South Downs National Park Authority asked that all viewpoints within or are on the edge of the SDNP are clearly identified.	The map in <i>Section A Local priorities sub-section 1.2 Neighbourhood character</i> has been amended to show the SDNP boundary.
<i>Tall Building Statement guidelines</i>	
Need to ensure utility companies assess capacity of water/sewage systems before planning approval has been granted.	No change. The LPA already consults Southern Water on all major applications, including tall buildings, prior to making planning decisions.
Regarding public realm and open spaces, Natural England suggested flagging up the need to consult the organisation if an Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment is required.	This is acknowledged and the text has been amended and link to Habitats Regulation Assessment added in <i>sub-section 6 Tall Building Statements</i> .
Regarding sustainability, the Environment Agency suggested including water efficiency targets in the Sustainability Statement guidelines.	This is acknowledged and the text has been amended.

