

City Plan Part Two

**Environment and Sustainability Workshops - BME
Community Partnership, Centre, Brighton**

9th September 2016

Workshop Notes and attendance list

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

Event	<p>CPP2 Environment & Sustainability Focussed Workshop Event</p> <p><u>WORKSHOP:</u> BIODIVERSITY AND OPEN SPACE</p> <p>Attendee post-it note comments and facilitator notes of round table discussions (combined notes of workshop 1 & 2)</p> <p>Facilitators: Rebecca Fry & Rich Howorth</p>
Date and Location	<p>Friday 09/09/16, 10.30-12.30, BME Community Partnership premises, 10 Fleet Street, Brighton</p>
Attendance	<p>Workshop 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nick Lomax(BH Professionals Forum – architect) • Chloe Rose (RSPB) • Maureen Winder (Allotment Federation) • Chloe Clarke (BH Food Partnership) • Bryn Thomas (Brighton Permaculture Trust) • Laura Brook (Sussex Wildlife Trust) • Maureen Holt (BH Wildlife Forum) • Maria Hawton-Mead (Green Building Partnership) • Peter Clarke (Community Land Trust Steering Group) • Tracie Parker (BH Wildlife Forum) <p><u>Workshop 2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ben Earl (Southern Water) • Andrew Coleman (Local Resident) • Hannah Packwood (Environment Agency) • Katharine Stuart (SDNPA) • Sean Ashworth (Sussex Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authority) • Rebecca Pearson (Natural England)
Key Issues Raised	
<p><u>POST IT NOTES:</u> (nb. Green Infrastructure abbreviated to GI)</p> <p><u>Landscape Scale Approach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comms and policy around allowing verges to grow: add wildflowers; easy way to create green corridors. • Encourage citizen action; green corridors map; join up green spaces. • Support continuation of work to identify and deliver green links, as part of the wider GI network, from the heart of the city and out to the SDNP. • GI - Multiple benefits; links to the water (section?) SUDS where possible for example. • Support the Green Infrastructure landscape scale approach idea for CPP2. • Green links from SDNP through into the city and clear requirements in policy for how development should enhance this. 	

- Encourage a landscape scale approach to planning policy to go beyond boundaries of Brighton and Hove: bigger and better and more joined up; Biodiversity 2020.
- Increase links to National Park for people to access the National Park
- Opportunities through development to safeguard biodiversity; increase habitat links and GI links to national park.
- Need to ensure the value of biodiversity to feed aquifer is recognised – especially when developing fringe sites.
- Open space: include landscape approach and GI in local plan; include education land and highway land in GI.
- GI policy should be adopted to ensure new development delivers net gains connectivity / climate change adaptation.
- Developments in NIA should be required to include food growing spaces – needs to be enforced, guidance could come in form of new SPD on food growing (food partnership).
- Allotments are natural elements of green infrastructure and should move to a new designation to protect their role as urban benefits; protect from pollution and chemical use.
- Greater engagement with local people to support and understand the value of green spaces. Opportunity to protect and consider and create.
- How are policies accounting to the Beachy Head West Marine Conservation Zone?
- CP10 – one objective is to conserve, restore, etc., LBAPs but concern that BHCC have no resources to manage/monitor them.
- Baseline policies required to reduce impact on wildlife, avoid chemical use and lessen overall pollution for health of species.
- Brighton and Hove should look at calculating Natural Capital Resources.
- Marine water quality: policy to protect and enhance water quality by reducing surface water run-off (including from highways).

Nature Conservation, Geodiversity and Landscape Sites

- LWS sites need to be looked at in conjunction with GI network as may have been important connecting sites.
- LWS process should be published as part of CPP2 as evidence base.
- If SNCIs are to be updated will this include new marine SNCIs?
- Policy to protect and enhance marine recreation, especially east of Brighton Marina, King Alfred, Peter Pan playground, Ovingdean, Rottingdean and Saltdean.
- How are we linking marine water quality, marine commercial fisheries and the marine environment through Planning?

- How do terrestrial policies take account of impacts on the marine environment (habitats and species)?
- Can policies encourage sustainable marine fisheries?
- Swifts – can we implement into the policy where all new builds have to have a specific number of swift bricks installed (Chloe Rose, RSPB).

Open Space and Local Green Space

- Dual use: schools; council owned.
- Access to open space and downland: encourage access to open space and SDNP by foot and bike.
- Get the balance right between a green space being a SUD and local amenity.
- Playing fields recognised as local green spaces, due to community value and provide connections for wildlife.
- Allotments designated as local green spaces due to benefits to community, health and recognised as having wildlife value.
- How will these local green spaces be managed? Is not improving access to the National Park more important?
- Local greenspace: how does this benefit a site above what designations that site already has ie SNCIs; LNRs; or National Plan.

FACILITATOR NOTES:

- Points raised at start to be of particular interest to attendees:
 - Local Green Space (LGS)
 - Allotments and LGS
 - Marine Environment
 - Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) (how they can be designated and how can people get involved)
 - Natural Capital and GI
 - Housing and biodiversity – 40% of the Local Authority lies within the National Park, how do we plug into the downs; Gateway issues and A27 barrier
 - Community based land issues
 - Integration of biodiversity and meeting the needs of people
 - Open Space, beaches and Inshore Waters
- Swift boxes – incorporate within development
- Link to the Marine Environment and consider how the city impacts upon the marine environment (control/protect)
- Create a Green Lung through the heart of the City to restore it
- Have proper corridors
- Important for peoples welfare
- Communicate the benefits of leaving verges to grow, engage the public eg potato mile initiative (food partnership project I think?)

- Promoting and using green space: Dual use - green space/SUDs; placemaking
- Urban Fringe – can be a step to the get to the National Park/Downs
- Potentially CP10 and CP16 address biodiversity adequately however no enforcement so gaps
- School playing fields provide an important asset where currently open shouldn't be fenced off

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

Event	Biosphere Board CPP2 Event
Date and Location	Fri 09/09/2016 BMECP
Attendance	<p><u>Workshop 1</u> Andrew Coleman Ben Earl - Southern Water Diane Smith – BHESCo Hannah Packwood – Environment Agency Sean Ashworth – Sussex Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authority Cat Fletcher - Freegle</p> <p><u>Workshop 2</u> Abigail Dombey – University of Brighton Anthony Probert Bioregional Helen Russell – Community Works Maria Hawton-Mead – Green Building Partnership Mark Pellant – Koru Architects Matthew Arnold – University of Sussex Mike Clark – University of Brighton Mischa Hewitt – Low Carbon Trust</p> <p>Facilitators – Francesca Iliffe, Maggie Moran and Paula Goncalves</p>
Key Issues Raised	
<p><u>Sustainable Drainage</u></p> <p>Given the existing national guidance and approach, is it necessary to have an updated policy on sustainable drainage in the City Plan Part Two?</p> <p><i>Feedback: Workshop 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific policy around the worst affected areas. • Awareness campaign with local nurseries, parent and toddler groups and schools re flushing wet wipes down toilets. • Strategy/policy for existing built areas that flood. • Is 1 in 200 years a robust assessment methodology? Should we consider planning for higher severity? • Is 50% attenuation from a site high enough? Map flow rates and paths from different surface types. • Policy should not be too prescriptive about the types of SUDS that could be used in new development HP (EA). • SUDS – Policy in Local Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hierarchy ○ Policy should require compliance with law on porous paving limits. ○ Identify particular parts of city where particular SUDS are required, e.g. 	

London Road.

- Need to consider the impact on groundwater quality, i.e. SUDS.
- How to address the removal of trees and hard landscaping that increase flooding and cause water problems in developments other than new development. Better communications?
- Strategy/advice to use bigger gutters on new/old homes.

Feedback: Workshop 2

- Guide for developers on flood solutions is a great idea.
- Yes to SPD on drainage, etc.
- Yes to more guidance on surface water and drainage.
- Is there a policy link between drainage and flood risk with marine water quality that protects marine habitats and species and designated sites?
- Stipulations on rainwater harvesting on all new developments.
- Encourage green walls and green roofs to achieve increased water attenuation, low carbon and visual attractiveness.
- Transcribe best practice into policy (to front end development design).
- Underground water storage: always integrate with 'brown water' sanitation, etc.

Low carbon and renewable energy

Should City Plan Part 2 include further policy to incentivise delivery of low carbon and renewable energy?

Feedback: Workshop 1

- Develop community energy strategy.
- Community energy policy should be included.
- Encourage mixed development (residential and commercial) and appropriate community scale renewables and heat network.
- Support and encourage community energy.
- Encourage installation of renewables rather than gas.
- Need a community energy strategy for the city.
- Encourage community heating and energy.
- Identify sites for renewable energy, major housing and employment.
- Link it back to the legal requirement for the plan to have a strategy for climate change mitigation and adaptation.
- Encourage PV and solar thermal on private housing through grant or other incentive.
- District heating: strengthen policy and build in as standard renewable energy generation.
- Encourage district heating with customer price protection plan.
- Demand renewable energy.

Feedback: Workshop 2

- No brainers: yes! PV policy, etc.
- Support energy loop renewables.

- Support for community energy.
- There are potential opportunities to link marine aquaculture (seaweed farms) to biomass energy production (discussed at Biosphere).
- Air quality action plan requires lower NOx or no combustion go further than BREEAM in AQMA.
- All new housing developments: integrated PV roofs!
- PV: issues - roof condition; planning; electrical infrastructure; DNO approval.

Energy efficiency

Should targets for energy efficiency be explored for City Plan Part 2 for smaller developments and those in existing buildings?

Feedback: Workshop 1

- Energy efficiency policy for conversions of commercial buildings.
- Need to apply strict standards to commercial and residential development.
- Should have a policy for converting commercial to residential such as minimum EPC rating.
- Include residential conversions from commercial in residential property.
- Link EPC to residential conversions.
- If EPC is to be used as a measure of low CO2 efficiency, minimum must be D rating for all commercial buildings.
- Passivhaus standard as minimum.
- Future proof existing and new buildings, e.g. for future climate: bigger gutters; better drainage design; waterproof facades.
- Design to prevent overheating: solar shading; cross ventilation; reduce excessive glazing.
- Should have a policy to encourage small commercial developments to attach an accredited certification.
- Evidence should be required at building control stage that additional energy target (20% better) has been achieved.
- Investigate how you apply the policy to retrofit/existing housing?
- Local authorities need greater resource for enforcement.

Feedback: Workshop 2

- Lean, clean, green? No! should be Lean, green, clean.
- Prioritise zero carbon over low carbon.
- Lean, clean, green.
- Fabric first approach then renewables.
- Use DEC's for all buildings.
- Home Quality Mark – encourage it.
- Design out inefficiencies.

Design

Should the Place Making Policy seek to incorporate guidance on new and emerging

design issues such as expert review and integrated infrastructure design?

Feedback: Workshop 1

- How can we connect various placemaking around the city.
- We need to include placemaking in large projects to improve the space.
- Community have an important role for the decisions in placemaking.
- Joining up existing 'city centre areas': green corridors or art to join them up?
- Building protected from heat in future? Shade.
- Green links: increase biodiversity / habitat and adaptation to climate change.
- Vertical spaces? Rooftops?
- Expert design review for large redevelopment.

Feedback: Workshop 2

- Concern for street scene should *not* mean pastiche design.
- Place making policy? If yes, must be from grassroots, not led by 'experts, academics'.
- Talk to Brighton & Hove Community Land Trust initiative: info@bhclt.org.uk
- Timber frame new builds.
- Walter Segal design build approach. Grass roofs.
- Reed beds; can be scaled up – e.g. Hockerton.

City Plan Part Two Scoping Consultation - Event Log

Event	<p>CPP2 Environment & Sustainability Focussed Workshop Event</p> <p><u>WORKSHOP:</u> Sustainable Energy, Sustainable Drainage and Environmental Design</p>
Date and Location	09 th September 2016, BMECP Centre, Brighton
Attendance	<p><u>Workshop 1</u></p> <p>Andrew Coleman Ben Earl - Southern Water Diane Smith – BHESCo Hannah Packwood – Environment Agency Sean Ashworth – Sussex Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authority Cat Fletcher - Freegle</p> <p><u>Workshop 2</u></p> <p>Abigail Dombey – University of Brighton Anthony Probert Bioregional Helen Russell – Community Works Maria Hawton-Mead – Green Building Partnership Mark Pellant – Koru Architects Matthew Arnold – University of Sussex Mike Clark – University of Brighton Mischa Hewitt – Low Carbon Trust</p> <p>Facilitators – Francesca Iliffe, Maggie Moran and Paula Goncalves</p>
Key Issues Raised	
<p>DESIGN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talk to people in the area to see what they want their place to be. Ensuring communities have a say and influences outcomes could lead to more ownership. • Seafront is our city square and needs to be improved to reflect this status. • Make sure policy is joined up to avoid overlapping and ensure efficient delivery of infrastructure. • Link up green spaces and places that people like in the city, using spaces in between buildings as connections from one place to another. • City needs protection from heat effect. • Wildlife and climate change. • Policy should enable for innovative design. Why follow what has been there? A mixture of new and existing should be welcomed. <p>Workshop Notes</p>	

GROUP 1

INTERESTS

- Water supply, treatment and quality in B&H
- Energy, water and marine coastal
- SW sustainable water, chair Biosphere Board
- Place making
- Renewable community energy
- Energy and sustainability
- Waste, energy and design
- Energy efficiency and renewable energy
- Pushing forward building standards
- Servers against sewers (Andrew contact?)

WATER

- SPD/guidance on water management in development?
- Things going down the toilet are a problem causing blockages
- Stronger policy to ensure water management is properly addressed in the face of loss of teeth of national policy?
- Does policy need strengthening in this area? If so, how?
- Policy has more weight than SPD. SPP1 provides enough of a hook to develop an SPD.
- Not being too prescriptive.
- Set targets. These are set in SFRA
- Just related to new developments? Removal of trees and paving back gardens have an impact right?
- Cumulative, collective impact can be significant and should be addressed.
- Need for specific policies in London road valley for instance.
- Reduction of consumption of water would help in a water stressed area.

ENERGY

- Standards for new build but not existing.
- Could we use EPC for monitoring, requesting of existing/renovations?
- Community energy: facilitate more in a city where this is already strong? How?
- PV remains increasing
- Energy study
- District heating? Gov. supporting still.

DESIGN

- Seize opportunities to use the top of buildings.
- Making sure community is involved in what is build, know what is happening and influence outcomes, leading to more ownership. Community should have a big say. Skate Park at The Level is a good example of how that works.
- City square: we don't have one, only small ones. Seafront is our city square and needs to be improved.
- Make sure policy is joined up to avoid overlapping and ensure efficient

delivery of infrastructure.

- Linking up and connectivity of green spaces and existing hotspots (places that people like in the city). Use spaces in between buildings as connections from one place to another.
- We need protection from heat.
- Wildlife and climate change.

GROUP 2

INTEREST

- Marine environment
- Sustainable energy and design
- Community land trust
- Energy and environment performance
- Renewable energy
- Sustainable design

WATER

- SFRA sufficient? Quality soakaways, drainages that are difficult to maintain these issues could be addressed via an SDP.
- Idea is to frontload information on water management. At the moment it is an afterthought.
- Recommendation is currently on the web but it is not prescribed.
- Height of electric plugs to avoid damage?
- Underground storage?

ENERGY

- Yes to all things.
- Fabric first approach always. PVs on the roof should be an additional option.
- Should we include renewable target? London has one.
- Zero carbon options should be promoted above low carbon.
- Have the right technology in the right place.

DESIGN

- Community engagement is key.
- Have to talk to people in the area to see what they want their place to be.
- Concern LPA has a lot of control of the street scape already. Policy should not be an excuse to have the same design as existing everywhere in the city. Why follow what has been there? A mixture of new and existing should be welcomed.

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

Event	<p>CPP2 Environment & Sustainability Focussed Workshop Event</p> <p><u>WORKSHOP</u> : Transport and Pollution (Workshop 1)</p>
Date and Location	9 th September 2016, BMEP Centre, Brighton
Attendance	<p>Abigail Dombey University of Brighton Chris Todd Community Works Mark Greening Brighton & Hove Motorcycle Action Group Mathew Arnold University of Sussex Roger Blake Rail Future Peter Elvidge Brighton & Hove Bus Watch Sam Rouse – BHCC Mita Patel – BHCC Facilitators: Liz Hobden and Helen Gregory</p>
Key Issues Raised	
<p>Transport and Pollution – Workshop 1</p> <p><u>Post it Notes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access routes to and from train stations, to enable more use of rail; to encourage walking and cycling to and from stations; to help accommodate extra travel demand on sustainable mode including active travel for access. Measures to include way-finding, fully-accessible walking routes, secure cycle-parking. • Reducing the need to travel. • Madeira Drive to King Alfred Corridor: fast track transport solutions to reduce congestion and acknowledge / accommodate new developments. • Nottingham: 33% reduction in CO2 since 2005. 8% drop in motor traffic. • Minimise impact of development and seek opportunity for improvement. <p><u>Transport/Travel and air quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urgency compliance (dioxides) – diesel – Nox - particulate levels – transport sources • Spatial dimension: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AQMA (quite likely to stay same) ○ Potential in 2016/17 reduce the size of AQMA ○ Most of B& H has good air quality • Recent improvements and actions – progress • Manage and mitigation • DEFRA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ clean air zone – consultation will come out soon – relevant LEZ 	

- low emission zone currently (buses) and taxi; should it include freight and trucks?
- Need to consider the location of major new development and how these will impact on air quality
- Red flag areas:
 - London Road and North Street; Preston Circus; Vogue Gyratory; Lewes Road
 - New England Street junction; South Portslade freight route;
 - Rottingdean High Street
- Boris Bike? Encourage switch to cycle. Tender being assessed B&HCC.
- Low carbon zones: London example.
- Technology: hybrid cars / electric bikes – how can we support this? Infrastructure – charging points.
- Public awareness and appetite for electric cars – engagement – campaign B&HCC use it as exemplar.
 - Need to sell the benefits; raise awareness of charging point locations; how they are used;
 - Still prohibitive costs; can't pass them on to users.
- GLA consultation on congestion: one of concerns as technology moves on; e-vehicles, etc.; tackling pollution won't tackle numbers / congestion.
- Attractive destination: better quality public realm, less car transport orientated.
- Congestion not always related to pollution? Eg. Seafront is congested but not air quality issue.
- Congestion charges?
 - Clarity about policy objectives;
 - attractive Brighton and Hove;
 - more space for people rather than motor cars;
 - How to manage demand? Price demand.
 - Churchill Square area a no car zones but bus congestion
- Language should be more positive rather than talking about: "controlled" parking or "no car zones".
- Reallocation space: pedestrian/cyclist – this could impact on buses
- Euro 6 should be rolled out.
- Space efficient travel within Brighton and Hove; car = space resource hungry
- We need to manage congestion – accept always be element of congestion.
- Workplace parking level. Nottingham: fund active travel, etc.
- Positive benefits:
 - Active travel

- Reduce cost to the NHS, mental wellbeing benefits
- Stronger words; to reduce parking provision in city.
- SMART technology: that can advise people travelling into city where parking is available; better use of such technology.
- CPPI policy around no additional public car parks but what is the definition of public car parks?
- Private car park? Is Churchill Square a public or private car park?
- Preston Park: proposals indicate 600 spaces – are they being required to have that many?
- SPD is due to be adopted shortly which sets out maximum standards.
- Low carbon preference – parking
- Withdean – rapid charging point.
- University of Sussex: car parking programme 50% charging; internal fleet of vehicles are electric.
- Bus policy:
 - Need to be clear about bus priorities/lanes
 - Accessible bus stop; bus shelter
 - Need to think about bus frequency and cost
 - Role of CIL
 - Planning gain
 - Reduce need to travel: does large development mean large car parking (London, etc.)? Link cycle lanes.
 - Valley Gardens design: single lane will impact on bus congestion.
- Preston Barracks: University of Brighton development; 600 spaces? Is that what the council requires from the university? Maintaining what they have? No net gain; better no net gain but reduced.

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

Event	<p>CPP2 Environment & Sustainability Focussed Workshop Event</p> <p><u>WORKSHOP</u> : Transport and Pollution (Workshop 2)</p>
Date and Location	9 th September 2016, BMECP Centre, Brighton
Attendance	<p>David Brookshaw - Brighton & Hove Local Access Forum Diane Smith - Brighton & Hove Energy Services Company Patrick Warren – Brighton & Hove Bus Company Trevor Beeston - South Downs Society Gordon Mackerron - University of Brighton Mark Buchanan- Smith - Churchill Square</p> <p>Facilitators – Liz Hobden and Helen Gregory</p>
Key Issues Raised	
<p>Transport and Pollution – Workshop 2</p> <p><u>Post it Notes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park and Ride for tourist and business community for north, east and west corridors. • Oyster card scheme. • Incentives for cycling and walking. • Better walking routes. • Increase train capacity, e.g. carriages. • Boris Bike scheme. • Integrated transport that includes pedestrians, cycles, motorbikes, cars, buses and trains. • Increase pedestrian and cycle thoroughfares. • Put more resources into walking and cycling and cutting pollution (less motorised transport). • More trains east and west – north is well served – at peak times. • Further pedestrianisation of the city centre. • Risk of Park and Ride: need to price it to discourage increased in car journeys. Location will also be an influence – increased in car journey if too close to city centre. • Are there pedestrianisation plans for city centre? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Station to Churchill Square ○ East to West ○ Controversial ○ Need to keep bus flows 	

- 120 buses/hour North Street, etc. – impact on attractiveness of bus routes if pedestrianize key bus stop routes.
- Encourage reduction in traffic:
 - Car parking is at capacity;
 - Reduce burden – alternatives offered
- Manage demand in key sites, e.g. Churchill Square, etc.
- Trains: capacity issue mainline.
- SMART VMS – letting visitors know about main routes; alternatives; help reduce queuing.
- Sustainable Travel - walking, cycling - relationship with improving air quality.
- Energy issues
- Impact on National Park
- Air quality improvements – sustainable modes
- Park and ride: north, east west, not just tourist/shoppers but workers part to get into city centre.
- Bus company:
 - Trying to bring forward park and ride north of city
 - 16 minute journey
 - High frequency network
 - Deliver choice
 - Commercially viable, potential for investment
- Investment in bus fleet:
 - vehicle delivery Euro 6 engines; smaller diesel engine;
 - has had improvements in air quality;
 - smaller, cleaner engines;
 - technology – zero emissions.
- Urban fringe development sites:
 - Saltdean (100 houses)
 - Encourage car
 - As a resident not happy about UF sites allocated CPPI when they feel sufficient brownfield sites exist in city.
- 6 mile bus route to city centre from Saltdean.
- Encourage bus and cycle use.
- Need more Lewes Roads style improvements
- Encourage walking; pedestrianisation improvement.
- Reducing traffic is important.
- East to west railway network less frequent. Need more frequency to support commuters.
- Congestion charge? Discourage car journeys.
- Difficulty of finding sites for park and ride; bus infrastructure but not

greenfield.

- Right of Way: need to look at improving routes out of city to the National Park.
- Do we have an integrated transport plan, e.g. Leicester, Aberdeen.
 - Integrated pricing; key card technology
 - All bus operators (except Stagecoach) – although due - use key card
 - Soon be able to link up to train
 - Cycle hire also available for that?

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

Event	<p>CPP2 Environment & Sustainability Focussed Workshop Event</p> <p><u>WORKSHOP:</u> Urban Fringe Development and the Setting of the National Park</p>
Date and Location	<p>09/09/16</p>
Attendance	<p>Workshop 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Clarke (University of Brighton) – Varley Halls site • David Brookshaw (Local Access Forum) – impacts of development on green infrastructure • Trevor Beeston – (South Downs Society) - impacts of dev on GI, conservation of UF sites • Anthony Probert (Bioregional) – quality of dev on UF sites; access & transport • Mark Pellhant (Koru Architects) – appropriate development on UF • Nicola Thomas (architect) – opportunities for good development on UF • Andrew (Brighton & Hove buses) – transport and ensuring bus network serves UF development • Helen Russell (Community Works) – on “community land trust” – steering group, appropriate dev on UF sites • Katherine Stuart (SDNPA) – impacts of UF dev on the setting of the SDNP, opportunities for GI • Rebecca Pearson (Natural England) – GI, linking the UF to the SDNP <p><u>Workshop 2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roger Blake (Rail future) – sustainable transport • Chris Todd (FoE) – safeguard green spaces, good development that makes the best use of UF sites • Maureen Winder (Allotment Federation) – incorporation of allotments into green space • Chloe Clarke (BH Food Partnership) – incorporation of food growing space • Bryn Thomas (Brighton Permaculture Trust) – increasing access to green space, the use of the UF as a connection between urban and rural areas • Laura Brook (Sussex Wildlife Trust) – achieving net gains in biodiversity, role of biodiversity in decision making

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nick Lomax (BH Professionals Forum – architect) – delivery on UF sites, connections to SDNP • Marueen Holt (BH Wildlife Forum) – biodiversity on UF sites • Peter Eldridge - connections between new development and existing bus routes • Mischa Hewitt (Low Carbon Trust) – promoting self-build and high standards of design on UF sites • Peter Clarke (Community Land Trust) – community-led building on UF sites • Chloe Rose (RSPB) – “swifts” project into planning policy requirements • Tracie Parker (BH Wildlife Forum) – UFA based on out of date evidence, some sites should be removed
--	---

Key Issues Raised

Notes of round table discussions:

Workshop 1:

Notes from discussion:

- Clarification sought regarding the types of additional assessments on UF sites that have been carried out; whether the indicative amounts for each UF sites are still relevant; whether all sites with development potential will come forward.
- Recent applications on UF sites have been **over-development**. Not sustainable/appropriate
- Important to make the **best use of green infrastructure**.
- There should be some **influence over the types of house-builders who develop the sites** (e.g. not the volume house-builders which only use a standard design).
- Concern that **Design Panel may not influence** applicants and planning applications with **sub-standard design** will get approved.
- **Council owned sites should prioritise “community-led” housing.**
- There is a need to **define appropriate development** for UF sites.
- Housing should **blend into UF sites** and **be sensitive** to surroundings.
- Should develop **brownfield sites** first however **developers prefer greenfield** sites.
- Development on UF sites will lead to an **increase in car-use on existing congested roads**.
- There is a need for **more bus-lanes, improved cycle routes and improvements to the pedestrian network**.
- **Bus services** are looking at provision for new areas however there is **no public subsidy** for this.
- To enable bus services to serve a new location, there **needs to be enough development to make the route sustainable**, or development needs to be well connected to existing centres of population. **Small pockets of housing are difficult to serve.**

- Council should have a **business car-parking levy** (Nottingham example – whereby employers that provide workplace parking have to apply for a license and pay a fee for it).
- Bus lanes adding to pollution by resulting in more cars standing still in certain places.
- Different types of **design standards and buildings should be encouraged on UF sites.**
- **How development is procured** will have the greatest influence on the types of housing that is brought forward in UF sites.
- Clarification on how planning applications for UF development will be brought forward before Part 2 adopted.
- **Specific conditions** regarding materials **must be applied to all developers of UF sites** (e.g. UoB had to meet certain requirements in order to gain permission).

Post it notes:

- The site specific policies for urban fringe sites should give clear requirements for 1) GI links, 2) design to minimise impact on and conserve and enhance the setting of the SDNP and key views.
- Opportunity to encourage alternatives forms of ownership and D&B
- Improved design standards for UF sites (mitigating extra impacts)
- Can we enforce/encourage good space standards , low energy standards e.g. Passivehouse
- Strong policies required to guide any development on UF sites e.g. a DPD?
- Make sure UF sites consider: full LVIA, setting of SDNP including light pollution, ecological value of sites, and ensuring local people can retain access to open space.
- Need to ensure any fringe sites that come forward for development have strict criteria re: wildlife corridors, maximise GI, links to the SDNP, do not detriment the setting of the SDNP, enhance biodiversity, consider hydrological issues
- Better access to SDNP and protect green space
- Integrate housing and green space with fluid edges between them, e.g. gardens, allotments, open space.
- New housing needs new local shops, and employment
- How feasible are shared surfaces on a large scale in the city
- GI strategy with specific requirements for urban fringe sites
- How do UF sites fit in with the GI network? What opportunities for enhancement are there?
- Very clear lines of engagement! Green space vs housing. Need to collaborate.
- Modern methods have to lead the way, so volume developers learn from us.
- Future “peak oil”. Combined heat and power (microgeneration) in all possible housing developments.

Workshop 2:

Notes from discussion:

- Clarification around whether Hollingbury Park is still included as having potential
- **Development should respect aims of the Biosphere** and educate people regarding

the environment

- **Access to SDNP is difficult. Access needs improving.**
- UF sites include designated green space.
- **Access to SDNP should be throughout the city**, not just through UF sites or separate “gateways”
- **Older style developments** in fringe locations tend to be cul-de-sac designs which **stops pedestrians accessing the countryside** behind the housing.
- Design in UF locations will be very important to meet various needs and requirements.
- There should be a **mechanism for disposing of sites which should be included in the Plan**. E.g. self-builders can't compete with major volume house-builders.
- **Useful to map access points** around the city and **improve/upgrade existing access** (e.g. allow cycle access on existing pedestrian only bridges).
- **Green spaces should be mapped** to show the population they serve.

Post it notes:

- Possibility of using S106 money to provide a green bridge to the SDNP at the THV site
- Any development within the urban fringe should have food growing incorporated due to value to biodiversity, communities, mental health etc. Food Partnership has evidence to support this.
- Concerned that latest LUC assessment did not visit the Meadow Vale site and did not take into account its biodiversity. Up to date information has not been taken into account. How can this be addressed?
- Importance of mapping to grow sense of value at fringe of the city to avoid land grab and to enhance and use for health and mental health benefits.

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

Event	<p>CPP2 Environment & Sustainability Focussed Workshop Event</p> <p><u>WORKSHOP</u> : Sustainability Appraisal Sustainability Appraisal Framework feedback</p>
Date and Location	9 th September 2016, BMECP
Attendance	Post it notes were gathered from all attendees
Key Issues Raised	
<p><u>SA1 Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCM should include protection and enhancement of a wider range of sites, including allotments. • Net gains in biodiversity need to be more creative, and not just bat/bird boxes. Need to think about all supporting features. <i>(nb. No examples provided)</i> • DCM should include enhancements to habitats or linear features to ensure connectivity and reduce breaks • Non severance of linear features such as hedgerows of great importance to biodiversity <i>(put under 2 but also of relevance here)</i> • Designations need to be linked with up to date information • Add protect and enhance marine water quality <i>(nb. Was put under SA2 but also of relevance here)</i> <p><u>SA2 Open Space / GI</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCM (2) Improve the quality <u>and /</u> or make better use of existing open space • Add protect and enhance marine water quality • Add protect and enhance marine recreation • Extra assessment required for urban fringe sites – LVIA, dark night skies, GI opportunities • Open space needs to include community food growing and allotments • Non severance of linear features such as hedgerows of great importance to biodiversity • Add reference to landscape scale approach and green infrastructure <p><u>SA3 SDNP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extra assessment required for urban fringe sites – LVIA, dark night skies, GI opportunities <i>(was put under SA2 but also of relevance here)</i> <p><u>A4 Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments 	

SA5 Travel reduction

- SA Objective – why do we need to “reduce the need to travel”?
- Provide material incentives for people to use sustainable forms of travel
- Well designed, fit for purpose bus stops (*under 15 but of relevance here*)
- Reduce the need to travel (*under 15 but of relevance here*)
- Reduce car parking, stop car-parking in the city centre and highly accessible locations (*under 13 but of relevance here*)
- *BHCC school admissions policy is at odds with the DCM “encourage the location of development close to where use of sustainable transport can be maximised”*
- Current proposals which encourage bus use are poor. The following measures would encourage bus use e.g. signal priority, bus lanes, accessible bus stops and bus shelters
- Reduce car-parking
- Increase permeability for pedestrians and cyclists

SA6 Air and Noise Quality

- Reduce motor traffic, particularly private cars in and around the city centre and bus corridors
- Less trucks and cars will result in air pollution being minimised, however business wants more cars
- Increasing congestion is increasing pollution but also making buses unreliable and therefore undermines one of the alternatives to the car

SA7 Water quality

- Comment of support for this objective
- Amend the words of DMC from “encourage” to “ensure”
- Under “reduce water consumption” we should insist on higher water efficiency standards that building regulations
- We’re in an area of water stress
- Add DCM on reducing marine litter
- Add DCM on meeting and exceeding Bathing Water Directive and River Basin Management Plan objectives
- DCM wording “Does not result in contamination of water resources” should be strengthened to ensure the water quality (groundwater) is protected and enhanced (in line with the Water Framework Directive)
- SUDS techniques must be suitable if we want to protect the GSPZ

SA8 flood risk

- The wording “considers the potential risks” should be strengthened to include “mitigates” the potential risks (*put under 10 but also relevant here*)
- Permeable infrastructure needs to be embedded
- Need for further guidance on reducing flood risk

SA9 Greenhouse gas reduction

- Ensure all new developments are carbon neutral, energy efficient fabric construction and use energy efficiency technology (*under 14 but of relevance here*)
- Low energy fabric for all new housing development (*under 14 but of relevance here*)
- BHCC needs a community energy strategy
- Need to enforce renewable energy generation through planning consents

SA10 Adapt to climate change

- The wording “considers the potential risks” should be strengthened to include “mitigates” the potential risks
- Add “contributes to BHCC Carbon Reduction strategy
- Legal duty to have a mitigation and adaptation strategy
- Need to require a maintenance budget for all development to ensure long term costs of up-keeping sustainable infrastructure
- Include DMC regarding reducing demand for water and increasing water efficiency under this objective

SA11 Soil Quality

- No comments

SA12 Waste

- How do we measure/report waste prevented or reused?
- Ensure development has integrated infrastructure –e.g for food waste recycling
- Considers scope and a place for re-use within development

SA13 Best use of land

- Reduce car parking, stop car-parking in the city centre and highly accessible locations
- All land should have a clear designation to gain community support and sense of identity

SA14 housing

- Ensure all new developments are carbon neutral, energy efficient fabric construction and use energy efficiency technology
- Do we need to re-examine wording around “affordable”
- Low energy fabric for all new housing development
- Is there potential for new SPD on flood growing on new housing development that has more detail than the PAN?

SA15 Access to services

- Well designed, fit for purpose bus stops
- Reduce the need to travel
- Build local community support and engagement
- DCM – improve access to all facilities/service by sustainable transport (*under 16 but of relevance here*)
- Importance of maintaining local parades; e.g. not allowing 2 shops to be knocked through into a tesco express (*put under 19 but also of relevance here*)
- Access to healthy affordable food (*put under 19 but also of relevance here*)

SA16 Health & wellbeing

- Recognise the health benefits of gardening and food growing as a core activity
- Links to community food growing space and allotments – have proven benefits of improved mental health
- DCM – improve access to all facilities/service by sustainable transport

SA17 Community Safety

- DCM add – encourage a sense of positive commitment to valuing the local environment

SA18 Equality

- No comments

SA19 Economy and employment

- Importance of maintaining local parades; e.g. not allowing 2 shops to be knocked through into a tesco express
- Access to healthy affordable food
- The conversion of industrial areas, with easy access to bus services, into housing will force people to drive to work in outlying areas (Rayner, Sackville Ind Est)