

## **City Plan Part Two**

### **Stakeholder Consultation – County Cricket Ground, Hove**

**8<sup>th</sup> September 2016**

### **Workshop Notes and attendance list\***

\*The workshop attendance list was taken from the sign in registration form.

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

<b>Event</b>	Stakeholder Workshop
<b>Date and Location</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016, County Cricket Ground, Hove
<b>Attendance</b>	<p>Annie Gilbert - Ovingdean Residents &amp; Preservation Society (Urban Fringe site 43)</p> <p>Clare Tikly (Vice-Chair)- Hove Civic Society</p> <p>John Craddock - Ovingdean Residents &amp; Preservation Society (Urban Fringe site 41)</p> <p>Kia Trainor - CPRE Sussex</p> <p>Paul Norman - Hanover Action</p> <p>Graham Oldfield - Brighton &amp; Hove Wildlife Forum</p> <p>Mark Jones - Brighton &amp; Hove Hotels Association</p> <p>John Richards - Deans Preservation Group</p> <p>Tracie Parker - Deans Preservation Group</p> <p>Roger Amerena - Montpelier &amp; Clifton Hill Assoc</p> <p><b>Facilitators:</b> Francesca Illiffe &amp; Rebecca Fry</p>
<b>Key Issues Raised</b>	
<p><b>Biodiversity, Open Space, Pollution, Water and Energy – Workshop 1</b> (only one workshop on this topic ran)</p> <p><i>Facilitators asked attendees to each name one issue they wanted to discuss</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LGS</li> <li>• Open Space</li> <li>• SNCIs/LWS (some mentioned specific sites: Wanderdown Road, Longhill)</li> <li>• Protecting environment from wrong development</li> <li>• How to protect areas of connectivity between protected areas</li> <li>• Sustainability</li> <li>• Health and Wellbeing</li> <li>• Air Pollution</li> <li>• Noise Pollution</li> <li>• Urban environment and inclusion of biodiversity within it</li> <li>• Community groups – eg green roofs: how do groups take ownership</li> <li>• Encouragement of tree planting</li> </ul> <p>Post-it note comments:</p> <p><i>Local Green Space related:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elm Grove as LGS Elm trees</li> <li>• Can we designate LGS at Ovingdean as pre the OPS suggestion</li> <li>• Be clear as to the protection given to designated LGS; is it strong enough to control developers</li> <li>• Yes to designated as LGS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Benfield Valley</li> <li>○ 3 Cornered Copse</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

- Ladies Mile
- Hollingbury Park
- Local green space Wanderdown Rd open space Site 41. Already has SNCI status. City Plan 1 identified a small PDA which was subsequently reduced. The remainder of the site should be LGS
- Designate as LGS - Land East of Longhill Close, Ovingdean – due to protected species living on this site
- LGS - Brighton Borough Cemetery + Preston. + Downs Cemeteries (in Hanover & Elm Grove)

*GI, Open Space, Biodiversity designations, SNCI/LWS related:*

- Yes to landscape scale approach for green infrastructure reflecting joint work with SDNPA
- Green Infrastructure in urban environment linked to SDNPA extending Corridors via trees + planning on loft conversion (green roofs)
- Green Infrastructure / wildlife corridors v. important – please link to National Park
- Unpaved front gardens as wildlife corridors
- Protect wild life link between sea / Downs
- The Wildlife Corridor that connects Beacon Hill with Happy Valley should be protected/designated a LGS due to wildlife travel between these 2 protected areas of SDNP
- How can SNCIs be protected from developer cutting down trees before submitting a planning application?
- Please regulate the unnecessary cutting down trees with no planning permission or supervision + destroying green space
- LWS/LGS Destroyed by developers
- Any developer who destroys a site before submitting a planning application should be refused planning for a period of X years.
- Could there be a review of SNCI/Local Wildlife Sites – can we add to them please
- Designation a site as LWS, SNCI or LGS is useless if you cannot stop developers destroying it.
- Urban Fringe sites assessment – will each potential development site be assessed on its own merit, not relying on LUC assessment
- Private potential Green Spaces eg gardens and car parks. What authority does the Planning department have?
- Management of existing of designation open spaces
- Meadow Vale, Longhill Woodland, Badgers Wood, Beacon Hill, Beacon Hills (Ovingdean & Rottingdean) (*no context given?*)
- BHCC has address their s40 obligation in the production of the LBAP, I'm concerned that they are being ignored
- How will LBAPs be included? No tracking at the moment. No money.

*SUDS & Aquifer related:*

- Protection of aquifers from development

- Protection of all major aquifers of city
- Protect aqua flows
- Recognise Brighton is built on hills need new drainage system to deal with torrential rainfall
- Ensure Infrastructure for drainage
- Ensure adequate land drainage
- Loss of front gardens to car parking
- Concreting over gardens + 'garden grabbing' should be addressed
- Gardens paved over – standing water – impact on drainage – alteration to flood zones
- Would like strengthening of sustainable drainage system
- Better SUDs hierarchy to promote green roofs / swales etc not rec soakaways
- Surface water + SUDS – hills in urban environment of Hanover – Rain Gardens to mitigate flooding + green roof (loft conversion)
  - Lower Bevendean Grassed urban opportunity Moulsecoomb Place

*Pollution related:*

- Concentrations of "Holiday Let" party houses – raise pollution eg Charles St in Kemptown
- Air B.B – Some blocks of flats are managed by shareholders, each of whom owns flats but not all live in them. What authority does the Board of Directors have to regulate these short term lettings? (Clare Tikly, HCS)
- Night Bus Routes – noise pollution for residents and staying visitors
- Refrigeration units on lorries when delivering at stores

*Energy related:*

- Please introduce renewables policy and strengthen CP8
- Can we ensure energy efficiency is addressed through tighter policy
- Energy - use energy bricks in development
- Policy for solar PV slates in heritage buildings
- P13 - Solar PV onto loft conversions – into planning policy
- P13 – Local Carbon Energy. Planning policy disposition to (a) green roof – water or (b) Solar PV – energy. Best practice policy in London to mitigate storm water – can we lean / adopt the same
- P13 – Solar PV on Council owned Hanover Community Centre (and other community sites)
- District Heating and storage on high density developments
- Seafront developments to include heat storage reservoirs to utilize power (tidal, wind, solar) generated nearby

*(no facilitator notes taken because high level of involvement in discussion/responding to questions)*

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

<b>Event</b>	Stakeholder workshop – Cricket Ground
<b>Date and Location</b>	09/09/2016, Hove Cricket Ground
<b>Attendance</b>	<p><b><u>Design and Heritage Workshop 1</u></b>  Barry Leigh - North Laine Community Assoc (NLCA)  Derek De Young - Kemp Town Society  Helen Walker - Regency Society / Uni of Btn Course leader  Jon Stanley- Hove Seafront Residents Association  Ron de Witt- Brunswick Town Group  Robert Edwards - Kingscliffe Society Committee  Sandy Crowhurst - North Laine Community Assoc (NLCA)  Valerie Paynter - SaveHOVE  Cllr Robert Nemeth - Conservative Group  Ann Menhinick - Portslade Purple People Kitchen Foodbank  Richard Hawkes- The Friends of Palmeira and Adelaide Residents Association within the Brunswick Town Association</p> <p><b><u>Design and Heritage Workshop 2</u></b>  Juilette Hunting - Brunswick Town Association  Helmut Lusser - Hove Civic Society  Sue Moffatt - Vice Chairman Kingsway &amp; West Hove Residents' Association  Nicky Jackman - Rottingdean Parish Council  Cllr Heather Butler - Rottingdean Parish Council  Paul Phillips - Kemp Town Society  Carolyn Candish - Ovingdean Residents and Preservation Society  Steve Wedd -Ovingdean Residents and Preservation Society  Roger Amerena - Montpelier &amp; Clifton Hill Assoc</p> <p>Facilitator: Paula Goncalves and Tim Jefferies</p>
<b>Key Issues Raised</b>	<p><b>HERITAGE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write better policies for better architecture. Poor quality design is encroaching on conservation areas. – e.g. white render boxes.</li> <li>• Need to reference conservation area character statements in policy.</li> <li>• Conservation-based policy approach can obstruct other policies.</li> <li>• CPP2 should review conservation areas.</li> <li>• Conservation areas are different in type and level of importance. Policy should distinguish between them.</li> <li>• Character statements: shouldn't the policy say that development should be in keeping with statements?</li> <li>• Setting of heritage assets needs to be better addressed in CPP2.</li> </ul> <p><b>DESIGN</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streetscape approach in Conservation Areas: people in the area should have a say in what they want their place to be. Ensuring communities have a say could lead to more quality of incoming design.</li> </ul>

- Materials: maintenance is important.
- Danger that if policy is too prescriptive it can hinder new, good design coming into an area.
- Policies should focus on performance aspects rather than style when it comes to delivering quality in design.
- Seafront is a heritage asset and should be treated as such.

## Workshop Notes

### Workshop 1

- Attention needs to be given to enforcement. Is CPP2 part of enforcement?
- Placemaking is a fashionable term that alienates the human factor. Corporate objectives are a menace when it comes to place (Park House).
- Planning system has no power. Things are subsidiary to planning.
- We have to go by policy to guide development.
- Write better policies for better architecture. Poor quality design is encroaching on conservation areas.
- White render boxes are awful. How can we design a policy that we can say if you come into our area bring quality?
- Streetscape approach. The rest of the street should influence the style of new builds.
- We need to build on existing policies.
- There are elements of design that transcend policies that do not have to do with fashion and taste. Could be much stronger in terms of materials palette. If it is good and easily maintained then it can look a lot better than something more trendy.
- Difficult balance between putting something in that is pastiche or obviously new. Fit it. NEQ ambition was for good architecture but that has not been realised.
- Ideas of what types of things will work rather than latest fashion or sound bites like live work units which were the flavour of the month in the Local Plan.
- Too many proposals for landmarks.
- Danger that if one becomes too prescriptive it can hinder new, good design coming in. There needs to be space for creativity.
- External wall insulation guidance – there is a section on render. Need to account for materials for challenging marine environment that are capable to dealing with this environment specifically.
- You need to know where to get to each location.
- Worst kind of architecture is bland and fake pastiche. But what is pastiche? If it is a re-creation of what is in the area: what is a good re-creation?
- What kind of buildings would we like the policy to churn out?
- Medina House Planning brief. Now there is a proposal to demolish it. New design is a ghost replica of the old buildings.
- Traditional buildings styles?

- Parameters for quality?
- Policies should talk about performance rather than style. Performance of materials in a marine environment.
- If going into conservation areas consult with local people.
- Need to reference conservation area character statements in policy.
- Stop paving gardens and removing front walls.
- Upland flood control.
- Large, intact conservation areas Brunswick and ????
- Tall buildings, Pavilion and surrounds – Aspects of SPGs
- Seafront is a heritage aspect.
- Graffiti problems. Why is the ‘norm’ in the North Laine?

## Workshop 2

- Scope of UDF: CP12 says areas of the city unlikely to change and those that might see incremental development and those that need more proactive change. More detail on DAs and tall building areas. Could aspects of that could be in CPP2?
- Constantly confronted with some excellent as well as some meagre stuff. Proposals with impact on conservation area are being considered when it shouldn't. Conservation-based policy approach can obstruct other policies.
- Boundaries of conservation areas are drawn too widely and liberally. Some areas are acting too much as a constraint (e.g. Hove Station CA).
- Review of conservation areas in CPP2 or UDF? Other comparable cities have more conservation areas – e.g. Plymouth.
- If LPA is more focused we could get better development. At the moment the lowest level denominator applies.
- Conservation areas are different in type and level of importance. Policy should distinguish between them.
- Character statements: shouldn't the policy say that development should be in keeping with statements?
- Link between policy and statements: not just about conservation areas. Other areas need that too. Not to end up with the wrong building in the wrong area. Maintaining the characteristics of the other areas of the city. Need to understand the need of each individual area.
- Character Statements: Black Rock impact - the conservation area study is mute as there is no statement for that part of the conservation area. Vulnerability to other policies taking precedence over protection. Main buildings are protected but the wider built environment not in this instance.
- The question of setting is not treated as it should be. Policy issue is that we should apply to existing and future CAs. Setting needs to be better addressed in CPP2.
- Black Rock: Is the council poacher or game keeper? 20,000m2 development
- Seek reassurance that CPP2/UDF will look at review of Conservation Areas. Some have changed and others have no Management Plans for the CAs. Old Town CS was paid for by the community. Council has not the resources and it

is up to community to help produce these statements. There are groups willing to draw investors in to improve the space in between. At the time they were built the public realm was given the same importance as the buildings. Via Neighbourhood Plans? Documents produced and not taken into account by the council.

- Seafront protection in Brighton, not in Hove. Seafront should be viewed as one CA and have greater protection. East at Rottingdean where narrows, erosion is a highway problem.
- Place making a bit of a cliché. New England Street a good example?
- Consultation document full of nice clichés.
- Setting: insufficient attention given to this in conservation e.g. Brunswick Town – abuse of The Lawns by over-use.
- No policy on enforcement over street furniture.
- Need for different approach to various CAs. Some need to be completely protected, others can go.
- Areas protected need an investment strategy – to be used for s106.
- Good places outside conservation areas must be considered.
- Protection of parts of south Portslade, St Andrew's Road and Old Police Station.
- Heritage groups to be quasi agents to BHCC – Article 4s, Regulation 7s, new CAs, writing of CA character statements.
- If the Kemp Town Society paid for a characterisation study would BHCC adopt it?
- There is conflict between Ovingdean Character Assessment and proposals for the development of Ovingdean farm.
- Very well to talk about design and conservation but how about keeping the city clean.

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

<b>Event</b>	Stakeholder Consultation
<b>Date and Location</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016, County Cricket Ground, Hove
<b>Attendance</b>	<p>Councillor Lynda Hyde  Councillor Mary Mears  Councillor Penny Gilbey  Mark McCullough Brighton &amp; Hove Hoteliers Association  Jeremy Mustoe Brighton Society (Chairman)  Juliette Hunting Brunswick Town Association</p> <p><b>Facilitators:</b> Helen Gregory and Andrew Motley</p>
<b>Key Issues Raised</b>	
<p><b>Economy, Retail and Tourism Workshop 1</b></p> <p><b>Visitor Accommodation and Tourism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 800 properties listed on Airbnb (according to Visit Brighton)</li> <li>• Don't need to wait for national guidance</li> <li>• FOI or court order to get information from businesses such as Airbnb,</li> <li>• By Laws?</li> <li>• Impacts other things – some may just be rooms but also situations where landlords using permanently built and selling as short term lets on airbnb rather than as housing</li> <li>• Impacts Tourism- New rooms on Air bnb affecting those rooms available in hotels (Air bnb not necessarily cheaper)</li> <li>• All hotels are full – need more hotels</li> <li>• Average occupancy e.g. Kemp Town, Broad St 50% for the year;</li> <li>• Citywide- at best average occupancy 70%- kept afloat by conference trade.</li> <li>• Hotel Futures Study 2006 update – need to understand the impact on visitor accommodation from invisible competition. Include air bnb in scope.</li> <li>• Allow bed and breakfast change of use to flats – abolish concept of 'core area'</li> <li>• Promote heritage of Brunswick Town and Kemp Town – heritage assets are not valued – promote Listed Buildings/ regency buildings. Make more of built and natural environment.</li> <li>• Increase the role of regency buildings in attracting tourists and increase the range of attractions.-</li> </ul> <p><b>Retail</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main reason people come to Brighton are the 'stand alone' shops – their independence and uniqueness is part of attractiveness of city centre.</li> <li>• Will come to Department Store like J Lewis</li> <li>• Need more department stores</li> </ul>	

- New Local Centre? – designate Brunswick Town Centre from Norfolk Square to St John’s Church. Keep important assets – have lost a Post Office- constant threat of bars, takeaways and newsagents. Small shops at risk
- Mill Lane Parade – Local Centre but run down now
- Lots of shopping parades around the city- review of shopping centres
- Shopping parades have a community and convenience role.
- Shopping centres can recover- e.g. London Road with redevelopment of Co-Op building- learn lessons from this example
- Rye- prevented major supermarket chains from moving in
- Tesco Metro, Sainsbury’s Locals etc. threaten vitality of local centres- however some feeling that there was also some boost in trade for some retailers. E.g. boundary Road – if take away Tesco.
- Hard to control retail- all about what’s popular to create vitality of the area
- People come from London because everything is close together – people make a day of it
- Park and Ride- People would love Park and Ride
- Retail Areas- would be more attractive without drinkers and drug takers on the streets- improve retail environment, cleanliness. Impact of Licensing Act.
- Imbalance of visitor types- Tourism – heritage buildings not valued as part of the Tourism draw- promotion of protected buildings and Architecture.
- Future vibrancy of city dependent upon – Heritage, Sea.

### **Office Space**

- Always about the office space in the City Centre
- Lots of offices around edges of the city but is not filled
- Businesses want city centre location- near station with main line service and amenities etc.
- More medium sized office space needed
- Development risk for office greater than that for residential- can sell resi before built but office only after built- money in residential
- Protect office space from conversion to residential – use article 4 direction.
- Site Allocation Issue- marketing is a more pro-active way to ensure businesses want to move in
- Zoning is a way could manage this
- Parking Issues - never enough provided for offices e.g Hove Park- lack of parking causes problems for residents
- Park and ride – smaller? Can work well and help support town centre
- People think of city as city centre and areas are not included such as Portslade
- City Centre goes up to Preston Park but does not go East and West- Shoreham Port in Portslade for example
- Smaller local hubs for office buildings

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

<b>Event</b>	Stakeholder Workshops
<b>Date and Location</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016, County Cricket Ground, Hove
<b>Attendance</b>	<p>Mark Jones - Brighton &amp; Hove Hotels Association  Helen Walker - Regency Society / University of Btn Course leader  Ron de Witt - Brunswick Town Group  Robert Edwards- Kingscliffe Society Committee  Andrew Boag - Brighton Area Buswatch (Chair)  Kia Trainor - CPRE Sussex  Derek De Young - Kemp Town Society</p> <p><b>Facilitators:</b> Helen Gregory and Andrew Motley</p>
<b>Key Issues Raised</b>	
<p><b>Economy, Retail and Tourism Workshop 2</b></p> <p><b>Retail</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of shops, where they are, focus on the market</li> <li>• Need a mixed economy of shops/residential etc. to keep the area alive- need flexibility re. change of uses so these changes can be reacted to</li> <li>• Overwhelmed with cafes- downside- more cafes there are; the less variety of uses</li> <li>• Could prescribe cafes with varieties of uses- mixed uses</li> <li>• Recognition of a local centre with its own needs – like a conservation area character statement to be put to the retail health checks.</li> <li>• Could come up with a figure where the mix works- work towards that figure (once you have calculated it)</li> <li>• St James Street – most damaging influence for retail and residential population is licensing practice- problems with 24 hr licensing laws- even though it’s a cumulative impact zone.</li> <li>• Brunswick Town – also CIA- works well – presumption against licenses- strengthen and extend it- down Church Road</li> <li>• Western Road should be designated retail ‘corridor’ in its own right</li> <li>• What will new Churchill Square be a mix of and how will this affect the rest of the surrounding retail areas- Impact Study?</li> <li>• Lots of people come to Brighton to go to the areas that aren’t Churchill Square- places that are unique to B&amp;H- keep that uniqueness; attractiveness of the whole area important to the economy. Reflect different character areas within city centre.</li> <li>• Kingscliffe area is attractive, seafront.</li> </ul> <p><b>Tourism and Visitors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Black Rock- doubts about moving conference Centre to BR- where will delegates stay? Transport concerns.</li> <li>• We need fewer hotels if people are using houses e.g. Airbnb</li> <li>• Hotels in city centre not being used as Hotels (eg. Backpackers instead)</li> <li>• Issue one of flexibility- eg trend of Airbnb not heard of until recently</li> </ul>	

- Trends- Need flexibility to find right level/react to new things
- Need to encourage one type of visitor accommodation and discourage other specific types that disrupt the city
- In past Hotels managed Stag and Hen do numbers but party Houses and Airbnb has allowed for more of these- 'quality' of visitor and 'quality' of hotel accommodation is reducing
- Hen and Stag nights create great damage to the street scene etc. cost to infrastructure
- People buying houses to turn into 'Party Houses' – Enforcement Issue. E.g Charles St in Kemp Town- whole street.
- Scrutiny Panel recommended self-management – this has not worked.
- Hotels, party house proprietors and Estate Agents should tell their guests, visitors and clients that the property is in a conservation area.
- Berlin banned BnB from areas of the city to allow for housing within the city.
- Similar problem as with HMOS- Article 4 to control?
- Not just about bed space numbers but also bed space quality
- Eastbourne- Realised unless quality of accommodation increased it will not be a good tourist destination - allow change of uses from 'tired' guesthouses with a low quality of offer
- Hotel Futures Study
- Conservation Areas- policy that keeps more family homes
- Brunswick- policy obstructs 5 flats to single family home- damaging, should encourage conversion back to family homes
- Subsidies for people to build Student Accommodation on periphery to protect the centre. This is being doing in York

#### **Economy**

- Need to discuss location of commercial and industrial areas with Adur and East Sussex County council
- Loss of artisan workshops in the mews of Brunswick Town
- Driverless cars - implications

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

<b>Event</b>	<b>CPP2 Stakeholder Event</b>
<b>Date and Location</b>	<b>Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> September 2016 County Cricket Ground, Hove</b>
<b>Attendance</b>	<p><b>Housing Workshops 1 &amp; 2 - notes of round table discussions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kelvin McDonald (Brighton Housing trust) – affordable housing, homelessness, HMOs</li> <li>• Helmut Lusser (Hove Civic Society) – maximise density, development in Hove</li> <li>• Stuart Cager (Family Homes not HMOs, Bevendean) – loss of family homes into HMOs, affordable housing</li> <li>• Pat Weller (Hangleton &amp; Knoll Project) – social and real affordable housing, housing choices for older people</li> <li>• Cllr Heather Butler (Rottingdean PC) – second home ownership, affordable housing, housing needs in Rottingdean</li> <li>• Carolyn Candish (Ovingdean Residents Society) – shaping of UF development and housing mix</li> <li>• Cathy Gallagher (Saltdean Residents) – UF development, lack of transport integration on UF, affordable housing</li> <li>• Cllr Anne Meadsows (Moulsecoomb LAT) – HMOs, use of homes as holiday lets</li> <li>• David Robson (Regency Society)</li> <li>• Sue Moffat (KAHWRA) – housing options for older people, need for additional housing</li> <li>• Peter Reeves (KAHWRA) – limited options for development in Hove, contradicting policies, clarification on policy</li> <li>• Jeremy Mustoe (Brighton Society) – need to increase housing whilst protecting attractiveness of city and environment</li> <li>• Tom Richards (Deans Preservation Group) – UF development, inappropriate development</li> <li>• Tracie Parker (Deans PG) – UF development, protection of biodiversity</li> <li>• Rob Sheppard (Saltdean RA) – traffic, infrastructure requirement of new housing</li> <li>• Marcus Oldfield (BH Wildlife Forum) – effect of housing on green space, need to control developers</li> <li>• Valerie Paynter (SaveHove) – development in Hove, need for areas to be distinctive, protection of heritage</li> <li>• Dani/Julie (LOGS Mile Oak) – over-development in UF, impacts on existing infrastructure, transport &amp; access</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Craddock (Ovingdean R&amp;PS) – dev on Wanderdown Rd site, against dev. on SNCIs</li> <li>• Nigel Smith (SAFE Rottingdean) – inappropriate dev on greenfield sites, need for supporting infrastructure</li> <li>• Annie Gilbert (Ovingdean R&amp;PS) – dev on Longhill Rd site, brownfield first</li> <li>• Lin Moss (SAFE Rottingdean) - against inappropriate over development, cumulative effects of development</li> </ul> <p><b>Facilitators:</b> Sandra Rogers and Helen Pennington</p>
--	---

### Key Issues Raised

#### Workshop 1:

- Concern over the high target for housing yet continued **conversion of family homes into HMOs** to provide student housing.
- **People are in the wrong stock**, e.g. older people in larger homes. There is a need to **make use of existing stock** by providing **smaller properties for older people** to release family homes onto the market.
- Existing **sheltered housing not meeting needs**, e.g. people in their 60s no longer want that type of housing and want to stay in their own homes.
- **Risk of moving older people out of communities** as no suitable provision.
- The city is **not in a position to resist development** and potentially **unsuitable developments are being found acceptable**.
- There should be an **evidence base to show the mix required on individual sites across the city**, as needs differ in different areas of the city.
- Bevendean/Moulsecoomb area is the last really affordable area of the city. Shouldn't be **losing family homes in this area to HMOs** . **Article 4 Direction needed** to control this.
- **Under-development** is an issue. Toad's Hole Valley housing target should be much higher. (2,000)
- Important to **make the best use of all sites**. **100dph is too little in Development Areas**.
- **Part 2 should have detailed requirements for all sites**, e.g. density, numbers, mix etc.
- Part 1 stops at the Marina. The **Deans needs to be looked at in more detail** as a distinct area in Part 2.
- NPPF states **housing shouldn't be delivered if the infrastructure cannot support it**.
- **Transport** is an issue linked to an increasing population.
- There is continued "nibbling away" at small areas. There should be a **properly planned approach to areas such as the Deans** to make sure all needs can be met locally, schools, jobs etc. Deans should be self-sufficient.
- The need for housing will continue to increase. There should be a **limit set**

**based on what the capacity of the city** is in its current form.

- Toads Hole Valley was designated a floodplain 20 years ago.
- Unequal society in Brighton & Hove. **New development not meeting the needs of people** who currently live in BH, only attracting people from out of the city.
- **Affordable housing isn't meeting local affordable housing needs.**
- There should be **restrictions on who moves into housing** (e.g. local connection)
- **40% affordable housing requirement is no longer achievable.**
- Affordable housing is only 80% of market cost. This still **too expensive.**
- Need to investigate **cheaper ways of providing housing.**

### Workshop 2

- UF development has **traffic and infrastructure impacts** but concern that **objections on grounds of traffic not listened to.**
- **Lack of confidence in the council to deliver measures to mitigate the traffic impacts** of development in the UF.
- **Conflict and tension between developers**, who want to build big, and residents, who want the city to be preserved.
- **No evidence of any updated infrastructure requirements** for the city.
- **Designate St Aubyn's Playing Field as Local Green Space** - importance to Rottingdean, planned inclusion in the Rottingdean Neighbourhood Plan and two petitions.
- **Local GP surgeries are closing** and remaining health provision can't meet existing needs.
- **Current transport policies not realistic and don't work** – car-free and restrictions on on-street parking
- **City hasn't accommodated change in shopping patterns** and the impacts this has on transport, e.g. internet/shopping deliveries
- Don't want the city to become a mass of high rise building.
- **Areas which are poorly served by public transport should be ring-fenced as not suitable for high density** development
- **Council doesn't listen to people's concerns**, e.g. lack of school capacity isn't acknowledged when planning decisions are made and S106 money for schools doesn't result in extra classrooms/schools.
- There is **no planning of the road infrastructure** required to support new developments.
- Concern that applications for student housing in the Falmer area have not been approved.
- Housing that is being built are **too expensive and not being sold.**

- Need to **re-develop brownfield** sites.
- **Affordable housing** units should be around **£100,000** to be truly affordable.
- **Affordable housing policy is too flexible.**
- Brighton Marina **isn't meeting local housing needs.**
- There should be a policy on **restricting people buying second homes.**

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

<b>Event</b>	Stakeholder Event
<b>Date and Location</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016, County Cricket Ground, Hove
<b>Attendance</b>	Barry Leigh North Laine Community Assoc (NLCA) Sandy Crowhurst- North Laine Community Assoc (NLCA) Cllr Carol Theobald -Conservative Group Cllr Lynda Hyde- Conservative Group Cllr Anne Meadows - Chair of Moulsecoomb LAT Cllr Daniel Yates -Labour Group  <b>Facilitators:</b> Steve Tremlett and Rebecca Fry
<b>Key Issues Raised</b>	
<b><u>Student Housing Workshop Notes</u></b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With better transport links purpose built student housing (PBSA) could be located on the urban fringe. This would need better transport links to the campuses to be established.</li> <li>• The possibility of locating new PBSA to serve the city in Lewes and Newhaven should be examined.</li> <li>• Higher levels of developer contributions should be sought on PBSA developments to reflect the impacts that they have.</li> <li>• Commuted sums should be sought to finance the development of off-site affordable housing.</li> <li>• The Article 4 Direction has slowed the conversion of more family homes to HMOs but the problem remains. The 50m radius should be expanded to 100m.</li> <li>• The proportion of all houses in a ward that are HMOs should be taken into account, rather than just those in the immediate vicinity.</li> <li>• Nottingham City Council’s policy should be looked at as a good example of how to manage the issue.</li> </ul> <p>Facilitator notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competing demands from student accommodation and housing (10,000 bedspaces students versus 13,200 new residential units)</li> <li>• Need homes for full time residents who are committed to the city</li> <li>• Could we provide more purpose built student accommodation sites in the city – some on the table said did not think this was a good approach</li> <li>• Could we tell the University’s to provide more on site – however it was raised that Brighton University was not as straightforward as Sussex</li> <li>• Could we say no to speculative student development – raised that CP21 does prevent student housing sites on potential housing sites</li> <li>• Do we allocate student housing to the outskirts of the city and direct housing to within (some on the table felt urban fringe is better for students but others disagreed)</li> <li>• Many students from beyond the city boundaries, some live at home.</li> <li>• Speak to neighbouring authorities (part of Duty to Cooperate) in respect of</li> </ul>	

meeting out student housing requirements. Newhaven could be a good location already reasonable transport links

- Need to look at housing density to help address all the needs however must recognise there is a need to also look outside the local authority boundary – city is constrained by National Park and the sea
- Can the infrastructure from the outer areas link into the Universities – think carefully about the infrastructure required and ensure buses link in (the no.25 and 50 bus currently provide good service to the Uni's. The no.5 does at certain times of the day does link but not as regular as no.25, students are not 9-5)
- Different infrastructure is required so should charge higher s106/developer contributions re student housing
- Apply 40% affordable housing proportion on student bedspace numbers
- Main area under pressure from student accommodation is Pelham Street up to the slope/Lewes Road. Approximately 50 HMOs in North Laines (it also suffers from holiday lets, party houses)
- The Article 4 Direction radius could be made larger than 50m – problems from student housing affects the health of the city/residents
- CP21 and Article 4 Direction has moved people on and caused problems elsewhere
- Nottingham have combined competing uses and set a threshold of 15%
- Concern raised over the future of the Astoria
- Need high enough standards and enforce them - perhaps a role for building control
- Due to the constraints may not be able to find sites for Travellers/Gypsies – should seek to address within other authorities via the Duty to Cooperate

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

<b>Event</b>	Stakeholder Workshop
<b>Date and Location</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016, County Cricket Ground, Hove
<b>Attendance</b>	<p>Nigel Smith - SAFE Rottingdean  Lin Moss - SAFE Rottingdean  Cllr Nicky Jackman - Rottingdean Parish Council  John Cook - Patcham Community Action Team  Cllr Heather Butler - Rottingdean Parish Council  Cllr Daniel Yates- Labour Group  Paul Phillips -Kemp Town Society  Andrew Boag -Brighton Area Buswatch (Chair)  Danielle Card -L.O.G.S Mile Oak  Manda Curry or Julie Harris - L.O.G.S Mile Oak</p> <p><b>Facilitators:</b> Liz Hobden and Clare Flowers</p>
<b>Key Issues Raised</b>	
<p><b>Transport and Community Facilities – Workshop 1</b></p> <p><i>LH asked attendees to each name one issue that was most important to them</i></p> <p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport through Woodingdean</li> <li>• Patcham – park and ride and new leisure facilities in Patcham</li> <li>• Kemptown – what is happening at Maderia Drive, Conference Centre and impact on transport in the area and tourism</li> <li>• Promote bus issues</li> <li>• Rottingdean – traffic impact and Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) – cumulative impact of traffic volumes on Rottingdean; transport volumes, air quality and community infrastructure eg primary school places</li> <li>• North Portslade – traffic have one way in and out of north Portslade and concerns over urban fringe site and transport</li> </ul> <p>Health and community facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of new dwellings and frameworks. Working more effectively on capacity – mitigatory impacts</li> <li>• Better air quality and impacts and best measures – gaps?</li> </ul> <p>Air Quality and Park and Ride</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park and ride – if adequate park and ride this would help. Support for park and ride especially in Cambridge, Oxford and Bournemouth – we have South Downs National Park which is a challenge.</li> <li>• Consensus of workshop participants that park and ride would help and even if outside boundary working with South Downs National Park – is a sub-regional issue.</li> <li>• Integrated travel policy into and out of city. Transport density (uses) studies required.</li> <li>• Restricting car use particularly for people coming from outside the city area</li> </ul>	

### Other solutions

- Mitigation – in AQMA need to improve situation before moving on. How about high standards eg zoning around areas – better parking and sustainable development in identified AQMA area
- AQMAs – certain priorities identified in action plan eg low emission zones and also need to have a wider area considered in transport plans
- Cumulative impact – how to reduce Air Quality Management areas.
- In Rottingdean AQMA figures dipped but no overall approach re cumulative effects of LDC sites.
- Transport Assessments of developments are not challenged sufficiently by Highways Authority. Transport Assessments submitted often not good enough. Transport officer not expert enough.
- Better design – difference between Rottingdean and Brighton, better definitions and tighter criteria.
- Also impact of changes of road usage
- Encourages sustainable travel via park and ride and discourage journeys into the city
- Also problems with congestion causing Air Quality issues even with hybrid cars
- Encourage active travel
- A23 M23 is very busy
- Our transport systems are low tech and should encourage smarter technology
- In Mile Oak only one road in and out and there is a big development site proposed
- Limited links to the bypass from Mile Oak
- Don't have clear picture of what the journeys in the city area (the technology is there but is not used by BHCC)
- Bus network is always north- south and not east – west.
- Getting across the city by bus without going through the centre.
- Restricting car use particularly for people coming from outside city centre.
- Limited link to Bypass in Mile Oak
- Travel Plans (TR5) no clarity in the city Plan and not working – congestion and pollution.
- There is support for clear thresholds to be in transport guidance.

### **Community Facilities**

- How do protect community uses, are community hubs a good solution?
- North Portslade – GP surgery shortage.
- Supportive of community hubs- e.g. of really good hub in Woodingdean. Should be looking at how to put community uses together
- Need to understand the demand for community facilities (like we are doing for housing figures) that will help plan for need for facilities.
- Also look at older hospital sites e.g. Polyclinic and what else could be there (eg a land use study). The whole delivery of health is changing.

- Need for retirement homes (Social Care indicate there is fine capacity here)
- Extra care is an important model to support
- Schools – in N. Portslade - we have a School Organisation Plan
- Re Rottingdean and Saltdean areas – need more schools for the amount of new development
- CIL requirements in City Plan Part Two to pay for community infrastructure requirements.

City Plan Part 2 Scoping Consultation – Event Log

<b>Event</b>	Stakeholder Workshop
<b>Date and Location</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016, County Cricket Ground, Hove
<b>Attendance</b>	<p>Clare Tikly (Vice-Chair) - Hove Civic Society  Paul Norman - Hanover Action  Jon Stanley - Hove Seafront Residents Association  Mark McCullough - Brighton and Hove Hoteliers Association  William Gandy -Bevendean LAT  Pat Weller - Hangleton and Knoll Project  Cathy Gallagher -Chair of Saltdean Residents Association  Cllr Penny Gilbey - Portslade Community Forum  Ann Menhinick - Portslade Purple People Kitchen Foodbank</p> <p><b>Facilitators:</b> Liz Hobden and Clare Flowers</p>
<b>Key Issues Raised</b>	
<p><b>Transport and Community Workshop 2</b></p> <p><b>Key concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to the city prime concern (hotel trade)</li> <li>• Air quality, covering land for parking spaces and run off issues, parking issues</li> <li>• Schools are relying on desktop transport plan and is inadequate</li> <li>• Bring transport and school transport plans as a central issue</li> <li>• Air quality management issue in Church Road/ Trafalgar Road, Portslade Shoreham Port and lorries.</li> <li>• North Portslade –heavy lorries go through as all bridges in West Sussex too low for lorries to pass.</li> <li>• Pollution from A27 and centre of city</li> <li>• Deans area issues – A259 and low connectivity in Saltdean – in and out. Lack of community facilities (Lido was community centre). Deans could be sustainable. Bus routes only go to city centre. At the back of Saltdean no buses to NH.</li> <li>• Hangleton and Knoll – longer hours for buses and cost of transport and buses (affordability issues).</li> <li>• Hanover – AQMA, active transport – insufficient cycle infrastructure (cycle parking) must be more of this. South over Community Centre is not accessible to all – limited to who is allowed to use it (not just physically limited).</li> <li>• Bevendean and Moulsecombe – costs of buses and community impacts of HMOs – impact on schools, not enough children for the school due to HMOs</li> <li>• Air quality – noise and vibration of lorries, accessing city.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Street air quality – why are Brighton &amp; Hove Buses latest fleet deliveries not hybrid?</li> <li>• Can there be a diesel ban – there is in London/ Southampton. There are only a few routes into town so those areas have AGMA and monitor those.</li> </ul>	

- Transportation of delegates to a new conference centre at Black Rock is critically important to the success or failure of the conference centre
- Get university to support bus routes from University of Sussex into outer areas of city beyond Lewes Road corridor.
- Promoting electric bikes for older age accessibility – promoting well-being and active travel
- Cross city bus routes – cutting down on cars goes hand in hand with public transport development
- Hanover and Elm Grove – allocations for cycle infrastructure in residential areas reduce cars and increase sustainable transport options in practice.
- Trees and Green Walls as mitigation in Air Quality Action Plan areas
- Concentration on cycling may not be so important in the Denes and need more or different mitigation – although there are more technological solutions – eg electric bikes.
- Want cycle facilities with public transport
- Also disability issues will need car parking
- Permit system - No car days or alternate car to promote – trying out alternatives and help reduce volume
- Need to removal of old bikes from existing bike stands – register bikes with QR codes to report dumped bikes and abandoned motor cycles
- QR codes so you can report abandoned bikes in cycle racks
- Better behaved cyclists on seafront – cycle give way signs don't work
- Promote city car club – space for every car parking permit granted
- Need to ban older diesels
- Not enough priority for safety around schools
- Better pavements – for wheelchairs
- Air Quality Management Plan- extend focus to alternative infrastructure beyond traffic management and green mitigation (trees and shrubs).
- Extend some community bus times - use by families – unable to use them
- Investigate park and ride take it seriously
- Concentration on cycling may not be so important in Deans
- Saltdean – cycling not possible for most – 50+ demographics – wind, hills.
- Better and safer for wheelchairs to use our streets
- Saltdean locked in A259 Falmer Avenue – no routes to the east from back of Saltdean.

### **Community**

- Closing down community facilities – children's facilities
- Community hubs – expectation that community should run with a budget
- Bevendean and Moulsecoomb – the biggest threat is being priced out of market by developers buying up for HMOs
- The University should help enable dispersal of students throughout the city via supporting sustainable transport.
- More HMOs is affecting the intake to our schools. Terrible loss of amenity
- Community centres – areas of benefit to whole community. Remove restrictions on access/ involvement.

- Communities struggling to retain community due to ongoing approvals – changing use of affordable family homes to HMOs
- Proliferation of HMOs leading to greater number of transient population with no/ limited interest in area/ community.
- Retaining affordable family homes essential for maintaining the character of communities and facilities.
- Communities stripped of resources. If you want communities to take hold of community need budget.
- Concerns in Saltdean – school at capacity, doctors at capacity, community centre closed. Chance to build sustainable communities.
- St Richards Community Centre – 2 halls available for consultation events for future city plan events