

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

Section of Plan	Page/ Parag raph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPf Action
<u>General Comments</u>			<p>BHCC recognises the hard work that has been carried out by the Coldean Neighbourhood Planning Forum to reach this stage in the emerging Plan process.</p> <p>The following comments suggest changes and corrections to the policies and supporting text:</p> <p>Hyperlinks should be put in footnotes</p> <p>Layout of the policies and supporting text is difficult to read. All supporting text should come before the policy text for ease of reading and interpretation.</p>	<p>Thankyou.</p> <p>Footnotes will be created for hyperlinks in the final Plan</p> <p>The style/layout of the Plan was agreed with Robert Davidson and his Planning team prior to the Regulation 14 Consultation in June 2024, and was purposely in keeping with supporting AECOM document layout. We therefore prefer to make few changes to the Plan layout, at this very late stage, especially as the Responses for the Regulation 16 Consultation were supportive of the Plan in its current format, and no one mentioned that it was confusing.</p>
<u>Map of the Coldean Neighbourhood Area</u> Page 2		N/A		N/A
<u>Table of Contents</u> Page 4 -5				To be updated in final Plan
<u>Table of Images</u> Page 6				To be updated in final Plan

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
Timeline Page 8-9	Page 9	n/a	Suggest adding " <u>Submission of Draft Plan to BHCC</u> " - September 2025, to ensure the plan is up to date.	Added
01 Introduction Page 10-11			Various references throughout Introduction to "Brighton City Plan" should be amended to "Brighton & Hove City Plan"	Amended throughout
			Suggest change "It sits alongside <u>the Brighton & Hove City Plan Parts One and Two, which will be replaced by the emerging City Plan 2041 Part Two</u> (and other documents such as City Plan – Part One, which is being revised)"	Amended
				Amended
			Suggest amending the wording of first sentence as follows; "The Plan covers the <u>Neighbourhood</u> Plan Area (hereafter referred to as the 'Plan Area' (see Figure 1))"	Amended
			Suggest amending the wording of sentence 3 in para 4 as follows; " For a planning application to be considered favourably, a All relevant policies contained within this plan should be considered <u>when assessing planning applications.</u> and complied with. "	Amended
		Suggest amending sentence 4 in para 4 as follows; "Where development does not require planning permission, the community <u>encourages adherence to the objectives outlined in this document.</u> would still like development proposals to adhere to the aspirations and objectives set out	Amended Amended	

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

			<p>within this document. It is accepted that the Policies in this Plan can only control development that requires planning permission. However, it is an aspiration of the local community that all development, including permitted developments, will have regard to the objectives set out within this Plan."</p> <p>Suggest deleting the final sentence, as appears out of context to the rest of the text which proceeds it. There is no 'Green Belt' land in the Brighton & Hove area.</p> <p>Suggest amending the paragraphs to be more focused as follows;</p> <p>"The current documents in the Council Development Plans <u>for BHCC</u> can be found on the Brighton & Hove City Council website at https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/planning-building/ containing any development plan that covers their area and states that: Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area or undermine those strategic policies. The current documents for the Development Plan in the SDNP can be found on the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) website at https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning-policy/</p> <p>Once a neighbourhood plan has been approved by Referendum, the policies it contains take precedence over existing non-strategic policies in a local plan covering the neighbourhood area, where they are in conflict, unless they are superseded by strategic or non-strategic policies that are adopted</p>	<p>Final two sentences retained.</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>This wording retained</p> <p>Amended</p>
Para 5				
Para 6 & 7				

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
			<p>subsequently. The Development Plans for the Neighbourhood area comprise a number of documents, the principal ones being <u>are currently the</u> Brighton & Hove City Plan Parts One and Two, and the South Downs Local Plan, which set out the strategic and other planning policies intended to guide development until 2030/2033 respectively."</p>	Amended

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

<u>02 Vision and Objectives</u>	Page 12		<p>Objective (e) suggest amending wording as follows: “(e) To work with other agencies to reduce crime and other anti-social behaviour. (Added April 2024) (See Policy C1)”</p> <p>To better reflect the detail in policy E4: Objective (h) suggest amending wording as follows: “(h) To promote sustainable development that helps Coldean to mitigate impacts on the environment and to respond to the impacts of water scarcity, flooding, and climate change into the future. (Added December 2024) (See Policies E4 (d) & (e) and E5 (e)”</p>	<p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p>
<u>03 About the Plan Area</u>	Page 14-17	<p>Para 11</p> <p>Para 12 & 14</p> <p>Para 13</p>	<p>Suggest rephrasing the word “jumped”</p> <p>The northern boundary was formerly marked by Coldean Lane, but the most recent developments “jumped” lie beyond this and are located to the north of the original settlement. The northern boundary is in effect the A27 trunk road, known as ‘the Bypass’ (managed by National Highways).</p> <p>Not sure the term ‘countryside gap’ is the right one. Suggest changing. Typo correct to ‘Downs’ not Down</p>	<p>Reworded</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Used ‘natural’ gap. Typo corrected.</p>

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPf Action
		<p>Para 34</p> <p>Para 35</p>	<p>“The South Downs National Park runs down the field from Ditchling Road to the perimeter road, Saunders Hill and Reeves Hill, which has housing on the Coldean side only”</p> <p>Suggest rewording the phrase ‘It almost goes without saying’. It would help to evidence the stated view concerning insufficient infrastructure.</p> <p>Sentence 3 suggest removing the word “draft”</p> <p>“The data in the draft Neighbourhood Plan suggests that there is an under occupation of family-sized homes in Coldean due to the number of older households.”</p>	<p>This wording used.</p> <p>Reworded. There is Evidence of sewage spills and low water pressures, so text has been augmented here.</p> <p>Removed word.</p> <p>Amended.</p>

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

<u>04 Housing and Development Policies</u> Page 18-26	General comments on this section	This section has a lot of confusing statistics which are repeated and could be simplified. Section reads very anti student.	This section was there at Regulation 14 stage and was not required to be removed. It has therefore been retained.
	Para 37	Para seems out of context – suggest removing 37— The Council has recently confirmed (end of 2023) that there will be a greater focus on developers seeking to carry out large scale developments to evidence public consultation and ensure they carry out a ‘Planning Performance Agreement’.	Retained. Removed.
	Para 38	“On a pro rata basis, Coldean would need to provide 105 new dwellings. In 2023 alone, it provided 242. <i>The Council have confirmed there is no building target for the Coldean area as at the time of writing.</i> ” The second sentence should be revised or omitted. At present, there are no allocated sites in	Retained as wording in italics was provided by the Council before.

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

		<p>Coldean; however, windfall developments may arise on available locations within the area.</p> <p>Suggest amending to state ‘By 2023, 242 new dwellings were provided at Bluebell Heights, increasing the number of households in Coldean by 23%’ to give a broad overview of the impact of recent housing development on the Coldean community.</p> <p>It is recommended to remove all paragraphs, as they primarily reiterate data from the table in Figure 10 without providing additional interpretation or context. There is no insight given into the scale of development activity in Coldean over the last ten years alongside these figures, and therefore the data is open to misinterpretation.</p> <p>“In general, this Plan does not envisage a significant ordinary resident population growth, after integrating residents on the Bluebell Heights development.” unclear what this means</p> <p><i>‘It is believed Coldean has more HMOs and households with 4 or more bedrooms than the BHCC average of 16.7%.’ - Clarify the relevance of grouping HMO’s and properties with 4 or more bedrooms together</i></p>	<p>Amended</p> <p>Retained. These were there before.</p> <p>Retained</p> <p>Reworded</p>
--	--	--	--

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

		Para 47	<p>Suggest deleting “All Policies for Section 4 of this Plan (apart from the Policies at Section 4.3 on HMOs which were the subject of a separate Consultation) were posted on the website and publicly consulted on in January 2024. Whilst there was no adverse feedback from the Consultation we do know that nearly 150 visits to the www.cnpf.co.uk website occurred on the day after the Consultation was launched.”</p>	Deleted
		Para 48	<p>Suggest deleting. The Council will be updating its Statement of Community Involvement (which sets out the requirements for consultation on planning policy documents and with planning applications). This Plan endorses a full consultation approach by the Council before there is any future large scale development in the Area. There will be a greater focus on developers seeking to carry out large scale developments to evidence public consultation and ensure they carry out a ‘Planning Performance Agreement’.</p> <p>Reasons why deletion is suggested: A Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) is an agreement between the council and an applicant to provide a project management framework for handling an application through to determination.</p> <p>This framework is intended to improve and speed up the planning process by committing both parties to an agreed timetable. It makes clear what level of resources and actions are required to ensure that all key planning issues are properly considered.</p>	Deleted

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
			<p>Imminent planning reforms are likely to remove the need for a Statement of Community Involvement and introduce a requirement for planning authorities to set out their overall approach to engagement as part of their Project Initiation Document.</p>	OK.

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

			<p>messages received from Forum members regarding HMOs</p> <p>This map is confusing as it is the Adopted Policies map from the City Plan. Suggest deleting. Title of map says Settlement Area and the map doesn't show this, it shows the built up area boundary. Not sure what a Settlement Area is.</p> <p>Figure 13 Suggest amending text "The total number of HMOs in the Neighbourhood Area is more than the average number of HMOs in all other City wards. Consequently, Policy H1 has been developed with advice from our consultants."</p> <p>Seems misplaced in this section – suggest deleting or moving elsewhere?</p> <p>The main potential for additional development within Coldean itself is infill sites, for example those areas currently occupied by lock-up garages, ie</p>	<p>Retained as the Council amended it before at Reg 14 stage.</p> <p>Title of Map changed. Settlement Area is the description from our adviser PMR</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Retained last phrase</p> <p>Retained</p> <p>Deleted</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Para 58		<p>Rusper Road and behind the Park Road shops, also in Hawkhurst Road. Developing these areas with additional housing may also be considered to be a way of improving detrimental sites within Coldean. The topography of the area may adversely affect the financial feasibility of constructing buildings in the already built</p> <p>As per Regulation 14 comments – unsure what Settlement Boundary means – we do not refer to this at all in our City Plan. Suggest removing and amending this paragraph and joining together the paras as below;</p> <p>We attach the Map of the Built Up Area and Settlement Boundary for Brighton & Hove with an inset for the Coldean Area. We do not expect the Council to amend the Settlement planning boundary during the Neighbourhood Plan period. <u>The Neighbourhood Plan supports the</u> The main Development Policy for the settlement of Coldean is to demolition, sh and rebuilding, or refurbishment and improvement, <u>of</u> existing dwellings and housing stock, as the topography of the neighbourhood provides a natural curb on building. New dwellings will only be built in <u>on</u> infill sites or where it improves detrimental sites. We do not forecast much population growth in the area during the Plan period.</p> <p>As per Regulation 14 comments, it is unclear why this policy is needed as we already have City Plan Part Two policy DM7 and City Plan Part One policy CP21. Over complicated for the assessment of planning applications.</p> <p>Criteria b) How would an unacceptable impact be measured? Criteria e) already reflected in City Plan policies – not required.</p>	Deleted
		Para 59		<p>Retained. It is clear what it means. As it restates existing policies it should be fine to keep it in.</p> <p>We prefer to say it in the Plan.</p>

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Page 25	Policy H2 New Developments within Settlement Boundary	Section text seems to merge in with section text for H1 – could do with being separated out to be clearer which policy it relates to.	It can be separated later in the final layout.
		Para 60	Para 60 needs rewording and justifying. The first sentence is set within supporting text; however, it is phrased like policy text. There is no definition of what an infill site or a detrimental site is. It is unclear what the justification is for stating “New dwellings will only be built in infill sites or where it improves detrimental sites”, A text amendment or a source is also required for “We do not forecast much population growth in the area during the Plan period”	Reworded
		Policy H2	Only criterion (a) of policy H2 relating to the Coldean Design Guidance and Codes adds anything further than that already in the City Plan. All other points duplicate existing city plan policies. Criteria H2 (e) seems to require all applications for new dwellings from one new dwelling upwards to demonstrate that there is sufficient infrastructure. Provision of Infrastructure to meet the needs of new dwellings is already required through the Community Infrastructure Levy. There are no required studies or documents specified in this plan for applicants to provide, and no justification for why these studies or documents may be required. Therefore the following text should be deleted: Demonstrate that adequate infrastructure (e.g. transport, drainage, schools, health services) is available or can be provided to support the development.	ONS figures referenced. Retained

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Page 25	Policy H2 Policy H2	<p>The NP could strengthen this policy by setting clear thresholds for when community engagement is required, rather than relying on the general statement that <i>“development proposals that meet these criteria and demonstrate early community engagement will be considered favourably.”</i></p> <p>While the Plan encourages developer consultation, it should be more explicit about the scale and type of development that triggers this requirement. The policy could specify that community engagement is expected for residential schemes of more than 10 dwellings, or for all non-residential developments, and outline a suggested engagement process to ensure meaningful and consistent dialogue with the community.</p>	<p>Developments of over 10 dwellings referenced</p> <p>Developments of over 10 dwellings referenced</p>
<u>4.4 Homes for Older People</u>	Page 26	General Comment	<p>As per Regulation 14 comments, parts of this seem to be read like a policy. The text is not set out like the other policies in the plan? Should para 63 be the policy? Is this all supporting text for Policy H2? Unclear. Comment from CNPF seems to be that it is intended to be set out this way but this is confusing and unclear. Microsoft Word - Coldean NP Reg 14 officer comments final.docx</p> <p>Most specialist accommodation for seniors in Coldean is currently provided by the council at social rents, and the figures above suggest there is a gap in the market for older people’s accommodation for people who do not qualify for social rented provision. Coldean is considered a suitable location for specialist housing for older people and partnering with specialist developers is recommended to introduce more housing options for older individuals,</p>	<p>This section was substantially amended by the Council at Reg 14 stage. We shall keep it as is.</p> <p>Coldean is very hilly.</p>

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

		<p>including more care-intensive independent housing solutions to meet the needs of an aging population.</p> <p>No reference to CPP2 policy DM4 Housing and Accommodation for Older Persons. Duplication of policy? Again, there are lots of statistics in the text.</p> <p>Suggest reworking as follows: “There were 470 people aged 60 or over in the 2011 Census and 507 in the 2021 Census living in Coldean, an increase of 37 people. There are currently 54 units of specialist accommodation for older people in Coldean identified in the ONS study and the demographic shift towards an older population during the Plan period prompts the need for more housing that meets the needs of older people. This is a nationwide issue as well as an issue in Coldean.”</p> <p>Delete as information moved to suggested text for para 61</p> <p>See general comment above which refers to paragraph 63. This paragraph is worded like a policy but a policy that does not address the full range of issues identified in this chapter</p> <p>Para 61</p> <p>Para 62</p> <p>Para 63</p> <p>Add suggested text for clarity: ‘Estimating the future need for specialist housing involves population projections, ...result in a range of <i>upwards</i> of 11-20 units required by 2030 and 20-36 by 2037.’</p> <p>Add suggested text for clarity:</p>	<p>Many of the statistics were provided by the Council before.</p> <p>Inserted.</p> <p>It is not a Policy. We didn’t think this needed a Policy.</p> <p>Added</p>
--	--	---	---

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

		Para 64	'The breakdown of care and tenure within specialist housing shows the greatest need (67-70%) for market specialist housing, with extra care and sheltered housing <i>showing much lower but similar levels of demand.</i> '	Amended
		Para 65	Add suggested text for clarity: <i>'Making new housing more accessible and adaptable can also help meet some of the needs of an aging population.</i> The adopted BHCC Plan Part Two policy DM1 Housing Quality, Choice and Mix sets targets for new housing to meet national standards for accessibility and adaptability, ensuring that 10% of affordable homes and 5% of market homes on sites with 10+ dwellings are suitable for mobility or wheelchair standard units (Category M4(3)).'	Added
		Para 66		
<u>05 Coldean Open Spaces</u> <u>Page 28-37</u>		General comments on this section	Para 67 first sentence needs rephrasing to be clear. Suggested changes below; "In November 2022, the Coldean Neighbourhood Plan Forum conducted a Community Consultation with two events .,the Vision meetings, where t The community expressed a strong interest in preserving open and green spaces. The natural environment was a top priority, with 26% of participants ranking it highly. In response, the Forum prepared an Open Spaces document to identify and protect Local Green Spaces and Local Community Spaces for the Coldean community, aligning with the Neighbourhood Plan's planning policies."	We left the Reference to Visions meetings in as they are a key initial part of the Neighbourhood Planning Process
	Page 28	Policy LGS1 – Local Green Space	Para 70 states that spaces which don't meet the criteria for Local Green Space can be designated as Local Community Spaces. There is no known planning designation for "Local Community Spaces" and it is questioned whether this is a valid designation.	There is a designation for Local Community space as advised by our professional advisers at the time. Hence there is a definitions box and we have used that designation. Although it is not a Planning designation it is understood. It has been there throughout.

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
		Designations	Para 71 goes on to describe the methodology for designating these spaces. It is not clear whether this is referring to the Local Green Space or Local Community Facilities. If this is referring to Local Community Facilities, is this a recognised methodology? Para 75 amend as follows: This aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan is in conformity with national policy, in general conformity with Brighton <u>& Hove</u> City Council's development plan...	This table has been there throughout and was composed by our advisers. It assesses Local Green Spaces and Local Community Spaces, consistent with the designations defined. Amended

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Page 29	<p>Para 76 states “the open space designations that are considered in this section of the Plan are:” Local Community Facilities then follow some of which are not technically open spaces. This is confusing. Suggest amending as follows:</p> <p>76 The open spaces designations that are considered in this section of the Plan are:</p>	<p>We have retained these paras as is, People understand them and they have been there from the beginning.</p>
	Page 30 and 35	<p>Para 77, 78 and 80: Suggested to move all the background information and Figure 15: “Summary of Open Space analysis grid” to an Appendix which can be referred to from the policy.</p> <p>Para 79: NPPF is not legislation. Suggest amending as follows: The policy is to protect Open Spaces from further development by classifying them under this Neighbourhood Plan as by <u>designating them as</u> Local Green Space <u>in accordance with the</u> under the NPPF. Legislation</p>	<p>NPPF guidance has been used instead. Reworded.</p>

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Page 35	Policy LGS1 – Local Green Space Designations	<p>As not all sites fall within the City Plan area suggest amending text as follows. A bullet point list is also suggested to aid the reader.</p> <p>Sites OS1 (The Park), OS2 (Coldean Woods Open Space), OS6 (The Roundway), OS12 (Coldean Lane South Verge), OS22 (Haig Avenue Open Space), OS25 (Wolseley Road Open Space and Play Area), OS41 (Coldean Lane South Verge No. 29 to Forest Road Junction) and OS42 (Beatty Avenue Shopping Parade) are designated as Local Green Spaces in this Plan in accordance with the NPPF1 and City Plan Part One DM38.</p> <p>Suggest deleting unnecessary text as follows: Only sites OS1 (The Park) and OS2 (Coldean Woods Open Space) fall in the South Down National Park Area and are subject to their local plan.</p> <p>Whilst the NPPF gives very strong protections to Local Green Space, development is allowed in “exceptional circumstances” as set out in the NPPF. The following amendment is therefore suggested to ensure conformity with the NPPF:</p> <p>Developments proposed on the designated local green spaces will <u>only be permitted in exceptional circumstances in accordance with the NPPF.</u> not be supported other than eEnhancements to improve the biodiversity <u>will be supported.</u></p> <p>Evidence is required that all landowners of the proposed Local Green Spaces have been contacted and informed of the proposed designations.</p>	<p>Amended</p> <p>Keep as SDNPA asked us to add this in!</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>As the Council owns all these spaces we had written to you before to ask whether we needed to write and if so to which department! A few years back, after Reg 14.</p>
--	---------	--	---	---

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPf Action
	Page 36	Policy LCS1 – Local Community Spaces	<p>As per Reg 14 comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If justified to retain local community spaces, have landowners been contacted re proposed allocation of these sites/uses? Evidence of this would be required for examination. • If justified to retain local community spaces, inset Maps should be provided in the plan otherwise no one is aware of their boundaries. • No policy text to accompany sites listed. • Query whether these can actually be designated? • Policy LCS1 should follow the supporting text (section 5.3 paragraph 81) for this policy in the same column to follow 	<p>See comment above</p> <p>We do have maps of these spaces, as prepared by the Council Cartographer, in the Evidence section of the Website. Perhaps its better to refer to that information being there, in the text.</p> <p>Yes, our adviser suggested it.</p>

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

			the layout of the Plan. Policy LCS1 currently reads as though it is linked to section 5.4.	We can reposition the Policy in the final document, its not a large green box.
	Pages 31-34	Policy LGS1	Policy LGS1 - Local Green Space Designations are designated in this NP in accordance with the NPPF. Suggest these areas are supported with a clear statement of local specialness (e.g. historic, recreational or wildlife characteristics) with photographs, local resident statements and evidence of landowner consultation	This was not required before. The analysis/rationale for the designation of each Green space is in the Evidence documents on the CNPF website.
<u>5.4 Local Community Facilities (LCF)</u>	36		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear whether the landowners for these sites have been contacted? • No maps showing extent of areas defined • Some mismatch between text in para 83 and list of sites i.e. refers to a chemist which we suggested at reg 14 was removed but is still commented on in this version of the plan. • No policy text and no policy number • Query whether these can all be designated as a local community facility, in particular infrastructure such as “steps”, “access routes” and “bridges”, as well as open spaces. • Text at end of long list of sites says the sites will be retained for their community use until approved evidence shows they are no longer 	<p>We understand that the Council owns all these sites or properties as Coldean was part of the Stanmer Estate gifted to the Council. There was no mapping done of these Facilities</p> <p>We were told to exclude the chemist before? In the list. It’s a descriptor in that sentence only.</p> <p>Not needed. No policy here, it’s not Planning, as you were mentioning.</p> <p>Our adviser advised us to list them here so the Community is aware. They all feature a special facility or benefit to the Community..</p>

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

			<p>needed etc. The plumbers shop is class E use class and can change with E use class without planning permission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paragraph at the end of the list of “local community facilities needs a paragraph number. • In relation to this paragraph, no explanation is provided which sets out the type of evidence that would be required to demonstrate the sites are no longer needed. • Loss of open space would also need to meet the requirements of City Plan Part 1 policy CP16 Open Space which should be referred to here. • This paragraph at the end of the long list of sites also refers to “very special circumstances set out in the NPPF”. However Very Special Circumstances only apply to land designated as Local Green Space and is not relevant to local community facilities. Suggest deletion. 	<p>The Shop would be retained, it can change use.</p> <p>Will fix paragraph numbers later</p> <p>This is an unrealistic request?! It will depend at the time.</p> <p>We had been asked not to keep listing CityPlan policies before, we can do so here if really needed.</p> <p>That is what we are referring to, as no other Spaces have protections.</p> <p>Not deleted, as you suggested.</p>
<u>06 Anti-Social Behaviour</u>	Page 38-39	General comments on this section	<p>Para 85 implies all HMO occupants act antisocially, which is inaccurate and should be deleted.</p> <p>Parts of para 86, 87, 88 and 89 are matters outside of planning and should be deleted.</p>	<p>We disagree this is the implication. Nevertheless, it has been slightly reworded..</p> <p>This should have been requested before. We have left these paras in.</p>
		Para 90	<p>The police are not a statutory consultee for all planning applications. This statement is incorrect and should be removed.</p>	<p>Slightly reworded. In practice we understand that the Police do monitor all Planning applications, as CNPF does for the Coldean Neighbourhood Area.</p>
	Page 39	Policy C1 – Designing out Crime	<p>Policy C1.</p> <p>Requiring this for all developments seems excessive.</p>	<p>Its either applicable to none, or all, developments, to be fair. Crime is increasing in Coldean because of new developments.</p>

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
<u>07 Traffic and Travel</u>	Page 40-45	General comments on this section	<p>It would be better to set out this section with supporting text to provide the reasoned justification for each policy, rather than a series of policies presented together with no specific explanation.</p>	<p>This was the layout before. Hence we have not changed this.</p>
	Page 43	Policy T1 – Increasing Sustainable Transport	<p>Policy heading would benefit from adding the word accessible.</p>	<p>We have added Accessible in other relevant Traffic Policies as requested before. Not changed</p>

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Page 43	Policy T2 – Through Traffic	<p>The need and/or focus/wording of this policy and what it is seeking to achieve should be reviewed. This is because it is difficult to justify a policy related to through/external traffic, as existing or new development will either be a trip origin or destination within the local area.</p> <p>Traffic signage is not a planning issue and traffic management measures generally do not require planning permissions</p> <p>It is difficult to understand how this policy can be used to assess a planning application.</p>	There is a lot of through traffic which stops in Coldean for shops etc. Traffic signage is important, as we have seen with the Denman Place development. It affects through traffic. We are happy to discuss how this can be improved. There should be a suitable Policy to cover this.
	Page 43	Policy T3 – Car and Cycle Parking	<p>Criterion (a) – unnecessary as this can be implemented by the Council without the need for a planning application.</p> <p>Criterion (b) - It is unclear whether off-street parking means a car park or parking that is part of a development. The latter would be considered against BHCC standards within policy DM36.</p> <p>Furthermore, an off-street parking space often means a dropped kerb and a loss of an on-street parking space.</p>	This Policy has been reworded by the Council before. Off street parking does not mean a car park, except in the case of Denman Place. We can discuss this Policy.

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
			<p>Criterion (a) and (b) - should both add the words 'that include' : 'Proposals 'that include' for' the...</p> <p>Permitted Development rights already allow for hardstanding of front gardens</p> <p>Criterion (c) – a policy cannot be used to state what does or does not need planning permission</p>	<p>Agreed. To amend.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>To amend.</p>
	Page 44	Policy T4 – Accessibility for all	(b) asking major applications to demonstrate inclusive design with reference to all of i)-v) is onerous	It is necessary for a major development. Car parking at Denman Place has already divided the community.

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Page 45	Policy T5 – Accessible Developments	<p>Requirement for “safe cycle and pedestrian connections” duplicates CPP2 DM33</p> <p>Priorities for cycling and walking are set out in the council’s Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan [LCWIP], and any routes will be expected to reflect these priorities. https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/lcwip The LCWIP includes references to Coldean and Coldean Lane.</p> <p>The policy needs to be more specific about the size and type of development it refers to. For example, does a new householder extension have to provide safe cycle and pedestrian connections; or should this requirement be upwards of certain number of dwellings? Unclear</p>	No changes made here, as we had already reworded it to include the Council comments before.
	Page 45	Policy T6 – Provision of	Unclear what this adds to existing City Plan Policy.	No changes made here, as we had already reworded it to include the Council comments before.

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
		Cycle /Walkways	As above, priorities for cycling and walking are set out in the council’s Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan [LCWIP]	
<u>08 Building & Design</u>	Page 46-47	General comments on this section	<p>NPPF paragraphs 134 and 133 highlight the importance of establishing clear connections between design policies and their supporting documents. ‘Design guidance and codes’ is the title of the document AECOM prepared. The following amendment is therefore recommended to paragraph 131:</p> <p>A Design Guide and Code, ‘Design Guidance and Codes’, has been prepared for Coldean Neighbourhood Area. by AECOM, our Technical Resource consultants. The link to this document is found at Appendix 3. It was subject to a Consultation with Forum Members and the public in the period from November 2023 to January 2024.</p>	Amended
	Page 46	Policy DC1 – Design Guide	<p>Suggest that the policy text should refer to BHCC’s SPD No. 17 Urban Design Framework (June 2021) as well as the SDNPA’s SPD ‘Adopted Design Guide (July 2022) as well as the Forum’s own design guide in Appendix 3.</p> <p>Policy should refer to the Neighbourhood Area boundary rather than the ‘settlement boundary’ as it is unclear what this is.</p>	<p>Previously we were being told not to include BHCC policy numbers. To discuss the wording of this Policy at our TEAMS meeting</p> <p>Neighbourhood Area has been used.</p>
	Page 46	Policy DC1 – Design Guide	<p>Suggestion to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments are encouraged to submit a Design Code compliance table or checklist 	Included in the Policy

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

<u>09 Environmental Policies</u>	Page 48-53	General comments on this section	Para 132: Delete references to dates of NPPF so that plan does not go out of date. Delete reference to “government guidance” as Environment Act is legislation not guidance. Suggested amendments as follows:	Amended in text.
----------------------------------	------------	----------------------------------	---	------------------

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
			<p>Government guidance includes the <u>The Environment Act and the National Planning Policy Framework, amended in December 2023 and 2024, which</u> emphasise sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Para 133 suggest footnoting ELMS.</p> <p>Para 133 3rd sentence: add as follows ...the South Downs National <u>Park</u> Authority...</p> <p>Para 133 2nd sentence needs amending as it is rather long</p> <p>We <u>wish to acknowledge</u> are also grateful for the Biological Survey and <u>land</u> assessment <u>conducted by a specialist of land</u> at Varley Park prepared by an expert in 2018, and published in January 2020, before prior to the formation of the Forum. <u>The report was provided formed, and which was passed</u> to the Forum by Coldean Community Organisation <u>and has played an important role in shaping several</u> which has informed some of the policies proposed outlined in this Plan.</p> <p>Para 134 – footnote Magic Maps link rather than in text. Para 135 footnote the Sussex Nature Recovery Strategy</p> <p>Para 136 – amend as follows to clarify that chalk grassland is also an ecological asset to avoid any confusion with heritage assets which are concerned with built heritage: Coldean’s heritage is not overlooked, with plans to continue to engage local experts and protect historical <u>ecological</u> assets such as ancient chalk grassland.</p>	<p>Amended</p> <p>If practical in the final layout.</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>If practical in the final layout.</p> <p>Amended</p>

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

		<p>Para 137 Ensure consistent wording with para 135. Is it a Nature Recovery Plan or a Nature Recovery Strategy?</p> <p>Para 137 Footnote link the Nature Recovery Plan by CCOrg</p> <p>Para 137 footnote the Stanmer-Coldean Community Land trust Project</p> <p>Para 139. Suggest deleting. Unnecessary repetition relating to a previous section of the Plan.</p> <p>Para 140 page 49 – footnote link to South Downs Way Nature Improvement Area.</p> <p>Para 145 needs rewording – complicated to read. Suggest removing the following sentence: ‘If for some reason the Part one LGS designations in Section 4 of this Plan are ignored These policies require..’ Ensure correct reference to Brighton & Hove <u>City</u> Council...</p> <p>Para 146 – suggest removing this paragraph. This seems irrelevant to this section and the only purpose is to state the Forum would argue against development in certain locations. This does not need stating in a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>“Environmental Policies Overview” box This needs to come before policy E1 and may be better placed at the very start of section 9.1 under “overview”.</p>	<p>Amended. Strategy.</p> <p>If practical in the final layout.</p> <p>If practical in the final layout.</p> <p>Deleted</p> <p>If practical in the final layout.</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Retained para. We think this is very important to state, for clarity.</p> <p>Box deleted. This text moved to Overview at the beginning of this Section, in 9.1</p>
--	--	---	--

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
	Page 50	Policy E1 – Settlement Containment	<p>The policy lacks the clarity needed to enable implementation.</p> <p>The text “Proposals for development within this area of countryside” is unclear as the area of countryside is not clearly defined spatially on any map.</p>	<p>Our adviser has redrafted all 5 Environmental policies, with headings, in the light of your comments. Please see revised texts. Settlement containment is important, to stop development taking over everything. There is a settlement map! It’s the Council’s ‘built up area’ map.</p>

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

		<p>It is noted in The background paper CNPF Environmental Policies it suggests that <i>'Settlement Containment Proposals for development of and to the North of Coldean, more specifically proposals for development of land around Varley Halls - outside of the built up area boundary as identified on the proposals map, will not be supported'</i> – it should be clarified if this is the area that the policy applies to. In relation to the urban fringe land between the built-up area boundary and the A27 within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Policy E1 needs to acknowledge City Plan Part 1 Policy SA4 Urban Fringe and outstanding site allocation in City Plan Part 2 Policy H2. As currently written may not fully comply with SA4 and H2.</p> <p>If this relates to land within the National Park, the policy will need to be in conformity with the South Downs Local Plan and City Plan Policy SA5.</p> <p>E1a) Unclear how the 'undeveloped feel' of the land can be retained with development coming forward. How would 'not be compromised' be assessed in terms of loss of open space?</p> <p>Query reference in E1(b) refers to "settlements" in plural. Is this referring to another settlement or is this a typo?</p> <p>E1c) refers only to not harming the 'landscape setting of the settlement', not to protecting landscape (or countryside) for its own value.</p>	<p>SDNPA had previously been asked to comment but no response on this received. They are invited to look at the revised policy wording now.</p> <p>See new Environmental policy wordings</p> <p>See new Environmental policy wordings</p> <p>See new Environmental policy wordings</p>
--	--	---	--

Section of Plan	Page/ Parag raph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	------------------------	----------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Page 50	Policy E2 – Protecting Valued Views	<p>Currently, Policy E2 is not precise enough to be used by Development Management case officers to determine planning applications.</p> <p>Therefore, as per BHCC Regulation 14 comments:</p> <p>The policy lacks the clarity needed to enable implementation. CPP1 Policy CP12 Urban Design, SPD17 Urban Design Framework and the Urban Characterisation Study identify key ‘strategic’ and ‘local’ views to aid the assessment of design proposals, in particular tall buildings. Strategic views are generally distant views from elevated locations, including some from the SDNP, and local views are used for wayfinding and as route markers. What are ‘valued’ views and how do they differ from the ‘strategic’ and ‘local’ views established in the UDF SPD? How have ‘publicly valued’ views been established and evidenced? Where are they located? What types of proposals would this policy apply to? These will need to be described in the policy and set out in on the NP policies map or appendix to the plan.</p> <p>It is questioned why only publicly valued views from designated LGS are identified for protection. What about views from other locations?</p>	See new E2 policy wordings from our adviser
	Page 51	Policy E3 – Protecting Allotments	<p>Policy E3 is not in is not in conformity with City Plan Part 1 policy CP16. This policy seeks to retain and seek better use of all existing open space including allotments and sets out exception criteria where loss is accepted.</p> <p>Legal</p>	See new E3 policy wording from our adviser

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

			<p>protection is afforded to statutory allotment sites and applies to Coldean Lane and Charlton Allotments; these allotments are well used with a waiting list.</p> <p>E3(b) allows loss if the allotment is in a “dilapidated” condition. There is no explanation of what constitutes a “dilapidated condition”. It is argued that most allotments, even if not in use, can be brought back into productive use even if they appear “dilapidated”. Does not accord with the statutory criteria for disposal of allotments. Suggest deletion.</p> <p>Point (c) repeats policy CP16.1(b) and is therefore unnecessarily repeating City Plan policy. Suggest deletion.</p> <p>If retained, the policy should reference policy CP16 to clarify the criteria are in addition to CP16. Suggested amendments as follows:</p> <p><u>In addition to criteria of City Plan Part One policy CP16</u>, proposals that result in harm or loss of allotments to <u>in</u> Coldean will not normally be permitted unless:</p> <p>a) Replacement provision be made, of at least equivalent <u>quantity and</u> quality, where it would be located at reasonable convenience for the existing plot holders. <u>or;</u></p> <p>(b) They are in a dilapidated condition without the potential for improvement.</p> <p>(c) The loss is necessary to bring about significant and demonstrable long term enhancements to Coldean’s open spaces as a whole.</p>	
	Page 51	Policy E4 – Adapting to	This policy largely duplicates the requirements set out in City Plan Part One policy CP8 Sustainable Buildings, and City Plan Part Two Policies DM43 Sustainable Drainage and DM44 Energy Efficiency and Renewables which	See new E 4 Policy wording from our adviser but we have retained wordings at E4 (d) and (e) suggested by Southern Water, and voted on /approved by Forum members in an Open Meeting

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

		Climate Change	<p>require accordance with Future Homes Standard and Future Building Standards set out in Part L as a minimum and opportunities for new development to achieve greater reductions in CO2 emissions through the use of passive design, fabric standards, energy efficiency measures and low and zero carbon technologies will be encouraged in housing allocations in the urban fringe.</p> <p>It should be clarified what extra criteria or requirement is added by Policy E4 when compared with the current relevant policies in CPP1 and CPP2</p> <p>E4 also seeks as in addition or as an alternative the adoption of Passivhaus design principles. It is recognized that this would enable new homes to be optimized for Net Zero and whilst this might be encouraged it could not be required as this would go beyond the City Plan Policies CP8 and DM44 and would need to address the December 2023 Written Ministerial Statement. How would compliance be assessed -through certification/ self-declaration?</p> <p>In terms of wording, the first sentence of the policy could be re-worded:</p> <p>All new development proposals within Coldean should seek to <u>are encouraged to meet a</u> high standards of sustainable development by improving upon the minimum standards outlined in Approved Documents Part F, Part L and Part O of the Building Regulations and/or adopt Passivhaus design principles, ...'</p> <p>E4(d) correct reference to City Plan policy: '...should also comply with City Plan Policy DM43 and Brighton & Hove City Council's Sustainable Drainage SPD.'</p>	
--	--	----------------	---	--

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

			<p>E4(e) suggest deletion of this criteria as standards for water consumption of new homes are set out in CP8 and Policy DM42 Protecting the Water Environment addresses these issues.</p> <p>Suggest amending title of policy to 'Mitigating and adapting to climate change'</p> <p>Relevant minimum standards are expected to also include the Future Homes Standard (expected 2025).</p> <p>E4(a) suggest adding "Avoid, or reduce the use of fossil fuels"</p>	<p>Southern Water wording at E4 (e)retained. The reference at E4(d) to be amended.</p> <p>To discuss at our TEAMS meeting.</p>
Page 52	Policy E5 - Biodiversity	<p>Point (a) includes a reference to "Schedule 7A of Town and County Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act)". This schedule refers to securing mandatory BNG which differs somewhat to the E5 policy requirements. The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, and Wildlife and Countryside Act would also be of relevance. However it is not considered necessary to refer to names of legislation in policy. Suggest deletion of this part of the sentence.</p> <p>Point (a) suggest also referring to "habitats" as follows: ...including the preservation of rare, protected, priority or notable habitats and species...</p> <p>Some of the policy requirements appear more like aspirations or projects than policy requirements and it is unlikely these will be directly applicable to development (e.g. point (b) and point (c)). Suggest deletion.</p>	<p>See new E5 policy wording suggested by our adviser. Policy E5 (e) wording from Southern Water, and voted on /approved by Forum members in an Open Meeting, retained.</p>	

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
			<p>Point (c) - CPP2 DM37 already requires the control and eradication of invasive non-native species. May be unnecessary repetition. Suggest deletion.</p> <p>Point (e) - possible typo "... preservation of pollution..." Should this be "...prevention of pollution..." ?</p> <p>Point (e) is the final part of (e) relevance to the Neighbourhood Plan as there are no rivers or streams locally? "...and the preservation of watercourses crucial for the ecosystem" In relation to water resource and quality this would duplicate CPP2 Policy DM42 Protecting the Water Environment. Suggest deleting.</p>	<p>There are aquifers! And underground water movement. Very vital on chalk downlands.</p>

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Page 52		<p>Paragraph 147 – add footnote to Biological Survey – delete text from main paragraph</p> <p>Paragraph 148 – suggest amending last sentence to improve grammar as follows:</p> <p>There were also found three England Red Listed plant species. Three England Red Listed species were found.</p> <p>This sentence would be better placed at the start of paragraph 149 which refers to the findings of the survey.</p>	<p>To add footnote in final layout</p> <p>Amended</p>
	Page 52	Policy E5	<p>The policy could be strengthened by explicitly requiring all new developments to demonstrate a measurable net gain, in line with national policy.</p> <p>This policy could be made stronger as well as clearer and more explicit just by referring to BNG rather than the legislation.</p>	<p>See new E 5 Policy wording from our adviser but we have retained wordings at E5 (e) suggested by Southern Water, and voted on /approved by Forum members in an Open Meeting</p>

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
			<p>a) Implements measures to protect and enhance the diversity of plant and animal species, including the preservation of rare, protected, priority or notable species through habitat restoration and conservation, providing Biodiversity Net Gain where required. in line with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021).</p>	
	Page 53		<p>Para 151 refers to chalk downlands being additionally preserved and protected. However this isn't referred to directly in any policy.</p> <p>Para 152 – put link to BHCC's Carbon Neutral 20230 Plan in footnote Para 153 – put link to Brighton & Hove Tree Planting Plan in footnote.</p>	<p>It is, in effect in E5.</p> <p>To include footnote in layout if practical</p> <p>To include footnote in layout if practical</p>
<u>10 Aspirations – Coldean Masterplan / Neighbourhood Improvements</u>	Page 54			

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

<u>11 Glossary, Acronyms and Acknowledgments</u>	Page 56		Remove all words not referred to in the actual plan as follows: Community Infrastructure Levy Compulsory Purchase Order Conditions (or planning condition) Contaminated Land Detailed Planning Application/Permission Enforcement Action Full Application General Permitted Development Order	Removed from Glossary, although why were these not all deleted before? They have been in every draft. Retained :- Detailed Planning Application Permission, Enforcement Action, Local Transport Plan, Planning Gain, Public Right of Way, Section 106 Agreement, Travel Plans, Tree Preservation Order, Unauthorised Development, Wildlife Corridor,
--	---------	--	---	---

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
			Habitable Rooms Home Zone Housing Corporation Infrastructure Landscape Appraisal Layout Local Strategic Partnership Local Transport Plan Outline Application Planning Condition Planning Gain Public Realm Public Right of Way Regeneration Section 106 Agreement Site of Special Scientific Interest Special Needs Housing Statutory Undertakers/Statutory Utilities Townscape / Cityscape Transport Assessment Travel Plans Tree Preservation Order Unauthorised Development Wildlife Corridor	See notes above

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
-----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	-------------

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

		Amend description for Ancient Chalk Grassland as this just describes a particular site.	Amended
		“Amend Change of Use Description to refer to the correct legislation “Town & Country Planning (use classes) (amended) (England) Regulations 2020”	Amended
		Amend description for Greenfield land – take out “ often used for farming ”	Amended
		Amend Use Classes Order – regulation title	Amended
		Amend title for windfall / infill site to just refer to infill and amend description to as follows....	Amended
		Amend title of Zero-carbon home to just say Zero Carbon	Amended
		Amend list of Acronyms to reflect words used in the plan.	Amended
		Suggest deleting the following:	Why not suggested before?
		AAP CH CS GDPO ICO LDF LDS LTP LSP	Deleted except

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
			SA SCI SEA SPG TCPA is two acronyms – Town & Country Planning Act and Town & Country Planning Association	Both referenced now
<u>12 Policy Monitoring</u>	Page 63		This section needs more explanation about how often policies will be monitored etc. not just a table. What will happen if policies are not effective? Explanation about timescales for a plan review would be helpful.	Heading elaborated. This matrix suggested by the Mock Independent Examiner so we included this page and prefer to retain it.
<u>Design Guidance and Code</u>		General Note	The Design Code should form a central tool for guiding and delivering new development within the Neighbourhood Plan Area.	Agreed

Appendix 1 Coldean Neighbourhood Forum Response to BHCC Reg 16 Comments with Action Column (prepared by Coldean Neighbourhood Forum)

	Page 46		<p>4.1 Checklist and Delivery:</p> <p>The current checklist could be reformatted to be more practical and user-friendly for all stakeholders, especially applicants and planning officers. Currently, it comprises a series of questions for applicants to answer; however, a standardised format should be introduced with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dedicated space alongside each question for responses and supporting evidence, and • a clear reference to the relevant design code section or principle. 	<p>This is an AECOM document we are not sure if this can be changed. The Council had reviewed this document before but not requested these changes.</p>
--	---------	--	---	---

Section of Plan	Page/ Paragraph	Policy Name	Officer Comments	CNPF Action
			<p>This would allow the checklist to ensure applicants demonstrate how proposals address the intent and requirements of both the Neighbourhood Plan and the Design Code.</p> <p>The checklist should be used throughout the design and planning process, from pre-application discussions through to submission and determination and revisited at key design stages to confirm that the evolving proposals have considered the design guidance</p>	<p>This is an AECOM document we are not sure if this can be changed. The Council had reviewed this document before but not requested these changes.</p>