

## Appendix 2

### Brighton and Hove Local Plan – National Planning Policy Framework compatibility assessment

On 27th March 2012 the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The City Council has reviewed the 'saved' Brighton and Hove Local Plan policies to determine whether they are consistent with the NPPF. The tables below summarise the consistency of the policies and indicate how the City Council will use them in determining planning applications.

The table is colour coded, with green indicating full or partial consistency, black showing a neutral impact or indicating policies that have not been assessed and red showing policies that are not consistent. Where policies may not be fully consistent, a brief explanation of the City Council's views is included.

Nine Local Plan policies were not saved by the Secretary of State in 2008. In addition, four policies relate to site specific development that has been completed. These policies have not been assessed for consistency with the NPPF.

#### Chapter 1 – Making the connection between land use and transport

Local Plan Policy	Policy title	Consistency with the NPPF
TR1	Development and the demand for travel	<b>Fully consistent</b>
TR2	Public transport accessibility and parking	<b>Partially consistent</b> – The supporting text refers to a supplementary planning document identifying the accessibility of different parts of the city. This has not been produced and, in its absence, limited weight may be given to the policy. That said, in principle, the issues raised in the policy do not conflict with the NPPF.
TR3	Development in areas of low public transport accessibility	<b>Partially consistent</b> – The policy seeks to positively address

		sustainable transport on less accessible sites. Whilst this accords with the NPPF, the lack of an assessment of overall accessibility assessment presents some difficulties in implementation. In principle, there is no conflict with the NPPF, but limited weight may be accorded to the policy given the lack of supporting evidence.
<b>TR4</b>	Travel Plans	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR5</b>	Sustainable transport corridors and bus priority routes	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR6</b>	Park and Ride	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR7</b>	Safe development	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR8</b>	Pedestrian routes	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR9</b>	Pedestrian priority routes	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR10</b>	Traffic calming	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR11</b>	Safe routes to school and school safety zones	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR12</b>	Helping the independent movement of children	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR13</b>	Pedestrian network	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR14</b>	Cycle access and parking	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR15</b>	Cycle network	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR16</b>	Potential rail freight depot	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR17</b>	Shopmobility	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR18</b>	Parking for people with a mobility related disability	<b>Partially consistent</b> – The policy seeks to provide parking spaces for people with disabilities close to the access to a development. This accords fully with the NPPF. See TR19 for significant concerns about the wider parking standards. Parking provision for people with disabilities is less likely to be a problem in that respect since some provision would be sought regardless of accessibility.
<b>TR19</b>	Parking standards	<b>Partially consistent</b> – The adopted parking standards are dated and take limited account of accessibility. Availability of public transport options, local car ownership levels and consideration of high emission vehicles are not reflected in the policy or the parking standards. Paragraph 39 of the NPPF sets out factors for consideration in drafting parking standards.
<b>TR20</b>	Coach parking	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>TR21</b>	Long term coach and overnight lorry park	<b>Fully consistent</b>

## Chapter 2 – Energy, water, pollution and waste

Local Plan Policy	Policy title	Consistency with the NPPF
SU1	Environmental impact assessment	<b>Policy not saved</b>
SU2	Efficiency of development in the use of energy, water and materials	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SU3	Water resources and their quality	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The NPPF states that policies should avoid, as is already standard practice, duplication of other pollution control regimes.
SU4	Surface water run-off and flood risk	<b>Fully consistent</b> – The council produced a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in 2008. The NPPF states that policies should avoid, as is already standard practice, duplication of other pollution control regimes.
SU5	Surface water and foul sewage disposal infrastructure	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SU6	Coastal defences	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The NPPF focuses heavily on coastal change and its management. The council has a shoreline management plan setting out how coastal defences will be managed. Despite Brighton and Hove not having an adopted Coastal Change Management Plan, the policy generally accords with the NPPF.
SU7	Development within the coastal zone	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The council has no Coastal Change Management Plan, but the Coastal Zone is shown on the Local Plan Proposals Map. The issues raised by policy SU7 and the NPPF closely align and both address safety and adequacy of protection, design and character of the coast, sustainability and support public access to and along the coast.
SU8	Unstable land	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SU9	Pollution and nuisance control	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SU10	Noise nuisance	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SU11	Polluted land and buildings	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SU12	Hazardous substances	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The NPPF does not give specific

		guidance on storage/use of hazardous substances, but the issues of potential hazard or pollution are supported more generally. The NPPF states that policies should avoid, as is already standard practice, duplication of other pollution control regimes.
<b>SU13</b>	Minimisation and re-use of construction industry waste	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The NPPF contains little on waste. Policy SU13 is consistent with minimisation of waste and using resources effectively. For larger developments, the policy duplicates the Site Waste Management Plans Regulations 2008.
<b>SU14</b>	Waste management	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>SU15</b>	Infrastructure	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The NPPF supports the need to provide infrastructure in relation to new development where necessary. Policy SU15 requires the provision of services and/or infrastructure or a contribution towards them. A clear and up to date assessment of the city's infrastructure needs will support the policy.  Where seeking infrastructure as part of a development, regard should be had to NPPF guidance on conditions and obligations.
<b>SU16</b>	Production of renewable energy	<b>Fully consistent</b>

### **Chapter 3 – Design, safety and the quality of development**

<b>Local Plan Policy</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Consistency with the NPPF</b>
<b>QD1</b>	Design – quality of development and design statements	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD2</b>	Design – key principles for neighbourhoods	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy QD2 is wholly consistent with the NPPF philosophy of local neighbourhood planning and the need for development to respond to local character and identity. Paragraph 65 of the NPPF raises some inconsistency in supporting buildings of high design and sustainability standards, even where there are townscape conflicts.

<b>QD3</b>	Design – efficient and effective use of sites	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy QD3 and the NPPF seek to reuse derelict or vacant land or buildings and to achieve densities of development appropriate to the locality. Whilst supportive of increased densities, QD3, unlike the NPPF, does not express support for buildings of high design and sustainability standards, even where there are townscape conflicts.
<b>QD4</b>	Design – strategic impact	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy QD4 and the NPPF both seek high quality design that takes account of the wider context of development including townscape, landscape and historic context. Paragraph 65 of the NPPF raises some inconsistency in supporting buildings of high design and sustainability standards, even where there are townscape conflicts.
<b>QD5</b>	Design – street frontages	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD6</b>	Public art	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD7</b>	Crime prevention through environmental design	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD8</b>	Shop shutters	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD9</b>	Boarding up of flats, shops and business premises	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD10</b>	Shopfronts	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD11</b>	Blinds	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD12</b>	Advertisements and signs	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD13</b>	Advertisement hoardings	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Whilst the policy identifies key issues of amenity and public safety, the exclusion of specific areas, such as conservation areas, is less consistent with the NPPF.
<b>QD14</b>	Extensions and alterations	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD15</b>	Landscape design	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD16</b>	Trees and hedgerows	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD17</b>	Protection and integration of nature conservation features	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD18</b>	Species protection	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD19</b>	Greenways	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Greenways can be valuable in helping to create the 'ecological networks' sought by the NPPF, although the policy itself is not specific about this role.
<b>QD20</b>	Urban open space	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy will be supported by up to date information on current and future open space needs.
<b>QD21</b>	Allotments	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD22</b>	Satellite dish aerials	<b>Fully consistent</b>

<b>QD23</b>	Telecommunications apparatus (general)	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The NPPF states that local planning authorities should not question the need for the telecommunications system.
<b>QD24</b>	Telecommunications apparatus affecting important areas	<b>Not consistent</b> – Paragraph 44 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should not ban telecommunications development in certain areas. Whilst QD24 does not represent a complete ban in “important” areas, it may be perceived as going further than the NPPF. Elsewhere, the NPPF is generally protective of these “important areas” and, in practice, this conflict is unlikely to be significant.
<b>QD25</b>	External lighting	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD26</b>	Floodlighting	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD27</b>	Protection of amenity	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>QD28</b>	Planning obligations	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy QD28 identifies five tests for planning obligations in accordance with the now defunct Circular 05/2005. Two of these tests have been deleted by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and paragraph 204 of the NPPF. The policy lists clear aims for which obligations will be sought. The council has adopted temporary recession relief measures, showing flexibility in relation to changes in market conditions and enabling development to proceed.

#### **Chapter 4 – Access to a decent home and community facilities**

<b>Local Plan Policy</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Consistency with the NPPF</b>
<b>HO1</b>	Housing sites and mixed use sites with an element of housing	<p><b>Partially consistent</b> – Both Policy HO1 and the NPPF seek the provision of housing supply to meet the city's requirements over a five year period and beyond. The NPPF now requires additional 5% beyond an identified five year supply.</p> <p>In practice, given that HO1 is based on 2003 figures and a superseded housing target (HO1 was based on Structure Plan</p>

		target), it is likely to carry little weight with inspectors, who will be keen to see a current five year supply (plus 5%) demonstrated.
<b>HO2</b>	Affordable housing – ‘windfall sites’	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO3</b>	Dwelling type and size	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy will be supported by up to date information on current and future housing needs/demand.
<b>HO4</b>	Dwelling densities	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO5</b>	Provision of private amenity space in residential development	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO6</b>	Provision of outdoor recreation space in housing schemes	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy will be supported by up to date information on current and future open space needs.
<b>HO7</b>	Car free housing	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO8</b>	Retaining housing	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO9</b>	Residential conversions and the retention of smaller dwellings	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy HO9 demonstrates flexibility and supports efficient and effective use of existing sites and housing stock. The policy will be supported by up to date information on current and future needs for family housing and smaller, converted units.
<b>HO10</b>	Accommodation for homeless people	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy will be supported by up to date information on current and future housing needs/demand.
<b>HO11</b>	Residential care and nursing homes	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy will be supported by up to date information on current and future housing needs/demand.
<b>HO12</b>	Sheltered and managed housing for older people	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy HO12 supports provision of specialist housing for older people. The required proximity to amenities and transport accords with wider NPPF objectives. The policy will be supported by up to date information on current and future housing needs/demand.
<b>HO13</b>	Accessible housing and lifetime homes	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO14</b>	Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy will be supported by up to date information on current and future housing needs/demand.
<b>HO15</b>	Housing for people with special needs	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy will be supported by up to date information on current and future housing

		needs/demand.
<b>HO16</b>	Safeguarding existing Gypsy and/or Travellers Sites	<b>Fully consistent</b> – See also the Government's planning policy for traveller sites <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2113371.pdf">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2113371.pdf</a>
<b>HO17</b>	Sites for Gypsies and/or Travellers	<b>Partially consistent</b> – HO17 is broadly consistent but does not set out what the assessed requirement for sites over the plan period is.  The Government's planning policy for traveller sites and the NPPF require planning authorities to address local needs and plan positively to meet those needs over the plan period and this includes having a five year supply of sites to meet assessed needs. The policy will be supported by up-to-date information on local needs.
<b>HO18</b>	Sites for Travelling Showpeople	<b>Neutral</b> - There is no assessed need for Travelling Showpeople sites.
<b>HO19</b>	New community facilities	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO20</b>	Retention of community facilities	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO21</b>	Provision of community facilities in residential and mixed use schemes	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO22</b>	Community centre at Coldean	<b>Policy not saved</b>
<b>HO23</b>	Community centre in Woodingdean	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HO24</b>	Community centre at St Andrew's Church, Portslade	<b>Policy not saved</b>
<b>HO25</b>	Not relevant	<b>Community centre approved as part of BH2010/01054</b>
<b>HO26</b>	Day nurseries and child care facilities	<b>Fully consistent</b>

## Chapter 5 – Supporting the local economy and getting people into work

Local Plan Policy	NPPF text (paragraph numbers in brackets)	Consistency with the NPPF
<b>EM1</b>	Identified employment sites (industry and business)	<b>Generally consistent</b> – This policy positively identifies sites for a range of employment uses, forming the “clear strategy” sought by the NPPF to meet economic needs. There is



		<p>flexibility within the acceptable uses, although the policy is restrictive of B8.</p> <p>The NPPF states that planning should not hold back economic development or unnecessarily protect sites. Policy EM1 does not directly conflict with the NPPF in that respect and will be supported by up to date information on local economic needs.</p> <p>Policy EM1 includes some out of centre sites. Office development out of town centres would be subject to the sequential approach and an impact assessment for sites larger than 2500 sq m. Some EM1 allocated office sites may not conform to NPPF.</p>
<b>EM2</b>	Sites identified for high-tech and office uses	<p><b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy EM2 promotes high-tech and general office uses on identified sites. This forms an element of the positive strategy to identify and support sustainable economic growth. In that sense, the policy is fully consistent.</p> <p>Any inconsistency with the NPPF arises from its lack of flexibility to allow other uses. The policy will be supported by up to date information on local economic needs.</p>
<b>EM3</b>	Retaining the best sites for industry	<p><b>Generally consistent</b> – EM3 is protective of existing employment sites in order to create and maintain jobs. The policy sets out clear criteria by which suitability for modern employment needs can be assessed and will be supported by up to date information on local economic needs.</p> <p>The need for alternative live/work units and affordable housing will be demonstrated by up-to-date evidence, in compliance with the NPPF.</p>
<b>EM4</b>	New business and industrial uses on unidentified sites	<p><b>Generally consistent</b> – The first criterion of EM4 seeks demonstration of need for the proposed commercial use. Whilst the NPPF highlights the need for LPAs to identify economic needs, inspectors may view the criterion as impeding sustainable growth.</p>

		The other criteria within the policy pick up sustainable development issues highlighted in the NPPF, such as housing need, nature conservation and reducing the need to travel.
<b>EM5</b>	Release of redundant office floorspace and conversions to other uses	<p><b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy seeks to retain office floorspace unless it is “genuinely redundant.” The NPPF states that policies should avoid long term protection of sites where there is “no reasonable prospect” of them being used. The policy sets out tests to demonstrate redundancy and broadly accords with the NPPF.</p> <p>The need for alternative employment generating uses and affordable housing will be demonstrated by up-to-date evidence, in compliance with the NPPF.</p>
<b>EM6</b>	Small industrial, business units and warehouse units	<b>Generally consistent</b> – See comments on EM5 above. This policy also addresses other issues, such as potential disturbance and heritage concerns, that are reflected in the NPPF.
<b>EM7</b>	Warehouses (B8)	<b>Neutral</b> - The policy is restrictive of warehouse development in order to maximise job creation locally and to reflect the physical characteristics of the city. Whilst reflecting local issues, in accordance with core principles of the NPPF, the policy could be viewed as restricting sustainable economic growth.
<b>EM8</b>	Live-work units on redundant industrial and business and warehouse sites	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>EM9</b>	Mixed uses and key mixed use sites	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>EM10</b>	North Laine Area – mixed uses	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy will be supported by up to date information on employment needs.
<b>EM11</b>	Mews – mixed uses	<b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy will be supported by up to date information on employment needs.
<b>EM12</b>	Shoreham Harbour – mixed uses	<p><b>Generally consistent</b> – The policy supports port related expansion, which accords with NPPF economic and transport objectives. The policy addresses infrastructure requirements and amenity issues.</p> <p>The policy promotes other uses, including some defined as</p>

		"main town centre uses" by the NPPF. As a result, sequential tests and impact assessments may be required in line with the NPPF.
<b>EM13</b>	Brighton Station – mixed uses	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>EM14</b>	Air Street/North Street quadrant-mixed uses	<b>Policy not saved</b>
<b>EM15</b>	Jubilee Street – mixed uses	<b>Jubilee Street development complete</b>
<b>EM16</b>	West Street/Boyces Street/Middle Street – mixed uses	<b>Policy not saved</b>
<b>EM17</b>	Preston Barracks	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>EM18</b>	University of Brighton	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>EM19</b>	University of Sussex	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>EM20</b>	Village Way North	<b>Community Stadium development complete</b>

## Chapter 6 – Shopping, recreation and leisure – maintaining vitality and viability

Local Plan Policy	NPPF text (paragraph numbers in brackets)	Consistency with the NPPF
<b>SR1</b>	New retail development within or on the edge of existing defined shopping centres	<p><b>Not consistent</b> – Policy SR1 deals with new retail development within or on the edge of centres. Whilst it does not identify specific sites, it does adopt a sequential approach in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>Within town centres, the NPPF does not require an impact assessment. Policy SR1 (a) requires applications to demonstrate no detriment to vitality and viability of existing centres and is not consistent in that respect. For edge of centre sites, SR1 seeks demonstration of a need for the development, whilst the NPPF requires assessment of the impact.</p> <p>The policy addresses other concerns of the NPPF, including accessibility for all and sustainable transport.</p>
<b>SR2</b>	New retail development beyond the edge of existing established shopping centres	<b>Not consistent</b> – Policy SR2 sets out a sequential approach in accordance with the NPPF. However, it seeks a needs

		assessment, rather than the impact assessment set out in the NPPF.
<b>SR3</b>	Retail warehouses	<b>Not consistent</b> – The NPPF makes no specific reference to retail warehouses, bulky goods or subdivision of units. Generally, the comments under SR2 above will apply. The issues relating to bulky goods and unit size/layout may be relevant depending on the details of any impact assessment for an out of centre proposal.
<b>SR4</b>	Regional shopping centre	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>SR5</b>	Town and district shopping centres	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>SR6</b>	Local centres	<p><b>Generally consistent</b> – This policy defines local centres as part of the city's shopping hierarchy and gives clear guidance on acceptable uses and thresholds. It accords with NPPF aims to create healthy and inclusive communities and meet day-to-day needs.</p> <p>Policy SR6 introduces a redundancy test for changes of use from retail. Whilst the clear intention is to retain vitality and viability, this test may be viewed as inconsistent with the NPPF in potentially restricting economic growth.</p>
<b>SR7</b>	Local parades	<p><b>Generally consistent</b> – This policy defines local parades as part of the city's shopping hierarchy and gives clear guidance on acceptable uses and thresholds. It accords with NPPF aims to create healthy and inclusive communities and meet day-to-day needs.</p> <p>Policy SR7 includes a redundancy test for changes of use from retail. Whilst the clear intention is to retain vitality and viability, this test may be viewed as inconsistent with the NPPF in potentially restricting economic growth.</p>
<b>SR8</b>	Individual shops	<p><b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy SR8 offers protection for individual retail units and aims to meet day-to-day shopping needs.</p> <p>Policy SR8 includes a redundancy test for changes of use from retail. Whilst the clear intention is to protect local shops,</p>

		this test may be viewed as inconsistent with the NPPF in potentially restricting economic growth.
SR9	Brighton Post Office, 51 Ship Street	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SR10	Amusement arcades/centres	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SR11	Markets and car boot sales	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SR12	Large Use Class A3 (food and drink) venues and Use Class A4	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SR13	Nightclubs	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SR14	New hotel and guest accommodation	<p><b>Not consistent</b> – The NPPF defines tourism as a “main town centre use” and introduces a sequential test. Policy SR14 guides new tourism accommodation towards a hotel core area defined in the Local Plan, but has no sequential test.</p> <p>The policy, whilst seeking to locate new tourist accommodation in relatively central areas, does not comply with the NPPF in terms of the sequential test, a defined town centre area or, potentially, flexibility on the use of industrial/business land.</p>
SR15	Protection of hotels/guest houses	<p><b>Not consistent</b> – The policy is protective of tourist accommodation within the defined core area. The principle of protection in the interests of the local economy and meeting the community’s needs accords with the NPPF, although the use of a core area rather than an identified town centre raises inconsistency.</p>
SR16	Major sporting and recreational facilities	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SR17	Smaller scale sporting and recreational facilities	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SR18	Seafront recreation	<b>Fully consistent</b>
SR19	Black Rock site	<p><b>Not consistent</b> – This policy allocates a vacant seafront site for recreation/leisure uses. It positively addresses NPPF aims on issues such as recreation, tourism, coastal, nature conservation, transport and sustainability issues.</p> <p>However, the NPPF identifies leisure, tourism, cultural, and community uses as “main town centre uses” and requires a sequential test where they are outside an existing centre and not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan. The NPPF</p>

		also requires, where development is over the appropriate threshold, an impact assessment to be carried out. The policy does not require a sequential test or impact assessment and, in these respects, the NPPF would take precedence.
<b>SR20</b>	Protection of public and private outdoor recreation space	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy SR20 and the NPPF recognise the benefits of recreation spaces for healthy communities. The policy will be supported by up to date information on outdoor recreation needs.
<b>SR21</b>	Loss of indoor recreation facilities	<b>Generally consistent</b> – Policy SR21 and the NPPF recognise the benefits of recreation spaces for healthy communities. The policy will be supported by up to date information on outdoor recreation needs.
<b>SR22</b>	Major sporting venues	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>SR23</b>	Community Stadium	<b>Community Stadium complete</b>
<b>SR24</b>	King Alfred/RNR site	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>SR25</b>	Hollingbury Park sports pavilion	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>SR26</b>	Hangleton Bottom	<b>Generally consistent</b> – This policy seeks to provide recycling and community/recreational facilities. Both accord with aims of the NPPF to reduce use of resources and enable healthy communities. The policy will be supported by up to date information on outdoor recreation needs. The site was not included in the South Downs National Park.

## Chapter 7 – An integrated approach to nature conservation and the countryside

Local Plan Policy	Policy title	Consistency with the NPPF
<b>NC1</b>	Sites of international and/or European importance for nature conservation	<b>Policy not saved</b>
<b>NC2</b>	Sites of national importance for nature conservation	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>NC3</b>	Local Nature Reserves (LNRs)	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>NC4</b>	Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs) and	<b>Fully consistent</b>

	Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS)	
<b>NC5</b>	Urban fringe	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>NC6</b>	Development in the countryside/downland	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>NC7</b>	Sussex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>NC8</b>	Setting of the Sussex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	<b>Neutral</b> – No specific mention of the setting of National Parks in the NPPF, although it is strongly protective of National Parks.
<b>NC9</b>	Benfield Valley	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>NC10</b>	Benfield Barn	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>NC11</b>	Land and buildings in the vicinity of Benfield Barn	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>NC12</b>	High grade agricultural land	<b>Policy not saved</b>

## **Chapter 8 - Managing change within an historic environment**

<b>Local Plan Policy</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Consistency with the NPPF</b>
<b>HE1</b>	Listed buildings	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HE2</b>	Demolition of a listed building	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HE3</b>	Development affecting the setting of a listed building	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HE4</b>	Reinstatement of original features on listed buildings	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HE5</b>	West Pier	<b>Policy not saved</b>
<b>HE6</b>	Development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HE7</b>	Land adjoining Pavilion Street, Princes Street and 3-4 Old Steine	<b>Policy not saved</b>
<b>HE8</b>	Demolition in conservation areas	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HE9</b>	Advertisements and signs within conservation areas and on, or in the vicinity of a listed building	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HE10</b>	Buildings of local interest	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HE11</b>	Historic parks and gardens	<b>Fully consistent</b>
<b>HE12</b>	Scheduled ancient monuments and other important archaeological sites	<b>Fully consistent</b>

