

Appendix 2: Feedback matrix from second consultation period 11 March – 19 April 2013.

Respondent	Summary of Main Comments	Response to Main Comments
Brunswick & Adelaide Residents Group	Welcome contents of SPD	<u>No change</u>
Montpelier & Clifton Hill Association	Welcome contents of SPD	<u>No change</u>
Natural England	SPD poses no risk to the natural environment	<u>No change</u>
Conservation Advisory Group	Welcome guidance and protections of CAs and LBs.	<u>No Change</u>
	Policy on UPVC windows to street elevations within CAs should be stronger as appeals have recently been lost	<u>No change</u> This guidance compliments further detailed advice already in SPD09 'Architectural Features'
	Confusion between the application of the 50% rule in chapter 2, and the 3m rule for rear extensions in chapter 3.1	<u>Change</u> 50% rule has been placed in Chapter 3.1 (rear extensions). 3m rule in Chapter 3.1 now replaced with a more relaxed proportionality rule
Brighton Society ARCH-Angels Architects	Generally not against formation of a design guide, however the SPD is overly restrictive and does not allow for the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. This is confusing for householders with the Government seeking to free up restrictions and get building and will likely result in more appeals and costs. The LPA is urged to redraft the	<u>No change</u> The SPD is a design guidance document only, not a policy document. All applications are always considered on their own merits having regard the development plan and all other materials planning considerations. The purpose of the SPD is to present best practice design guidance, not set out a mandatory list of requirements for all proposals

	SPD to be much more positive with regard sustainable householder development. A general statement is required that states that proposals that do not comply with guidance will be considered on their merits, within the general parameters of the guidance, and that the SPD is guidance only and not mandatory given the variety of buildings in the city.	
	Some drawings do not comply with the 45 degree rule	<u>No change</u> The 45 degree rule is not mandatory for all extensions- it is guidance only
	Boundary walls should be allowed to be replaced where agreement made under Party Wall Act	<u>No change</u> Part Wall Act is separate to Planning Acts and is not a material consideration. Merits of retaining/replacing boundary wall taken case-by-case but presumption against remains
	1m setbacks are unnecessarily restrictive and not always best solution.	<u>Change</u> 1m setbacks for side extensions reduced to 0.5m
	Front and corner exts should be considered on their merits only.	<u>No change</u> This is inherent to the consideration of all applications
	Confusion as to whether window guidance relates to replacement or new windows	<u>Change</u> Guidance updated to clarify it applies to both
	Unbalanced roofs to semi-detached houses is not a big problem visually.	<u>No change</u> Good design practice remains to preserve or restore balance to semi-detached pairs, as currently expressed in SPGBH1 'Roof Alterations and Extensions'
	Solar panels should not be allowed at all on front roofs in CA's unless treated as part of roof finish, as they have a worse impact than rooflights	<u>Change</u> Guidance updated accordingly

	The 45 degree ruling in Appendix A is unduly restrictive- better to restrict extensions to depth only.	<u>No change</u> 45 degree rule is standard BRE guidance. The SPD does not require the 45 degree rule to be complied with in every case.
	Cabrio rooflights are not inappropriate when not on street elevations	<u>No change</u> Cabrio rooflights form balconies that in most cases cause overlooking therefore presumption remains to resist.
Mr Johnson (resident)	SPD stifles contemporary extensions that may upgrade existing bad quality homes. Contemporary design and materials that compliment but do not necessarily match existing building should be supported.	<u>No change</u> Guidance on modern design is already addressed in Chapter 2
	Balconies, additional floors, terraces etc should be allowed along seafront to make most of views	<u>No change</u> Each case is taken on its own merits based on context. The purpose of the SPD is not to prescribe particular approaches for particular areas of the city.

