

CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT
REGULATION 12 CONSULTATION STATEMENT

OCTOBER 2016

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Statement has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and 'Getting Involved', Crawley Borough Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). It also has regard to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
- 1.2. Regulation 12 of the Local Planning Regulations requires that before a local planning authority adopts a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) it must prepare a statement identifying the persons who have been consulted in the preparation of the document, the main issues raised by them, and the manner in which these have been addressed. The present document is that statement. An earlier version was made available alongside the SPD for the purpose of seeking representations as part of a public consultation and has been updated accordingly.
- 1.3. 'Getting involved ... in planning', an appendix to the council's SCI requires that local planning documents be subject to a period of 'early engagement' prior to formal consultation, providing opportunities for interested stakeholders and individuals to feed into the preparation of the document. In setting out the details required by Regulation 12 as mentioned above, this document provides a summary of the 'early engagement' process and the formal consultation.

2. Involve: Stage 1 – early engagement

- 2.1. Early in October 2015, the council contacted all those parties who had previously asked to be kept informed about the progress of the Crawley Borough Local Plan¹, highlighting the fact that the council proposed to produce a group of SPDs across a range of identified topics, including green infrastructure. Those contacted were invited to sign up for further updates in relation to particular topics, and directed to a page on the council's website providing further information about the function of the SPDs and their proposed scope. The web page also invited interested parties to respond to nine broad questions about their coverage and approach.
- 2.2. Alongside this engagement with contacts from the council's Local Plan database, invitation was sent to members of the council to express their interest in particular SPDs. The SPDs and the associated web page were also publicised via the council's main web page.
- 2.3. In response to these communications a number of parties, including external stakeholders and council members, confirmed their desire to be kept up to date with progress with the SPDs, including the Green Infrastructure SPD. Two respondents provided some limited feedback at this early stage, and a

¹ See Appendix A for details of the materials used as part of the general Early Engagement consultation.

further response was submitted alongside the recent public consultation on the Urban Design and Climate Change SPDs. These comments were taken into account during the drafting of the consultation Green Infrastructure SPD.

- 2.4. On 20 January 2016, a seminar was held for council members at which the proposed focus and approach of each SPD currently being worked on was summarised, and questions and comments were invited. Members drew attention to the importance of care and management of landscaping, the need to replace lost trees adequately and seeking open space improvements where there are deficits and increased population putting pressure on local facilities.
- 2.5. Concurrently with these engagement exercises, a number of internal and external stakeholders were invited to provide comment on individual SPDs where the council considered that their expertise would be particularly valuable in the early drafting work. Responses were incorporated into the consultation draft SPD.

3. Consult: Stage 2 - publication

- 3.1. A formal stage of public consultation was undertaken on a draft version of the Green Infrastructure SPD. The draft document was made available for representations over a four week period between Monday 16 May and Monday 13 June. This consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 12.(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and 'Getting involved... in planning', the appendix to the council's Statement of Community Involvement.
- 3.2. All consultees included on the council's Local Plan consultee database were emailed or written to with notification of the commencement of the consultation. A further reminder email was circulated highlighting the close of consultation date. The consultation materials are set out in Appendix B of this consultation statement.
- 3.3. During the consultation period, the draft Green Infrastructure SPD was available to view online at www.crawley.gov.uk/crawley2030. Paper copies of the documents were available at the following locations during normal office hours:
 - Town Hall
 - Crawley Library
 - Broadfield Library
- 3.4. The SPD included a number of specific questions to aid the consultation process. These were set out within the document, both throughout at the end of each chapter and together at the end of the document for reference. They are replicated in Appendix B of this consultation statement. Responses did not have to be restricted to answering the questions, and comments were welcomed on any part or aspect of the draft SPD.

Representations Received

- 3.5. Representations had to be provided in writing. This could be done either by emailing the Forward Planning team or by post. Representations received during the consultation period are set out in tabular form in Appendix C. The council's response to the comments received are provided in the same table; this includes reference to where the representation received have led to changes in the final SPD.

APPENDIX A: EARLY ENGAGEMENT MATERIALS

1. GENERAL CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

The following questions are being asked to feed into the early stages of scoping the SPDs:

Q1: Do the topics identified cover the main areas requiring additional guidance?

Q2: Are any of the topics considered unnecessary?

Q3: Are there any additional topics which haven't been identified as a Supplementary Planning Document which the council should consider?

Q4: Are the policies identified to be covered by the SPDs appropriate?

Q5: Should any of the policies be addressed in a different SPD to that identified in the table?

Q6: Should policies only be covered by one SPD rather than considered by each relevant topic area?

Q7: Are there other policies in the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (Crawley 2030) that haven't been identified which should be considered for inclusion in one of the SPDs?

Q8: Should the SPDs focus solely on statutory planning policy guidance or should they provide best practice examples and to provide advice and suggestions beyond the remit of planning policy, within the topic area?

Q9: Do you have any other, strategic comments on the scope and remit of the SPDs for consideration at this stage?

Further detailed questions will be asked relating to each of the topic areas in due course.

2. EARLY ENGAGEMENT EMAIL TO LOCAL PLAN CONSULTEE DATABASE

LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

2 October 2016



Dear ,

You have previously indicated an interest in being involved in the preparation of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030: Crawley 2030. As you are aware the Local Plan is now in its advanced stages, having been considered through a series of Examination Hearing sessions held earlier this year. The council is now awaiting the Planning Inspector's final report.

This email seeks to draw your attention to the work the council are now commencing on to support the Local Plan once it is adopted as the borough's primary Planning Policy.

To aid the interpretation and implementation of some of the Policies within the Local Plan, a number of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are currently being considered for early preparation. These are proposed to cover the following topic areas:

- Affordable Housing
- Climate Change
- Design
- Green Infrastructure
- Planning Obligations
- Town Centre

A period of early engagement is currently being undertaken from October to December 2015, with a number of general questions being asked in relation to these documents which we welcome your views on. The council's webpage www.crawley.gov.uk/crawley2030SPD provides more information.

If you are interested in being kept informed in any of the above topics, please could you contact the Forward Planning team and indicate which of the SPDs you are interested in. You are welcome to be involved and informed about any number of these, from one to all. The contact database for each will be kept separately to the others and the Local Plan.

Kind Regards,

The Forward Planning Team

More information

For more information, please visit our website www.crawley.gov.uk/crawley2030 where you can find details of the Local Plan and preparation of the new Supplementary Planning Documents.

Contact us

If you would like to contact the Forward Planning Team, please email us at forward.plans@ Crawley.gov.uk or you can phone us on 01293 428624.

Subscribe/unsubscribe

You have received this message as you have expressed an interest in being kept up-to-date with progress on Crawley's Local Plan. If you would not like to receive these updates any more, please respond to this email and let us know. If you know anyone that would like to receive these updates please ask them to email us at forward.plans@ Crawley.gov.uk

3. EARLY ENGAGEMENT LETTER TO LOCAL PLAN CONSULTEE DATABASE

Strategic Housing & Planning Services

Contact: Elizabeth Brigden

Date: 09/10/2015

Direct Line: 01293 438624

Email: Forward.Plans@crawley.gov.uk



Lee Harris
Chief Executive Directorate

Dear Sir or Madam,

You have previously indicated an interest in being involved in the preparation of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030: Crawley 2030. As you are aware the Local Plan is now in its advanced stages, having been considered through a series of Examination Hearing sessions held earlier this year. The council is now awaiting the Planning Inspector's final report.

This email seeks to draw your attention to the work the council are now commencing on to support the Local Plan once it is adopted as the borough's primary Planning Policy.

To aid the interpretation and implementation of some of the Policies within the Local Plan, a number of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are currently being considered for early preparation. These are proposed to cover the following topic areas:

- Affordable Housing
- Climate Change
- Design
- Green Infrastructure
- Planning Obligations
- Town Centre

A period of early engagement is currently being undertaken from October to December 2015, with a number of general questions being asked in relation to these documents which we welcome your views on. The council's webpage www.crawley.gov.uk/crawley2030SPD provides more information.

If you are interested in being kept informed in any of the above topics, please could you contact the Forward Planning team by email at Forward.Plans@crawley.gov.uk or phone 01293 438624 and indicate which of the SPDs you are interested in. You are welcome to be involved and informed about any number of these, from one to all. The contact database for each will be kept separately to the others and the Local Plan.

Yours Faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Elizabeth Brigden".

Elizabeth Brigden
Planning Policy Manager

4. SPECIFIC AND GENERAL CONSULTEES

Addaction
Afro Caribbean Association (ACA)
Age Concern West Sussex
Ahmadiyya Muslim Association UK (Crawley Branch)
Alternative Learning Community Bewbush
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure
BAPS Swaminarayan Santha
Barton Willmore
Black History Foundation
Blue Cedar Homes Limited
BME Ladies Health and Social Wellbeing Association
Bodhisattva Buddhist Centre
British Horse Society
British Humanist Society
Broadfield Christian Fellowship
Broadfield Youth and Community Centre
Campaign for Real Ale
CBRichard Ellis
Celtic & Irish Cultural Society
Central Crawley Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Central Sussex College
Chagos Island Community Association (CICA)
Chagos Islands Refugees group
Chagossian Elderly West Sussex Group
Charwood Parish Council
Churches Together in West Crawley
Colgate Parish Council
COPE
County Mall
Crawley Bangladeshi Welfare Association
Crawley Baptist Church
Crawley Campaign Against Racism
Crawley Clinical Commissioning Group
Crawley Community Relations Forum
Crawley Community Transport
Crawley Community Voluntary Service
Crawley Educational Institute
Crawley Ethnic Minority Partnership
Crawley Festival Committee
Crawley Homelessness Forum
Crawley Homes in Partnership (CHiP)
Crawley Interfaith Network
Crawley International Mela Association (CIMA)
Crawley Kashmiri Women's Welfare Association
Crawley Mosque
Crawley Museum Society
Crawley Older Person's Forum
Crawley Portuguese Association
Crawley Shop Mobility
Crawley Tennis Club
Crawley Town Access Group
Crawley Wellbeing Team
Crawley Young Persons Council
Cycling Touring Club
Darlton Warner Davis LLP
Deloitte LLP
Deloittes
Development Planning & Design Services Ltd
Diego Garcian Society
Divas Dance Club
DMH Stallard LLP
Drivers Jonas Deloitte
DTZ
East Sussex County Council
Eastern Stream
Elim Church Crawley
Equality & Human Rights Commission
Firstplan
Forestfield & Shrublands Cons. Area Adv Cttee
Freedom Leisure
Friends of Broadfield Park
Friends of Goffs Park
Friends, Families and Travellers
Fusion Experience
FusionOnline
Gambian Society
Gatwick Airport Limited
Gatwick Diamond
GL Hearn Ltd
Gleeson Strategic Land
Gurjar Hindu Union (GHU)
Health Through Sport Action
Heathrow Airport Holdings Limited
High Weald AONB Unit
Home Builders Federation Ltd
Housing & Planning Directorate
Housing 21
Hunter Page Planning Ltd
Hyde Housing Association
Iceni
Ifield Park Care Home
Ifield Village Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Ikra Women & Children Learning Centre
Inspire Broadfield (youth group)
Ismaili Council
Iyad Daoud
Jones Lang Lasalle
Kashmiri Educational and Welfare Trust
Kenneth Boyle Associates
Lewis & Co Planning South East Limited
Local Economy Action Group
Lower Beeding Parish Council
Maidenbower Baptist Church
Maidenbower Community Group
Malaika Sussex Multicultural Women's Group
Manor Royal Business Group
Michael Simkins LLP
Millat-e-Jafferyyah (Shia Muslim Mosque)
MITIE Property Services Limited
Moat Housing
Montagu Evans
Muslim Women's Forum
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
New Hope Church
Newdigate Parish Council
Northgate Matters
Oakton Developments
Outreach 3 Way
Parish of Worth, Pound Hill and Maidenbower
Parker Dann Limited
Pegasus Group
Pembroke Residents Association
Persimmon Homes

Planware Ltd.
 Play England
 Premier Planning Plc
 Rapleys LLP
 RenewableUK
 RISE
 Royal Mail Properties
 RPS Group
 Rusper Parish Council
 Savills
 SEBA South East Bangladeshi Association
 Seva Trust
 Shelter Housing Aid Centre
 Shire Consulting
 Sikh Community Centre Crawley & CPT
 SIVA
 Slaugham Parish Council
 Soka Gakkai International – UK
 Southern Counties
 Southgate Conservation Area Committee
 Sport England
 Spurgeons
 Sri Guru Singh Sabha
 Sri Lanka Think Tank UK
 Sri Lankan Muslim Welfare Association
 St Margaret's C of E Primary School
 Stanhope PLC
 Stiles Harold Williams Partnership LLP
 Strutt and Parker
 Sussex Action Traveller Group (STAG)
 Sussex Traveller Action Group
 Sussex Wildlife Trust
 Sustrans
 Swadhyay Community Project (SCP)
 Talk Bewbush
 Taylor Wimpey
 Thakeham Homes Ltd
 Thales UK
 The Clearwater Gypsies
 The Gypsy Council
 The McLaren Clark Group
 The Miller Group
 The Palace Street Group
 The SIVA Trust
 The Theatres Trust
 The Vine Christian Fellowship
 Three Bridges Forum
 Three Bridges Free Church
 Tinsley Lane Residents Association
 TRY (Plus Chair of Black History Foundation &
 other orgs)
 United Reformed Church
 Vision in Youth Collective
 West and Partners
 West Sussex Access Forum
 West Sussex Children and Family Centres
 West Sussex Crossroads
 West Sussex Youth Support and Development
 Service
 Woodland Trust
 Worth Conservation Area Group
 Worth Parish Council
 WRVS
 WS Planning & Architecture
 WYG Group
 Metrobus

Reside Developments Ltd.
 Savills
 Land Planning & Development
 DevPlan
 JWL Associates Limited
 HCA
 Deloitte
 Arora International
 Development Securities
 Moat Telford Place
 Crawley Clinical Commissioning Group
 Adur & Worthing
 Brighton & Hove City Council
 British Telecom
 BT Plc
 Chichester District Council
 Coast to Capital LEP
 Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
 English Heritage
 Environment Agency
 Highways England
 Homes and Communities Agency
 Horsham District Council
 Lewes District Council
 Marine Management Organisation
 Mid Sussex District Council
 Mole Valley District Council
 National Grid
 Natural England
 Network Rail
 NHS Sussex
 Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
 South Downs National Park
 Southern Gas Network
 Southern Water
 South East Water
 Surrey County Council
 Sussex Police
 Tandridge District Council
 Thames Water
 The Coal Authority
 UK Power Networks
 Waverley District Council
 West Sussex County Council
 Worthing Borough Council
 West Sussex County Council
 West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service
 Guildford District Council
 National Landlords Association
 Sport England
 Travis Perkins
 Deloitte
 Dev Plan UK
 DPDS Planning
 Indigo Planning
 AMEC Foster Wheeler
 WYG Planning
 WYG Planning
 Holiday Extras
 Sussex Wildlife Trust
 Sussex Gardens Trust
 Historic England
 Quod Mayfield Market
 Tetlow King
 Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign
 Stratus Environmental

Zoe Elphick
Miss Z Read
Yvonne Lindsay
Sean
Yvonne Shaw
Yeshwant Patel
Yasmin Church
Y Bosseva
Rosa Pereira
Miss R Nieman
Wendy Bell
Wendy Whittington
W Chorley
Stephen Hayes
Wendy Plaistow
Mr & Mrs Bennett
Z Wilson
Brian Wilkinson
Paul West
Michael-Thor Bateman
Wesley Brazier
Wes Botting
Mrs WJ Paton
W Lovell
Ann Pile
Vivienne Dawson
Vishal Mathur
Vikki-Jade Peters
Vidita Shah
Victoria Martin
Vicky Langham
Victoria Beach
Vicki Wallage
Vicki Mills
Vicky Nixon
Vicki Clare
Verity Eunson-Hickey
Paul Owen
Veronika Novotna
Verity Colbert
Katie Vella
Iryna Varvanina
Mr Vaidya
Mr R S Upton
Patricia Upham-Hill
Charles Jones
T Pawlak
M Wright
Miss Tracy Poynter
Tracey Gillett
Tracy Jones
Tracy Clarke
Tracey Wesson
Tracey Leicester
Tracey Coleman
Tony Sutton
Tony Fullwood
Toni Smith
Thomas James Whittington
Tom Familton
Thomas Carney
Tom Woolner
Natalie Tippett
Tina Wort
Tina Thrift
Tina Patel
Priscilla Lambert

Emma Thrift
Coral Thompson
Thomas Peckham
Tom Pashley
Morgan O'Flanagan
Clare Loader
M B Lanham
Mrs Jenny Lakeman
Roy Howard
Lynn Howard
Karen Tankard-Fuller
Timothy Caig
Amanda Whale
Kim Gordon
Mrs Teresa Perrott
Terry Beavis
Mr Terry Wheller
Jake Hawkins
Chay Sharp
David Sharp
Ellice Sharp
Patricia Sharp
Tom Doyle
Terry Stanley
Tracey Bennett
Tara Petty
Tanya Bunn
Tanya Sladovich
Tadeusz Jasko
T Pool
Tracey Cox
Sylvia Handy
Angela Heath
Mrs Siyar
Suzanne Davies
Mrs S Knight
Suzannah Guy
Susan Lester
Susan Smyth
Sue Carraher
Sue Arnold
Sunita Singal
Sumra Ahmed
Sumi Patel
Sue Mason
Miss Susan King
Sue Janota
Natacha Wilson
Karla Strudwick
Sarah Dowdall
Sandra Foxton
Stewart Neate
Stevin
Mr Steven Soper
Steve Taylor
Stephen Rivers
Stephanie Cox
Stella Daff
Dtella Makey
Staum Parrett
Charis Atkinson
Stacy Malin
Sharon Spice
Stacey Rose
Nina Spence
Sophie Davies
Sophie Airey

Sophie Harding
Colin Snook
Dawn O'Dwyer
Sophie Eaton
Sam Bouglas
Sharon Richardson
Sarah-Jane Willis
Siobhan Miller
Claire Collins
Doreen Simpson
Simon Thrift
Joan Thrift
Simon Freeman
Simon Douglas
Simon Randall
Simon Hickey
Simon Burrows
Simon Biffen
Sim Sidhu
S.Newbury
Sherwin Scott
Michelle Holmes
Darren Williams
Shelley Williams
Malcolm Woodhead
Sheila Woodhead
Shazia Ahmed
Shazia Sidat
Gwen Poyton
Sharon Ottley
Shayne Fensom
G V Sharp
Sharon Terry
Leandro Correa
Sharon Correa
Sharon Brumwell
Sharon Vygus
Mrs S Veaney
Sharon Harris
Ms L Flay
Mrs Harrington
Alison Shackell
S. Garvin
Serene Cottee
Mrs S E Cooke
Sean Reynolds
Steven Woods
Zoe Grimshaw
Amanda Bounds
Samuel Beach
Andy Marriott
Mrs Sarita Arya
Mrs. Renata Hegedusne
Sarik
Sarah Piper
Miss Sarah Carter
Sarah Newman
Sarah Lee-Fisher
Sarah Greenwood
Sarah Parker
Sara Ahmed
Sara Doyle
Martin Santaniello
Sandra Mehmet
Sam Judge
Sam Bateman
Samantha Haines

Sam Cook	Mr Burgess	Nick Wilkinson
Clare Salvage	Mrs Burgess	Rachael Wilkinson
Karen Salter	Rudi Bird	Shaun Wilkinson
Sally Croft	Christopher Vincent Gartlan	Neena Seeruthun
Sally Thorn	Katerina Radova	Andrew Towner
Sally Osmond	Radhika	Martin Bates
Sally Sanders	Rachel Price	Mrs Kim Nobbs
Mrs Sabeen Mansoor	Rachel Pamment	Nadine Terry
Sarah Keen	Georgina	Anita Bateman
Mr Ryan Tate	Mr P Wakeham	Niraj Patel
Ryan Page	Mrs I Wakeham	Nick Cornwell
Ryan Jenkinson	Lisa Wilson	Nick Edwards
Bob Woods	Claire Burrage	Nicole Sullivan
Russell Milton	Paul Thomas	Niall Kelly
Russell Sharp	Samantha Thomas	Niall Nugent
Russ Mitchell	Sir / Madam	Johnny Da Silva
Rukiya Maxwell	Jenny Willis	Netta Bond
Pamela Ruel	Paul White	Vanessa Marriott
Reniece Robinson	Sir / Madam	Neil Slugocki
Richard Page	Adelaide Jenkins	Neil Donald
Daniel Stannard	Kerry Dawson	Natalie Bingham
Josie Stannard	Cristian Pierri	Julie Roberts
Libby Stannard	Karen Lewis	Neil Smith
Roy Stannard	Tyler Pierrri	Natalie Saunders-Neate
Kay Stannard	Philippa Mitchell	Mr Nathan Spriggs
Ross Margetts	Rex Upham-Hill	Natalie Chambers
Rosie Cavedaschi	Petty West	Natalie Zevka
Ros February	Graham Petschel	Mrs Natalie Moran
Rosemary Cogdon	Peter Willis	Natalie Sullivan
Rosemarie Jerome	Peter Brooks	Naomi Wiggins
Rosemary Benwell	Peter Beckley	Nancy Weltner
Rory Church	Pete Lyons	Najiya Slimani
Ronnie Armstrong	Peter Griffiths	M. Lashmar
Rohan Patel	George Penfold	Mr Michael Whiting
Rod Horton	Mr. & Mrs. G. Harwood	Maeve Weller
Robert Rolfe	Jean Goodrich	Laura Randall
Robert MacPherson	Joanne Brown	Terry
Roberta Page	Peter Burrows	Moustapha Kada
Robert Bruins	Mary Burrows	Mrs Janette Thompson
Robert Bird	Emily Johnson	Linda Keynes
Robin Vallins	Paul Oliver	Wayne Bonner
Yvonne Vallins	Paul Brown	Kara Bonner
Rob Pullinger	Pauline February	Amanda Madel
Thomas Pullinger	Paul Hughes	Harry Madel
Vicky Pullinger	Paul Davis	Trevor Madel
Robert Paliotta	Paul Berry	Samantha Wood
Rik February	Paul Miller	Mrs Sue Bristow
Richard Thorburn	Paula Hanslow	Margaret San Juan Martin
Richard Symonds	Paul Roberts	Shani Wheatley
Richard Nixon	Paul Harrison	Molly Rumble
Rhys Whittle	Patricia Patel	Morag Warrack
Rhonda Dann	V Patel	Mohsin Ahmed
Sophie Warren	Mrs P Godwin	Mr M Richardson
Benson Kalubi	Alexander Curtis	Mr Martin Saunders
Rhoda James	Pat Crees	Jonathan Mitchell
Rachel Hillman	Simon Pashley	Paul Lewis
Reuben Peters	Nick Pashley	Michael Petryszn
Aurora Lula	Mr P Akhtar	Mike Parker
Remo Lula	Parmjit Sidhu	Michael Eaton
Aaron Squirrell	Peter Parker	Michael Simmonds
Maretta Rees	Pam James	Mike Doyle
Reece Church	Sarah Page	Maria Lula-Harris
Mr Reece Tate	Julie Daly	Michael Schultz
Kelly Byworth	Patricia Burrett	Michelle Collins
Stephen Leake	Nick Price	Michele Singleton
Rebecca Betteridge	Christopher Wilkinson	Mike Jones
Rebecca Holt	Mandy Wilkinson	Pat Eldridge

Michelle Taylor	Lisa Burton	Kate Nulty
Melissa Gomes	Charlotte Cox	Joyce McGinty
Mel Ansell	Lauren O'Sullivan	Kevin McGinty
Marion Auffret	Lorraine Pateman	Karla Thompson
Cheryl Higgins	Lorraine Graham	Kathryn Pashley
Joanna Dyckes	Susan Johnson	Krystal-Ann Peters
W.M. Deacon	David Thrift	Harish Purshottam
Michael Clive Latin	Lois Thrift	Kirsty Piper
Deborah Burbidge	Sir / Madam	Kirsty Browning
Mrs Maxine Soper	Mr Lee Whiting	Kim West
Maurice Frost	Mr D Hill	Kim Fairman
Nathan Frost	Gordon Mitchell	Kerry Hughes
Maureen Foster	Carina Higson	Mrs Linda Kelly
Matt Leese	Jackie Littleton	Kevin Grimshaw
Matthew King	Lisa Tomkinson	Kevin McGrath
Matthew Butler	Lisa Powell	Kerry Powell
Matt Calver	Kara-Leigh April Harrison	Kerry Longmate
Matthew Allen	Lisa Curcher	Kerry Pearson
Matthew White	Lisa Brown	Kerry Mudway
Matt Coleman	Joan Hoys	Kerry Allen
Stacey Barker	Emma Challis	Lerrie Atkinson
Stuart Mason	Ian Johnson	Kenneth Webster
Mary Gasson	Shirley Bettinson	Pamela Webster
Martyn Moore	Lisa Bettinson	Kelly Channell
Martin Huxter	Linda Dabboussi	Kerry McBride
Greg Upcott	Mrs L Burchett-Vass	Karen Litten
Kinsley Upcott	Master Liam Spriggs	K Christensen-Webb
Lola Upcott	Lewis Holman	Kim Elliott
Martine Channell	Lesley King	Elizabeth Gardner
Martin Harbor	Lesley Jacobs	Kayleigh Nash
Mr A Marriott	Susan Bevis	Kaye Handman
Mrs K Marriott	Miles Carroll	Kaya-May
Mark Hynes	Julia Hayes	Alfie Turner
Mark Lawford	Len Hayes	Ben Turner
Sir / Madam	Lee Sellers	Charlie Turner
Mark Brown	Lee Kabza	Katie Turner
Mark Amos	Rhys Carney	Josh Turner
Mr M Nieman	Jimi Carney	Katie Lampey
Mark Butcher	Lee Carney	Katherine Randall
Marilyn Stockbridge	Leanne Sim	Katie Peers
Mary Scott	Kyle Sim	Barbara Deakin
Victoria Arnold	Olivia Lindsey	Karen
Sarah Seager	Lewi Lindsey	Karen Hackwell
Mr Williams	Leeanne Jones	Karen Pitt
Amanda Mustafaj	Mrs Stevens	Karen Eales
Mark McKown	Sir / Madam	Karen Randall
Malcolm Woodhead	Lauren Judge	Karen Lambert
Malcolm Millard	Laura Virgo	Karen Burling
Mala Patel	Laura Fraser	Karen Beckett
Maja Jasko	Laura Irvine	Kara Bonner
Margaret Florey	Laura Marden	Lotti
Mohammad Badshah	Laura Hamilton	Katharine Thompson
Lynsey Woods	Ms Charlotte Latimer	Kelly Virgo
Lynn Lowe	Pauline	Ashad Khan
Mrs Lynda Morgan	Alena Hobson	Janet Gilroy
Lee Warner	Donna Botting	Julie Brennan
Luke Grima	Jayden van de Lagemaat-	Julie Denman
Lucy Downie	Bettinson	Barbara Frost
Lucy Vella	Andre van de Lagemaat	Julia Frost
Linda Taylor	P Wheeler	Julia Lee
Logan Peers	Kyle Fish	Jigar Solanki
Lauren Parisi	Jakub Jasko	Shanaya Solanki
Louise Waugh	Kate Townner	Nick Young
Louise Weekes	Karen & Phil Smith	Jo Murray
Louise Brooks	Phil Smith	Jacky Curtis
Louise Golding	Kim Piercey	Josephine Anne Young
L Haynes	Peet Boxall	Josh Clarke

Josh Lambert
Josh Collins
Jose Manuel Pereira Sousa
Jocelyne Berreen
Jordan Fawcett
Josephine Evans
Peter Evans
Jo Bender
John Thompson-Balk
John Collisson
Sue Collisson
Nathan Johnston
John Mortimer
Pat Mortimer
John Connelly
John Tite
June Tite
John Mills
John Cooban
Joseph James
Joe Dines
Joe Comper
Joe Doyle
Jody Channell
Jodi Sanderson
Russell Dentith
Wesley Sanderson
Joanne Minihane
Sophie Coward
Billy Coward
Jacob Coward
Jo Coward
Jenny Deacon
Emily Tobin
James MacLean
Jilly Thompspons
Jill Dunster
Jennie Walters
Jennie Parkes
Mrs Jennifer Sweeney
Jennifer Hord
Jenny Lockyer
Jenny Yaglikci
Jean MacLean
John Winter
John Dempsey
John Browning
Jay Whittle
Jay Carson
Jason Miles
Sian Richards
Mrs J Sully
Janna Smith
Janice Judge
Garry Bonner
Jan Bonner
Janet Large
Kieront Hollamby
Janet Lee
Janet Boniface
Janet Armstrong
Jane Schultz
Jane Grimshaw
Jane Edwards
Jane Binmore
Jan Constable
Jamie Lewis

James Woodhead
James Wallace
James Senra
Jake Saul
Jaedon Mulligan
Jacqui Amos
Jacqueline Cogdon
Gemma
Jacquie Ballard
Mrs. J. Jenkins
Sir / Madam
Jack Veaney
Jo Parrock
John Baker
Paul Wilsdon
Claire Howard
Michelle Howe
Isaac Allen
Peter Cole
Iqra Ahmed
Kevin Stephenson
Koji Stephenson
Mayumi Stephenson
Miyuki Stephenson
Steve Coward
Chris Manning
Imogen Baldock
Katie Nichols
Ines Manning
Kay Ambrose
Ian White
Ian Madel
Ian Harris
I Debruin
Katie Hull
Hazel Santaniello
Howard Sanders
Clare Haworth
Roy Hood
Sheila Hood
Sean Dowling
Clare Dowling
Maureen Dowling
John Dowling
Delia Hodder
Hayley Skerry
Hinal Limbachia
Kerry Haines
Helen Burton
Mr. Tamas Hegedus
Heather Bonner
Heather Peters
Linda Healy
Hayley Allen
Charlotte Hassan
Sarah Hares
Daniel Patrick Cambel
Michaela Hanusová
Hannah Brown
Haley Kelly
Thomas Spindler
Helen Spindler
Gwyn Colbourn
Greig van Outen
Kevin Greenfield
Graham Johnson
Nicola Faulkner

Gemma Neathey
Tess Weisner
Jacqueline Russo
Joanne Brooks
Georgina Atkins
Gill Courtnell
Gillian Kellam
Mrs G Lawrence-Maxey
Ms E Lawrence-Maxey
Ms M Lawrence-Maxey
Gillian Field
Daniel Jenkins
Georgina Woodhead
Georgina Rice
Georgina Hillen
George Hockley
Steve White
Geof Mulligan
Geoff Robinson
Gemma Friend
Gemma Williams
Gemma Legrand
Gemma Kearsey
Geoff Bellamy
Garry Blunt
Gary Brazier
Gary Broadbridge
David Roskilly
Gareth Gates
Ms Frost
Jennifer Frost
Sue Wells
Samantha Willmor
Fumiyo Tansley
Christopher Wright
Lisa King
Funmi Aji
Nathan Hanson
Fernando Engelbrecht
Phil Barnett
Fay
Faye Bargery
Fatima Moseley
Falak Badshah
Fahmi Maxwell
Kay Lewis
Ethan Peers
Eric Crawford
Emma Challis
Emma Maxwell
Sanda Andrew
Denis Andrew
Emma Andrew
Erin Andrew
Ewan Andrew
Elain
Anthony Ellis
Ellie Marsh
Edward Lewis
Elaine Dancaster
Gillian Billing
James Billing
Jessica Billing
Eileen Maughan
Estelle Gaines
Ian Holman
Dwayne Stuart

Alan Dunt
David Thornback
Daniel Britton
Daniela Scialo-Page
Gladys Betton
Leslie Betton
Debbie Betton
Clive Turner
Donna Pickin
Dr Richard Phillips
Ben Mark
Dave Kernohan
Patricia Kernohan
Sandra Kernohan
Declan McGinty
David L. Andreson
Darren Saunders
Dionne Wilson
Diane Cooper
Ray Cooper
Diane Penfold
Diana Brown
D Wilbourn
W. Witsen Elias
Debbie Staples
De Malone
Derek Wall
Derek Meakings
Deion Newman
Debbie Guttridge
Debbie Street
Debbie Piller
Debbie Saunders
Mr Dean Whiting
Dean Hollamby
Darren Browning
Dawn Wilkinson
Brian Keegan
Eleanor Keegan
Dawn Keegan
David Probett
David Margetts
David Ashton
David Spindler
David Newcombe
David Covill
Dave Taylor
Dave Neathley
David Christensen
Dave Carter
Daria Czekajska
Daniel Jones
Danielle Bunn
Dan Gardener
Daniel Furlong
Jennifer Cheeseman
Damian Tommy
Donna Ray
David Cox
Mrs Carole Whiting
Chris Simmons
Colin Webster
Tina Webster
Thomas Barlow
Michael Cook
Graham Harding
Michael McKnight

Linda Connelly
Collette Davies
Mr Colin Spriggs
Chris Morris
Tim
Pieter Classens
Sam Clark
Ashley Clark
Clare Clarke-Jones
Clare Bowler
John Gunner
Claire Robinson.
Edward Carroll
Mrs Claire Carroll
Chris Kennedy
Ciaran Barron
Kieran Faulkner
Chris Bower
Sir / Madam
Chris Cook
Christine Christensen
Chris Spurgeon
Chris Shelford
Cheryl Jones
Cheryl Brown
Jane Chart
Mr S Chart
Charlotte Verbeeten
Charlotte Scotney
Charlotte Janjetich
Charlie Field
Donna Hughes
Charis Edwards
Chantelle Bateman
Greg Tyler
Chris Oxlade
Colin Field
Ross Pennycook
Sir / Madam
Chrissie Cook
Chrissie Cook
Carol Easley
Cassie Barry
Hollie McCarthy
Carmen Cespedes Sanchez
Carl Rickwood
Paul Capper
Carrie Anne Campbell
Chris Smyth
Chris Jones
Chris Maidment
Carina Anane-Dumfeh
Kristen Bailey
Ian Burke
Martin Hayward
Gill Collins
Barbara Thornback
Dr Bill Temple-Pediani
Bryan Pashley
Brian Fagence-Traynor
Bruce Trewin
Brian Webb
Brian James
Brian Dickinson
Brian Smith
Brian Eastman
Brenda Burgess

Brenda Holman
Bradley Flory
Will Bower
Leigh Holman
Mehboob Sidat
Barbara McMahon
Brett Lincoln
Jason Jeffers
Charlotte Grimshaw
Robin Malcolm
Bhavesh Lakhani
Beckie Hayward
Rebecca Willis
Beverly Clayden
Mrs Beverley Bain
Janine Robins
Benjamin Webster
Samuel Webster
Ben Turner
Ben Golding
Ben Coleman
Stephen Pomroy
Rebecca Zammit
Rebecca Allen
Bea Chambers-Whyte
William Dunning
Barry Edwards
Becky Bates
Ellis Barton
Gillian Barton
Peter Barton
Toby Barton
Barry Taylor
Jan Harding
Barry Preston
Jennifer Preston
Barbara Alice Heather
Vivian
Barbara Pattison
Mrs B Coleman
Barbara Dunning
Paul Ballard
Lin Ballard
David Baker
Suzanne
Steven Vine
Holly MacDonald
Sir / Madam
Azra Meral
Mrs Donna Ayres
Alan Wells
Jean Austin
Anne Heuser
Audrey McLoughlin
Audrey Lindo
Ashleigh Miller
Armin Hartinger
Anita Rice
Georgia Thomas
Jessica Thomas
Louis Thomas
Danny Swain
Olivia Meadows
Charlie Meadows
S Meadows
Finley Meadows
Anisah Sidat

Tony Sillince
Ann Richardson
Ann Harrington
Anne Tullett
Annette Gidman
Anne Greenbrook
Anne Fairbank
Aisha Sidat
Ania Jasko
Angie Gasson
Angie Crudgington
Angela Cohen
Angela Darbon
Angela Cole
Andy Tolfrey
Billy Tolfrey
Andrew Summers
Andrew Jagger
Jensen Jagger
Madelaine Jagger
Carlene Ahangama
Linda Ahangama
Mrs B Brown
Andrew Judge
Andrew Cusack
Andrew Chan
Lily Chan

Andrew Skudder
Mrs Andrea Richardson
Andrea Roberts
Ananda and Pieter
Ana
Ammaarah Sidat
Amy Young
Amanda Stannard
Mrs A Austin-Way
Amanda Roskilly
Amanda Jagger
Amanda Parker-Small
Joe Lavery
Edward Page
A Page
Miss Allanna Dwyer
Allan Lambert
Georgina Allan
Gina Allan
Alan Burgess
Alison Warner
Alicia Haworth
Alicia Cusick
Alison Burke
Mrs Alison Hollman
Alfie Jones
Alexander Thrift

Alex Harris
Alex Petryszyn
A and P Smith
Alan Kenward
Kathleen Kenward
Ishtiaq Ahmed
Alexander Wilbourn
Adam Parker
Adam Foxley
Abi Watkins
Abby Allen
Aaron Lumley
Mr Alexander Collins
Antonio Percudani
Mrs Audrey McKown
Alan Hollman
Sam Brown
Jennifer
Rhys Miller
Alison Heine
Perry Doherty
Nelson Reid
Alice Broomfield
Heidi Kelly
Andrew Metcalfe

5. CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL CRAWLEY 2030 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT WEBPAGE



[A](#) accessibility | [site map](#) | [contact us](#) | [cookies](#) | [what's new](#)

 Advanced Search

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

Main Menu

- HOME
 - Business
 - Community and Neighbourhoods
 - Council Services and Democracy
 - Council Tax and Benefits
 - Health and Environment
 - Homes and Housing
 - Jobs and Careers
 - Learning
 - Leisure and Culture
 - News and Events
 - Planning and Development
 - Streets, Roads and Transport
 - Waste and Recycling
- or browse by theme
-
-

Most Popular

- [Elections](#)
- [K2 Crawley](#)
- [Waste & Recycling collection](#)
- [Public Notices](#)
- [Council Tax](#)
- [Apply for a job](#)

Listings

- [Community Directory](#)
- [Events directory](#)
- [Job Vacancies](#)
- [News Releases](#)
- [Fees & Charges](#)

Find It Tell Us Pay It Apply

[Location: Home](#) | [Planning and Development](#) | [Planning Policy](#) | [Local Plan - Crawley 2030](#) | [Crawley 2030: Supplementary Planning Documents](#)

Crawley 2030: Supplementary Planning Documents

Crawley Borough Council is commencing work on a number of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) to expand upon the policies established by the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 — 2030: Crawley 2030.

Topic Areas

The SPDs will not make new planning policy, but will aid the interpretation and implementation of the new Crawley Local Plan once it is adopted as the council's primary Planning Policy document. The topic areas being considered for SPDs are:

- Affordable Housing
- Climate Change
- Design
- Green Infrastructure
- Planning Obligations
- Town Centre

These SPDs will eventually replace the existing suite of supplementary planning guidance notes and some of the other SPDs. Manor Royal SPD and Design Guide will remain a council adopted document, as will Development of Gatwick Airport SPD.

The extent to which the SPDs provide guidance and expansion of the Local Plan policies will vary and will depend upon whether it is concluded that additional information adds value, beyond that which is already provided.

Some of the Policies are currently proposed to be covered by more than one SPD, the information will not be repeated and will only be in the most relevant SPD to the principle behind the policy objective. However, it is acknowledged that there will have to be clear cross-referencing to ensure there is no confusion caused, duplication, inconsistency or omissions.

Who are they for?

The SPDs will be aimed at individuals and companies who wish to make a successful planning application. This will include:

- Householders
- Businesses
- Landowners

Why do we need SPDs?

The SPDs will seek to provide guidance for applicants to meet the policy requirements set by the Local Plan, and offer information as to what is expected at each of the key stages relating to the making of a planning application:

- Pre-application;
- Submission & validation;
- Planning application;
- Post-planning permission.

Where relevant, the SPDs will clarify what is required for the following types of planning application:

- Householder
- Change of Use
- Residential Development
- Non-Residential Development
- Shop Fronts
- Advertisement Consents

Involvement and Engagement

If you are interested in being involved and kept informed on the progress of the SPDs please contact [Forward Planning](#) with your name and contact details, along with the topic area, or areas, you are interested in. You are welcome to be engaged in as many or as few of the SPDs as you would wish to be.

We welcome your views on the following questions.

In This Section:

- [Planning and Development](#)
- [Planning Policy](#)
- [Local Plan - Crawley 2030](#)
- [Crawley 2030: Supplementary Planning Documents](#)

Contact Us

tel: (01293) 438512

fax: (01293) 438495

email: [click to contact us](#)

address:
Strategic Planning
Town Hall
The Boulevard
Crawley
W.Sussex RH10 1UZ



General Consultation Questions

Q1: Do the topics identified cover the main areas requiring additional guidance?

Q2: Are any of the topics considered unnecessary?

Q3: Are there any additional topics which haven't been identified as a Supplementary Planning Document which the council should consider?

Q4: Are the policies identified to be covered by the SPDs appropriate?

Q5: Should any of the policies be addressed in a different SPD to that identified in the table?

Q6: Should policies only be covered by one SPD rather than considered by each relevant topic area?

Q7: Are there other policies in the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (Crawley 2030) that haven't been identified which should be considered for inclusion in one of the SPDs?

Q8: Should the SPDs focus solely on statutory planning policy guidance or should they offer best practice examples and be used to provide advice and suggestions beyond the remit of planning policy, within the topic area?

Q9: Do you have any other, strategic comments on the scope and remit of the SPDs for consideration at this stage?

Further detailed questions will be asked relating to each of the topic areas in due course.

Next Steps

The Local Plan policies remain subject to modification depending on the outcome of the Planning Inspector's final report into the Crawley Borough Local Plan.

Consultation on the draft SPDs will take place following the receipt of this, and after the Local Plan has been formally adopted by the council by way of a resolution at its Full Council meeting. This is currently anticipated to allow for public consultation on the SPDs to be undertaken early in the New Year (2016).

APPENDIX B: STATUTORY CONSULTATION MATERIALS

1. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SPD CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Are there any other issues or areas of the policy that need further clarification and do you have any further suggestions to help applicants meet the requirements of Local plan Policies covered in this SPD?
2. Please let us know if you have any examples (including photos) in Crawley which show good green infrastructure planning.

Part 2: The Green Infrastructure Network

3. Does the GI map fully reflect the green infrastructure assets and general opportunities present in Crawley? If not, how could this be improved?
4. Is the guidance on how applicants should consider green infrastructure clear?
5. Are the green assets and opportunities to deliver benefits sufficiently covered?
6. Is the guidance on landscaping and maintenance helpful to applicants?
7. Does the guidance enable proposals impacting structural landscaping to adequately assess the impacts?
8. Does the rights of way section highlight the key issues for applicants to consider?
9. Are you aware of any other opportunities for enhancing the rights of way network?

Part 3: Trees

10. Is the guidance for provision of one tree per new dwelling and on tree replacement standards clear?
11. Are there any other considerations in the type and location of new and replacement tree planting?
12. Are there any issues we have not covered which you would like to draw our attention to?

Part 4: Open Space

13. Does this section clearly set out what is required to mitigate the impacts of new development on open space and the process for determining proposals on open space?
14. Should there be further guidance from the council on what an applicant would need to assess to determine whether an open space is surplus to requirements?
15. Is further guidance needed on provision of open space?

Part 5: Biodiversity

16. Does this section clearly set out survey requirements and process for considering biodiversity?
17. Is the technical information in this section up to date and an accurate reflection of biodiversity in Crawley?

Part 6: Countryside and AONB

18. Does this section adequately define appropriate and detailed character areas for Crawley?
19. Do the character area descriptions and guideline enable applicants to understand the character and role of the area in which the proposal sits?
20. Is the High Weald AONB management Plan sufficient for consideration of planning applications? Is any further detailed guidance needed?

2. EMAIL NOTIFICATION OF COMMENCEMENT OF FORMAL PUBLIC CONSULTATION TO CONSULTEE DATABASE

LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

16 May 2016



Dear,

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: CONSULTATION

Following the adoption of the Crawley Borough Local Plan: Crawley 2030, on 16 December 2015, Crawley Borough Council are seeking your views on the following Supplementary Planning Document:

- Green Infrastructure

This document has been prepared to support the interpretation of some of the Policies set out within the Local Plan, and to provide additional advice and guidance in relation to ensuring planning applications are submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan.

The document is available to view on the council's website: www.crawley.gov.uk/crawley2030spd and in hard copy at the Town Hall and the borough's libraries during normal office hours.

Consultation will take place between 16 May and 13 June 2016. All responses must be made in writing, by **5pm 13 June 2016**, and can be submitted either by email to forward.plans@crawley.gov.uk or by post to:

Forward Planning
Crawley Borough Council
Town Hall
The Boulevard
Crawley
RH10 1UZ

Consultation questions are set out within the Green Infrastructure document for your consideration and assistance. However, comments do not have to be restricted to responses to these.

If you have any questions relating to this public consultation, please contact Elizabeth Brigden, Planning Policy Manager on 01293 438624 or elizabeth.brigden@crawley.gov.uk

Kind Regards,

The Forward Planning Team

More information

For more information, please visit our website www.crawley.gov.uk/crawley2030spd.

Contact us

If you would like to contact the Forward Planning Team, please email us at forward.plans@crawley.gov.uk or you can phone us on 01293 428624.

Subscribe/unsubscribe

You have received this message as you have expressed an interest in being kept up-to-date with progress on Crawley's Local Plan and/or the Supplementary Planning Documents. If you would not like to receive these updates any more, please respond to this email and let us know. If you know anyone that would like to receive these updates please ask them to email us at forward.plans@ Crawley.gov.uk

3. LETTER NOTIFICATION OF COMMENCEMENT OF FORMAL PUBLIC CONSULTATION TO CONSULTEE DATABASE

Strategic Housing & Planning Services

Contact: Elizabeth Brigden

Date: 16/05/2016

Direct Line: 01293 438624

Email: Forward.Plans@crawley.gov.uk



Lee Harris
Chief Executive Directorate

Dear Sir or Madam,

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: CONSULTATION

Following the adoption of the Crawley Borough Local Plan: Crawley 2030, on 16 December 2015, Crawley Borough Council are seeking your views on the following Supplementary Planning Document:

- Green Infrastructure.

This document has been prepared to support the interpretation of some of the Policies set out within the Local Plan, and to provide additional advice and guidance in relation to ensuring planning applications are submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan.

The document is available to view on the council's website:

www.crawley.gov.uk/crawley2030spd and in hard copy at the Town Hall and the borough's libraries during normal office hours.

Consultation will take place between 16 May and 13 June 2016. All responses must be made in writing, by **5pm 13 June 2016**, and can be submitted either by email to forward.plans@crawley.gov.uk or by post to:

Forward Planning
Crawley Borough Council
Town Hall
The Boulevard
Crawley
RH10 1UZ

Consultation questions are set out within each document for your consideration and assistance. However, comments do not have to be restricted to responses to these.

If you have any questions relating to this public consultation, please contact Elizabeth Brigden, Planning Policy Manager on 01293 438624 or elizabeth.brigden@crawley.gov.uk

Yours Faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E Brigden'.

Elizabeth Brigden
Planning Policy Manager

4. EMAIL REMINDER TO CONSULTEE DATABASE

LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

7 June 2016



Dear,

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT REMINDER: CONSULTATION DEADLINE 5PM 13 JUNE 2016

Following the adoption of the Crawley Borough Local Plan: Crawley 2030, on 16 December 2015, Crawley Borough Council are seeking your views on the following Supplementary Planning Document:

- Green Infrastructure

This document has been prepared to support the interpretation of some of the Policies set out within the Local Plan, and to provide additional advice and guidance in relation to ensuring planning applications are submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan.

The document is available to view on the council's website: www.crawley.gov.uk/crawley2030spd and in hard copy at the Town Hall and the borough's libraries during normal office hours.

Many thanks to those who have already submitted comments, they are being collated and will be taken into account when preparing the document in its final form for adoption by the council.

Should you still wish to comment on the document, please note that the consultation period will close at **5pm 13 June 2016**. All responses must be made in writing and can be submitted either by email to forward.plans@crawley.gov.uk or by post to:

Forward Planning
Crawley Borough Council
Town Hall
The Boulevard
Crawley
RH10 1UZ

Consultation questions are set out within the Green Infrastructure document for your consideration and assistance. However, comments do not have to be restricted to responses to these.

If you have any questions relating to this public consultation, please contact Elizabeth Brigden, Planning Policy Manager on 01293 438624 or elizabeth.brigden@crawley.gov.uk

Kind Regards,

The Forward Planning Team

More information

For more information, please visit our website www.crawley.gov.uk/crawley2030spd.

Contact us

If you would like to contact the Forward Planning Team, please email us at forward.plans@crawley.gov.uk or you can phone us on 01293 428624.

Subscribe/unsubscribe

You have received this message as you have expressed an interest in being kept up-to-date with progress on Crawley's Local Plan and/or the Supplementary Planning Documents. If you would not like to receive these updates any more, please respond to this email and let us know. If you know anyone that would like to receive these updates please ask them to email us at forward.plans@crawley.gov.uk

5. CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL CRAWLEY 2030 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT WEBPAGE



[A](#) [accessibility](#) | [site map](#) | [contact us](#) | [cookies](#) | [what's new](#)


Advanced Search

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

Main Menu

- [HOME](#)
- [Business](#)
- [Community and Neighbourhoods](#)
- [Council Services and Democracy](#)
- [Council Tax and Benefits](#)
- [Health and Environment](#)
- [Homes and Housing](#)
- [Jobs and Careers](#)
- [Learning](#)
- [Leisure and Culture](#)
- [News and Events](#)
- [Planning and Development](#)
- [Streets, Roads and Transport](#)
- [Waste and Recycling](#)

or browse by theme

 

Find it
Tell Us
Pay it
Apply

Location: [Home](#) | [Planning and Development](#) | [Planning Policy](#) | [Local Plan - Crawley 2030](#) | [Crawley 2030: Supplementary Planning Documents](#) | [Listen](#)

Crawley 2030: Supplementary Planning Documents

Crawley Borough Council is commencing work on a number of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) to expand upon the policies established by the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030. Crawley 2030.

Update: Public Consultation 16 May 2016

Public consultation is taking place on the following Supplementary Planning Document (SPD):

- [Green Infrastructure](#)

This document has been prepared to support the interpretation of some of the Policies set out within the Local Plan, and to provide additional advice and guidance in relation to ensuring planning applications are submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan.

The document is available to view using the links below and in hard copy at the Town Hall and the borough's libraries during normal office hours.

All responses must be made in writing by **5pm on Monday 13 June 2016** and can be submitted either by email to or by post to:

Forward Planning
Crawley Borough Council
Town Hall
The Boulevard
Crawley
RH10 1UZ

If you have any questions relating to this public consultation, please contact Elizabeth Brigden, Planning Policy Manager on 01293 438624 or email [Elizabeth.Brigden](#).

Green Infrastructure

- [Green Infrastructure SPD](#)
- [Green Infrastructure Map](#)
- [Consultation Statement](#)

Crawley's Green Infrastructure network supports the wellbeing of residents and the environment. Green Infrastructure functions include, but are not limited to: recreation, biodiversity, climate change mitigation/adaptation, drainage, transport, job creation, visual amenity, and food and fuel sources. The SPD sets out the key elements which make up the important assets within the borough and expands upon the requirements of the following Local Plan Policies:

- [Policy CH3: Normal Requirements of All New Development](#)
- [Policy CH8: Tree Planting and Replacement Standards](#)
- [Policy CH7: Structural landscaping](#)
- [Policy CH9: Development Outside the Built-Up Area](#)
- [Policy CH11: Rights of Way and Access to the Countryside](#)
- [Policy ENV1: Green Infrastructure](#)
- [Policy ENV2: Biodiversity](#)
- [Policy ENV3: Local Green Space](#)
- [Policy ENV4: Open Space, Sport and Recreation](#)
- [Policy ENV5: Provision of Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities](#)

A key element of green infrastructure planning is taking opportunities, where possible, to create multi-functional green spaces to make the best use available land and to enhance the connectivity of the network, and, in applying the Local Plan policy requirements, consideration should be given to how each functions as part of the wider green infrastructure network.

Previous Consultations 1 March 2016

Consultation previously took place on the following two Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

In This Section:

- [Planning and Development](#)
- [Planning Policy](#)
- [Local Plan - Crawley 2030](#)
- [Crawley 2030: Supplementary Planning Documents](#)

Contact Us

tel: (01293) 438512
fax: (01293) 438495
email: [click to contact us](#)

address:
Strategic Planning
Town Hall
The Boulevard
Crawley
W Sussex RH10 1UZ



- [Planning and Climate Change](#)
- [Urban Design \(including Parking Standards\)](#)

The representations received on these two documents are currently being considered and addressed, wherever appropriate, into the final versions of the SPDs. The consultation versions of the SPDs can be accessed below.

Planning and Climate Change

- [Planning and Climate Change SPD](#)
- [Guidance Note: Energy and Water Efficiency for Alterations and Extensions to Buildings](#)
- [Consultation Statement](#)

The Planning and Climate Change SPD describes how development in Crawley should be designed in order to comply with those policies in Crawley's Local Plan which address the challenge of climate change. It focuses on the following policies:

- [Policy ENV6: Sustainable Design and Construction](#)
- [Policy ENV7: District Energy Networks](#)
- [Policy ENV8: Development and Flood Risk](#)
- [Policy ENV9: Tackling Water Stress](#)
- [Policy IN3: Development and Requirements for Sustainable Transport](#)

It also provides guidance on the parts of the following policies which contribute to the agenda of addressing climate change:

- [Policy CH3: Normal Requirements of all New Development](#)
- [Policy ENV1: Green Infrastructure](#)

This document includes guidance on the specific information required to accompany planning proposals in order to demonstrate compliance. Following this consultation, and consideration of the representations received, it will be adopted as Supplementary Planning Document and will be a material consideration in planning decisions taken by the council for developments within the borough.

A guidance note has been prepared to accompany the full SPD to assist in applying the Policies relating to energy and water efficiency for alterations and extensions to buildings (including for household planning applications).

Urban Design

- [Urban Design SPD \(4 MB\)](#)
- [Parking Standards Plans \(2 MB\)](#)
- [Consultation Statement](#)

The Urban Design SPD aims to support applicants in preparing and submitting good quality schemes, which meet national and local planning policy requirements, for planning permission and aid successful navigation through the council's Development Management process. The urban design principles and guidance in the document relate to all development of all scales and uses.

It provides additional guidance in order for applicants to meet the requirements set by the following Local Plan Policies:

- [Policy CH1: Neighbourhood Principles](#)
- [Policy CH2: Principles of Good Urban Design](#)
- [Policy CH3: Normal Requirements of All New Development](#)
- [Policy CH4: Comprehensive Development and Efficient Use of Land](#)
- [Policy CH5: Standards for All New Dwellings \(including conversions\)](#)
- [Policy CH9: Important Views](#)
- [Policy CH9: Development outside the Built-Up Area](#)
- [Policy IN4: Car and Cycle Parking Standards](#)

The draft Urban Design SPD provides guidance specifically related to development affecting heritage assets: within designated areas, or of buildings and structures. Expanding upon the Policies established in the Crawley Borough Local Plan:

- [Policy CH12: Heritage Assets](#)
- [Policy CH13: Conservation Areas](#)
- [Policy CH14: Areas of Special Local Character](#)
- [Policy CH15: Listed Buildings and Structures](#)
- [Policy CH16: Locally Listed Buildings](#)
- [Policy CH17: Historic Parks and Gardens](#)

Two options are provided in the Annex in relation to the Crawley Borough Parking Standards. Once adopted, the final approach set in the Urban Design SPD will supersede the current approach set out in the adopted Planning Obligations and S106 Agreements SPD.

Topic Areas

The SPDs will not make new planning policy, but will aid the interpretation and implementation of the adopted Crawley Local Plan. The topic areas currently being prepared as SPDs are:

- [Affordable Housing](#)

- Climate Change
- Design
- Green Infrastructure
- Town Centre

These SPDs will eventually replace the existing suite of supplementary planning guidance notes and some of the other SPDs. Manor Froyal SPD and Design Guide will remain a council adopted document, as will Development of Gatwick Airport SPD.

The adopted Planning Obligations and S106 Agreements SPD will be amended alongside the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Crawley. More details can be found on the council's dedicated CIL webpage:

www.crawley.gov.uk/CIL.

The SPDs will provide guidance and expansion of the Local Plan policies where it is concluded that additional information adds value, beyond that which is already provided in the Policies and supporting text of the Crawley Borough Local Plan.

Who are they for?

The SPDs will be aimed at individuals and companies who wish to make a successful planning application. This will include:

- Householders
- Businesses
- Landowners

Why do we need SPDs?

The SPDs will seek to provide guidance for applicants to meet the policy requirements set by the Local Plan, and offer information as to what is expected at each of the key stages relating to the making of a planning application:

- Pre-application;
- Submission & validation;
- Planning application;
- Post-planning permission.

Involvement and Engagement

If you are interested in being involved and kept informed on the progress of the SPDs please contact [Forward Planning](#) with your name and contact details, along with the topic area, or areas, you are interested in. You are welcome to be engaged in as many or as few of the SPDs as you would wish to be.

We welcome your views on the following questions.

General Consultation Questions

Q1: Do the topics identified cover the main areas requiring additional guidance?

Q2: Are any of the topics considered unnecessary?

Q3: Are there any additional topics which haven't been identified as a Supplementary Planning Document which the council should consider?

Q4: Are the policies identified to be covered by the SPDs appropriate?

Q5: Should any of the policies be addressed in a different SPD to that identified in the table?

Q6: Should policies only be covered by one SPD rather than considered by each relevant topic area?

Q7: Are there other policies in the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (Crawley 2030) that haven't been identified which should be considered for inclusion in one of the SPDs?

Q8: Should the SPDs focus solely on statutory planning policy guidance or should they offer best practice examples and be used to provide advice and suggestions beyond the remit of planning policy, within the topic area?

Q9: Do you have any other, strategic comments on the scope and remit of the SPDs for consideration at this stage?

APPENDIX C: CONSULTATION REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND COUNCIL RESPONSES

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT			
Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
Surrey County Council		Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council. We do not have any comments on ' Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document '.	Noted. No further action.
Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FANTASTIC that you are signposting applicants and developers to SxBRC. I'm really keen that the information we provide is used to inform the planning process from the earliest stages. I'd love to see applicants coming to us routinely for a desktop biodiversity report to inform their responses to any biodiversity screening questions, for example. And obviously it's essential that they come to us for data if they're carrying out any kind of ecological survey. (Just so you're aware: all data requests relating to the submission of a planning application are classified as 'commercial' and we therefore charge a fee to cover our administrative costs – regardless of whether it's the householder / applicant coming to us for data or a commercial consultant acting on their behalf. We're currently looking at the categories we use for data requests as some householders find the 'commercial' terminology confusing, but we will always charge a fee if the data request is for a planning application). Perhaps worth flagging that SxBRC also provides information on all designated sites (statutory and non-statutory) and priority habitats in the search area. We hold more comprehensive information on priority habitats than is available in the national inventories (through the Natural England website) as our information is continuously updated. Regarding designated sites, it may also be worth signposting applicants to SxBRC for information on the location of Local Wildlife Sites (SNClS) as this would be included in a standard desktop biodiversity report. I had a quick look on the Crawley.gov.uk website and it looks like the Local Wildlife Sites are listed, and there's a google map showing their locations, but the boundaries are not clear. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This has been included in Paragraph 5.35(2) to help applicants locate important information.</p> <p>Local Wildlife Site boundaries are shown on the Local Plan Map.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding provision of survey data (section 5.40) – perhaps we could have a chat about this? I welcome the general principle but I think in practise we might struggle to deal with reports submitted in the way described. CIEEM has recently published guidelines on Accessing and Using Biodiversity Data² and you could perhaps align your requirements with this. All relevant biodiversity data obtained must be submitted to SxBRC either directly or through the Consultants Portal (see http://www.consultantsportal.uk/). We're currently trialling the use of the Consultants Portal with The Ecology Consultancy; if we get their data through OK, using our existing data flow arrangements, then we'd be happy for all consultants to use the portal. The <i>Species Recorder</i> data entry tool for Excel is getting rather out of date now, so we probably wouldn't want to signpost people to that. 	<p>This section has been amended to reflect the up-to-date method of submitting survey data.</p>
<p>Gatwick Airport Limited: Aerodrome Safeguarding</p>		<p>Thank you for your email dated 16 May 2016, regarding the above mentioned document.</p> <p>We have assessed the document from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and our main concern is in connection with 'Wildlife Hazard Management'. Aerodrome operators are required by the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) and UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), to take necessary steps to ensure that the hazard is assessed and the risk is reduced to the lowest practicable level.</p> <p>Aircraft are vulnerable to birdstrikes and it has been identified as one of our top risks, therefore it is important that any proposed developments do not increase the wildlife hazard risk over and above that which already exists.</p> <p>With regard to aerodrome safeguarding our area of concern stretches out in a 13km circle which is centred on the runway and is shown on the 'Coloured Squares' Consultation map which is lodged with yourselves. Further details of this can be found in DfT, ODPM Circular 01/2003 'Safeguarding of Aerodromes, Technical Sites & Military Explosives Storage Areas.....' under Annex 2 paras 7 – 9.</p>	<p>A section on aerodrome safeguarding and birdstrike hazards has been included.</p>

² (see http://www.cieem.net/data/files/Publications/Guidelines_for_Accessing_and_Using_Biodiversity_Data.pdf)

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>By working together it is possible to achieve both biodiversity gain without increasing the risk to the airport.</p> <p>Our comments are as follows:</p> <p><u>Part 1 – Introduction</u> Questions 1& 2: No aerodrome safeguarding comments.</p> <p><u>Part 2 – The Green Infrastructure Network</u> Questions 3 – 5 & 7 – 9: No aerodrome safeguarding comments.</p> <p>Question 6 – Is the guidance on landscaping & maintenance helpful to applicants?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to ‘Landscape Design for new Developments’ paras 2.15 to 2.18, mention should be made of the need to take aerodrome safeguarding requirements into consideration, possibly under Para 2.18. For example ‘Gatwick Airport Ltd should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that any proposed landscaping will not increase the birdstrike risk to the airport, please email gal.safeguarding@gatwickairport.com who will be happy to advise’. <p><u>Part 3 – Trees</u> Question 10: No aerodrome safeguarding comments.</p> <p>Question 11: See response to question 12 below.</p> <p>Question 12: Are there any issues that we have not covered which you would like to draw our attention to? Aerodrome safeguarding requirements have not been mentioned and we feel that mention should be made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to ‘New Tree Planting & Replacement Planting’ Paras 3.7 to 3.37. Under Paras 3.22 & 3.23, mention should be made of the need to consider aerodrome safeguarding in relation to wildlife hazard risk management at an early stage. For example ‘Gatwick Airport Ltd should be consulted at an early stage to ensure that any proposed tree planting will not increase the bird strike risk to the airport please email gal.safeguarding@gatwickairport.com who will be happy to advise’. 	

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>Part 4 – Open Space Questions 13 & 14: No aerodrome safeguarding comments.</p> <p>Question 15 – Is further guidance needed on provision of open space? Mention should be made of the need to consider aerodrome safeguarding in relation to wildlife hazard risk management, possibly under Para 4.36. For example 'Gatwick Airport Ltd should be consulted at an early stage with regard to green roofs, hedgerow planting, improvements to watercourses and water bodies, landscaping & implementation of SUDS, to ensure that the proposals will not increase the birdstrike risk to the airport, please email gal.safeguarding@gatwickairport.com who will be happy to advise'.</p> <p>Part 5 - Biodiversity Question 16 – Does this section clearly set out survey requirements and process for considering biodiversity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to 'Biodiversity in the Development Process', in Figure 5. 'Pre Application Stage'. A further stage should be added as follows: <i>'Are the biodiversity enhancements/planting of a type that are likely to attract birds to the site? (for further general guidance please refer to the AOA Advice Notes at www.aoa.org). If so please contact gal.safeguarding@gatwickairport.com for further advice.</i> • With regard to 'Enhancing Biodiversity & Habitat Creation' under Para 5.63. reference should be made to the AOA Advice Notes as mentioned above. • With regard to 'Landscaping' under Para 5.75 a bullet point should be added in relation to aerodrome safeguarding as follows: <i>'The potential for increasing in particular birdstrike risk to the airport depends on several factors for example the proposed development, species of bird present and existing conditions around the site. For example the following can have an impact:</i> <u>Proposed Landscaping & Amenity Planting</u> <i>The location & density of landscaping & amenity planting can have an impact upon the potential risk of birdstrike as it could attract birds such as Pigeons, Corvids & Starlings in large numbers, depending on the amount</i> 	

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p><i>and type of planting and its proximity to the airport. It may provide nesting and roosting habitats. Large unbroken blocks of planting are more likely to attract roosting, nesting or feeding birds rather than small blocks of widely spaced trees.</i></p> <p><u>Restoration, Enhancement & Creation of New Watercourses & SUDS</u> <i>Water bodies and their associated features, depending on their size and shape and proximity to the airport have the potential to attract birds hazardous to aviation such as Gulls, Geese, Swans, Heron, Cormorants & smaller waterfowl for feeding, nesting and roosting. Further general information can be found in the AOA Advice Notes at www.aoa.org</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to 'Green Roof & Living Walls' under Paras 5.79 to 5.82 a Para should be inserted with regard aerodrome safeguarding requirements as follows: <i>'Large areas of flat/shallow pitched and green roofs can be attractive to large numbers of Gulls and Pigeons for nesting roosting and loafing. If a proposed development includes roofs of this type, depending on its proximity to the airport, it may be necessary to agree a bird hazard management plan with Gatwick Airport Ltd to ensure that the birdstrike risk to the airport is not increased'.</i> <p>Question 17: <i>No aerodrome safeguarding comments.</i></p> <p>Part 6 – Countryside & AONB Questions 18 -20 <i>No aerodrome safeguarding comments</i></p> <p>As an alternative to mentioning aerodrome safeguarding under each section as per the above, the following could be inserted at the beginning of the document as follows:</p> <p>Aerodrome Safeguarding – Wildlife Risk Management <i>It is important to ensure that proposed developments that have the potential to attract wildlife the vicinity of the aerodrome are properly assessed. Aircraft are vulnerable to bird strikes and birds moving between sites located off the aerodrome can increase the birdstrike risk. Birdstrikes by all species have the potential to result in damage and delays to aircraft operations.</i></p>	

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p><i>It is important that any proposed developments do not increase the wildlife hazard risk over and above that, which already exists, by increasing the population of hazardous birds on the site and in the vicinity of the aerodrome, or by the formation of flight lines that enter critical airspace. The internationally accepted safeguarding area with reference to bird strike hazards is a 13km radius around the aerodrome.</i></p> <p><i>The matters to be taken into consideration are:</i></p> <p><u><i>Proposed Landscaping & Amenity Planting</i></u> <i>The location and density of landscaping and amenity planting will have an impact upon the potential risk of birdstrike as it could attract birds such as Pigeons, Corvids & Starlings in large numbers, depending on the amount and type of planting and its proximity to the airport. It may provide nesting and roosting habitats and large unbroken blocks of planting are more likely to attract roosting, nesting or feeding birds rather than small blocks of widely spaced trees.</i></p> <p><u><i>Restoration, Enhancement & Creation of New Watercourses & SUDS</i></u> <i>Water bodies and their associated features, depending on their size and shape and proximity to the airport have the potential to attract birds hazardous to aviation such as Gulls, Geese, Swans, Heron, Cormorants & smaller waterfowl for feeding, nesting and roosting.</i></p> <p><u><i>Flat/Shallow Pitched & Green Roofs</i></u> <i>Large areas of flat/shallow pitched and green roofs can be attractive to large numbers of Gulls and Pigeons for nesting roosting and loafing. If a proposed development includes roofs of this type it may be necessary to agree a bird hazard management plan to ensure that the birdstrike risk to the airport is not increased.</i></p> <p><i>Gatwick Airport Ltd are supportive of biodiversity and are keen to work with both LPA's and developers to ensure that biodiversity gains are met without increasing the wildlife strike risk to the airport.</i></p>	
Thames Water		<p>Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) Property Services function is now being delivered by Savills (UK) Limited as Thames Water's appointed supplier. Savills are therefore pleased to respond to the above consultation on behalf of Thames Water.</p>	<p>This has been added to the designing with trees section.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>As you will be aware, Thames Water are the statutory sewerage undertaker for the Borough and are hence a “specific consultation body” in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. We have the following comments on the consultation document on behalf of Thames Water:</p> <p>Thames Water recognises the environmental benefits of trees and encourages the planting of them. However, in order for the public sewers and water supply network to operate satisfactorily, trees, and shrubs should not be planted over the route of the sewers or water pipes.</p>	
Highways England		<p>Thank you for inviting Highways England to comment on the Crawley Borough Council Green Infrastructure SPD Consultation.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network.</p> <p>We do not have any comments.</p>	Noted. No further action.
Natural England		<p>Thank you for consulting Natural England on the Crawley Local Plan's G.I SPD. Natural England notes and welcomes the provision of this. We have the following comments to make:</p> <p><u>General points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support the provision of spatial Strategic network which is highlighted for its multifunctional benefits to wildlife and people. We support the inclusion of this SPD as it provides a strategic joined-up approach to safeguarding G.I. rather than a piecemeal approach from individual applications. We advise that this approach is key to identifying and protecting G.I and wildlife corridors from future impacts thorough development. 	Ecosystems services is now mentioned in the overarching Green Infrastructure section with the protection and enhancement of ecosystems services implicit throughout the document.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We Support policy ENV1 Green Infrastructure which requires justification for any application which blocks or damages the identified Network. We advise that Ecosystems Services are included here for the wealth of benefits they bring for vital resources such as water food and cleaner air. 	
	Para 2.5	<p><u>Specific Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 2.5 states that: <i>Green infrastructure functions include but are not limited to: Recreation, biodiversity, climate change mitigation/adaptation, drainage, transport, job creation, and visual amenity, and food and fuel sources.</i> This should also cite Ecosystems services. 	See above.
		<p>Landscaping We advise that landscaping proposals use native species preferably of local provenance to enhance biodiversity.</p>	This is already mentioned in the landscaping section of the SPD.
		<p>Ancient Woodland Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat. Once lost it cannot be replaced and this has been recognised in National Planning and Policy Guidance (see below). Ancient woodland should be a clear and vital part of the green infrastructure network. These woodlands and hedgerows/habitats which link them contain a wealth of wildlife and interconnecting wildlife corridors throughout the landscape. These are vital for the maintenance of robust populations of species into the future. We advise that the maintenance and enhancement of these key habitats through the landscape should be a vital component of any G.I network.</p> <p>We advise that NPPF Paragraph 118 is cited here which gives protection to ancient woodland as follows:</p> <p><i>planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss;</i></p> <p>We refer you to Natural England's standing advice on ancient woodlands for more information.</p>	Protection of ancient woodland under NPPF and Local Plan policy is now referred to in the ancient woodland section of the SPD.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>Open space We advise that open space could be considered as multifunctional rather than simply providing recreational space or allotments for example. A single space could be considered for combinations of these, for example play space and natural greenspace for children to experience nature.</p>	<p>The open space section ensures that a sufficient amount of good quality open space is in the right location but a section has been added to reference the benefits of multifunctional open space.</p>
		<p>Biodiversity Clear links to habitats and the potential for enhancing and linking these should be more clearly shown on the attached map.</p> <p>Links to wellbeing from experiencing natural habitats and spaces should be included,</p> <p>Opportunities for linking up G.I beyond Crawley's boundaries should also be explored here</p> <p>We hope these comments are helpful</p>	<p>The opportunities for enhancing/linking habitat are shown as biodiversity opportunity areas. Identification of further opportunities within and beyond Crawley's boundary will be developed further through partnership working. The Green Infrastructure Map and SPD will be updated periodically to reflect this.</p>
The Woodland Trust	2.14	<p>We would wish to see no damage to or loss of ancient woodland.</p> <p>Ancient woodland is defined as land that has been wooded continuously since at least 1600, though many ancient woods are much older than this, and some may even form a link with the primeval woodland that covered the UK after the last Ice Age.</p> <p>Ancient woods are irreplaceable. They are our richest terrestrial wildlife habitats, with complex ecological communities that have developed over centuries, and contain a high proportion of rare and threatened species, many of which are dependent on the particular conditions that this habitat affords. For this reason, ancient woods are reservoirs of biodiversity, but because the resource is limited and highly fragmented, they and their associated wildlife are particularly vulnerable.</p> <p>Their long continuity and lack of disturbance means ancient woods are often also living history books, preserving archaeological features and evidence of past land use, from earthworks to charcoal pits. They are also places of great aesthetic appeal, making them attractive for recreation and the many benefits this can bring in terms of health and well being.</p>	Comments noted.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>With only 2.4% of the land area in Great Britain covered by ancient woodland, it is essential that no more of this finite resource is lost. This means that ancient woodland must be protected absolutely from permanent clearance, but also that it must be protected from damaging effects of adjacent and nearby land-use that could threaten the integrity of the habitat and survival of its special characteristics.</p> <p>It is not possible to replace ancient woodland by planting a new site, or attempting translocation. Every ancient wood is a unique habitat that has evolved over centuries, with a complex interdependency of geology, soils, hydrology, flora and fauna.</p>	
	2.16	<p>We suggest adding these points: Trees can improve air quality. Trees can help with water management eg reduced flood risk, improved water quality. For more information, visit https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/plant-trees/why-plant-trees/water-management/</p>	This has been added to paragraph 2.16 which lists the benefits of open space.
	3.1	We would wish to see an aspiration to increase canopy cover.	This has been added to the beginning of tree section.
	3.7	We suggest planting a range of native trees (depending on site conditions) – using different species will help mitigate the potential effects of tree disease.	Advice on providing native trees is included in the landscaping and biodiversity sections as the tree section is primarily focused on retention and protection of trees.
	3.40	<p>We suggest moving this to be the first point about ancient woodland. We suggest adding this additional wording taken from the Standing Advice (2015): “...developers should start by looking for ways to avoid the development affecting ancient woodland or veteran trees eg by redesigning the scheme.” <u>Query:</u> Have you had official notification from Natural England about the new Standing Advice? The wording you use is from the 2014 Standing Advice pdf</p>	This section has been amended to include some information from the standing advice and reference national/Local Plan policy to provide a clearer position on ancient woodland.
	3.41	Please add the Woodland Trust as consultees.	Whilst there are no statutory consultees for applications which affect ancient woodland the Forestry Commission

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
			has been chosen as a consultee as set out in the National Planning Policy Guidance. However, this request will be considered when the council's list of non-statutory consultees is reviewed.
	3.42	<p>There is no clear definition of a veteran tree. Therefore, any tree of a good age for its species may have potential to become a veteran tree and the advice of an Arboriculturalist will be needed to identify trees that could be considered veteran.</p> <p>Suggest amending the text above to include wording from the Standing Advice on https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences</p> <p>'Therefore, any tree of a good age for its species or exhibiting senescence may be a veteran tree and the advice of an Arboriculturalist will be needed to identify trees that could be considered veteran.</p>	Suggested wording has been included to provide guidance on what a veteran tree is.
	3.45	We would like to be consulted on any proposed felling of veteran trees.	This will be considered when the council's list of non-statutory consultees is reviewed.
The Wilky Group		<p>This is a representation on Crawley Borough Council's Green Infrastructure SPD, submitted on behalf of The Wilky Group (TWG).</p> <p>TWG has been promoting a strategic business park aligned with the economic objectives of the Gatwick Diamond, the growth of the Airport and the economic needs of Crawley. The land was promoted via the Crawley Local Plan Examinations in 2006/7 and 2015. A masterplan was prepared covering land shown edged red on the attached plan*. TWG owns land between Balcombe Road (B2036) and Peeks Brook Lane to the south of the M23 spur road.</p> <p>I have reviewed the Green Infrastructure SPD and have no comments to make on its guidance, which I assume will be applied in a flexible and pragmatic way in relation to the above-mentioned land, recognising that it falls within an Area of Search for a Strategic Employment Location(s) within the adopted Crawley BLP (2015) – Policy EC1. The land could accommodate a strategic business park, incorporating existing green infrastructure and additional green linkages /</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The GI Map has been amended to improve legibility. The possibility of an interactive GI map will also be explored which will give users the opportunity to turn layers on/off. 2. The mapping of rivers will be explored in consultation with the Environment Agency and the GI map updated accordingly.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>planting to deliver a sustainable development, taking account of the context of the site and its existing landscape framework.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Map shows a number of environmental features within the above-mentioned land, comprising ancient hedgerows, River Centrelines and a Footpath. In relation to two of these features, the following comments are made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Footpath is shown on the GI Map extending north from Fernhill Road along Donkey Lane. This Footpath extends north towards the M23 spur road, and then west to join Balcombe Road, but this part of the Footpath does not show up clearly on the GI Map. The Map should be amended to show more clearly the full length of this Footpath. 2. A number of River Centrelines are shown on the GI Map. The 'River Centrelines' shown are dry (ephemeral) ditches, performing a field drainage function during wet weather. These dry ditches do not constitute Main River as defined by the Environment Agency's online Main Rivers Map, so should not be defined on the GI Map as 'River Centrelines'. Such features are defined by the Environment Agency as 'Ordinary Watercourses' – the GI Map should be amended to either (1) remove the features from the above-mentioned land, or (2) revise the GI Map and key to show these features within the above-mentioned land as 'Ordinary Watercourse Centrelines'. <p>I trust the above representations assist the Council in reviewing the Green Infrastructure SPD and in making final changes prior to its adoption.</p> <p>Please don't hesitate to contact me if you need any further clarification or information.</p>	
Gatwick Airport Limited		<p>Background</p> <p>Gatwick Airport is the UK's second largest airport and the most efficient single-runway airport in the world. It serves more than 200 destinations in 90 countries for more than 40 million passengers a year on short and long-haul point-to-point services. It is a major economic driver for the South-East region, generating around 21,000 on-airport jobs and a further 10,000 jobs through related activities. The airport falls within Crawley Borough and is 28 miles from the UK's main economic hub of London with excellent public transport links to</p>	Noted.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>the City, including the Gatwick Express. Gatwick Airport Limited is a proactive member of the Crawley Business Community and wider sub region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This note sets out GAL's formal comments as an interested party in this Consultation and as the owner and operator of Gatwick Airport. • GAL's submission to this Consultation is made with particular regard to positively and appropriately developing suitable planning guidance on Green Infrastructure which may be in close proximity to the airport. • GAL request to be notified of any amendments made to the Draft SPD following the Public Consultation and of the next stages in progressing the Green Infrastructure SPD through to adoption. 	
		<p>Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) greatly welcomes the opportunity to comment upon the new Crawley Borough Council Green Infrastructure SPD. Gatwick Airport Limited is proactive in striving to continuously improve in areas of environmental sustainability. As a stakeholder within the Crawley community GAL has made key commitments addressing issues of sustainability. GAL clearly recognises the important role of Green Infrastructure locally and cumulatively across the sub region. GAL are proud to have been awarded by the Wildlife Trust a Bench Mark Award in recognition of the environmental best practices that GAL has firmly adopted particularly in terms of managing valuable habitats and its biodiversity enhancement strategies.</p> <p>The proximity of the airport to Crawley has had an important influence upon the shaping of the Green Infrastructure of the Borough. GAL therefore considers it is crucial that we continue to engage in a long term working with CBC to support the aims of the Draft SPD in gaining positive Green Infrastructure networks in Crawley Borough and the wider area.</p>	Noted.
		<p>GAL has been fully engaged in the recent review process of the newly adopted 'Crawley 2030' Local Plan. GAL recognises that the key principles for achieving sustainable development are embedded within the new CBC Local Plan which provides the overarching planning policy direction for future development of Green Infrastructure. GAL is fully supportive of the production of this more detailed document Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which will provide the planning policy in greater detail and add to the robustness of the development proposals in Crawley. The SPD will be an</p>	Noted.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>important planning tool for assisting developers in achieving more sustainable forms of development.</p> <p>The Government is currently considering whether Gatwick should be permitted to grow and build a new runway. Expansion at Gatwick would provide an even greater economic boost with a new runway by 2025. It is widely recognised that the local economic benefits would however be appreciated far in advance of a second runway actually opening with many socio economic benefits potentially being realised almost immediately within local communities particularly Crawley. If Government afforded permission for a second runway to be developed at Gatwick Airport then it is acknowledged that there would need to be a Review of the CBC Local Plan. The Local Plan has laid down planning policies which are relevant to the current single runway configuration of the airport and the Draft SPD is therefore also applicable to the airport in its existing one runway operation. If a twin runway configuration was to be introduced GAL would like to highlight that the Draft Green Infrastructure SPD would also need to be reviewed in line with the bringing forth of a nationally significant project. It is highly probable that a full review of Green Infrastructure SPD would be required due to the scale of a potential second runway development. It may also be considered more pragmatic that a separate standalone Green Infrastructure Management Plan for R2 would be necessary if the proposed second runway were to be realised in time.</p> <p>Therefore the comments provided by GAL to this consultation are within the context of the airport operating as a single runway operation only as that is the adopted position of the current Local Plan.</p>	
		<p>Aerodrome Safeguarding GAL considers that the SPD is seriously lacking in the consideration the implications of Green Infrastructure on aerodrome safeguarding and the potential conflicts which may occur. Developers need to be aware of the need for green infrastructure proposals to be compatible with the requirements of aerodrome safeguarding in order to reduce the risk of the potential for bird strike for example. GAL has therefore submitted to CBC a separate set of consultations documents which focus upon addressing the Draft SPD and matters of Aerodrome Safeguarding.</p>	<p>A section on aerodrome safeguarding has been added.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>Gatwick Airport Limited Consultation Comments:</p> <p>In response to the SPD Consultation GAL would like to put forward the following broader comments:</p> <p>GAL welcomes the vision CBC have set out for in the SPD and broadly supports the Green Infrastructure and planning policies CBC are aspiring to adopt.</p>	Noted.
		<p>GAL would welcome the creation of a Green Infrastructure online micro – (site as has been established for 'Regenerating Crawley') as a positive communications channel. Ambitious Green Infrastructure schemes can only be fully realised with clear channels of communications engaging the involvement of the wider Crawley community, businesses, public and private sector partners, developers and residents.</p>	Noted. This is something that the council could explore following the adoption of the SPD alongside working with other local authorities to create a strategic approach to GI delivery.
		<p>The visitor experience can positively impact upon economic regeneration and enhanced footfall can be achieved by simply making it more attractive green spaces to spend recreational time. The quality and type of surface access and overall connectivity of Green Infrastructure can be a key factor in its success. It has been recognised that there needs to be a good access to green environments for pedestrians to enjoy the greater benefits Green Infrastructure can bring. Creating more walkable green spaces will increase footfall and usage of green amenity space, which is also a key factor for regeneration. A successful and sustainable green space network requires development integrated with good pedestrian and cyclist routes, and efficient public transport. Improved pedestrian and public transport options to green spaces in the Borough will not only encourage greater usage but also promote a lower carbon footprint and contribute towards improving air quality which are essential features of sustainable growth.</p>	Comments noted. Reiterating the benefits of GI are welcomed and set out in the SPD.
		<p>Summary GAL supports the ambitions and policy basis of the guidance laid out in the CBC SPD. GAL has presented constructive comments to feed into the development of a pragmatic and successful Green Infrastructure SPD. GAL has noted that the comments provided are within the context of the airport in its current single runway operation (and if a twin runway configuration was</p>	As above.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>realised then GAL considers that there would need to be a further review of the SPD). GAL welcomes the opportunity to continue to work alongside CBC and explore how we can further support the delivery of this important SPD planning tool.</p> <p>If you have any queries or would like to further discuss the comments put forward by GAL please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
		<p><u>Are there any other issues or areas of the policy that need further clarification and do you have any further suggestions to help applicants meet the requirements of Local plan Policies covered in this SPD?</u></p> <p>The “key diagram” on page 12 of the Crawley Local Plan (CLP), and the larger figure on Page 124 show that the area to the south and east of Gatwick is designated as an “area of search for future employment land (Policy EC1)” and that it is also safeguarded land for the development of a second runway. However, this land is also identified on the Green Infrastructure Plan as being a “biodiversity opportunity area”.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Plan should acknowledge the designations within the overarching CLP to make it clear, that whilst the area may have potential for biodiversity, it is otherwise being safeguarded for employment land or for development of a second runway (policies EC1 and GAT2).</p> <p>The supplementary planning document should be clear that inclusion on the Green Infrastructure plan of these areas should not restrict development compatible with EC1, GAT1, GAT2 and GAT3, or give more weight than is appropriate to provision of green infrastructure in these areas above other uses compatible with the designations in the CLP.</p> <p>[For example, Figure 4 on page 36 of the Consultation document Crawley's Designated Biodiversity Sites includes the “biodiversity opportunity areas” on it.]</p>	<p>The GI map has been amended to show the area of search and Gatwick Safeguarding to highlight the development opportunities depending on the outcome of the decision on additional runway capacity in the UK.</p>
		<p><u>Please let us know if you have any examples (including photos) in Crawley which show good green infrastructure planning.</u></p> <p>The diversion of the River Mole around the north west perimeter of Gatwick is an excellent example of how delivery of multifunctional green infrastructure</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>within a wider Project, provide public access to an area attractive to wildlife. An image of the river diversion is shown below.</p> <p>photo</p>	
		<p><u>Does the GI map fully reflect the green infrastructure assets and general opportunities present in Crawley? If not, how could this be improved?</u></p> <p>See comment above regarding the designation without reference to other Local Plan policies safeguarding employment land and for the wider development of Gatwick Airport.</p>	Noted.
		<p><u>Is the guidance on how applicants should consider green infrastructure clear?</u></p> <p>Generally: Yes it is clear, however this section has omitted to identify constraints on landscaping that apply to Gatwick Airport due to bird strike risk. It should also identify that development should not be incompatible with the requirements of DfT/ODPM Circular 1/2003 - advice to local planning authorities on safeguarding aerodromes and military explosives storage areas. GAL has submitted a separate set of consultation comments specifically looking at how the SPD needs to fully consider the requirements for Aerodrome Safeguarding. The current SPD is significantly lacking in its content on Aerodrome Safeguarding and the need for developers to engage with the Council and GAL to ensure that there are no potential conflicts regarding green infrastructure proposals and the need to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the airport.</p>	Noted. See earlier comments/response.
		<p><u>Are the green assets and opportunities to deliver benefits sufficiently covered?</u></p> <p>No comment</p>	Noted. No further action.
		<p><u>Is the guidance on landscaping and maintenance helpful to applicants?</u></p> <p>No comment</p>	Noted. No further action.
		<p><u>7. Does the guidance enable proposals impacting structural landscaping to adequately assess the impacts?</u></p>	Noted. No further action.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p><u>8. Does the rights of way section highlight the key issues for applicants to consider?</u></p> <p><u>9. Are you aware of any other opportunities for enhancing the rights of way network?</u></p> <p>No comment</p>	
		<p><u>CONSULTATION QUESTIONS: PART 3 TREES</u></p> <p><u>10. Is the guidance for provision of one tree per new dwelling and on tree replacement standards clear?</u></p> <p><u>11. Are there any other considerations in the type and location of new and replacement tree planting?</u></p> <p><u>12. Are there any issues we have not covered which you would like to draw our attention to?</u></p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 provides for a financial payment to the Council of £700 or £3319</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where development results in the loss of council owned trees in open ground. • Where development results in the loss of trees on the development site, and is unable to provide replacement tree planting on site. <p>Paragraph 3.14 provides for a compensation ratio of trees to be replaced which is related to the girth of the trees lost.</p> <p>Given that GAL may advance a DCO for the Government allows for a second runway development at Gatwick Airport and the DCO will provide for replacement habitat areas within it GAL therefore considers that it should not be subject to either the financial contribution element above with regards to a second runway development. Furthermore and the ratio of trees to be replanted should be determined in the context of specific conservation objectives following appropriate environmental assessment. The supplementary planning document should thus acknowledge that large projects may have alternative delivery mechanisms which meet the requirements of ENV1, and other policies including CH6, CH7 and CH8.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Acknowledging the DCO process under a second runway scenario is unnecessary in this SPD.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>GAL strongly considers that the guidance should make clear that should a new runway be brought forward at Gatwick then the approach to replacement planting will need to be subject to its own provisions and review considered at that time.</p> <p>GAL again would refer to the separate consultations comments submitted by GAL in reference to the need for the SPD to further acknowledge the need for aerodrome safeguarding constraints - which may limit certain tree species types and may require innovative solutions to avoid risk to safety and compromising the operation of the airport.</p>	
		<p><u>Part 4: Open space</u></p> <p><u>13. Does this section clearly set out what is required to mitigate the impacts of new development on open space and the process for determining proposals on open space?</u></p> <p><u>14. Should there be further guidance from the council on what an applicant would need to assess to determine whether an open space is surplus to requirements?</u></p> <p><u>15. Is further guidance needed on provision of open space?</u></p> <p>There is a flow chart in Figure 3 on page 33 which explains how the re-provision of open space is calculated; Table 7 (p30) provides accessibility standards in terms of walking distances. GAL considers that in the event that a second runway is to be brought forward at the airport then it will give rise to unique circumstances and the need for comprehensive approach and a further policy review to all Green Infrastructure issues.</p>	<p>Comments noted. A second runway being brought forward would trigger a review of the Local Plan.</p>
		<p><u>Part 5: Biodiversity</u></p> <p><u>Policy ENV2 aims to support the Local Plan's objective to deliver a net gain of biodiversity over the Plan period through the incorporation of features to encourage biodiversity in new development wherever possible. The Policy establishes a hierarchy of biodiversity sites against which policy criteria is set. Biodiversity is also protected through a range of other legislation outside of the Planning system.</u></p>	<p>Noted.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		This section accords generally with what might be expected. GAL is in agreement that the indicative landscape and habitat plan is intended to deliver a net gain in biodiversity in the medium to long term.	
		<p><u>16. Does this section clearly set out survey requirements and process for considering biodiversity?</u></p> <p><u>17. Is the technical information in this section up to date and an accurate reflection of biodiversity in Crawley?</u></p> <p>No comment – as expected.</p>	Noted. No further action.
		<p><u>Part 6: landscape</u></p> <p>No comment – as expected</p>	Noted. No further action.
West Sussex County Council		<p>Part 2: The Green Infrastructure Network</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>It is welcomed that the SPD recognises Public Rights of Way (PROW) as a key element of Crawley's GI network and highlights the role of the West Sussex Rights of Way Improvement Plan.</p> <p>In a PROW context we would encourage Crawley Borough Council (CBC) to work with neighbouring District and Parish Councils in support of its desire to protect, enhance and encourage use of the various routes within the Borough. This will help to make routes continuous and also identify logical alternatives to use of the road network which acts as a deterrent for some users. Access to and from the Borough could be considerably enhanced for non-motorised users by maximising use of existing infrastructure, particularly grade-separated crossings of the M23 motorway.</p> <p>We would agree with the key issues for the accessibility of GI within and close to the Borough that are set out in paragraph 2.27. Suggested additions to the 'opportunities' paragraph are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle and equestrian access to/from Ifieldwood; • Cycle access into/from Buchan Country Park from St Clement Road; • Cycle and equestrian access from Tilgate Park into Tilgate Forest and to Parish Lane; 	Additional opportunities have been added to the list which will be reviewed periodically in consultation with WSSC and adjoining authorities.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle access to/from Crabbet Park (and possibly equestrian too given its part use as a stables); • Cycle access (and possibly equestrian too) between Tinsley Green and Fern Court Farm; • Cycle access (and possibly equestrian too) between Langley Green and Charlwood; and, • Linking bridleway between existing bridleways 1525/1 and 350Sy. <p>Staff from our Rights of Way Team would be willing to meet with CBC officers to help identify routes for future creation and enhancement if that will be helpful. We suggest that joint working with WSCC on the development of schemes to improve path surfaces, path widths and changes to path status would help to deliver the ambitions identified by CBC.</p>	
		<p>Q3. Does the GI map fully reflect the green infrastructure assets and general opportunities present in Crawley? If not, how could this be improved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the Green Infrastructure Map does have a good representation of the GI within Crawley, some designations are hard to decipher, such as Ancient Woodland and Scheduled Ancient Monuments (particularly within the Forge Wood key housing site) – it would be clearer if these were moved to the front of the layering. • It would also be useful if any significant water bodies such as lakes were mapped. • By restricting the majority of the mapping to the administrative boundary, opportunities to enhance GI or avoid adversely affecting GI could be missed. The GI network reaches beyond the boundary. This is of particular importance when considering opportunities for physical well-being in relation to PROW or cycle links, creating corridors for wildlife or enhancing habitats. It would be beneficial to map the natural green space, woodland and designated areas (including Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Biodiversity Opportunity Areas) within a certain distance of Crawley, perhaps 3km. Cross boundary issues could then be considered. 	<p>The GI map has been amended to improve legibility. For future maps the possibility of an interactive map will be explored so that layers can be turned off/on.</p>
		<p>Q4. Is the guidance on how applicants should consider green infrastructure clear?</p>	<p>This paragraph has been amended to show more clearly the multifunctional benefits of open space.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the whole the guidance is clear, however the multifunctional benefits of GI could have greater emphasis. For example in paragraph 2.6 it says: '<i>... for housing development, there may be opportunities to create open space to encourage activity and social interaction, footpath links to local shops and services and allotments to encourage locally grown food.</i>' Further functions could be highlighted as, with good design, a footpath can also incorporate SuDS (which reduce surface water flooding) and trees (which provide shade and a corridor for wildlife). In paragraphs 2.11 and 2.12 is it possible to state that 'the applicant <i>must</i> ensure that the design of the development ...' and that 'Details of green infrastructure <i>must</i> be provided with the planning application ...' rather than <i>should</i>? 	<p>Para 2.11 and 2.12 have include the requirement for large proposals as set out in policy ENV1.</p>
		<p>Q5. Are the green assets and opportunities to deliver benefits sufficiently covered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be good to clearly highlight the opportunity new development has to use GI to tackle issues common in urban areas such as surface water flooding, traffic calming, noise pollution and the need to build in resilience to the future effects of climate change. It is important to encourage the use of GI rather than traditional grey infrastructure - the added benefits of GI often make it an attractive alternative from economic, ecological and visual points of view. 	<p>Comments noted.</p>
		<p>Q6. Is the guidance on landscaping and maintenance helpful to applicants?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our only query here is that there is no mention of the maintenance of SuDS, this being particularly relevant for above ground SuDS. This aspect may be included within another SPD, if so it would be worth directing applicants to it. 	<p>More detail on SuDS is set out in the Climate Change SPD</p>
		<p>Part 5: Biodiversity</p> <p>Q16. Does this section clearly set out survey requirements and process for considering biodiversity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. Even though the section is very comprehensive there is further information that could be added. However this would result in 	<p>Comments noted.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		unnecessary detail, complexity and the risk of becoming out of date quite quickly. As a result it is considered that the correct approach, which is to refer to the relevant Institute etc, has been followed.	
		<p>Q17. Is the technical information in this section up to date and an accurate reflection of biodiversity in Crawley?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Our only minor comment is that 'Chartered' is missing from Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management in paragraphs 5.26, 5.35 & 5.89. 	This has now been added to the SPD.
John Cooban	1.3	<p>Green infrastructure is a network of multifunctional and multidimensional space...</p> <p><i>Green infrastructure is not simply an alternative description for conventional open space. As a network it includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, allotments and private gardens, parts of highway, railway, pathways, streams, canals and other water bodies, and all trees, landscape and wildlife-supporting features or structures associated with them. It can include buildings such as green roofs and walls, whether deliberately designed or by natural process. It includes all urban landscape, spaces, surfaces, underground substrates and structures that make positive contribution to ecosystem services, whether natural or designed.</i></p>	Comments noted.
	2.13 / Figure 1	<p>Fundamentally, there is no acknowledgement of the urban tree canopy cover – the urban forest – growing throughout the developed areas of the town – whether privately, publicly or statutorily owned. (Tree cover is one of the principal components of GI, yet CBC as planning authority has not engaged on the need for a Tree Strategy to quantify or evaluate this, as a basis for managing it through policy.)</p> <p>There are obviously some issues of clarity with areas of multi-layered designations even at the full scale of the 'accompanying detailed plan'. Tree canopy cover is another layer, but not one that should be omitted from a Green Infrastructure Map.</p>	<p>The benefits of increasing tree canopy have been included under para 3.1.</p> <p>Tree canopy whilst not a layer itself is part of the open space, structural landscaping, ancient woodland, tree preservation order/areas and biodiversity opportunity areas.</p>
	2.28	'Landscaping' is a vocabulary term adopted by planners that can still reflect slightly unfortunately on those that use it, in that it diminishes the concept and	Opinion Noted.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>appreciation of landscape as an art and science, to something which might be accomplished by a tradesman. 'Landscaping' is something that is done by a 'landscaper'.</p> <p>The word appears about 30 times in the document – sometimes referring to a policy or another document title which is already saddled with it. There is nearly always a better term; 'landscape' alone often covers it - if necessary supplemented by a word such as 'existing', 'proposed', 'design', 'scheme', 'work', 'measure', etc.</p>	
	Part 3	<p>Please check and make reference to attached NPPF Guide to tree and landscape clauses**.</p> <p>Headline: Trees are a material planning consideration.</p> <p>This part of the SPD needs to be structured to systematically cover the way in which trees are considered at all stages of the planning cycle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asset evaluation / context Targets / objectives Methods / Guidance Statutory (TPO) protection (actionable only in the breach) Actual physical protection (through enforcement of Conditions) Monitoring / Enforcement / Review <p>Early reference, including the use of its introduction in part at least, should be made to BS 5837:2012 in this section. Not only does it set the scene and refer to the benefits of trees in a GI context, but it also gives essential context to the use of the quality assessment categories A, B, etc. mentioned in 3.5.</p> <p>Reference to benefits of tree cover to human health and wellbeing could be added. (see e.g. Toronto tree study and others)</p> <p>The lack of any current evaluation of the overall town-wide tree cover asset should be acknowledged, together with a declared intention to rectify the situation through the implementation of a comprehensive (multi-ownership) tree strategy.</p>	<p>The benefits of tree canopy cover have been included in Part 3.</p> <p>The decision to create a comprehensive multi-ownership tree strategy is outside the scope of this SPD.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
	3.3 / 3.4	<p>Heading should be Designing <u>for</u> trees; the fundamental point behind this is that it is about designing space for trees – both existing and proposed. Space for trees is more fundamental than mere numbers of tree stock. New trees are cheap, it is the space they (we) need that is seen as expensive, depending on the prevailing value system.</p> <p>Don't lose the authority of the headline message in the text as drafted ... <i>Trees are considered to be a material consideration where planning permission is required ...</i></p>	
	3.15	Throughout, use 'arboriculturist' as the correct term, not 'arboriculturalist' (see BS 5837:2012 para 3.3)	Both spellings seem to be common but to reflect the BS 5837:2012 this has been amended.
	3.19	Text should be amended to refer to inclusion of the whole of the BS 5837 page 38 containing Annex B and Table B1.	This has already been included under Submission Requirements.
	Consultation Question 12	<p>The following issues need discussion / inclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanctions to deter preemptive felling. • GAL 13km aerodrome birdstrike safeguarding / anti-biodiversity measures as interpreted by CBC in respect of constraint on 'large' tree species, particularly where large trees will be increasingly important in mitigating environmental / landscape and visual impacts of Gatwick Airport. • Tree Strategy / i-Tree or equivalent surveys • Review period and SPD consultation procedure / community engagement for tree planning issues generally. 	Comments noted.
Ifield Village Conservation Area Advisory Committee		<p>From a lay point of view, this looks a carefully thought-out document and IVCAAC is pleased to see such a wide range of policies for the protection and enhancement of the green infrastructure. I am afraid we do not have the expertise to comment on much of the detail. Here, however are a few comments.</p> <p>Circular routes</p>	Comments noted.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>CH11 2.23. We endorse the importance of circular routes into the countryside at as many places in Crawley as possible. They are a valuable feature of Ifield Village Conservation Area and it would be a valuable asset if they can be developed at other places in the town.</p> <p>Q 15 Is further guidance needed on provision of open space?</p> <p>Noise Noise in green spaces has only been mentioned with respect to noise from Gatwick. The peace of the countryside and of many green spaces in and around Crawley is spoilt by car noise. The proximity of the M23 and A264, particularly on the east and south side of the town produces a persistent 24 hour hum on that side of the town. Policies to restrict further road building to the west would enhance the preservation of the countryside there.</p> <p>Examples of noise pollution from car traffic are: Tilgate Park – the Peace Garden is not peaceful from a noise point of view. Worth Conservation Area is spoilt by the hum of the M23. Willoughby fields are spoilt by the presence of a race track having been built on Bonnets Lane – it is used at weekends and is very noisy.</p> <p>Accessibility to toilets. The document refers to making green spaces locally available so that people can walk to them from their homes, but it acknowledges that this is not always possible. Where people come from a distance or are at a place for some time, there need to be toilet facilities. Ifield Village Green is an area which people come to for family picnics, to watch matches and to use the swings etc., but it has no toilets. Parks in the town all have toilet facilities.</p> <p>Bridleways We would support any improvement of bridleways and their linking to rural footpaths, providing the footpaths don't become impossibly churned up. (p12 linking of bridleways with footpaths through Ifield Brook Meadows).</p> <p>CH9/ENV 3 – West of Ifield Rural Fringe and Local Green Space - restriction of airport parking? We endorse the description of the West of Ifield Rural Fringe and Local Green Space and its link to the rural landscape on the Horsham side. We do not</p>	<p>Noise is a criteria of Policy CH9: Development Outside the Built-Up Area and also Policy ENV11: Development and Noise.</p> <p>Enhancements to Local Green Space that improve use/access are supported.</p> <p>Noted. Enhancements to public footpaths could include improving surfacing.</p> <p>Policy GAT3 of the Crawley Local Plan only allows new and additional parking on-airport. Horsham have a similar policy in their Local Plan. The council work with</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>know, however, if the Horsham Landscape Plan for this area includes restriction of Airport Parking. Such parking is beginning to encroach on this landscape – the most recent (and obtrusive) example being that at Ifield Court Farm.</p> <p>Ifield Brook We would support any enhancement of Ifield Brook as it is an important feature of the conservation area. The maintenance of the river is essential as, sadly, rubbish gets dumped there from time to time.</p> <p>Finances and resources to implement the plans One last question relates to whether the council has the resources and finances to implement these policies.</p>	<p>surrounding authorities to stop unauthorised parking relating to Gatwick Airport.</p> <p>This is an important element of the Green Infrastructure Map.</p> <p>Noted. The policies and guidance contained within the Local Plan places the onus on the developer to demonstrate that a proposal meets planning policy.</p>
Homes & Communities Agency (HCA)		<p>The HCA agree generally with the technical content of the document but would like to see a section on viability included. Suggested wording could be as follows:</p> <p><i>The provision of Green Infrastructure should be considered on a site by site basis. There may be instances where elements of Green Infrastructure provision is not physically feasible or financially viable. On marginal sites facing significant delivery constraints, the financial viability of a scheme may be called into question. Where this is the case, the applicant should enter into formal S106 negotiations with the Council and it may be feasible for some S106 requirements, such as the provision of some forms or open space or the ongoing maintenance costs to be reduced. Applicants should discuss S106 matters and scheme viability issues through the formal pre-application process at any early stage.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. Provision of green infrastructure will be on a site by site basis and decisions made based on an understanding of viability to ensure realistic decisions. Where viability is demonstrated as an issue the council will look to be flexible in applying policy requirements, where possible.</p>
Mole Valley District Council		<p>Thank you for consulting MVDC on the draft Green Infrastructure SPD. I can confirm that MVDC has no objection to the content. However, I would like to bring the following factual issues to your attention.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.12 and Appendix 2 refer to landscape character areas within Mole Valley. This recognition that landscape considerations may cross local</p>	<p>Appendix 2 has been amended to reflect the Mole Valley character areas.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>administrative boundaries is welcome. However, the reference on the map at Appendix 2 to an “unpublished Mole Valley LCA” is out of date. MVDC adopted a Landscape SPD in July 2013, a copy of which is included with this response.</p> <p>The part of Mole Valley adjacent to the Crawley Borough boundary is within the Open Weald landscape character area and section 5.4.1 of the Landscape SPD includes a Character Profile highlighting its key characteristics.</p> <p>More recently, a Surrey-wide Landscape Character Assessment has been published by Surrey County Council. This is available online: https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/environment-housing-and-planning/countryside/countryside-strategies-action-plans-and-guidance/landscape-character-assessment</p> <p>The Surrey LCA includes individual reports for the three Surrey authorities which adjoin Crawley, so could usefully be referenced as a source of information for assessment of cross-boundary impacts.</p>	
Thakeham Homes		<p>We support the comprehensive approach that has been taken so far in the preparation of the SPD. However, there are a number of aspects that, in our view, should be amended to promote an integrated, cross-boundary approach towards green infrastructure provision. In particular, we note that the SPD does not consistently account for strategic development in neighbouring authorities adjacent to the Borough boundary. In doing so, opportunities for a strategic approach towards green infrastructure provision across administrative boundaries are missed.</p> <p><i>Integrated Approach</i></p> <p>The SPD should adopt a strategic, integrated approach to existing and proposed green infrastructure, including where projects and networks cross administrative boundaries. Proposals should knit development together and help sites integrate into the wider area.</p> <p><i>“The strategic approach to green infrastructure may cross administrative boundaries. Therefore neighbouring authorities, working collaboratively with other stakeholders... may wish to consider how wider strategies for their areas can help address cross-boundary issues and help meet the Duty to Cooperate”</i></p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance, Paragraph 029</p>	<p>Comments noted. Consideration of allocating a site adjacent to Crawley but outside its boundary should include green infrastructure in discussions between Crawley, the local authority and the developer having regard to assessments of landscape character and other policy and guidance of both areas.</p> <p>Additional wording has been added to the end of paragraph 2.3 which now states <i>“This is particularly important for large proposals where there is greater scope for enhancing existing, providing new green infrastructure and creating links to/between existing green infrastructure, including opportunities beyond the borough boundary.”</i></p> <p>The Mid Sussex and Horsham Landscape Character Assessments, alongside which the Crawley Landscape Character Assessment, supporting the Local Plan and considered through the Crawley Local Plan examination, was undertaken, are referenced in the</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>The need for an integrated approach to green infrastructure is acknowledged within the draft SPD, which emphasises the importance of enhancing the connectivity of the network.</p> <p><i>“A key element of green infrastructure planning is taking opportunities, where possible, to create multi-functional green spaces to make the best use available land and to enhance the connectivity of the network.”</i></p> <p>Draft Green Infrastructure SPD, Paragraph 2.5</p> <p>The draft SPD also includes an acknowledgement of the importance of an integrated approach with regard to large projects, which should be linked with the existing green infrastructure network.</p> <p><i>“This is particularly important for large proposals where there is greater scope for enhancing existing, providing new green infrastructure and creating links to/between existing green infrastructure.”</i></p> <p>Draft Green Infrastructure SPD, Paragraph 2.4</p> <p>It is evident that the draft SPD has been prepared in the spirit of applying an integrated approach to existing and proposed green infrastructure, and has taken into account a number of large projects outside of the Council's administrative boundary. This includes, for example, clear landscape principles with regard to the development at Kilnwood Vale, which falls within the administrative boundary of Horsham District Council. In this context, the draft SPD states, “the guidelines relate to integrating the new development into the existing qualities of the urban/rural fringe” (Draft Infrastructure DPD, Paragraph 6.47). This is the correct approach, which serves to knit development together and to help sites integrate into the wider Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>It is our view however, that this approach is not consistently applied throughout the SPD, with the notable absence of the Pease Pottage strategic site in the emerging Mid Sussex District Plan. The Pease Pottage strategic site lies adjacent to the administrative boundary of Crawley Borough Council south of the M3, and is currently allocated for development within the Focussed Amendments to the emerging Mid Sussex District Plan. As such, we consider that the interaction of the Pease Pottage site with the wider green infrastructure should be clearly acknowledged and supported within the SPD. As stated in the SPD, the M23 acts as a barrier to pedestrian access to the countryside to the south. Whilst the Pease Pottage site is well contained, it provides an opportunity for landscape integration with Tilgate Forest, providing</p>	<p>appropriate Area/Edge sub-sections within Part 6: Countryside and AONB of the Green Infrastructure SPD, in particular, in relation to Pease Pottage, Edge 4 – South of Broadfield into Buchan Hill Forest and Fringes and Edge 5 – Tilgate/Worth Forest and Fringes.</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>improved recreational areas and connections between Crawley and the wider countryside.</p> <p>Landscape Character Areas and Edges – Edge 5 The emerging Pease Pottage strategic site lies within an area identified within the draft SPD as 'Edge 5 – Tilgate/Worth Forest and Fringes' and it is clear that the document has not accounted for the strategic site in its assessment. In particular, the draft SPD refers to the Mid Sussex Landscape Character Assessment, which was published in 2005 prior to the emerging District Plan and makes the following observation:</p> <p><i>"Whilst the M23 may act as a barrier to development spreading into this character area it also acts as a barrier to achieving the most positive use of this area of countryside"</i></p> <p>Draft Green Infrastructure SPD, Paragraph 6.60</p> <p>At Paragraph 6.63, the draft SPD also goes on to describe the landscape sensitivity of the area as 'medium to high', however it is not clear on what basis this conclusion has been made, as it is not described as such within the Mid Sussex Landscape Character Assessment. Similarly, the SPD should also recognise the degraded landscape quality around Junction 11 of the M23.</p> <p>As such, it is our view that the section of the draft SPD 'Edge 5 – Tilgate/Worth Forest and Fringes' should be revised to account for the Pease Pottage strategic site in the emerging Mid Sussex District Plan, thereby enabling a consistent strategic approach to green infrastructure in accordance with PPG Paragraph 029.</p> <p>Conclusions The Green Infrastructure SPD should seek to improve connections between individual projects within and beyond administrative boundaries so that individual developments can be brought forward in the most appropriate way. As such, we consider that significant strategic sites such as Pease Pottage should be considered carefully as part of the ongoing work on the SPD, with clear principles for landscape integration.</p>	
Environment Agency		<p>Biodiversity To ensure that development, including energy generation, positively contributes to the Water Framework Directive, and it's clear that the use of</p>	<p>The approach to biodiversity and water is set out in Part 5 and table 8. Watercourse are a habitat of principle importance that require ecological assessment setting</p>

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>SuDS, and appropriately buffering watercourses from development, contributes to the River Basin Plan.</p> <p>If these issues are adequately covered in green infrastructure documents, they should be cross referenced within your document.</p>	<p>out the impacts. Where harm is likely evidence must be submitted to show how alternatives designs or locations have been considered, how adverse effects will be avoided wherever possible, how unavoidable impacts will be mitigated or reduced, and how impacts that cannot be avoided or mitigated will be compensated.</p>
Colin Maughan		<p>Thank you for sending me your letter asking for my comments on this recent document. As with the previous one which I read in March, I am too busy at the moment to deal with this one as thoroughly as I should like. The provision of a list of consultation questions is very helpful, and if I have time I will answer them. I will see how it goes, on my second reading of your report.</p> <p>1. As there is so much about trees in this particular report I wonder whether you could state why they are important – possibly because, in Crawley’s case, it was designed and built in the spirit of the Garden City movement. And this set of remarkable documents provides a maintenance manual for the town, and a guide to its development. It might surprise you and your team to hear that where I live my neighbours, and their insurance companies, regard trees as a dangerous nuisance, so many have been lost.</p> <p>When I came to live in Crawley and the council had its own gardeners the manicured standard of care, including large herbaceous borders, was remarkable. This possibility of labour intensive care apparently became impractical, but a less demanding regime still works reasonably well at this time of the crisis brought on by the banking industry.</p>	Comments noted.
		<p>One aspect that hasn’t been mentioned so far is that at what may turn out to be the end of the Modernist Movement in design and architecture, with its sometimes uncompromising use of concrete and flat roofed buildings, mature trees and wall covering creepers provide a softening and humanising contrast. The former design school atrium and the Bauhaus teachers’ housing in Germany, and the Telford New Town here are good examples. This use of mature trees near buildings requires careful management in the long run of course, and the careful choice and siting of the trees initially.</p>	Guidance on siting of trees in relation to buildings is set out the Designing with Trees section.
	Page 7	<p>2. It is only a small editorial point but I was initially a little mystified by the word “applicants” in the main heading on page 7, because the report as a whole isn’t</p>	Noted. Heading has been amended to be more general.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		only aimed at developers and home owners seeking planning permission. I see it, as I said above, as a working manual.	
	Paragraph 2.8	3. In 2.8, "Delivering green infrastructure benefits" seems to imply that rising maintenance costs will have to be afforded. In a world run by accountants, and in Crawley's case at the moment, under West Sussex County Council's parsimonious thumb, I hope that the necessary funds and additional labour will be available when required.	Noted.
		4. I don't think there is any mention of the use of some evergreen shrubs and trees (Holm Oaks for instance) to brighten the winter scene a little, after deciduous trees have shed their leaves. Neither is it mentioned that after the current generation of untrained "tree surgeons" have reduced many handsome deciduous trees to unsightly stumps in and around Crawley, they are even more unsightly when leafless in the winter.	Noted. Advice on tree species has been included, particularly the use of native species.
	Paragraph 2.8	5. 2.8 talks about "protecting and enhancing heritage assets". In Britain, and especially in Crawley since I have known it, for the last seventy or more years, old buildings have been crudely altered or removed completely one by one, so that there isn't much left. Having seen the sound original Crittall windows removed from the New Town shops and offices south of the former Peacocks' shop in the Broadway, and the canopies removed from the old Tesco's shop in Queens Square, I fear for the future of the New Town centre. The economic migrants from Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and our more prosperous friends from France and Germany are surprised and disappointed to find how we do not care for our heritage compared with their home countries. As you know, at the time of the Ottoman Empire and during World War Two many whole cities were destroyed, and then carefully rebuilt as soon as peace came. In fact, some French towns and cities were destroyed and rebuilt twice – after both world wars. Here Sheffield, Liverpool, Bristol, Leeds, Birmingham, to mention five of our key cities have been ruined during the war and since, and remain as unsightly monuments to the efforts of developers and traffic engineers. London's development is now out of control, with a boom in development of offices and flats. As in Birmingham and Barcelona, many of them will probably never be occupied. At least in Crawley some empty offices are being	Comments noted.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		converted into flats. Let's hope people can afford the rents, and increase the footfall to keep some shops staying in business.	
	Paragraph 2.10	6. In 2.10, the report speaks of "applicants and developers engaging with the council" – as the would-be developers have done on the redevelopment scheme for Crawley Railway Station, recently. Everyone concerned though, needs to know that there are hardly any good architects working in this country – a situation made worse by undue reliance on the computer programmes, which allow any fool to design a building. Another example, of flats over shops, is coming soon, opposite the car park at the southern end of the Broadway. It may turn out well if the design of the balconies can be improved.	Comments noted.
	Paragraph 2.5	7. 2.15 mentions "community orchards" unexpectedly and I wondered what they are, or will be, in future.	More information on community orchards can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-orchards-a-how-to-guide
	Paragraph 2.17	8. 2.17 deals with poorly planned open spaces – poor maintenance is presumably a component of unrealistic planning. The boxwood hedge around the lovely giant pebbles (ruined by garish engraved lettering done by two of CBC's misguided artists) appears not to have been cleaned since it was installed. I can't explain it, but a generation of Crawley people celebrate the availability of drinks in cans, and fast food in cardboard boxes, by throwing these containers and their contents all round the town. When asked why they do it, when there are numerous litter bins, they usually say it provides people with work to clear up the mess they have made.	Noted.
	Paragraph 2.20	9. 2.20 is concerned with replacing failed planting. I have never seen this done successfully anywhere, especially in Crawley. The failure is due to a lack of maintenance, the purchase of poor quality trees (sometimes from a Welsh firm recorded in my blacklist and sometimes from Barchams *phone number provided), unsatisfactory staking, and vandalism. The local examples are the trees planted to stabilise the imported soil used in making the hole near the golf course buildings in Tilgate Forest. About half of them have failed – and the hawthorn trees planted near Vines BMW showroom to replace an avenue of mature willows in Haslett Avenue. They were all snapped off by vandals soon after planting. Why were large urban trees cut down? Why were they replaced	Noted. As the SPD sets out, failed trees are required to be replaced via conditions and maintenance details required. The tree policy requires planting of an appropriate sized tree from the outset.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		by small trees like hawthorns? Why have all these trees been lost due to lack of maintenance and making good vandalism?	
	Paragraph 2.22	10. 2.22 "management of wildlife" reminded me of Ken Livingstone, who was unpopular when Mayor of London, for getting rid of the pigeons – someone leaves piles of bread on the grass for Crawley pigeons outside the Roman Catholic church. As you probably know, there are about 40 pigeons living in and around the bus station, and I am not sure that they should be encouraged. What is CBC's policy on possibly unwelcome wildlife I wonder?	This is outside the scope of the SPD.
	Paragraph 2.22a	11. In 2.22a under "Planting and establishment" there is no mention of coppicing and pollarding, and I wonder whether this urban treatment of trees should be encouraged in Crawley, as it is in France. I think they are mentioned in passing later – without comment (see .22e and .22g)	Coppicing and pollarding are included in the landscape management and maintenance section under information required for a landscape management plan.
	Paragraph 2.22b	12. 2.22b mentions "removal of tree guards and tree grill sections", but doesn't explain why they are removed, and whether they are put back. It also mentioned "inappropriate new paving". This is a sore point, as Crawley has large areas of bogus concrete brick paving which looks cheap, and weathers badly. Horsham Borough Council is more popular because it has put in stone setts, which may never have been there originally, but look handsome and wear well. More worryingly, they put in, in the past, concrete reproduction work York stone on pavement areas. These slabs trip pedestrians, especially in icy winter conditions. See enclosed articles on the late Ian Nairn, who particularly grumbled about cheapjack firms selling concrete paving bricks.	Comments noted. Paving is outside the scope of this SPD.
	Paragraph 2.22c	13. 2.22c deals with water features. Not so long ago Crawley town centre had three fountains in the Martletts, near the County Mall side entrance. They were removed and given to a local school because the public threw rubbish into them. CBC's short memory has unfortunately unwisely agreed to have fourteen(?) new fountains in Queens Square. Perhaps the public's behaviour has changed for the better. In Horsham though their disagreeable "globe" sculpture fountain has been switched off, and boarded over with sheets of hardboard. They still have questionable stream with small waterfalls working, and nearly rubbish free.	This is outside the scope of this SPD.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		14. The council would be better advised to avoid buying any more public sculpture as, like architects, there are hardly any good artists working now. Richard Quinnell's bird sculpture which has been moved unfortunately to the Library. It is the exception. The Saatchi Gallery and Goldsmith's college are largely to blame for the poor work artists do now. There are also "artist blacksmiths", unfortunately Quinnell also made the lovely gates to the Globe Theatre in London. He is a good smith.	This is outside the scope of this SPD.
	Paragraph 2.22g	15. 2.22g refers to British Standard 3998 on trees. It may have improved but it used to be sound but only a brief guide. I will see if I have anything more thorough.	Noted.
	Paragraph 2.25	16. As far as I am aware there are no signs at Three Bridges Station to the Worth Way, and the Sustrans route for cyclists from the Station to Pease Pottage via Tilgate Forest is unduly tortuous and badly signposted – like most or all the cycle paths in the Town Centre (see page 64 "Area Objective" in the grey box).	This issue is raised in para 2.27.
	Paragraph 2.27	17. In 2.27 it states "the urbanism of prows..." what are they?	Public Rights of Way. The lower casing of this acronym has been amended to reflect the previously abbreviation following the initial reference, which will hopefully clarify the reference as the same.
	Paragraph 3.3	18. 3.3 mentions "expert advice", but living in a conservation area, where there are two key linden trees that give Linden Close its name, I have been trying for some time to get tree preservation orders on them, but have been unable to get any cooperation from either Crawley or West Sussex councils. It is only a question of time (by next autumn) before one or both are converted to unsightly stumps or completely cut down by county tree surgeons, Danny Beadell, Holly Tree Surgeons Ltd (the three splendid London Planes they pruned recently still don't have any leaves due to their haircut, but they <u>may</u> survive) or another incompetent firm. Total Tree Care in Horsham might be good, but as Surrey has even more trees than Sussex there will probably be better tree surgeons there still. Ours should be sued for vandalism. I plan to contact some arboriculture advisors such as Capel Manor College in Enfield and Michael Volp in Norwich City Planning Office (again) who worked on the	Comments noted.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		current BS3998 publication, with its 76 pages, and costing £182.00. I am not holding my breath, because many such organisations – like the Guild of Master Craftsmen and the Royal Society of British Architects, are spurious money making rip offs.	
	Paragraph 3.11	19. In 3.11 the addition of the word “financial” to “contribution” would clarify the statement.	Noted – the word “financial” has been added to clarify.
	Paragraph 3.12	20. Tree planting by Crawley Borough Council – doesn't West Sussex Council do any tree planting? “Ensuring that new tree stock survives” (see my comments in 9 above).	Comments noted.
	Paragraph 3.14	21. In 3.14 the number of trees required as replacements seems over generous. It used to be said that CBC's policy was to replace each lost tree by two. In reality, in my experience, no lost tree has been replaced, and one new memorial tree outside the Tilgate Golf Course buildings has unwisely planted under another tall mature tree. It will not prosper in that position.	Comments noted.
	Paragraph 3.41	22. The mention of the Forestry Commission in 3.41 reminds me that they cannot be trusted to take care of forests. The controversial conversion of Tilgate Forest into a golf course when there was sufficient provision (at Copthorne for instance) was followed by total neglect for thirty or more years. Recently, the remaining trees, which should have been thinned out periodically, have been done by a contractor using much too large vehicles and machines, during a too wet season. This made the good Forestry Commission roads impassable to cyclists, walkers, golfers, runners and dogs, and ruined the roads. Months later the damage has not been repaired. In fact, the holes have been filled with large grade gravel, which is as bad or worse than mud and water, and the materials dumped for proper repair remain unused. Presumably following American National Forest Practice much or all the detritus (tree and shrub) has been left for the benefit of insects and animals. I don't know yet who the contractor was, but the mess left everywhere, including plastic pipes is shameful. A sign near the golf clubhouse states that the county's tree officer inspected the site twice, and found the work satisfactory – the managers of the Golf Course – Glendale are mentioned. I visited the site twice and the shambles is disgraceful. Apart from one area, where trees have been felled unnecessarily, or by mistake, the thinning is	Comments noted. Felling licencing is outside the scope of this SPD and the planning system.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		satisfactory. As with the work of a well trained tree surgeon, it should look as it was found when thinning is done properly, I will find out who the contractors concerned were in this case. They and the (remnants of) the Forestry Commission should be ashamed. For the time being traffic noise from the motorway and has increased due to the reduction in tree cover. This was unavoidable and, in time, there will be a little improvement as the unduly slender trees fill out. I wonder if Crawley Council's tree officer Russell Spurrell has any hand in this example of poor tree management and inconvenience to the public.	
		23. While I think of it, I should like to point out that what signing there is in Tilgate Forest is very unsatisfactory. As on pages 69 and 70 the appendices and in this series of report the heavy-handed use of large, bold capitals sets an unduly authoritarian, undemocratic tone reminiscent of police states. "If in doubt use lowercase letters" is always a sound principle on signs and printed matter.	Noted.
		24. The contemporary trend to fence off schools, flats and formerly fenceless, hedgeless front gardens in housing areas, is a sign of a breakdown in neighbourliness and community, as personal wealth and the significance of the consumer role increase. Self interest, selfishness and a narcissistic outlook in the public is growing, as seen in the mindless use of mobile phones.	Noted. This is outside the scope of this SPD
		25. Similarly, I should have said that living on an urban island in an attractive rural area, in spite of the provision of sound and generous leisure facilities and events, there is a danger that children will not benefit from forestry, agriculture and wildlife if they are sealed into hermetically sealed Chelsea tractors. By contrast, in Hungary or Romania, children have their own railway line to run (with some adult assistance), and develop a pride in their work and the responsibility. Here, they remain children.	The Local Plan and SPD includes requirements and guidance on improving/creating links to the countryside.
		26. Due to the very unfortunate rise in the cost of housing (I think in Henry VIII's time it was 10% of people's incomes) multiple occupation is a growing trend. Rising middle class incomes and the absence of interest on savings, is leading to buying property to let. This also often results in multiple occupations and family housing being converted into flats. As a result, more and more front gardens are paved over to make car parks, often four or five cars. This relieves	Guidance on paving front gardens is here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/permeable-surfacing-of-front-gardens-guidance

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		the narrowing of roads, and the damage of grass verges, but in heavy downpours of rain roads flood due to the reduction in soil permeability. Planning permission needs to be sought to do this.	Preventing loss of front garden areas is outside the control of the planning system.
		27. When considering the welfare of wildlife, the cat population is a threat, especially to birds, and it should be remembered that trees and shrubs provide them with shelter. Permission for cats?	This is outside the scope of planning policy legislation.
		28. There are a number of approaches to management of the built environment and green space, varying from cheese-paring neglect to perhaps unduly over managed sterile perfection, in the Swiss and Scandinavian tradition: neglect and minimal rubbish clearance; labour intensively programmed frequent street cleaning and rubbish removal; minimal intervention in managing green space and trees and shrubs taking into account the flowing season of wildlife – public safety being the only consideration; Forestry Commission's present policy of using Natural Forest Practice with mixed species of trees and some felled timber left to encourage wildlife occupation; a military approach to the management of green space and woodland – a labour intensive regime of a highly managed natural environment – the gardener's methods of achieving apparent perfection at all times; the illumination of buildings and key open spaces, as in Table 8 (page 43) is possibly obsessional and showy for people who live a relaxed, varied existence and not relying on tourists' approval.	Comments noted.
		29. The list above introduces the problem of keeping a balance between the environment in general as a living and leisure area, and a working/industrial one. The Scandinavian and (probably) Dutch approach to planning differs from ours in the UK in not dividing the environment into watertight zones. This is more interesting to visit and live in, but probably difficult to manage. I used to visit a friend in London with a flat over a 24hour baking factory, and our sleep was intermittent. The balance can be found in Midhurst's efforts to reduce the loss of amenity as the nearby stone quarry's homes grow larger and prove to be a threat to a safe and comfortable life in the town centre. Similarly if the size and activity in these industries – factories, scrapyards, airports etc. grows there is eventually a change from them being welcomed as sources of employment within easy	Comments noted.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		reach of homes, and sometimes, like the chalk quarries in Lewes, landscape features, to the traffic jams and unacceptable noise characteristic of large airports like Heathrow. Planning controls become essential before environmental standards cannot be restored, and houses cannot be sold, and residents are depressed.	
	Table 8, Page 42	<p>It would be interesting to see Dutch planning legislation, especially in relation to protecting wildlife. Where much of the agricultural land has been reclaimed from the sea (as it has also in the Fens) it is highly valued, being hard won, and in many areas there are no hedges, green verges or footpaths, and grow up to the edge of roads.</p> <p>Incidentally, industrial methods of farming, monocropping and the factory farming of animals leads to loss of landscape quality and soil fertility. This is probably not relevant to this report, apart from questions of water management and flooding, trees being very important in the reduction of damage caused by the latter. See Table 9, which deals with the town's landscape periphery.</p>	Comments noted.
	Paragraph 5.44	Plant species being invasive does not deal with ivy which in Crawley is increasingly being allowed to kill more or less sound trees (*officially it is not parasitic but it spreads from tree to tree through its underground root system. Sometimes it takes trees' bark off), presumably in order to shelter insects and birds. Good, healthy trees provide this service in summer at least. Bamboo, which I inherited in my garden, is surprisingly invasive – it will grow through concrete and tarmac unless well managed, and should not be specified in an unguarded moment.	Comments noted. Ivy and bamboo is not currently considered invasive species in the UK.
		32. Invasive animal species such as jays, magpies, squirrels and rats seem not to be mentioned. Grey squirrels for instance often severely damaged trees, and sometimes infest houses, especially attics.	Control of invasive animal species is not covered in relationship to development in national legislation.
	Paragraphs 6.27 and 6.31	33. Gatwick Airport, the rural fringe and green space between Crawley and the airport. When Yorke, Rosenberg and Mardell were the architects and consultants, there was an enlightened policy of keeping a firm boundary between the airport and the surrounding farmland, as is the case with the town of Crawley itself. Largely, this still applies, and should perhaps be formally recorded in this series of planning reports. Heathrow Airport, by contrast, has	The importance of maintaining the distinct identities of Gatwick and Crawley are covered in the landscape Character section: Upper Mole Farmlands Rural Fringe.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		been allowed to sprawl, and incorporate nearby villages, resulting in a sad, dramatic loss of environmental quality, and amenity for local people.	
	Paragraph 6.47	<p>Kilnwood Vale has something in common with Heathrow Airport and is a housing desert rather than a village. Presumably its design has something in common with the unconvincing “vernacular” housing in Prince Charles Poundbury, and the Essex housing guide. It has given the large scale housebuilders a freehand to build caricatures of Voysey Gertrude Jeckyle’s Godalming house, and increase rock bottom agricultural land values.</p> <p>As there is no infrastructure apart a bus service which nobody uses, as they are dyed in the wool motoring commuters, there are already more traffic jams on Crawley’s periphery roads and roundabouts as a result of such banal developments. The result is that we are reminded of how well the New Towns were thought out in the 1940s. This seldom recognised and respected.</p>	Comments noted. This is outside the scope of this SPD.
	Page 66, Paragraph 6.74	6.74, page 66, mentions Crawley’s remaining listed buildings. Some years ago CBC commissioned a report on its old buildings, but it has never been published, and the buildings are not easy to find because they are now amongst the younger New Town housing. People living in listed buildings might have reservations about undue intrusion of the public, but it is a shame that these attractive buildings are a hidden heritage.	Listed Buildings are not specifically covered in this SPD but the council’s policy is set in the Local Plan as Policies CH15/16.
		<p>As I said above, I have read through the questionnaire on page 76, and I think I have dealt with much of it already. As with all the previous documents you have done, it is quite remarkably thorough and sound. Would it be possible to get it published?</p> <p>All being well, if I can find them, I would like to enclose copies of several articles by/about Ian Nairn. Unfortunately, I didn’t know him, in spite of being very familiar with his work. I did know his contemporaries, Nicholas Pevsner, Richard Reid, Kenneth Browne, Gordon Cullen, Bill Slack (of the “Architectural Review”) and Michael Middleton editor of “House and Garden” and later of the Civic Trust (under Duncan Sands). This 1950s and 60s period was a Golden Age in terms of what you and your team have achieved.</p> <p>And I will try to find my signing that I did for Wimbledon and Putney Commons. As you will probably know, until Bisley was established as the primary, largely</p>	Comments noted.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>military, shooting ground, it was on Wimbledon Common. The neighbours complained about the noise so a more isolated site was eventually found. Nevertheless, the regime who ran the common as Rangers were still quite military in outlook when we were the landscape consultants.</p> <p>Incidentally, I heard at the weekend, via a CBC mole, that the exGatwick Racecourse bandstand is to be scrapped and a new one has been ordered for erection in the Memorial Gardens. Partly because it was probably restored when it was moved some years ago from the other end of Queens Square, it proved to be in remarkably good condition when it was dismantled by your good Newdigate contractors. I hope this new bandstand news report is untrue. There are a few wrought iron flowers missing. I am probably not going to be happy with the new Queens Square, but I <u>have</u> located the handsome discarded Crawley clock and clock tower, rusting in a farmyard nearby.</p> <p>With best wishes, and a job very well done.</p>	
Sport England		<p>Q1: Do the topics identified cover the main areas requiring additional guidance? The Green Infrastructure SPD may, depending on its scope, incorporate some outdoor sports facilities. SPD scope should cover all forms of outdoor AND indoor sports. Some GI plans only incorporate informal outdoor sports (excluding MUGAs, tennis courts etc.), some include playing pitches (some not) and by its nature it will exclude indoor sports facilities such as swimming pools and sports halls which are key community infrastructure. Sport England would advise that either the scope of the Green Infrastructure SPD should incorporate all outdoor sports (informal or formal) and indoor sports be considered within a wider community infrastructure SPD or a separate SPD be prepared to address comprehensive sports infrastructure provision?</p> <p>http://sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/ To ensure the SPD is sound it should be underpinned by a robust and up to date needs assessment. Sport England provide methodologies for such work to assist LAs in preparing such assessments and strategies (e.g. 'Assessing Needs and Opportunities Guidance' that replaces PPG17 Companion Guide in relation to formal sport and the 'Playing Pitch Strategy Guidance') and provides some free data on our 'Active Places Database' regarding many important key sports facilities to again assist as it includes some analysis tools. Other</p>	Comments noted. The council have an up-to-date Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study which will be updated periodically. The need to include built facilities such as swimming pools and indoor courts will be considered.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Respondent	Para/ Page no.	Comments	Council's Response
		<p>modelling tools, the 'Facilities Planning Model', are available should this be useful in assessing need and supply or testing scenarios (please see below for more information). I note Crawley has a PPS in place, dated 2013. It will be important to ensure this is still up to date to form a basis for the SPD. Has it been reviewed and monitored on an annual basis? Has there been much change in either the supply or demand since the data was collated and assessed? If the answer to this is no and yes then it is likely that it will be ready for a review in 2016.</p> <p>http://sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/</p>	
		<p>Q3: Are there any additional topics which haven't been identified as a Supplementary Planning Document which the council should consider? Built sports facilities (see above).</p>	Noted.
		<p>Q5: Should any of the policies be addressed in a different SPD to that identified in the table? ENV4 and 5 would include both outdoor and indoor sports provision but the existing list of SPDs appears to exclude built sports facilities.</p>	Noted.
		<p>Q7: Are there other policies in the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (Crawley 2030) that haven't been identified which should be considered for inclusion in one of the SPDs? See above re built sports facilities.</p>	Noted.
		<p>Q9: Do you have any other, strategic comments on the scope and remit of the SPDs for consideration at this stage? Yes. In terms of design our main objective is to ensure new development or regeneration proposals encourage and provide more opportunities for physical activity. In supporting LAs with this Sport England and Public Health England have recently launched a guidance note called 'Active Design'. I would promote this guidance to you, to be incorporated/reflected in the Design SPD to support the objective of seeking to improve community health through planning (see link below):</p> <p>http://sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/</p>	Comments noted. This has been incorporated into the Urban Design SPD.

Note:- Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Map with the permission of the Controller of H.M. Stationery Office Crown copyright license number 100024244 Savills (UK) Limited. Published for the purposes of identification only and although believed to be correct accuracy is not guaranteed.

V:\SOUTHAMPTON\DATA\URBAN DESIGN\JOBS\WPL 43023 - Wilky - Gatwick\B] Drawings\NDD\Site Boundary. 25/07/15.



Copyright Savills (UK). No dimensions are to be scaled from this drawing. All dimensions to be checked on site. Area measurements for indicative purposes only.

savills planning & regeneration
2 Charlotte Place, Southampton
SO1 4 0TB
t 02380 713900
savills.com/urbandesign

project Gatwick Green
client The Wilky Group
date 25/07/2015
drawn by N-1
checked by SF

drawing Potential Masterplan Area
job no. WPL 43023
drawing no. 38002
rev -
scale 1:1000 @A4



* Plan attached to The Wilky Group representation received.

Trees in the Townscape – A guide for Decision Makers (TDAG)
Arboricultural Association Roadshow, November 2012

National Planning Policy Framework, published March 2012

Download full document from:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf>

Key clauses of potential relevance to landscape and trees
Information prepared by Ian Phillips

NOTE – The references below are only intended as a signpost to some of the content of the NPPF and are generally paraphrased or simplified extracts. Reference should be made to the original source document and the full wording and context of each clause in all cases. No reliance should be placed on the wording below without such further reference.

NPPF - Building a strong economy

- S21- identify priority areas for environmental enhancement
- S28 -Plans should respect the character of the countryside
- S52 – New settlements may follow principles of Garden Cities
- S53 - Resist development of residential gardens

NPPF on design

- S58 - Positive references to landscape design and incorporation of green and other public space
- S59 - Local quality standards, strong sense of place, local distinctiveness – use of design codes
- S61 - Respond to local character, integrate into natural, built and historic environment
- S64 - Refuse permission for poor design

NPPF – Promoting healthy communities

- S69 - Safe and accessible development and high quality public space
- S74 - Protection of open space and playing fields unless surplus or replaced with better
- S76 - New designation of 'Local Green Space'

NPPF – climate change and flooding

- S94 - Proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change
- S96 - New development to take account of landform, layout, orientation and landscaping to minimise energy consumption
- S97 - Maximise renewable and low carbon development but address adverse impacts, including cumulative landscape and visual impacts.
- S99 - Long term risks to be managed through adaptation measures, including green infrastructure

NPPF – natural environment

- S109 - Protect and enhance *valued* landscapes
- Recognise benefits of ecosystem services
- Minimise impact on biodiversity and seek net gains
- S110 - Prevent pollution
- Remediate poor quality land
- Develop land of least environmental value
- S113 - Set criteria based policies to test development against wildlife, geodiversity and landscape and establish hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites
- S114 - Strategic approach in Local Plans for creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure

NPPF – natural environment

- S117- Plan for biodiversity at landscape scale across boundaries
- Identify and map ecological networks – international, national and local sites; corridors and stepping stones and areas identified for habitat creation or restoration
- Preserve, restore and re-create priority habitats, link to targets and identify indicators for monitoring
- Specify types of development suitable for identified Nature Improvement Areas
- S118 - Refuse permission for development resulting in loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats
- S123 - Protect areas of tranquility
- S125 - Limit impact of light pollution

NPPF – local plan making

- S152 - Seek net gains in economic, social and environmental dimensions. Adverse effects to be avoided, mitigated or compensated.
- S156 - Local plans to set out strategic priorities to include strategic policies on:
 - transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy
 - health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities
 - climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape

NPPF – local plan making

- To include:
 - S157 - Clear strategy for enhancing natural, built and historic environment and supporting Nature Improvement Areas
 - S165 - Sustainability appraisals
 - S170 - Landscape character assessments
 - S171 - Health and wellbeing
 - S177 - Infrastructure together with development

NPPF - Collaborative working

- S178 - Duty to co-operate across administrative boundaries, especially for strategic priorities
- S179 / 180 - Collaborative working, joint policies and strategies, consultation with LEPs and Local Nature Partnerships

** Guidance attached to John Cooban representation received.