

Number	Group	Content
OCAR001	Individual	<p>1. Copy of document highlighted with following comments: 2. Comment on traffic intensity on page 1. 3. Definition of local listing. 4. Ovingdean Hall Sports Pavilion should be noted as curtilage listed or a positive feature. 5. Error on date (amended on consultation copy). 6. Ovingdean Road should be referred to as a quiet country lane of medieval origin (p8). 7. A number of minor amendments and corrections</p>
OCAR002	Individual	<p>First comment: 1. Information about the Saxon evidence in the Church. 2. Request for map from 1970 designation. Second comment: 3. Historical relevance of farming has continued and advanced during last 40 years. 4. Attempt to detach the farming activities physically and visually is considered ill-founded and illogical. 5. Urban development/sprawl is city related and village spread is not the same thing. 6. Almost all conservation areas contain buildings of no architectural value. 7. Use of 'the village' is confusing. 8. Suburban is an alien term. Many of these area were developed through subdivision of small holdings and still have rights to keep livestock (and do). 9. 'The original buildings' needs to be better defined. 10. Many would define the Grange/green/church as village centre - no contention. 11. Important view from Grange to Church is missing. 12. Greenways corner is an important green space. 13. The architectural interest of Field End is undervalued.</p> <p>14. Description of farm buildings as physically and visually removed from the village gives wrong impression. Farm buildings are an integral part of the village. 15. Must welcome improvements which are more visually pleasing but must remember it is, and will hopefully continue, as a working farm. 16. Comments relating to school particularly welcome. 17. Historic precedent for farming on the area recommended for removal has not changed since designation. 18. Removal of area will sever historical thread that links the past, present and hoped future. 19. Inference that maintaining or enhancing the CA has failed; we should consider how to resolve the situation for the future; how can downgrading the conservation area do this. 20. Recommend including area between CA and SDNP. 21. Welcome Article 4 Direction. 22. A fuller definition of a conservation area, criteria used for evaluation and a fuller explanation as to why the conclusions were made would have been useful.</p>
OCAR003	Individual	<p>1. Traffic passes through the whole of the village and does not stop. This is a negative feature throughout the area and doesn't stop at the boundary. 2. Condition of flint wall of Ovingdean College should be noted. 3. Agree that working buildings are in need of improvement but should retain this area in the conservation area to give some guide to the building materials and finish of new buildings / repairs.</p>

OCAR004	Individual	1. Strongly object to exclusion of farm area. 2. See no benefit. 3. Very much part of the natural beauty and rural environment of the village. 3. Demolition of unsightly buildings or repair would be positive. 4. There should be absolutely no development which is not completely in line with the rural environment and no commercial or residential development. 5. Forms a vital area of the village with horses/sheep/cows and views adding to amenity of Ovingdean
OCAR005	Individual	1. Ask whether taking farm buildings out of area is opening the way for more housing. Not against it but some would be. 2. Questions regarding underpass below coast road
OCAR006	Individual	1. Useful historic research on Ovingdean Hall and St Wulfran's Church
OCAR007	Individual	1. Agree that there is a strong argument for redundant farm buildings to be removed, but alternative uses need to be discussed, proposed and approved before alterations are made. 2. Do not agree that this area should be removed. It is a vital part of the village with the horses/sheep/views and has been a farm since 1863. 3. Concern that removing farm from area will leave it open for redevelopment with few restrictions. Not against development per se but struggle to see benefit of moving boundary when usage of area remains undecided. Retention in the conservation area would encourage a sympathetic use. 4. Wider concern that any future development will not be covered by conservation restrictions. 5. National Park means development already restricted, but possible. Surely new development should be governed by same restrictions as conservation area, so what does removal achieve? 6. Placing general restrictions on issues such as window and door materials is not appropriate. If a building is important enough to be preserved then it should be listed. There is already a range of materials evident in Ovingdean.
OCAR008	Individual	1. Why are the allotments not included? They are an integral part of the village and have been for many years
OCAR009	Individual	1. Broadly in favour of proposals to maintain or enhance the traditional character. 2. Concerns over removing the farm buildings. 3. No further housing development should be allowed. Important boundary between village and National Park. 4. Any new housing would increase road use which is already narrow and busy. 5. Important to the character of village to have a working farm present. 6. Agree that some buildings are not an asset and should be removed if no longer required and grassland reinstated for use by thriving livery

OCAR010	Individual	1. Impressed by the useful historical descriptions and general analyses. 2. Detailed comments on the text. 3. Information sheet with letter provides useful explanation which could be included in Statement. 4. Support the 9 proposals including the boundary amendment and proposed article 4 direction. 5. South Downs National Park should amend boundary to match that of the conservation area. 6. Clarification of which buildings are listed or locally listed
OCAR011	Individual	<p>First Comment: 1. Removal of farm buildings will undermine very purpose of the conservation area which is to 'protect or enhance' the character of the area. 2. Area should be extended to include all farm buildings and the allotments - positive features that denote a sustainable rural and agricultural community. 3. Seek an extension to consultation period.</p> <p>Second Comment: 4. Reiterate concerns regarding period of consultation. 5. Ovingdean is separate from Brighton and is rooted in the downs with a rural setting. 6. Strong amenity value. 7. The farm area is essential to the character as a downland farming village which has evolved over time to meet modern needs. The boundary should be re-drawn to match that of the SDNP. 8. Heavy traffic flows are the single most important negative feature of the CA. Further growth of traffic should be deterred and measures developed and implemented to reduce traffic. 9. Detailed textual comments including: use of 'suburban' is incongruous. Village has changed but this is not a dilution of its character. Important views identified. Tythe Barn is a landmark building. Green functions as a green. Farm is not a negative feature. Buildings no longer necessary should be reverted to green space. School buildings backing on to Ovingdean Road are a negative feature.</p> <p>10. The allotments are a natural extension of the community's farming past and have become an important local feature. Essential that CA continues to be defined by a farming and horticultural presence. Areas between the SDNP and CA are vulnerable, especially in light of planning reform. Given pressures due to proximity to Brighton, amenity value of CA with adjoining downland, importance of retaining essential link between CA and NP. the boundary should be extended to meet that of the SDNP. 11. Article 4 Direction is supported, if applied with common sense. TV reception is poor so satellite dishes are often required. 12. Comments relating to traffic management, road surfaces should be in keeping and signage kept to a minimum.</p>
OCAR012	Individual	1. Would have been more productive to write to residents. 2. Strange to spend public funds on this at a time of cutbacks. 3. Believe historic buildings within the area must be conserved. 4. Hope that removing the farm does not leave this beautiful setting vulnerable to any future developments. 5. Village has already suffered from increased traffic from changes to coast road

OCAR013	Individual	<p>1. Welcome recognition of special interest. 2. Do not understand benefit of boundary amendment. 3. Can only mean you wish to have the opportunity to sell it off to developers. 4. Further major residential/commercial builds will dilute the character of the village further. 5. If wish to encourage further farm use and these should be considered within the conservation area, not outside it. 6. Agree flint walls, clay tile roofs and windows should be protected (Article 4 Direction). 7. Agree traffic should be discouraged. 8. 'Quiet backwater' is not an accurate description. 9. Vibrations from traffic is detrimental to walls.</p> <p>10. Should be seeking improvement to the farm buildings rather than removal from area. Plan to encourage use would be much preferred. 11. Ovingdean College site - welcome protection and planning developments; need to be careful of development creep. 12. Agree signage and lighting should be minimal. 13. Agree with revision of local list. 14. Agree tree cover should be protected. 15. Agree surrounding open spaces are important and should be protected, including views.</p>
OCAR014	Individual	<p>1. Very good summary of the nature and needs of the conservation area. 2. Cannot agree with the proposed boundary change. Included in area originally for good reason; a working farm forms an integral part of the setting of the village, forming an important part of the village as a whole. 3. Now that farm has moved from the main village there is more rather than less reason to retain the area in the CA. Now that SDNP boundary has been finalised this will leave a gap, enabling unchecked infill development, particularly bearing in mind the Government's asserted planning policy changes. 4. Always regarded as very much part of the village and to remove it would be a retrograde step potentially threatening the historic character. CA designation should be able to encourage appropriate repair where needed. 5. Suggest extending conservation area to abut SDNP. 6. Area has become a rat run especially since construction of bus land on A259. Issue has been picked up for Greenways but not Ovingdean Road. Would like to see positive proposals for the management and reduction of traffic.</p>
OCAR015	Individual	<p>1. Broadly support proposals. 2. p10 there is no mention of minimal road signs to emphasise rural character. An unattractive plastic sign has been erected on the entrance to Byre Cottages regarding people walking through the area. This does not fit in with conservation standards. 3. For sale signs should have more restrictions, especially for The Ridings and Ovingdean Road. 4. p17 4 Orchard Court has flint walls to the front, side and rear. 5. Area has become a rat run which is impacting the flint walls. Only a matter of time before major damage is done. 6. Deeds to The Ridings and Ovingdean Court (attached) refer to open aspect. In last few years this open space directive has been eroded with erection of fences and hedges especially to rear of Ovingdean Court. What is the situation regarding this?</p>

OCAR016	Individual	<p>1. Support view that old Ovingdean was an agricultural settlement and that a farming presence should be encouraged and retained with all the associated sights, smells and sounds. Agricultural land surrounding village is part of character. Agree that green spaces including school grounds should remain. 2. Pleased with inclusion of numbers 50-52 as local listed buildings and importance of flint walls is recognised. 3. Glad mentioned issue of traffic and that further growth in traffic should be deterred. 4. Pleased to hear there are no plans for development in the proposed excluded area and that any future proposals should be sympathetic to needs of continued farming. Chief concern is that the excluded area be protected from commercial development and urban expansion.</p> <p>5. Would like more detailed map showing area proposed to be excluded to clarify in relation to 6 Byre Cottages. 6. If there is future development, will the community be notified at the earliest stages; what sort of protection will the excluded area have? 7. Useful clarification of details in the text. 8. Retain a historic photographic archive which may be of use. 9. The area proposed for removal is particularly rich in wildlife.</p>
OCAR017	Individual	<p>1. The farm is the very basis on which the Ovingdean community is built. Farming is likely to remain as a major activity locally and is a dynamic industry. If this site became housing, the central core of farming will have been lost to Ovingdean</p>
OCAR018	Individual	<p>1. Fully support OCAR011 comments above. 2. Roads have become a race track and it is really dangerous to walk there</p>
OCAR019	Individual	<p>1. Please do not remove the modern farm area's conservation status</p>
OCAR020	Individual	<p>1. Support the key points set out by OCAR011. 2. Agree that there are some minor inaccuracies, as detailed by OCAR011. 3. Agree with proposed amendments of OCAR011, especially that the boundary be extended to meet that of the SDNP. Vital that link between conservation area and surrounding downland is not broken by uncontrolled development. Inclusion would ensure any future development would maintain the existing character of that part of the village. 4. There is a great sense of community in Ovingdean, which feels very separate to Brighton. Significant part of character is rural setting. 5. Most residents of Ovingdean would wish to preserve those areas currently protected, including the farm and agricultural buildings.</p>
OCAR021	Individual	<p>1. Removal of farms area will leave it open to more undesirable development and bring additional traffic to the village. 2. Ovingdean is already overdeveloped and cannot cope with more houses or traffic. 3. Council should reconsider proposal</p>

OCAR022	Individual	1. Taking the farm area out of the conservation area does not seem to serve any useful purpose, unless the council wish to build on this land. 2. It would result in a non-designated area between two protected areas, with a risk of inappropriate development. 3. Existing problem with cars 'rat-running' due to bus lane on A259/ 4. Would not like to see any more buildings which would take away quiet nature and ruin the lovely old Ovingdean Road. 5. The farm itself is part of the personality of Ovingdean. This area needs to remain as farmland.
OCAR023	Individual	1. Opposed to any proposals to develop the area and would like to record our objections
OCAR024	Individual	1. Largely agree with the points made in the report. 2. Some concern over the removal of the farm buildings. May not have architectural significance but do emphasise the farming link to our community. 3. Currently projects a feeling of an unloved soulless farm. 4. Should be careful in presuming any agricultural community is always a beautiful one. Just because not pretty on the eye, does not mean it has no significance to the area. 5. Interested to know if council has looked at alternative agricultural uses for these buildings, perhaps community based projects, producing locally grown crops or workshops for artists. 6. Document states that keen to keep its link to its agricultural roots, but does not state how it intends to do so. 7. It would be reassuring to know what practices will be in place to protect the area from being vulnerable to property development.
OCG001	CityParks	1. Useful information on the council ownership, protected permanent pasture and chalk grassland and local wildlife sites
OCG002	East Sussex County Archaeology	1. No errors in archaeological summaries. 2. In agreement with proposed boundary change
OCG003	ORPS	<p>First Comment: 1. Request extension of consultation period. Further representation to come</p> <p>Second Comment: 1. Adopt comments of OCAR002 with the following points emphasised: 2. References to suburban are inappropriate. We would like the report to recommend that Ovingdean's rather unique, semi-rural setting and location, physically separated from Brighton and other nearby areas, be maintained. 3. The designation should drive the quality of buildings within it, rather than let the lesser quality of some buildings define the area. We would like the report to recommend that the Council actively engage with the interest parties, including ourselves, to enhance the character of the area rather than recommend its removal.</p>

		<p>4. Status of area should be strengthened to deter redevelopment, rather than remove the current protection. Potential impact of additional traffic arising from possible redevelopment of farms area should be considered. 5. Rear elevation of the College is an eyesore. Noting the problem and including an appropriate recommendation would assist in convincing the College to address this in forthcoming building works. 6. Opportunity to redefine CA boundary to match SDNP</p>
OCG004	South Downs Society	<p>1. Historic village including conservation area contributes to the National Park, particularly flint walls and clay tile roofs. 2. Retains rural setting, important views that should be added are long views to and from the north west where village can be seen from downland from a considerable distance. 3. Agree that Church and Manor comprise heart of Ovingdean and would generally agree that late 20th century buildings are disappointing additions. 4. Agree that Ovingdean Road area remains distinctive, with majority of buildings unified through traditional materials. 5. Also agree that continued presence of farm is important reminder of significance of farming. We would support proposals for appropriate repair, removal and general tidying up of the area. 6. Agree there are a number of intrusive features to Ovingdean Hall, that later school buildings detract from its setting and that retention of key green space and surrounding tree cover becomes highly significant.</p> <p>7. Acknowledge farm is of no historic or architectural merit and is visually removed from much of village. Its current character dilutes the special interest of the area and no longer meets the tests for inclusion. 8. However it does now abut the national park. We would expect any repairs or indeed new buildings to be constructed to a high standard of design and appropriate materials for both the historic area and national park. We would challenge whether removal of the farm from the CA at this time would be of benefit. 9. We support the proposed Article 4 Direction. 10. Suggest inclusion of the following in a management plan: protect and enhance vistas from and to SDNP; Improve the distinctive gateway from the SDNP; Use traditional materials; Retain existing boundary to ensure future proposed repairs/development are considered in context of historic village and SDNP; Obtain Article 4 Direction.</p>
OCG005	CAG rep for SIAS	<p>1. Ovingdean Rectory - south side is faced with red mathematical tiles in header bond and the rear (west) elevation is faced with red mathematical tiles in Flemish bond above a brick plinth. This suggests to phases of application. 2. Mathematical tiles to the front elevation of Ovingdean Hall have solid brick quoins and dressings. This is the only example I recollect of this feature which is usually carried out using wooden fillets, wooden imitation rusticated quoins or external angle tiles.</p>
OCG006	CAG rep for AMS	<p>1. Interesting information regarding St Wulfran's Church</p>

OCG007	CAG	The group commented that the boundary should be increased as it forms part of the approach to the village, and recommended the boundary be adjusted to abut the National Park boundary on all sides.
OCG008	CAG rep for Stanmer Preservation Society	1. Unusual stile accessing the church path from Hog Croft Field should be mentioned. 2. The unusual and rare wall letterbox on the roadside of the rectory should also be mentioned.
OCG009	CPRE Sussex	1. Concern that proposed boundary amendment would leave an area with weaker protection which could lead to 'domino development' - countryside being developed for agricultural use, converted to commercial development and then replaced by dense residential development. 2. Can lead to agricultural buildings being built anew on greenfield sites and process repeating itself. 3. This would not be a concern if the SDNP boundary was being proposed for extension concurrently. 4. CPRE Sussex objects to the proposed alteration at least until such time as a matching SDNP boundary is proposed concurrently.
OCG010	The Wiggonholt Association	1. Endorse points of principle made by CPRE Sussex and South Downs Society and objection to reduction of Ovingdean Conservation Area boundary. 2. Proposal creates a 'buffer zone' between the CA and SDNP which inevitably becomes hostage to fortune. 3. The farm buildings were built once the CA was designated, and thus were at the time considered acceptable (or were erected without permission and should be enforced against). 4. Alternative would be to require the unloved buildings to be demolished and area reverted to greenfield. 5. In our view it would be a neat and rational solution to harmonise the two boundaries to avoid lollypop development.
OCG011	Member of Parliament	1. Register support for view of OCAR011 regarding the boundary issue and the detrimental effects of traffic on the area. 2. Boundary issue needs to be considered in wider context of relationship with National Park. The area's location is of considerable strategic importance to the National Park and an important gateway to the Downs. 3. Reducing the size of the conservation area would leave pockets with weaker protection against inappropriate development; expanding it would provide a more coherent management framework.