

Old Town Conservation Area Character Statement

Consultation Report

Comments were invited in respect of five questions:

1. Do you have any comments to make on the summary of the area's historic development?
2. Do you agree with the general assessment of what factors make up the special interest of the Old Town conservation area in terms of its character and appearance?
3. Do you agree with the spatial analysis of the conservation area?
4. Do you agree with the identification of four distinct 'character areas' within the Old Town?
5. Do you have any other comments?

Respondent	Comments	Action
N Bushby	Support for the conservation area but more concerned about outer areas.	Noted.
C J Pobjoy	1. A thorough summary of the history.	Noted and welcomed.
	2. Buildings and materials should be maintained to reflect importance.	Noted.
	3. Yes.	Noted.
	4. Yes.	Noted.
	5. Supports regeneration particularly of the Hippodrome.	Noted.
	Need to insist that residents and businesses maintain their properties in keeping with historical status.	To be addressed in the management plan as far as possible.
L Selig	1. No.	Noted.
	2. Yes.	Noted.
	3. Yes.	Noted.
	4. Yes.	Noted.
	5. Council should resist major retailing chains.	Difficult to enforce through planning policy, but consider the issue in the management plan stage.
Tommy Coyne	No comments recorded.	Noted.

Regency Society	5. Proposes boundary revisions to take in parts of the Old Steine, the north side of North Street and the west side of West Street.	This issue was considered by the Steering Group with reference to historic maps and the conclusion was that the conservation area must address Old Town as it is now rather than as it may have briefly existed at one point in the past.
Katharine Rodda	5. More should be said about King's Road - smelly, dirty, noisy, polluting and dysfunctional. Assess using TfL matrix. Also shared spaces within the area and surfacing e.g. in Middle St and East St.	Revise text to identify the issues more robustly. However, some of these concerns can be considered in the management plan.
Laura King	1. Yes - Concerns about Moshimo and vacant shops, lamp standards and conversion of commercial space to residential.	Ensure these issues are identified and then considered in the management plan, where achievable through the planning system and where consistent with other policy.
	2. Yes	Noted.
	3. Yes, but concern that development threats are not adequately represented – e.g. redevelopments of the Brighton Centre, Churchill Sq, Hannington's Lane and Moshimo	Management of future change in the area will be considered in the management plan but recent planning approvals will not be reviewed.
	4. No – “whole area should be classified”.	This comment appears to misunderstand that the four areas do add up to represent the whole area, which will remain designated.
	5. Repeats threat from proposed developments and the effect of the i360.	As response to question 1 above.
Conservation Advisory Group (CAG)	1. No comment.	Noted.
	2. Basically sound but too general. Suggest street-by-street commentary as in other statements such as Valley Gardens.	Reviewed, but excessive detail that does not add to the overall character assessment has been avoided.
	3. Suggests 13 specific views that should be taken into account.	Reviewed and key views included.

	4. Agreed, but include south and west side of Old Steyne.	This issue was considered by the Steering Group with reference to historic maps and the conclusion was that the conservation area must address Old Town as it is now rather than as it may have briefly existed at one point in the past.
	Use street numbering rather than building names.	Reviewed and amended but names are used where relevant.
	Suggests 14 areas that should be specifically referred to.	Reviewed, but avoiding excessive detail that does not add to the overall character assessment.
	Use of the word 'twitchen' is Sussex but not Brighton.	Amended. The term 'lane' has been used instead.
	5. Several specific points of clarification particularly in relation to Section 6.	Reviewed and amended as relevant. However, 'bow window' is a reasonable term for a non-technical audience, rather than 'tripartite segmental bay'.
	5.1 The Historic England format not specifically followed in respect of negative factors, general condition, risk, problems, pressures and capacity for change.	The Historic England format is for guidance only and Historic England have confirmed that a tailored approach should be taken in each case. Some of these issues are picked up in the sub-area analysis and in Section 7.
	5.2 Limited guidance provided. If that is to come in the management plan, this should be made explicit.	Section 7 clarifies what will be covered in the management plan without prejudicing consultation on that document.
	5.3 Identification of local list buildings should not be constrained by the conservation area designation.	The council has an up-to-date Local List that will be reviewed in 4 years. But buildings within conservation areas will only be added where they have a heritage value that is atypical of the area.
	5.4 Add a section on new development proposals, not all of which are opportunities.	This will be a matter for the management plan.
	5.5 Note the effect of public utilities on public realm e.g. rubbish storage.	Reference added in section 7.18 on Public Realm.
	5.6 Need for guidance on new buildings and works to existing buildings.	The appraisal is not the place for this. The issue will be addressed through forthcoming City Plan policy and the management plan.
	5.7 The document should create a vision for enhancement.	The appraisal is not the place for this. The issue will be addressed through the management plan.

	5.8 Note inclusion on Historic England's 'at risk' register.	The character statement is the first step towards removing the conservation area from the 'at risk' register. Any reference to this would soon make the document out-of-date.
Nick Tyson	Generally a very good document.	Noted and welcomed
	P4. Not a village but always a town. Focus is on the smaller streets but larger cardinal streets are significant too.	Instead use the word 'settlement' for the earlier stage of the area's development, to reflect the growth of Brighton. The cardinal streets have been acknowledged.
	P5. Include mention of clunch and bungaroosh	Added.
	P7. There is almost no surviving medieval fabric.	The point is made about the medieval extent of the settlement defined by East, West and North Streets for which there is still archaeological potential. Add that most of the Old Town is within an Archaeological Notification Area
	P9. Village/town issue again.	Use the word 'settlement' for the earlier stage of the area's development.
	P12. Georgian/Regency styles not defined by bows.	Reviewed and clarified.
	P15. Concern for archaeology.	Add that most of the Old Town is within an Archaeological Notification Area.
	Economic cycles of boom and depression are only one factor to explain complicated history.	Amend to clarify that this is an important factor that has influenced the area's complex history but that other factors have also played a part.
	P18. Comment on constituents of bungaroosh.	Reviewed and revised.
	P22. Concern that loss of Timpson's shoe shop should establish a strong case against such losses.	This decision was properly made by the Planning Committee having regard to all relevant matters and does not set a precedent.
	P23. More detail on mathematical tiles.	Noted.
Hove Civic Society	The need for improvements should be developed into investment programmes not just for buildings, but also for the public realm.	Issues of future improvement are matters for the management plan.