

Respondent	Summary of Main Comments	Response to Main Comments
Ann Markwick	Most interested to read the new proposals. Worried that no mention was made of the water catcher that runs parallel with Back Lane. The pond at the top of the village is an integral part of the whole water scheme. There was once a canal joining the pond at the top of the village with that by the pond; running behind the cottages	The water catcher is mentioned in the historic background section. It currently lies outside the conservation area. It is not considered appropriate to include it in the conservation area, as it is protected by listed building designation and it does not have a visible impact on the character or appearance of the area. The archaeological significance section will be amended to highlight the extent and likely survival of the water catchment system. The pond at the top of the village is evident on the 1840 tithe map, and therefore predates the water catcher.
Ann Markwick	No mention made of the horse engine behind Stanmer House or the donkey wheel, both of which were part of the 18th century water scheme designed by Nicholas Dubois	Both the horse engine (gin wheel) (p13) and donkey wheel (p19) are mentioned in the report. The gin wheel is 17th century in date, and therefore predates Dubois' scheme. It is unclear when the donkey wheel dates to; it may be 18th century or earlier. The report will be amended to clarify this information.
Ann Markwick	Stanmer Preservation Society has a licence to care for and run Stanmer Church from the Church commissioners until such a time as a tenant is found for it	Noted
Hugo Blomfield, CityParks	Would it be possible to prioritise the car parks in terms of which have the most impact on the landscape	The report will be amended accordingly
Hugo Blomfield, CityParks	The recommended 'coherent strategy for paraphernalia along the drive' would usefully discuss general presumptions regarding 20mph signs vs painted 20mph on the road surface, painted double yellow lines vs signs (temporary or otherwise) and the possibility of better speed humps	The report will be amended accordingly
Hugo Blomfield, CityParks	Clarity required on the Character Area maps showing positive and negative features. For example, it is not clear in the Parkland Character Area map on p23 what the northernmost strip of hatched 'negative feature' relates to.	Additional labels will be added to the maps to clarify
Friends of Stanmer Park	We would like to have had the time to make contact with other Stanmer based organisations to hopefully come forward with a united voice on the issues raised. Why is it necessary to have such a restricting time schedule if the Council really wants local consultation? We would like to have been able to undertake a paragraph by paragraph assessment but the restrictive timescale already referred to above prevents this. Therefore we are only able to make general comments.	Stakeholders were notified in October. The timeframe and 4-week consultation period provided are in line with national and local guidance and has been set out in order to review the conservation area prior to the commencement of the National Park
Friends of Stanmer Park	We do not accept the reasons set out for removing the areas of woodland to the south of the A27 bypass. Indeed the reasons given for extending the area to the north and east to 'frame' the park can equally well be applied for retaining the areas to the south, in that when using the outlying parts of The Great Wood for walking and other recreational activities, it is imperative that the remains of Coldean Belt and Coldean Wood on the opposite side of the by-pass remain protected by their Conservation Area status as they are highly visible from the walks on the Great Wood southern perimeter.	Conservation Area designation is primarily concerned with the built environment. PPG15 states that designation is not an appropriate means of protecting landscape features. Case Law determines that it is legitimate to designate the setting of important buildings, and historic parks and gardens that contain structures of special interest. This is not the case for this area, which can be more appropriately identified as the setting of the conservation area, rather than the setting of the House. It therefore does not warrant retention now that it is visually and physically removed from the area. It is protected as part of the registered historic park and garden, confirmed National Park, Site of Nature Conservation and proposed Local Nature Reserve. These designations more accurately reflect its significance.
Friends of Stanmer Park	We support the proposed boundary extensions to the Conservation Area	Supports appraisal. No amendments required

<p>Friends of Stanmer Park</p>	<p>We feel strongly that the proposed boundary to the Conservation Area in Northwest, Great Wood, is totally fictitious and that ALL Great Wood, through to Chalk Hill, Old Boat Corner, the Upper Lodges, Iron Square and the woodland areas between and connecting to the Village on its northern side should be included in the Conservation Area. The reason for this again, as put forward by yourselves, being the framing of the Village.</p>	<p>Conservation Area designation is primarily concerned with the built environment. PPG15 states that designation is not an appropriate means of protecting landscape features. Case Law determines that it is legitimate to designate the setting of important buildings, and historic parks and gardens that contain structures of special interest. Further consideration of this area has been undertaken. It is not felt that this part of the wood comprises part of the immediate setting of the House. The area feels removed from the parkland and the House, with instead greater visual and physical links to the designed farmland forming the northern portion of the registered historic park and garden. The area is protected more appropriately as part of the registered historic park and garden, confirmed National Park, Site of Nature Conservation, Environmentally Sensitive Area, proposed Local Nature Reserve and containing a number of Archaeologically Sensitive Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments. These designations more accurately reflect its significance.</p>
<p>Friends of Stanmer Park</p>	<p>The Friends of Stanmer Park staged a long, hard and successful campaign over several years, eventually persuading the Council that the regular users of the park did NOT want the existing small car parks removed by creating a new, large car parking area on what is presently a pleasant large grass area to the north of the Lower Lodges, used for football and other pitches and by large events. We reject the view that the present traditional car parks do not sit comfortably within the layout of the park. However, we do have views about their now inadequate size and the manner in which they should be better disguised.</p>	<p>Noted. However the cars and car parking do have an impact on views across the park, and this needs to be identified in the report in order to inform any future management decisions required to overcome the present problems with parking provision. The report does not recommend any changes to the traffic management in the park, but seeks to identify the issues in conservation terms</p>
<p>Friends of Stanmer Park</p>	<p>Similarly, we do not accept the proposed removal of lime, cherry and other trees planted in the park in recent years for being aesthetically and historically detrimental to the park. A number of these trees have been privately provided in memory of deceased loved-ones. It must be remembered that any park, woodland or open space is a living organism, unlike buildings which can be framed in the time in which they are constructed. As such they cannot be time restricted for, whatever man may try to do, they will continue to grow and develop and should be allowed to do so according to the trends of the day, without restrictions inflicted by man.</p>	<p>Agree that a park is living and will evolve over time, but, in order to ensure the park retains its special interest and historic character for which it is popular, it is important that future developments, including the planting of new trees, are managed appropriately. The report will be amended to promote a long-term strategy of non-replacement and future planting strategies that are in-keeping with the historic character of the area, rather than the removal/relocation of existing trees.</p>
<p>Friends of Stanmer Park</p>	<p>Friends of Stanmer Park consider it highly regrettable that the Review now seeks to revive issues previously raised (particularly points 6 and 7 above) which have been a Council decision NOT to proceed with. We strongly feel that whilst the Council may wish to put these forward as long term objectives, the decisions taken over the past few years including that of not implementing car parking charges should be recognised and should be the subject of consultation with Stanmer Stakeholder Groups before being implemented at any time in the future.</p>	<p>There is a general appreciation that current arrangements are inadequate, and that at some point changes will be required. This report does not look to make any changes or specific proposals such as implementing car parking charges. The report provides a statement of the historic character of the park in terms of its special architectural and historic interest, identified in order to manage any decisions regarding its future. If any changes are proposed in future these will be part of a different process and subject to consultation at that time</p>
<p>Karen Hooper</p>	<p>Character Area 1: The House. (i) Certainly a use should be found for the old stables, it is wrong that the lease was not renewed for the villagers to continue to use it as a community space. (ii) Agree the public realm in the ancillary area should be improved. (iii) Walled garden, orchard and the renamed Harvest Farm should be included.</p>	<p>Supports appraisal. No amendments required</p>
<p>Karen Hooper</p>	<p>Character Area 2: Agree that the long barn should be put to enhanced useage, with repair works carried out, but I think any plans should be balanced with the current usage of them as additional stables. Having horses in the village adds character and many people visit in order to see the various animals including the horses. The hardstanding opposite the tearoom/around the toilet blocks needs improvement, along with the adjacent buildings which should be put to good use to build upon the feeling of this being a hub for the village, centred around the tearoom. All other farm buildings should also be used between there and Home Farm</p>	<p>Agree that opportunities for the continued presence of livestock at the farm would be beneficial. Report will be amended to reflect this. Other comments support appraisal and require no amendments</p>

Karen Hooper	Cars parked on the pavement occurs as now all the cottages are fully occupied and with no regular bus service to the village, residents need to have cars. There are too many cars to park just on the street, and the overflow area used by residents is the vacant plot. I feel this area should be improved to become a car park for residents only with gravel/asphalt and marked bays to maximise space. Your suggestion of adding a small scale housing development will only increase the pressure of cars in this village. The car parking area for the public also needs attention as there is not enough provided elsewhere in the park, and on a busy day people park all the way up to the vacant plot. A sign at Home Farm entrance to the village should advise the public that only those with limited mobility or residents are allowed past that point. Over time when the cottages become more fully occupied with changes of tenancy, the parking situation will only become more of an issue. There is no capacity to park cars at the north end of the village as they will then block tractors etc.	Noted. The beneficial use of the vacant plot has been noted, and this will be considered as part of any planning brief/enhancement plan for the village centre. The report will be amended to reflect this. Any improvements to the site will also be considered as part of a planning brief/enhancement plan.
Karen Hooper	Character Area 2 (cont'd): Pavements where provided need maintaining. I agree with recommendations (i), (ii) and (iv). Point (iv) I agree with in principle, but feel that solar panels are a future addition to houses that are a necessity and if they reduce pollution then they should be allowed to be mounted to unlisted buildings, even in this village. Also changing roof types I feel is acceptable.	Supports appraisal. Agree that sustainable energy sources are important, and will become increasingly so. However, the Article 4 Direction is not a means of stopping such development. It is a method of controlling change - ensuring that sympathetic systems are used and located appropriately as to not harm the character of the area.
Karen Hooper	Character Area 3: I understand that you wish to respect the historic design of the parkland, but feel that fruit trees are not inappropriate. Surely we should accept their existence and utilise them. Any trees are surely better than having none. A balance is needed between the original design and what currently exists.	Some fruit trees do not have long lifespans so their historic inappropriateness should be identified in this report in order to inform future management decisions. Agree that a balance is needed; not attempting to wholly recreate the 18th century design. The report will be amended to emphasise a long-term strategy of non-replacement and future planting that has regard to the historic character of the area, rather than removal/relocation
Karen Hooper	Removal of the central pitch would be welcomed and agree that the university grassland is very much part of the park.	Supports appraisal. No amendments required.
Karen Hooper	Tenantiain belt and Coldean belt areas do need improvement as suggested	Supports appraisal. No amendments required.
Karen Hooper	How can noise and pollution levels be reduced from the A27? Is a sound boundary appropriate in the form of fencing and trees?	Existing planting and fencing do provide some mitigation against noise and visual disturbance from the A27. The report will be amended to emphasise the importance of these considerations for any future proposed developments.
Karen Hooper	Lower Lodges. No difference in levels of maintenance noticed, except the information oval sign which needs replacing	This was evident only in summer 2009 and will be omitted from the report
Karen Hooper	Parking areas do need to look tidier, but the various modern introductions of bunding, bollard etc has occurred due to people driving on the grass to picnic near their vehicle as well as joy riders skidding all over the grass at night time. Both of these were not issues in previous centuries and only increasing park wardens and locking gates at night will otherwise solve these problems. Both options cause more cost to cover staffing or maintenance of equipment so presume will not occur	Agree that bunds and bollards are of benefit in deterring driving on the grass, and the report does not recommend their removal. However the impact of such intrusions on the character and appearance of the park still needs to be identified in order to inform future decisions in order to preserve and enhance the area, at a time when, for example the wooden bollards may need replacing
Karen Hooper	Street lighting needs to be low level and effective, currently it is neither and poses a safety issue for pedestrians, number of which will increase as buildings are fully used. Effective signage needs to be inkeeping and maintained.	Supports appraisal. No amendments required
Karen Hooper	With regard to recommendations: (i) How will you restrict car borne trips to those that are only essential? Most visitors bring dogs for a walk and would not have time or inclination to get on a bus. There is no bus service in the park on week days. Other people who visit the park are families / groups. If a bus service were offered it would be very expensive for such numbers of people to visit, as it is cheaper for them to come by car.	Such considerations lie outside the scope of this document, but may be considered as part of any future traffic management proposals.

Karen Hooper	(ii) It is completely not acceptable to remove trees from the driveway, even if they are not in-keeping with the original design. There are a large number of big specimens that you would have to destroy, this should never happen. Ones that can be relocated could be elsewhere as long as they are still able to thrive.	The creation of an avenue remains inappropriate to the park and will significantly alter views across the valley and the character of the drive. It is appropriate that the report identifies this, in order to inform future decisions regarding the management of the park. In view of the results of public consultation, the recommendation will be amended to promote long term strategies of non-replacement and future planting that has regard to the historic character of the park
Karen Hooper	(iii) Agree	Supports appraisal. No amendments required
Karen Hooper	(iv) The current boundary should include extension C, D and F. I do wish to know what would be proposed for the area called Removal E. It comprises of wood and walks and areas for wildlife and concern is that if removed it would then be considered for development. Therefore until a time when alternative plans for this area are provided I feel it should stay included in the parkland. Archaeological remains were found on the Varley Halls bank, during the construction of the A27, so even though this area is not in the sight line whilst in the park, it is adjoining and only separated by the A27 and modern housing.	Conservation Area designation is primarily concerned with the built environment. PPG15 states that designation is not an appropriate means of protecting landscape features. Case Law determines that it is legitimate to designate the setting of important buildings, and historic parks and gardens that contain structures of special interest. This is not the case for this area, which therefore does not warrant retention now that it is visually and physically removed from the area. It is protected as part of the registered historic park and garden, confirmed National Park, Site of Nature Conservation and proposed Local Nature Reserve. These designations more accurately reflect its significance and will form important material considerations of any future proposed development. Removal of Area E from the conservation area has not been prompted by proposals for development on this site
Ms Brenda Pollack	Welcome the assessment of the importance of woodland in and around Stanmer Conservation Area. When I walk in the area, the woodland sections are equally part of the landscape and enjoyment. I therefore support the proposed boundary changes incorporating woodland to the east and west. I believe however that the proposals would be further improved if the Great Wood new area was extended to include all the woodland westwards of Old Boat Corner and around to the Upper Lodges. This is an alternative route into Stanmer Park and provides attractive tracks on foot through mature woodland and would make a more sensible new boundary to those using the area on foot.	Conservation Area designation is primarily concerned with the built environment. PPG15 states that designation is not an appropriate means of protecting landscape features. Case Law determines that it is legitimate to designate the setting of important buildings, and historic parks and gardens that contain structures of special interest. Further consideration of this area has been undertaken. It is not felt that this part of the wood comprises part of the immediate setting of the House. The area feels removed from the parkland and the House, with instead greater visual and physical links to the designed farmland forming the northern portion of the registered historic park and garden. The area is protected more appropriately as part of the registered historic park and garden, confirmed National Park, Site of Nature Conservation, Environmentally Sensitive Area, proposed Local Nature Reserve and containing a number of Archaeologically Sensitive Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments. These designations more accurately reflect its significance.
Ms Brenda Pollack	The section about the Village mentions (p21): 'Cars park on both sides of the street and on the pavement, and impact on the street's historic character and on views along its length. The hardstanding opposite the tea shop is in a poor state of repair, and used informally as additional parking.' However, there is no direct recommendation regarding this issue at the end of this section along with recommendations relating to the village aspect. I should like to see some clear recommendations set out here. I suggest that the informal use of the hardstanding is made more formal and that visitors are directed to park here.	The future formal use of the hardstanding is dependent on the future use of the adjacent farm buildings, and therefore needs to be considered as part of any planning brief or application for this site. No recommendations are therefore given at this stage
Ms Brenda Pollack	I support recommendation (i) (p27) and suggest a minor addition (in bold below) to ensure that it is understood that this relates to various areas across the park, not just the access road. 'vehicular access to the park should be carefully managed, (a) to restrict car borne trips to the village to essential trips only, so as to preserve the village's rural character and (b) to locate parking <b>throughout the park</b> in a manner that minimises visual impact and enhances enjoyment of the park.	Supports appraisal. The text will be amended to clarify
Dr Sue Berry	Highlights a number of historical inaccuracies	The report will be amended accordingly

<p>Conservation Advisory Group (CAG)</p>	<p>Mrs Markwick (Stanmer Preservation Society) described her Society's concern over the suggested felling of trees along the drive, and the deteriorating condition of the Stanmer House stable block. She reported that the house was for sale. She urged new uses for the stables and the long barn, and welcomed the proposed actions described in the appraisal and the expansion of the conservation area. Mrs Montford queried the use of the terms landscape and parkland, suggesting reference is only made to parkland as the land was designed and planted in a conscious manner. Overall the group welcomed the appraisal and felt it was very well written and carefully considered.</p>	<p>Generally supports appraisal. Regarding the use of the word 'landscape' vs 'parkland'; confusion also arises from referring to the whole estate as parkland vs the formal park area/grassed approach as parkland. Therefore park/parkland will be used where appropriate, and the term 'designed landscape' or similar elsewhere in order to clarify. As discussed under SPS's comments, recommendations regarding inappropriate planting will be amended to promote a long-term strategy of non-replacement and new planting that has regard to the historic character of the area rather than removal of existing trees.</p>
<p>Charlotte McLearn, English Heritage</p>	<p>I was very pleased to see the new conservation boundary line and had no major comments. I would support proposals to remove/relocate modern planting, particularly along the drive. In restoration terms the way in which the house and landscape is revealed to the visitor is a key part of the landscape design and more recent planting interferes with the structure of 18th century views and planting. With regard to Removal E, this was once part of the park - it still lies within the registered park boundary and should remain so. However, I'm not sure how it serves the aims and objectives of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Supports appraisal. Area E will remain in the registered historic park and garden. No amendments required</p>
<p>Friends of Hollingbury and Burstead Woods</p>	<p>Welcome the very positive assessment of the importance of woodland in, and adjacent to, the Stanmer Conservation Area, and support the proposed boundary changes incorporating woodland to the east and west of the present area. We suggest that if such incorporation is confirmed the definition of the Parkland 'character area' on p12 should be revised: at present 'some woodland' is the last element mentioned, the list comprising 'open green space, including access land, amenity grass and some woodland'. With the inclusion of east ridge woodland, and, particularly, much of the Great Wood, the definition as it stand would misrepresent the relative 'weight' of the features mentioned.</p>	<p>Agree. Report will be amended accordingly</p>
<p>Friends of Hollingbury and Burstead Woods</p>	<p>We suggest that the proposed northern limit to the conservation area in respect of the Great Wood be reconsidered: while it may make sense in relation to some aspects of estate history we think that in relation to the Wood itself it is arbitrary. Extending that boundary to Old Boat Corner and around to the Upper Lodges would make it 'legible on the ground' (to borrow a phrase from the recommendations on p28 in respect of the proposed A27 boundary) and facilitate uniform management of the Great Wood.</p>	<p>Conservation Area designation is primarily concerned with the built environment. PPG15 states that designation is not an appropriate means of protecting landscape features. Case Law determines that it is legitimate to designate the setting of important buildings, and historic parks and gardens that contain structures of special interest. Further consideration of this area has been undertaken. It is not felt that this part of the wood comprises part of the immediate setting of the House. The area feels removed from the parkland and the House, with instead greater visual and physical links to the designed farmland forming the northern portion of the registered historic park and garden. The area is protected more appropriately as part of the registered historic park and garden, confirmed National Park, Site of Nature Conservation, Environmentally Sensitive Area, proposed Local Nature Reserve and containing a number of Archaeologically Sensitive Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments. These designations more accurately reflect its significance.</p>
<p>Friends of Hollingbury and Burstead Woods</p>	<p>We have some reservations about the recommendation that 'inappropriate modern planting (especially along the drive and beside Old Lodge Clump) should be removed or relocated to more historically appropriate planting positions in the park. Any further planting in the park should follow the strategy set out in the Restoration Management Plan', a strategy which is 'to restore the largely intact 18th century planting scheme, and remove most of the postwar plantings.' We acknowledge that the Plan goes on to note that this might be controversial, and even mentions a possible long-term policy of non-replacement as a mode of implementation.</p>	<p>The rare survival of a 18th century designed landscape at Stanmer is central to the area's special interest and present character as reflected in its designation as a registered historic park and garden and as a conservation area. The creation of an avenue remains inappropriate to the park and will significantly alter views across the valley and the character of the drive. It is appropriate that the report identifies this, in order to inform future decisions regarding the management of the park in order that the special interest and character of the area is preserved and enhanced. In view of the results of public consultation, the recommendation will be amended so that it does not recommend removal, but promotes long term strategies of non-replacement and future planting that has regard to the historic character of the park</p>

South Downs Society	<p>Nonetheless, we feel that there may be an over-emphasis on one historic plan for the estate: not only has there been a change of use from private estate to country park, and a change of access from foot or horse to car, but it is unrealistic to assume that the estate owners would themselves have implemented decade after decade a scheme set up by forebears. We should certainly not commit ourselves to doing so centuries later. (The importance of this is demonstrated by the proposal in the review for 'substantial' planting to shield the park from the A27, clearly no part of the 18th century vision). We believe that woodland managers should be asked to 'have regard to' original planting schemes - we hope that they would do so, anyway! - but not more tightly constrained in their decision making</p>	
South Downs Society	<p>The Society welcomes the preparation of this report and its consideration of the special features of the Conservation Area and how they can be adapted to meet the changing needs of society and the resources that are available</p>	Supports appraisal. No amendments required
South Downs Society	<p>The Society agrees with the analysis of the landscape structure of the conservation area; the special views, open spaces, and landmarks and the character area of the parkland areas. It agrees that there has been a tendency to over-plant with trees so that the flow of open spaces around the parkland and the views between areas has become restricted. Some of the planting species are out of character (eg Lime Avenue on the drive and cherry trees in the pleasure gardens). Their relocation elsewhere would be supported. The landscape detailing has become unsympathetic to the historic landscape with industrial scale fencing and lighting and holes in flint walls and poor surfacing and loss of kerb stones. There is a need to generate a more distinctive landscape house style.</p>	Supports appraisal. No amendments required
South Downs Society	<p>The Society agrees that finding suitable new uses for the vacant main buildings in the vicinity of the mansion eg the stables, walled garden, church and Home Farm is crucial to the future prosperity of the Stanmer estate. Such development must be self-supporting, sympathetic to the rural landscape character, sympathetic to the objectives of the National Park, require minimum change to the historic built structure, generate limited traffic movement, provide opportunities for education, provide opportunities for young people, provide a managed staff presence in the evenings.</p>	Noted. Comments are consistent with advice in appraisal and will inform the planning brief / enhancement plan
South Downs Society	<p>Some of the buildings require emergency building repairs now to safeguard their structure and further decline. They include the stables, village farm barn and bothies in the walled garden.</p>	Noted. Need for repairs identified in appraisal
South Downs Society	<p>Landscape enhancement of the pleasure gardens and the land surrounding the mansion would help to enhance its setting as a key feature in the parkland and help stimulate restoration work</p>	Noted. Supports appraisal. No amendments required
South Downs Society	<p>The walled garden to the west of the House is a service area not normally visited by the public. It is a large brick walled area with a variety of buildings including several brick bothies. Although in poor condition, with only half the buildings currently in use, the area with the adjoining orchard, City College and the Care Co-operative Farm has the potential to develop in to a model environmentally friendly nursery. We would urge that all the buildings in this area, including those north of the walled garden, be included within the conservation area.</p>	Supports appraisal. No amendments required
South Downs Society	<p>The village has developed as a classic farm estate village with buildings of considerable historic character. Sadly due to changing management and demands the two principal buildings; the Village Barn and the Church are redundant. Some of the buildings are in poor condition and are in need of repair. Generally the landscape detailing of the walls, kerbs and pavements require attention. The society supports the report's objectives to find new uses that are compatible with the village's rural location, secure sympathetic restoration of the traditional buildings and enhance its position as a recreational gateway to the National Park</p>	Supports appraisal. No amendments required

South Downs Society	We support the recommendation for the preparation of a development brief and enhancement plan for the farm area of the village and the provision of an Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights for the unlisted buildings within the village.	Supports appraisal. No amendments required
South Downs Society	The A27 diversion has had a significant impact on accessibility in the southern part of the Park and created substantial visual and noise pollution. The planting of a tree belt of appropriate species along the north side of the A27 would help to reduce the impact and would be supported by the Society. The land south of the trunk road, now served from the Park proper by the A27 has been included within the National Park, can continue to provide a buffer for noise disturbance and, for that reason, may beneficially be retained within the conservation area.	Conservation Area designation is primarily concerned with the built environment. PPG15 states that designation is not an appropriate means of protecting landscape features. Case Law determines that it is legitimate to designate the setting of important buildings, and historic parks and gardens that contain structures of special interest. This is not the case for this area, which therefore does not warrant retention now that it is visually and physically removed from the area. It is protected as part of the registered historic park and garden, confirmed National Park, Site of Nature Conservation and proposed Local Nature Reserve. These designations more accurately reflect its significance.
South Downs Society	The construction of a new access road, past the Park entrance lodges and across the corner of the Park to join up with the Sussex University campus and its car parks, will intrude visually into the Park and additional screening may be required.	Additional screening through planting and earthworks is a condition of the planning permission
South Downs Society	The Society agrees that car parking along the drive can be detrimental to the landscape character and that no further areas should be allocated. Although the bollards on either side of the road detract from the parkland character, they have been successful in reducing trespassing and damage from vehicles off road. Vehicular access to the Park should be carefully managed, to meet village needs and help people with special access requirements, but great care should be taken to minimise the visual impact and disturbance of visiting vehicles.	Supports appraisal. Agree that bunds and bollards are of benefit in deterring driving on the grass, and the report does not recommend their removal. However the impact of such intrusions on the character and appearance of the park still needs to be identified in order to inform future decisions in order to preserve and enhance the area, at a time when, for example the wooden bollards may need replacing
South Downs Society	The Sports Pitch in the centre of the park is inconsistent with the character and informal recreational use of the Park and its removal would be supported	Supports appraisal. No amendments required
South Downs Society	The extension of the conservation area boundary to include the surrounding woodland within the boundary of the Park is supported. The woods form an intrinsic part of the setting of Stanmer Park and part of its designed landscape.	Supports appraisal. No amendments required
South Downs Society	In conclusion the Society considers that Stanmer Park is a valuable historic and recreational facility within the National Park. Major works are however urgently required to conserve and manage the estate for future generations which are beyond the resources of a local authority at the present time. The Society would therefore support a community approach to the National Lottery for assistance to secure its long term conservation. Works and management measures to conserve and enhance the conservation area will need to be the subject of a management plan: the Society will be keen to contribute to the development and implementation of that plan and we would be grateful to hear the intended timescale for this.	Noted. Future management planning will be undertaken in consultation with interested parties and the National Park Authority
Pru Gridley	As a lifetime user of Stanmer Park I welcome the City Council's decision to review Stanmer Park Conservation Area, but find para 2 of the introduction confusing to say the least in defining the compass points. Given that the 2 sports pavilions at the A27 entrance to the park are known as Pavilion North and Pavilion South. The drive entering between the Lower Lodges from the A27 is East Drive, while the drive that leads out of Stanmer Village to the Upper Lodges has always been West Drive. Indeed many of the correct names of the buildings referred to in this report have not been used. When read in conjunction with The Colson Stone Historic Landscape Survey the Conservation Draft appears conflicting to anyone not familiar with the Stanmer Park Estate.	West Drive is consistently identified by this name in existing literature, and the report will be reviewed to ensure it does the same. However the main drive is referred to variously in the Colson Stone report as 'the drive', 'the approach drive', 'the main drive' and 'the South Drive'. Although aware that the sports pavilions are named 'North' and 'South', the true alignment of the park is closer to north-south along the axis of the main drive. As such, and as there is no consistent historic terminology to suggest otherwise, the report will retain its current form. The introduction paragraph has been included to try and avoid confusion but will be reviewed to see if it can be made clearer. Similarly, there is a lack of consistency in other terminology. The Colson Stone report refers to the barn in the village as 'the barn', 'Farm Barn', 'Long Barn' and 'Village Barn'. The Review will endeavour to be consistent and clear within itself.

Pru Gridley	Due to the diversity of interest and special features in Stanmer Park it is my opinion that a single Conservation Appraisal for the future protection and enhancement of the Park should be drawn up that coordinates buildings/wildlife/parkland and recreational issues. Forming a team from all the Council's departments that pull together as 'one' for the preservation of Stanmer Park the jewel in the city's crown. Buildings and Wildlife issues are closely linked for example the: Long Barn is a roosting/nesting site for bats and barn owl; vacant farm buildings in the village are nesting sites to visiting House Martins; 3 modern agricultural buildings adjacent to the village pond have for 2 years been the nesting site of Kestrels. Yet change of use was granted in 2009 to allow an artist group use of one of these barns during the nesting season and the RSPB had to be asked to intervene.	Noted. This report concentrates on heritage conservation, and to consider other factors is outside its scope. However, the implementation of changes to the park as per its recommendations will consider all factors. The Historic Landscape Survey and Restoration Management Plan similarly considered all factors in detail within one report.
Pru Gridley	Broadly speaking I support the majority of recommendations in this appraisal, but wish to add some observations of my own: The buildings that are referred to as neglected/run-down/different degrees of maintenance etc are owned by BHCC	Noted
Pru Gridley	p16: To include all area known as Stanmer Organics in the conservation area in order to retain a tighter control over the erecting of unsympathetic buildings, and to ensure a high standard of ground maintenance. To repair and put back into use both the orangery and glass house. To extend the conservation boundary to include the pets cemetery adjacent to the formal gardens and orchard lining the south wall of the walled garden. To reinstate the flint ha ha in Great Wood to the south of Pets Cemetery.	Noted. The current character of Stanmer Organics is not of historic or architectural interest, and it therefore does not warrant inclusion in the area. Inclusion would dilute the character and historic integrity of the conservation area. The pets cemetery is included in the conservation area
Pru Gridley	p20: Regarding the former housing plot: To build two new cottages fronting the village street, their design to be sympathetic to the adjacent houses.	Supports appraisal. No amendment necessary
Pru Gridley	p21: To open talks with the Stanmer Preservation Society for joint use of The Long Barn/former farm yard/stores/shelters with the purpose of establishing a South Downs Visitors Centre similar to that at Beachy Head (but without the cheap trashy souvenirs). Sales items should be relevant to visitors use, ie maps, relevant publications, sun cream, trek sticks etc. This should enable the majority of the buildings to remain within 'Agricultural Rateable Values'. Note that the SPS has brought the Church back into community use. To extend the boundary to include all three barns that are adjacent to the village pond.	Noted. However this lies outside the remit of this document. Consultation on future uses of the Long Barn and other farm buildings would form part of the production of any planning brief and enhancement plan. The modern portal-framed buildings (other than that proposed for inclusion) are of no historic or architectural merit and do not warrant inclusion in the area
Pru Gridley	p24: Parkland: The 'inappropriate fruit tree specimens' provide a vital source of food for many species of birds that inhabit Stanmer Park. The Tenanitin Belt did once screen the road. But the new Sussex University access road currently under construction now and will in future dominate this end of the park. The southwest corner of the conservation area, south of the A27 is the hunting ground of Owl and Kestrel, also home to many species of butterflies. It also provides a pedestrian link via a footbridge to Great Wood and must therefore be retained within the conservation area. It would provide an ideal location for a 'Wildlife Tower Home'.	Screening for the new access road is a condition of its planning permission. Wildlife issues lie outside the auspices of conservation area designation. The southwest area to the south of the A27 is designated as part of the proposed Local Nature Reserve, a Site of Nature Conservation and part of the confirmed National Park. These designations are more appropriate to protecting these wildlife concerns.
Pru Gridley	p25 - The Drive: The hard standings created by the military are 'Tank Stands' now by virtue of their age they qualify as Ancient Monuments	Noted. The appraisal will be amended to highlight that these areas do reflect a period in the history of the Park
Pru Gridley	p27 (i): If car borne trips to the village are to be restricted, a free and frequent alternative public transport service must be provided seven days a week between the hours 7am and dusk	Noted. However this is beyond the scope of this document. This will be considered as part of any future traffic management proposals
Stanmer Preservation Society	We have read the review carefully and found it generally to be a well-written and helpful document highlighting many of the important issues facing the park.	Supports appraisal. No amendment required



<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>The House: There are historic remains that would be of great public interest: the ice wells, now hidden under Stanmer House car park, and the horse engine, which contrary to agreement seems not to be clearly available for public access. The House's fencing, especially in the grounds behind the House, is also out of character with the park. Every effort should be made to ensure that the grounds behind the House remain as open to the public as they are at present.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>If there is a possibility that the House will return to Council control, consideration should be given to possible uses. One proposal is that the council considers using it for the local records office, using money that would be saved by new building on a greenfield site apparently being considered for Woollards Field. Having the record office in Stanmer Park would have ready-made parking, would not require heavy traffic, would be easily accessible for local people and would put the records in an ideal historical context, as well as setting it in an area with other important resources such as the museum, and the Stanmer Digital Archive, which we hope to launch later this year.</p>	<p>Noted. However this lies outside the scope of this document</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>Ancillary Area: Repairs to the Stables are urgently needed as is documentation of the remaining historical fittings (eg floorings, doors), possibly using planning gain funding. In particular, the village was granted a club room in the stable block in 1850 by the then Earl of Chichester. This space was lost and not replaced when the house was leased. Although there was a plan for riding for the disabled, the stable block has remained empty and undeveloped and is deteriorating. No replacement social club for the village has been made available and the community has suffered as a result. Any consideration of conservation has to consider the human element and it is vital that the villagers have a place to meet and socialise. SPS recently ran a Christmas decoration-making workshop that attracted 26 people out of a 26-residence area, showing that it is still possible to draw on the strengths of the community.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>Behind the nursery is an almost unique water catcher and associated structures, which should be preserved. SPS restored it many years ago but the area was then taken over as the nursery buildings encroached, and it has regrettably again fallen into disrepair.</p>	<p>The significance of the water catcher is highlighted and protected by its designation as a listed building and through inclusion in an ASA. These designations are considered more appropriate than inclusion in the conservation area as the structure does not have a visible impact on the character or appearance of the area. The archaeological significance section will be amended to highlight the extent and likely survival of the water catchment system. Its presence is mentioned and will be further highlighted in the historic background section too</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>The ancillary area could be made more obvious to the public with sign-posting. The left turn at this junction needs to be made more visible and would make a good place for a noticeboard. Naturally all signage should be in keeping with the character of the area.</p>	<p>This can be dealt with as part of the coherent strategy for paraphernalia along the drive</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>The report comments that 'unsightly or inappropriate buildings and structures' should be removed. We agree that this is the case but wanted more detail about how and by whom the decisions are to be made. We would also urge restoration of the orangery. We have in our archive some interesting photographs of it before its decline.</p>	<p>Decisions will be made through the normal planning control process</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>Church and Donkey Wheel: While the House is the 'centrepiece', it is important to highlight the church as being central to the iconic view of the park. It encapsulates the scenic and rural environment and is the building that most visitors see, and photograph. SPS now opens the church every Sunday and events are held ad hoc. Sunday openings typically attract over 50 visitors and special events have achieved up to 250 visitors. However, because SPS only has a temporary lease, long-term planning is not currently possible. With a longer lease the church could become the centre for activities across the park, such as walks, tours and craft sessions, and act as a display for the history of the park and local area. At present it acts as a display and demonstration area for weaving, dyeing, spinning, the Stanmer Rural Costume Project and Knitting the Map. These activities could all be continued and developed.</p>	<p>Noted. However this lies outside the remit of this document</p>

<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>There is enormous potential for informal and engaging educational activity about the past and the future: for example last year we ran a 'sheep' day that informed people about the past economy of wool, and involved them in a game illustrating the 'tragedy of the commons' dilemma as a way to think about how we can best share finite resources. The Donkey Wheel, also run by SPS, is a very popular attraction, bringing in almost 3000 visitors last year. It could be improved simply with a small notice explaining its function, leaving the window (where the explanation is currently located) free for viewing.</p>	<p>The Barn and Farmyard Area: The report's suggestion of a 'South Downs Interpretation Centre' would fit in well here. We feel that in addition the area would be ideal for rural craft demonstrations, artisan workshops and local history displays. The whole area could be used as a place for workshops and local history societies to come together. This would lead to an educational, practical and informative space that would show the history of the area in both hands-on and documentary ways as well as acting as a gateway to the South Downs.</p> <p>SPS has had much interest expressed in the idea of a rural craft and history quarter here and it would provide creative synergy with the groups who are currently involved in cultivation eg Stanmer Organics, Special Branch, Nourish (Care Co-ops) and the Earthship, and with the Sussex Wildlife Trust. Possible activities might include the Rural Museum (and refurbishment of the milking equipment in the barn), local archaeology (eg Brighton and Hove Archaeological Society), glass blowing, spinning and weaving. These activities would fit well with the work of the blacksmith, especially if longer leases were available to help users develop sustained business planning</p>	<p>Supports appraisal. No amendments required</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>The Village: Agree that additional protection to the village is needed. Removing cars from the street would improve views. The vacant plot provides ideal off-street parking hidden from public view by mature trees. Our suggestions for use of the barn and stables will inevitably attract more traffic, so very careful thought needs to be given to reducing its impact in the village and encouraging truly sustainable transport policies. Farm vehicles, villagers and drop-offs would need access but reducing the amount of traffic would create a more rural impression and make the area safer for the elderly, the disabled, small children and dogs. There is a real opportunity to develop a new model of how business and tourism can combine in a way that reduces reliance on private transport and supports those who need extra help (eg the many visitors who are elderly or disabled who visit the park).</p>	<p>Noted. The beneficial use of the vacant plot as car parking has been noted, and this will be considered as part of any planning brief/enhancement plan for the site. The statement will be amended to reflect this. Specific proposals for car parking in the village lie outside the scope of this document and would be considered as part of any future traffic management proposals.</p>	
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>The toilet block should be rebuilt so as to be more in keeping with the village and measures taken to preserve the telephone kiosk. It should also be noted that there is a medieval dovecot of chalk in the corner of what is now a stable yard. A useful addition would be a notice board for village news and events. At present there are few places to inform people of events and to have a centralised location for notices would increase attendance. The rest of the hardstanding would be more attractive if cleaned. Action needs to be taken against fly-tippers and car dumpers who frequently use the area. The current fencing of the open barn has restricted some of the dumping but severely detracts from the area and dumping continues outside the fencing. The Northern Terminus could be improved by some general cleaning and making the small pond more visible, with information about its historical importance.</p>	<p>Noted. Improvements to the hardstanding will be incorporated as part of any planning brief / enhancement plan for the farm buildings.</p>	
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>Parkland: There are currently 4 football pitches at the lower end of the park. The one furthest from the lodges should be removed, because it seems not to be necessary and is anyway very sloping. We would support refurbishing Dukes car parking and repairing and rebuilding the toilet block to the west of the lower lodges, as well as sympathetic improvement of the existing Pavilion on the east side of the park. The Frankland monument at the edge of the woods behind the house is also in dire need of repair and protection.</p>	<p>Noted. Supports appraisal. No amendments required.</p>	

<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>We applaud the suggested boundary changes, which are very forward-thinking and will do much to protect Stanmer. However, we were very sorry to see that it was assumed Millbank Walk (woodland south of A27) would be lost for 2 reasons: First, although the road development has damaged and separated it, we do not think this is a reason to exclude it: the permission for the football stadium explicitly acknowledged that it would damage the park, but we still aim to minimise the damage in all ways possible. Second, the walk is still part of the history of Stanmer, and forms part of a pleasant woodland walk along the side of Coldean Lane. There may be archaeological value present, as in other parts of the park, but this has not been investigated.</p>	<p>Conservation Area designation is primarily concerned with the built environment. PPG15 states that designation is not an appropriate means of protecting landscape features. Case Law determines that it is legitimate to designate the setting of important buildings, and historic parks and gardens that contain structures of special interest. This is not the case for this area, which therefore does not warrant retention now that it is visually and physically removed from the area. It is protected as part of the registered historic park and garden, confirmed National Park, Site of Nature Conservation and proposed Local Nature Reserve. These designations more accurately reflect its significance.</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>The report implies that the avenue of lime trees is relatively new. In fact, an avenue of trees appears to have existed since the village cottages were built in the 18th century, and the avenue was simply extended when the lower lodges were built and the drive extended further down towards the lower end of the park. We therefore do not agree that there is 'no historical precedent for an avenue of trees'. The trees are popular and form a pleasant cover, hiding the cars driving along the drive and the drive itself, as well as being habitat for lime hawk moth caterpillars.</p>	<p>Historic maps of the park show that planting along the drive was comprised largely of formal 'clumps' of trees, with some specimen tree planting further to the north along the valley bottom. The current lime 'avenue' therefore does not have any historic precedent. It is appropriate that the report identifies this, in order to inform future decisions regarding the management of the park in order that the special interest and character of the area is preserved and enhanced. In view of the results of public consultation, the recommendation will be amended so that it does not recommend removal, but instead promotes long term strategies of non-replacement and future planting that has regard to the historic character of the park</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>Woodland: The woodland in Stanmer Park is a very important asset. There has not been a single dedicated team of forestry workers since the forestry team retired and were replaced by a series of private contractors. It is crucial that there is integrated oversight and management of the forestry. Problems reported to us include dogs attacking deer, people picking orchids and unauthorised digging. Foot or cycle patrols by wardens could help, as well as more public education, as would be provided for example by an interpretation centre.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>Views: The architecture of the University of Sussex is an excellent example of how sympathetic architecture and careful planning can allow building that does not intrude on views of a rural landscape. The same cannot be said of much of the new development: for example, new building at the University of Brighton and the stadium development intrudes on previously attractive rural vistas and there seems to have been no attempt to design the buildings in a way that is sympathetic to a rural downland environment. The new buildings also produce large amounts of glare. Tree-planting and earth banks might mitigate this somewhat, and more consideration should be given to this aspect in any future development</p>	<p>Noted. The open vistas across this adjacent hillside are however important to the character of the area, and should not be blocked completely by planting and earthworks (this is more effective for closer intrusions such as the A27 and new access road). The statement will be amended to emphasise the importance of these considerations for future proposed developments.</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>Access to the Park: Car parking provision in the park is a hotly-debated subject and there is no overall agreement and no easy solution. However, all agree that the existing car parks could be designed and marked so cars could use the existing space more efficiently, and there needs to be consideration of the needs of disabled and elderly visitors. The bunding has done much to prevent illegal parking, joyriding and encampments on the grass. The appearance of the bunding is seen by many as a minor factor compared to the damage previously wrought by these illegal activities and it encourages people to use the grass for playing and picnics. If the posts had reflective tags this would prevent collisions with posts, especially at night.</p>	<p>Agree that bunds and bollards are of benefit in deterring driving on the grass, and the report does not recommend their removal. However the impact of such intrusions on the character and appearance of the park still needs to be identified in order to inform future decisions in order to preserve and enhance the area, at a time when, for example the wooden bollards may need replacing. Improvements to the car parks would form part of any future traffic management strategy</p>
<p>Stanmer Preservation Society</p>	<p>Current car parking is generally unsatisfactory, as noted in the report, and causes many problems. The 78 Sunday service bus into the park sometimes gets blocked by badly parked cars and is suspended. Measures could include a larger car park at the lower lodges, with only the small, single car spaces on the right hand side of the drive available up to where the drive separates. The appearance of car parks could be improved by tree planting. The parking area beyond the one-way system/separation of the drive could remain, possibly with additional foliage cover, with no further public parking available until Church car park. This would mean that while the park had ample parking it would be obscured from view. There are also many spaces by Stanmer House, and the use of these depends on future plans for the House.</p>	<p>Noted. If changes to current traffic management are proposed in future, all options will be considered (including that of retaining the present arrangement) at that time, and will be subject to public consultation. This report seeks to identify the issues with parking in the park in conservation terms, which will be one material consideration of any future traffic management scheme. To propose a new traffic management scheme is beyond the scope of this review.</p>

Stanmer Preservation Society	Encouraging use of the park with inevitably encourage an increase in traffic, and mitigation of this needs to be addressed before it happens. Many park users could use the excellent bus and train services to the park and more could be done to help those who need support, eg providing disabled parking bays and rewarding use of public transport. Recently more people have taken the bus but more needs to be done, such as increasing subsidy of the 78 service, as well as enforcement of existing parking restrictions.	A major issue for Stanmer is travellers. Although the problem has been reduced significantly by bundling and posts, travellers continue to take over car parks for long periods, causing some the the parking problems and leaving large amounts of rubbish that need to be cleared. We are aware that the council has been addressing this vigorously but problems remain.	Noted
Stanmer Preservation Society	Environmentally-friendly Stanmer: Stanmer Village could be a candidate for becoming carbon-neutral. Although the houses are clearly not highly efficient, the area could cut emissions, for example by reducing traffic. The very foundation of Stanmer was driven by the importance of water, as shown in the name. A complex system of water catcher, springs, underground tanks and ponds shaped the development and growth of the village. As well as giving more prominence to conserving and displaying this important aspect of Stanmer history, perhaps it could be used productively to generate power and work alongside the water requirements of village activities. Biodiversity needs to be encouraged and while many species live in the park at present, further protection needs to be placed on them.	Noted. However this lies outside the remit of this document	
Stanmer Preservation Society	Management of the Park: We have been told of several unfortunate incidents where damage has apparently been caused unintentionally in the park, and we would like to be assured that there is integrated and informed management of the park to prevent this in the future. For example, the land is now farmed through individual private contractors. In 2009 some contractors apparently disc-harrowed Patchway field in contravention of its archaeological status as uncultivated since the 16th century. The gear and fully functional mechanisms for the water catcher were, it seems, taken out and destroyed without consultation and without knowledge of their significance. Elements of the fountain at the back of Stanmer House were apparently subjected to an attempt at removal and have not been restored. We are not aware of any inventory or audit detailing what assets exist in the park, House and buildings, and are concerned that the lack of this may lead to further damage and loss.	Concerns noted	
Stanmer Preservation Society	Comments were based on committee meetings, a specially-convened meeting, a survey, and experiences of meeting the public every week at the museum and church. Many people expressed interest in new ideas for use of the buildings eg craft workshops, glass blowing, wood working, wheelwrights, willow growing, dyeing gardens, city farm and rural demonstrations. Others wanted church open more than SPS can currently manage and more events. Requests for a community garden, refurbishment of the orangery to grow fruit, the House to be open to the public with a museum in it. Construction of historic reproduction buildings such as an Iron Age roundhouse or Anglo Saxon long barn, perhaps with help of Weald and Downland museum. Many requests for energy reduction, such as horse-drawn or electric transport up and down the bridleway, and for the general preservation of the buildings and area.	Noted	
Stanmer Preservation Society	The 'road' running through the park, referred to frequently in the report, is technically a bridleway and should remain as such. The church has not been deconsecrated but is decommissioned.	Noted. Report will be amended to reflect this	
Sussex Garden Trust	Welcomes the initiative to review the conservation area designation and fully supports the proposed amendments to the conservation area boundary	Supports appraisal. No amendments required	

Sussex Garden Trust	Stanmer Park and Village is a highly significant landscape area within the South Downs National Park. It is a unique heritage resource vibrantly illustrating an 18th century estate parkland and the working village that developed around the principal house. Regrettably in the latter part of the 20th century the lack of comprehensive planning, and, most particularly because of unsympathetic usage and maintenance, the parkland and the village have lost key elements in their distinctive character. The conservation area review provides a vehicle through which these issues are raised and its recommendations are key to giving the whole estate an assured future. For this reason the detailed suggestions relating to the maintenance, planting and usage of the area contained within the Review are supported and should, within the document, be highlighted to give them due prominence.	Supports appraisal. Maintenance, planting and usage are highlighted in the document and will be emphasised where possible
Sussex Garden Trust	In regard to the open areas of the Parkland, the Park still retains the framework of the original plan so the removal of the playing field and 'modern' and 'urban' features along the driveway is supported to reclaim the open, planned, landscape character. The removal of trees not in character with the Park is also supported. While some controls are necessary to ensure vehicles are constrained into acceptable areas the means of providing these controls should be to a comprehensive style. It is inevitable that visitors will wish to come by car but the presence of vehicles must not detract from the primary character of the area.	Supports appraisal. No amendments required
Sussex Garden Trust	It is disappointing to note that the whole of the Stanmer Park Nurseries area to the north-west of the stables has not been included within the reviewed area. This feature is an integral part of the estate complex and requires careful management in association with the remainder of the Park and village to avoid its further degradation. Having been used as productive gardens or nurseries this type of use could be encouraged through the community or individuals to maintain the historic character of the locality. By being a contained area its security and management for such usage is greatly assisted.	Its current character is not of historic or architectural interest, and it therefore does not warrant inclusion in the area. Inclusion would dilute the character and historic integrity of the conservation area
Sussex Garden Trust	The effective conservation of the House and Village areas is a significant issue. The noticeable lack of pride, maintenance and unsympathetic minor development in much of these areas detracts from the visual amenity visitors should expect in such a fascinating location. Lack of a cared for environment will discourage investment to maintain the village. If the character of the area is to be secured - and it is inevitable that with reduced farming activity and loss of the raison d'être of the village change will have to take place - a new focus for the village has to be developed. Its location within the heart of the new National Park could be a driving factor in attracting the necessary investment. While this may not be the primary function of the Conservation Area Review the Review must firm in its policies by securing the planning position to facilitate these changes. Establishment of an Article 4 Direction to control minor development in the village is a good but only a first step. Stronger statements to achieve the desirable outcomes should be included in the Review recommendations.	Noted. The statement will be amended accordingly
Jamie Hooper	Main concern is that there should be a balance between preserving the past, and the practicalities of living in the 21st century.	Agree
Jamie Hooper	The Colson Stone report that you quote is a useful reference tool but the research that its authors made did not include speaking to the village inhabitants, or finding what services were, and were not, available in the village. The report was presented to the Council's Environment Committee in September 2002 after just 2 weeks of consultation. At no time has the Report been wholesally endorsed by B&HCC. The countryside department has acted on a number of recommendations, but the council has chosen not to act on others. Some of those recommendations were controversial and did not enjoy significant support, especially those on future accessibility by cars and car park provision. After this had been made manifest by the public over a number of years, B&HCC relented in 2006 and agreed to the present arrangements, which whilst not perfect by any means, continues to allow the public access by car.	Noted. There is however an appreciation that current arrangements are inadequate. If changes to current traffic management are proposed in future, all options will be considered (including that of retaining the present arrangement) at that time, and will be subject to public consultation. This report seeks to identify the issues with parking in the park in conservation terms, which will be one material consideration of any future traffic management scheme. To propose a new traffic management scheme is beyond the scope of this review. The report does not reopen the recommendation from Colson Stone

<p>The Appraisal (p26) states 'car parking areas along the drive are detrimental to the open historic landscape character and to views across the park'. I respectfully suggest that this suggestion has been fully debated, and that Cllr Theobald has agreed upon the present arrangement. To reopen this recommendation from Colson Stone is not helpful and will again be fiercely resisted. The park was purchased to give citizens a chance to enjoy a public space, which many of them living in flats could not enjoy at home. Stanmer Park is not easily accessed by public transport and besides many pensioners and young families choose to visit by car because of the impracticalities they would encounter on the roughly 282 days a year when there is no bus service into the park. If they are not allowed to park easily in the Park, they would not choose to visit as often.</p>	
<p>The small informal car park between 16 and 19 in the village can presently accommodate about 6 cars belonging to villagers. There is a wide plot of disused land behind it sloping up to the copse at the rear. This could be cleared at a fairly small price if it was given a similar informal covering as the car park if it was wished to encourage villagers not to park in the village street. However I believe householders should retain the right to park outside their homes particularly at night.</p>	<p>The beneficial use of the vacant plot as car parking has been noted, and this will be considered as part of any planning brief/enhancement plan for the site. The statement will be amended to reflect this. Any improvements to the site will also be considered as part of a planning brief/enhancement plan.</p>
<p>I understand perfectly that the views in the village and other areas should not be marred by unsympathetic development, but I am a little disturbed by the reference to 'negative' features, and the recommendation to 'secure the demolition of unsightly or inappropriate buildings and structures' shown on p18 and 21.</p> <p>I cannot concur in the assumption that the former milking parlour and barn shown on your map as negative. The milking parlour was built around the late 1940s/1950s in brick stock, and is demonstrative of how a group of buildings are added to, as work patterns change. The barn is not visible from the street, and whilst unattractive in itself, I am more concerned that a viable future is devised for the collection of buildings.</p> <p>The Long Barn is listed, and therefore the adaptations that can be made for future use are limited. I believe that the former milking parlour could be used as community space, and that because it is not listed it could be adapted to conform to present Accessibility legislation. Similarly the barn identified at the rear of the Long Barn can be redivided as possible workshops/studios whose rents could subsidise the upkeep of the Long Barn and other vulnerable buildings.</p>	<p>The milking parlour and barn are identified as negative in order to inform future development plans for this area. Relatively speaking, they are of less architectural and/or historic interest, and impede the arrangement of buildings and vistas across the farm yard. Their identification as a negative feature does not mean that they will necessarily be demolished, but this identification as negative in their current state will be a consideration in any future planning brief or enhancement plan</p>
<p>I have been trying for 5 years to prod B&amp;HCC into taking responsible action as both the owner and planning authority in securing a future for the redundant farm buildings. At the same time I have asked B&amp;HCC to consider providing some much needed community space to replace that lost when the Victoria Rooms in the Stable Block were withdrawn from public use by the leaseholder, Cherrrywood Developments.</p>	<p>Noted. The report aims to secure a future for the redundant farm buildings</p>
<p>I have pointed out at our recent Forum meeting that because of weak signals due to the local topography, that some villages gain their TV signal via a satellite dish. Mine is on the rear elevation, and is in no way visible from the street. You have assured me that these will not be prohibited. Similarly, there is no gas available in the street, and therefore some people have LPG consisters or oil tanks in their rear gardens.</p>	<p>Noted. The Article 4 Direction is not a means of stopping such development. It is a method of controlling change - ensuring that such modern additions are located appropriately as to not harm the character of the area. As the Direction will be an Article 4(2) Direction, it will relate only to alterations to house frontages</p>
<p>The hipped porches (p20) are regarded as sympathetic. The rear gardens are not overseen from the street and therefore sympathetic rear extensions such as mine should not be presumed as negative. Small rear extensions should be allowed if designed carefully, if thought necessary by the owners (mainly either B&amp;HCC or the Conservation Trust)</p>	<p>As the Direction will be an Article 4(2) Direction, it will relate only to alterations to house frontages</p>
<p>I would like to see any Leaseholder for the disused Stables Block adjacent to Stanmer House be compelled to undertake emergency repairs whilst a future use is found for the collection of buildings.</p>	<p>Noted. Negotiations are in progress</p>

Jamie Hooper	The lime trees that flank the main South Drive in the Park were paid for by relatives as a memorial to their loved ones. In some cases, ashes have been deposited by these trees, and relatives occasionally visit them. Whilst they do not appear in the Figg Plan, they are an attractive feature in the summer, and their removal would please no one except those that cherish a hope that the park could somehow revert to how the Park looked before cars, and the public ownership of Stanmer.	The creation of an avenue remains inappropriate to the park and will significantly alter views across the valley and the character of the drive. It is appropriate that the statement identifies this, in order to inform future decisions regarding the management of the park. In view of the results of public consultation, the recommendation will be amended to promote long term strategies of non-replacement and future planting that has regard to the historic character of the park
Jamie Hooper	If Figg is regarded as important, then the Lower Lodges would need to be removed as they are a later addition, and the original lodges be re-erected where they previously stood halfway up the drive.	The Lower Lodges are depicted on the Figg plan, having been built in 1770. However the report is not promoting the wholesale restoration of the Figg design, it instead identifies the special interest of the park as that of a relatively intact 18th century designed landscape, the character and appearance of which it is important to preserve and enhance.
Jamie Hooper	No objection to the public parking in the immediate vicinity. The rough parking area opposite the tea rooms could be made more attractive as you have noted. We are not happy that vehicles are left in the street that are not used, and may not be owned by villagers but this is probably not within the scope of your review.	Noted. The future use and any improvements to the hardstanding are dependent on the future use of the adjacent farm buildings, and therefore need to be considered as part of any planning brief or application for this site. No recommendations are therefore given at this stage
Brighton and Hove Environmental Action Group (BHEAG)	We welcome any initiative for the preservation of the Stable block and fully support emergency repairs to halt the structural decline. We should also like to see the Village Community Centre, previously known as the Victoria Rooms, reinstated within the complex as a focal point for social and community activities. Contrary to popular myth, this was not simply a drinking den but a vibrant community facility where generations of villagers had enjoyed christening, wedding and funeral receptions as well as the regular and seasonal meetings and gatherings associated with rural community life.	Noted.
BHEAG	The inclusion of the orchard and the Care Co-operative Farm is also supported	Supports appraisal. No amendment required
BHEAG	We fully support new uses for the Long Barn and Church that will ensure the continued repair and maintenance of both. Such use could well include a visitor and education facility both for the history and significance of the Stanmer Estate and the South Downs National Park.	Supports appraisal. No amendment required
BHEAG	Whatever uses are decided for the adjacent farmyard enclosures, it is imperative that these retain the rural and agricultural character for which they were intended by leasing or letting to suitable tenants as at present. We would have no objection to the demolition of the obtrusive milking parlour. The pleasure that visitors, especially children, derive from seeing cows and calves and the horses and ponies has to be witnessed to be believed. For many of them, a visit to Stanmer Park is the only time they have experience of our great rural heritage.	Supports appraisal. The agricultural character of the buildings at Home Farm is extremely significant and should be maintained. Opportunities for the continued presence of livestock at the farm would be beneficial. The report will be amended to encourage this
BHEAG	The site of the former vicarage or dwellings between numbers 16 and 19 is currently used as a car park by the villagers. Whilst its capacity is strictly limited, there is scope for enlargement in its present well landscaped manner and we would recommend that, subject to the concurrence of the villagers themselves.	The beneficial use of the vacant plot as car parking has been noted, and this will be considered as part of any planning brief/enhancement plan for the site. The report will be amended to reflect this. Any improvements to the site will also be considered as part of a planning brief/enhancement plan.
BHEAG	The Article 4 Direction is supported so long as this does not inhibit residents' ability to enjoy 21st century facilities such as oil or gas storage, television reception and rear garden leisure facilities. We support the boundary extension to the north of the village.	Noted. The Article 4 Direction is not a means of stopping such development. It is a method of controlling change - ensuring that such modern additions are located appropriately as to not harm the character of the area. As the Direction will be an Article 4(2) Direction, it will only affect house frontages

BHEAG	<p>Vehicular access and car parking is one of the most contentious issues to have been addressed in relation to the park in recent years. The Colson Stone report recommended a single centralised car park at the southern end of the parkland and this was seized upon by elements within the Council who wished to introduce parking charges. These proposals were vigorously opposed by the vast majority of park users and stakeholders that resulted in a comprehensive examination of alternatives under the Stanmer Traffic Management Scheme. A Working Group was formed from the Stanmer Park Stakeholders, under the chairmanship of the then Countryside Manager, that proposed and planned the refurbishment of the existing six informal car parks and was agreed and authorised by the Environment Committee of the day.</p> <p>The accepted plan allowed for 325 parking spaces within the parkland, with a provision for overflow arrangements on special event occasions. Regrettably, this figure was not achieved in its implementation and has subsequently been exacerbated by the loss of 100 spaces in Duke's Car Park due to the new approach road structure. Further details provided. We do not support revisiting this issue other than to amend its implementation in order to compensate for the loss of Duke's Car Park and achieve the planned 325 spaces.</p>	<p>Noted. However observation and consultation has emphasised that current parking arrangements are generally deemed inadequate and will require improvement, especially if the redundant buildings are brought back into use. If changes to current traffic management are proposed in future, all options will be considered (including that of retaining the present arrangement) at that time, and will be subject to public consultation. This report seeks to identify the issues with parking in the park in conservation terms, which will be one material consideration of any future traffic management scheme. To propose a new traffic management scheme is beyond the scope of this review. The report does not reopen the recommendation from Colson Stone</p>
BHEAG	<p>We do not support the removal of what we agree is historically inappropriate tree planting because of the emotive nature of such action. The avenue of limes was wrongly approved in the first place but has achieved a memorial status for the many people who subscribed to its creation.</p>	<p>It is appropriate that the report identifies the impact of the avenue, in order to inform future decisions regarding the management of the park in order that the special interest and character of the area is preserved and enhanced. In view of the results of public consultation, the recommendation will be amended so that it does not recommend removal, but promotes long term strategies of non-replacement and future planting that has regard to the historic character of the park</p>
BHEAG	<p>We fully support a more coherent strategy for signage and lighting</p>	<p>Supports appraisal. No amendment required</p>
BHEAG	<p>We agree with proposed boundary changes 1, 2 and 3. Change 4 is not supported as it excludes Pudding Bag Wood and the Upper Lodges that form an integral part of the historic landscape and backdrop to the House and parkland. We recommend that the boundary should extend to the whole of the existing western flint wall up to and including the Upper Lodges and the modern car parks, the run south east along the line of the southern fencing of Patchway Field, New Field and Nursery Field before following your proposed entry into the rear of the Nurseries and walled garden as shown in Appendix 1.</p>	<p>Conservation Area designation is primarily concerned with the built environment. PPG15 states that designation is not an appropriate means of protecting landscape features. Case Law determines that it is legitimate to designate the setting of important buildings, and historic parks and gardens that contain structures of special interest. Further consideration of this area has been undertaken. It is not felt that this part of the wood comprises part of the immediate setting of the House. The area feels removed from the parkland and the House, with instead greater visual and physical links to the designed farmland forming the northern portion of the registered historic park and garden. The area is protected more appropriately as part of the registered historic park and garden, confirmed National Park, Site of Nature Conservation, Environmentally Sensitive Area, proposed Local Nature Reserve and containing a number of Archaeologically Sensitive Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments. These designations more accurately reflect its significance.</p>
South Downs Joint Committee (SDJC)	<p>P1 (introduction) - The references to both AONB and National Park could cause confusion. We would suggest either only referring to the NP, or stating that the area is currently AONB, but shortly to be replaced by the NP</p>	<p>Mention of the AONB will be removed</p>
SDJC	<p>P20 - The document states that the paddock has a 'major impact' on the streetscene - it needs to explain whether this is positive or negative.</p>	<p>The report will be amended to clarify</p>



SDJC	Lighting - p21 of the document states that lighting within the village has a neutral effect - we would suggest that it actually has a negative effect. We agree with comments elsewhere in the document regarding insensitive lighting in other parts of the CA. The document suggests replacing such lighting with less intrusive low level lighting - we would agree with this where there must be lighting, but in some cases, we would suggest complete removal.	On consideration, it would be illogical to exclude lighting in the village from the production of any coherent street paraphernalia strategy and therefore the report will be amended.
SDJC	Other clutter - we feel that there is too much signage and other unnatural features on the approaches to the house (including bunding, rocks, and posts intended to control parking). However, we accept that parking needs to be controlled somehow.	Supports appraisal. No amendment required
SDJC	Inappropriate Tree Planting - We agree that ideally the inappropriate trees could be removed. However, we understand that many are memorial trees, and so their removal may therefore be difficult/insensitive	Supports appraisal. It is appropriate that the report identifies the negative impact of the planting, in order to inform future decisions regarding the management of the park. In view of the results of public consultation, the recommendation will be amended to promote long term strategies of non-replacement and future planting that has regard to the historic character of the park
SDJC	Parking areas - These need to be rationalised. We would suggest 3 areas - either side of the entrance and at the church car park in Stanmer Village. These three areas would keep visual intrusion to a minimum.	Noted and generally supports appraisal. However to propose a new traffic management scheme is beyond the scope of this review.
SDJC	The 'Forest Garden' - This contains some excellent trees and could be promoted as an arboretum.	Noted.
SDJC	Boundary extensions - We agree with the reasons for boundary extensions to include areas of woodland, but elsewhere the document refers to various management regimes - does extending the CA designation (and therefore tree protection) take into account implications for future tree management? We agree with inclusion of the flint building remains at the northern end of the village and that the land severed by the A27 no longer reads as part of the CA	The designation will have no effect on the management of the woodland by the local authority
SDJC	Detracting features within the village - perhaps minor, but nevertheless these things cumulatively detract from the character of the village: 'residents cars only beyond this point' sign on crush barrier; wheelie bins; garden paraphernalia (eg 1st dwelling on west side immediately north of paddock).	Agree. Report will be amended accordingly
SDJC	Unlisted buildings in the village - we would suggest emphasising the importance of retaining timber framed windows and would support the document's suggestion of an Article 4 Direction for those buildings that are not listed.	Supports appraisal, which will be amended to emphasise the importance of retaining timber framed windows.
SDJC	New dwellings in the village - The document recommends a new dwelling between 16 and 19. The village does not have a designated Settlement Policy Boundary and infilling is not normally permitted (as per Local Plan Policy NC6). In addition the foundations of a previous building are known to occupy this plot, and so there may also be a risk to archaeology. We would draw your attention to application BH2004/02516/FP. This was withdrawn following advice from the City Council, although the detailed reasons for withdrawal are not available online. It would therefore seem inappropriate for the document to be encouraging development on this site	Any application would have to be considered, having regard to relevant 'downland' planning policies
SDJC	Stables and Long Barn - We agree that both of these buildings are in need of repair and a long term use quickly secured, and generally agree with the removal of unsightly buildings. However, with regard to Long Barn and immediate surrounding area, see also comments below regarding farming use.	Supports appraisal. No amendment required

SDJC	<p>Agricultural use - The document acknowledges that a number of agricultural buildings have become redundant as a result of changes to farming in the park. We agree that a secure future is needed for the Long Barn and it may well be that a sensitive use could be found that would not conflict with continuing agricultural use of the adjacent areas. However, the working farm (whether or not it includes the Long Barn itself) is a crucial part of the village's character, as emphasised by the Colson Stone report.</p> <p>We therefore feel that the Conservation Area Appraisal seriously underplays the importance of retaining this agricultural use. Even the modern buildings identified as negative features contribute to the character of a working farm, and therefore to the unique character of the Conservation Area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the main enterprise can no longer be focussed in this area, surely B&amp;HCC, as landowner, could encourage the tenant to retain some form of agricultural use on the area at the southern end of the village? There may even be an opportunity to gain some income from visitors - eg as a children's farm, possibly also housing the Stanmer Rural Museum collection?</p>	<p>Agree that agricultural use (and, as commented elsewhere particularly the presence of livestock in the village) is particularly important to the character of Home Farm and the village. The report will be amended to emphasise this.</p>
SDJC	<p>Wider impacts from outside of the CA - The document identifies noise from traffic on the A27 as an impact - could low-noise surfacing be added as an aspiration? Also the school, university and sports buildings on the other side of the railway line detract from views from the southern end of the Park, and this should be reflected in the document.</p>	<p>Noted. The negative impact of developments to the south will be emphasised further in the report</p>
SDJC	<p>Military hardstanding - We would not suggest that this would make them worthy of retaining, but should the document acknowledge that the evidence of military occupation reflects part of the history of the site?</p>	<p>Agree. Report will be amended accordingly</p>