

Consultation Report:

PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDERS (PSPOs) in City Parks and Open Spaces, 2016

Contact

Public Health Team

Brighton & Hove City Council

Tel: 01273 29 1088

e-mail: consultation@brighton-hove.gov.uk

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction and purpose	3
2. Methodology.....	3
3. Response and respondents profile.....	3
4. Results and findings.....	4
4.1 Experience of anti-social behaviour in parks	5
4.2 Public Space Protection Orders	6
4.3 Managing behaviour.....	8
4.4 Final comments.....	10
5. Respondents profile.....	11

1. Introduction and purpose

Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs) are intended to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in an area that is detrimental to the local community's quality of life by imposing conditions on the use of that area that apply to everyone. They are designed to ensure people can use and enjoy public spaces safe from anti-social behaviour. The council is proposing to use PSPOs to deal with issues in parks and open spaces that are detrimental to the quality of life of people using those areas or living nearby.

The council was seeking to know;

- Which parks and open spaces were used most frequently
- If in the past 12 months people had witnessed any incidences of anti-social behaviour in a park or open space
- If people agreed or disagreed with the idea of PSPOs
- Of the behaviours that the PSPO will be used to manage which the council should prioritise

2. Methodology

A consultation document and on-line self-completion questionnaire were devised to inform and give an opportunity to comment on the proposals.

The questionnaire was available on the city's online Consultation Portal between 25 January 2016 and 27 April 2016 with the link distributed via the usual council channels with specific emphasis on social media linking through to the council webpages. Hard copies were also available if requested.

As a self-selecting questionnaire it is not possible to determine if the responses to the survey are representative of all residents in the city.

As part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked;

- If they were responding to the consultation as either a local resident, visitor or as a representative of a local community or voluntary organisation (CVS), local business or other stakeholder group
- To complete the council's standard equalities monitoring form
- For their postcode

3. Response and respondents profile

In total 1,109 responses were received including responses from;

- 977 local residents
- 66 visitors to the city
- 31 local community & voluntary sector (CVS) representatives
- 21 local business, stakeholder or partnership representatives
- 47 'other' responses

Notes:

- (i) Respondents are not mutually exclusive to one group.
- (ii) Seven responses were removed due to racist language/response.

Relatively high numbers of respondents (15 to 24 per cent depending on the question) did not complete the equalities and demographic questions. Therefore it is not possible to compare the respondents profile with that of the city as whole.

Nearly two out of five respondents are regular users of Preston Park (42 per cent, 420 people) and Stanmer Park (40 per cent, 393 people) a quarter of respondents are regular users of open spaces along the seafront (25 per cent, 252 people) and more than one in ten use Wild Park (15 per cent, 149 people) and Rottingdean Recreation Ground (11 per cent, 108 people).

A full equalities and demographic profile can be found in section 5 of this report.

4. Results and findings

The responses to the consultation have been analysed by the following groups;

- Local residents
- Visitors to the city
- Local business, CVS, stakeholders and partnership representatives
- 'Other' respondents
- All usual equality groups

Responses from local residents and visitors to all closed questions have been analysed by the following demographics and equalities groups;

- Age
- Carers
- Connection to the Armed Forces
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Health problem and disability
- Religion or belief
- Sexual orientation

Note: Due to the relatively high numbers of respondents that did not provide complete equalities and demographic responses, combined with the small number of responses from some equalities groups, makes equalities and demographic analysis difficult. Therefore care needs to be taken when interpreting the results.

4.1 Experience of anti-social behaviour in parks

Respondents were asked if in the last 12 months, they had experienced an incident in a park or open space which they regard as anti-social.

- More than nine out of ten responded to this question (93 per cent, 1,026 people)
- More than a quarter of those responding (29 per cent, 298 people) said that they had not experienced an incident within a park/open space in the last twelve months that they considered anti-social.
- The most common incidents respondents said they had experienced (Table 1) were:
 - Vehicles / caravans / tents in the park / open space (38%)
 - Fly tipping / rubbish (27%)
 - People defecating / urinating (15%)
 - Vehicles driving or speeding over grass areas (15%) – of particular note were the use of quad bike
 - Verbal abuse / intimidation or aggression (13%)

Table 1: Behaviours and people whom the behaviours were attributed						
	All respondents		Attributed to Gypsies and Travellers	Key Locations (most mentioned)		
	n = 1,026	%				
Vehicles / caravans / tents in the park/open space	392	38%	67%	Preston Park	Rottingdean Rec	Seafront
Fly tipping / rubbish	275	27%	54%	Preston Park	Seafront	Stanmer Park
People defecating/urinating	152	15%	58%	Preston Park	Rottingdean Rec	Seafront
Vehicles driving or speeding over grass areas	150	15%	57%	Preston Park	Stanmer Park	Wild Park
Verbal abuse / intimidation or aggression	137	13%	65%	Preston Park	Seafront	Stanmer Park
Felt intimidated by presence of Gypsies / Travellers or unable to use park / open space	116	11%	-	Preston Park	Seafront	Stanmer
Dogs (threatening / out of control)	102	10%	48%	Stanmer Park	Preston Park	Seafront
Damage to gates / fences / public property	69	7%	57%	Rottingdean Rec	Seafront	Stanmer Park
Owners not picking up after dogs	57	6%	14%	Stanmer Park	Seafront	-
Damage to grass / habitat	54	5%	59%	Preston Park	Sheepcote Valley	Stanmer Park

- Many respondents specified who had been responsible for the behaviour and these results are given in table 1 – for example 54% of incidents of fly tipping / litter were specifically attributed to Gypsies/Travellers but only 14% of incidents mentioning dog owners not picking up after their dogs was attributed to Gypsies/Travellers (the majority did not specify)

4.2 Public Space Protection Orders

Respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed that having PSPOs was a good idea.

Table 2 shows that respondents had strong views about whether PSPOs are a good idea or not. Nearly all respondents either strongly agreed or strongly disagreed with only a small number of respondents tending to agree, tending to disagree or saying neither.

- More than three quarters of residents (77 per cent, 748 people) agreed that PSPOs were a good idea with more than two thirds strongly agreeing (69 per cent, 674 people). A fifth of respondents (21 per cent, 203 people) disagreed with 16 per cent (158 people) strongly disagreeing.
- CVS, business and stakeholder representatives were most likely to agree that PSPOs were a good idea with 43 out of 50 representatives (86 per cent) doing so.
- Three out of five visitors to the city (60 per cent, 39 people) disagreed that PSPOs were a good idea.

Table 2: How much do you agree or disagree that having Public Spaces Protection Orders is a good idea?					
	Are you completing this survey as a...				All responses
	Brighton & Hove resident	Visitor to the city	CVS, Business, stakeholder or partnership representative	Other	
Strongly agree	674	22	40	23	735
	69%	34%	80%	52%	67%
Tend to agree	74	3	3	3	81
	8%	5%	6%	7%	7%
Neither agree nor disagree	15	0	0	1	16
	2%	0%	0%	2%	1%
Tend to disagree	45	5	1	2	52
	5%	8%	2%	5%	5%
Strongly disagree	158	34	6	15	204
	16%	52%	12%	34%	19%
Don't know / not sure	7	1	0	0	8
	1%	2%	0%	0%	1%
Total	973	65	50	44	1,096

More than nine out of ten respondents who agreed (92 per cent, 753 people) or disagreed (93 per cent, 238 people) that PSPOs are a good idea gave reasons why. Tables 3a and 3b summarises their reasons.

Table 3a: Respondents who agree that PSPOs are a good idea

	Number	%
Enable everyone / residents / visitors to use parks	264	35%
Protect the parks/environment/wildlife	179	24%
Addresses anti-social behaviours	134	18%
Will reduce costs / save money	110	15%
Other routes have been ineffective / take too long – will speed up the process	94	12%
Improve safety	72	10%
Fairness – should be the same rules for all	55	7%
Addresses illegal activities	36	5%
Removal of health hazards	27	4%
As long as enforced	18	2%
But need safe spaces for Gypsies and Travellers	15	2%
But need safe spaces for homeless people	7	1%
Miscellaneous	62	8%
Base: All who strongly or tended to agree that PSPOs are a good idea and who shared their reasoning (n=753/92%)		

- The most common responses for those who agreed with having Public Spaces Protection Orders were that they would:
 - Enable everyone / residents / visitors to use parks (35 per cent)
 - Protect the parks / environment / wildlife (24 per cent)
 - Address anti-social behaviours (18 per cent)
- For those that disagreed with having the orders, the most common reasons cited were that they would:
 - Discriminate against / criminalises Gypsies and Travellers (35 per cent)
 - Discriminate against homeless people (23 per cent)
 - Be too punitive (21 per cent)
- Respondents who either agreed or disagreed that PSPOs are a good idea cited the importance of providing safe spaces for Gypsies and Travellers and homeless people.

Table 2b: Respondents who disagree that PSPOs are a good idea		
	Number	%
Discriminates against / criminalises Gypsies/Travellers	83	35%
Discriminates against homeless people	54	23%

Too punitive	51	21%
Infringement of civil liberties / People should have freedom of movement	44	18%
Public spaces should be for the use of all members of the public	36	15%
Need safe spaces for gypsies/travellers to stay	35	15%
Need safe spaces for homeless people to stay	23	10%
By enforce existing legislation on anti-social behaviour dog fouling / speeding etc. this would not be required	20	8%
Waste of money / the cost / resource to enforce	15	6%
Unnecessary e.g. there isn't anti-social behaviour	15	6%
Depends how it's enforced / could be misused	11	5%
Unenforceable	8	3%
People will use it to harass other park users for activities they consider anti-social	5	2%
Miscellaneous	4	2%
Base: All who tended to or strongly disagree the PSPOs are a good idea and who shared their reasoning (n=238/93%)		

Looking at responses by equality groups for local residents and visitors there a couple of notable differences (please refer to the note about the equalities analysis on page 4).

- **Younger respondents are less likely to agree that PSPOs are a good idea.** Only 35 out of 80 respondents (44 per cent) aged 18 to 34 agreed that PSPOs are a good idea compared to 65 per cent of respondents aged 35 to 54 and 92 per cent of respondents aged 55 and over.
- **Support for PSPOs varies by ethnicity.** Only 27 out of 49 respondents (55 per cent) of 'other' White ethnicity agreed that PSPOs are a good idea compare to 77 per cent of White UK/British respondents and 12 out of 16 (75 per cent) of non-white BME respondents.

4.3 Managing behaviour

From a list of behaviours, respondents were asked to rank them in order of priority and if there were any other behaviours which they think the PSPO could or should be used to manage. Table 4 summarises their responses.

Table 3: Which of these behaviours that Brighton & Hove City Council intends to manage using PSPO do you think should have the highest priority?

	Are you completing this survey as a...	Total
--	--	-------

	Brighton & Hove resident	Visitor to the city	CVS, Business, stakeholder or partnership representative	Other	
Occupying any vehicle, caravan, tent or other structure	501	10	32	16	543
	54%	17%	65%	41%	52%
Lighting or maintaining a fire	20	0	0	1	20
	2%	0%	0%	3%	2%
Littering or fly tipping	210	29	7	12	249
	23%	50%	14%	31%	24%
Driving any vehicle on grass	44	2	0	1	47
	5%	3%	0%	3%	5%
Defecating or urinating	157	17	10	9	185
	17%	29%	20%	23%	18%
Total	932	58	49	39	1044

For more than a half of residents (54 per cent, 501 people) occupying any vehicle, caravan, tent or other structure was the behaviour that the council should give the highest priority too. Less than one in twenty think driving any vehicle on the grass (5 per cent, 44 people) or lighting or maintaining a fire (2 per cent, 20 people) was the highest priority.

CVS, business and stakeholder representatives were more likely to want to prioritise occupying any vehicle, caravan, tent or other structures (65 per cent, 32 people) but for visitors the top priority was litter or fly tipping (50 per cent, 29 people).

Looking at responses by equality groups for local residents and visitors there are notable difference by age (please refer to the note about the equalities analysis on page 4).

- **The priority behaviour for the council to manage for people aged 18 to 34 is littering or fly-tipping.** Nearly a half of respondents aged 18 to 34 (47 per cent, 35 people) think that littering or fly tipping is the highest priority compared to only 28 per cent of 35 to 54 year olds and 14 per cent of respondents aged 55 or over.
- **Occupying any vehicle, caravan, tent or other structure is a lower priority for younger people.** Only 20 per cent of respondents (15 people) age 18 to 34 think that occupying any vehicle or structure should be given the highest priority compared to 45 per cent of 35 to 54 year olds and 64 per cent of respondents aged 55 and over.

In response to the question about what other behaviours PSPOs could or should manage 85 respondents (8 per cent) said none, while 433 respondents (39 per cent) made 44 suggestions. Table 4 summarises the behaviours mentioned by 10 or more people.

Q4. Are there any other behaviours which you think the PSPOs could or should be used to manage?		
	Total	Percent

Abuse / intimidation / aggression including by children	91	21%
Dogs (threatening / out of control)	78	18%
Dogs defecating	56	13%
Alcohol consumption	48	11%
Noise including from generators, fireworks and or parties	47	11%
Vehicles / including taxing of vehicles	43	10%
Fly tipping / rubbish	41	9%
Damage to gates / fences / public property	41	9%
Drug use / dealing	27	6%
Damage to grass	24	6%
Animal cruelty / husbandry	22	5%
Driving / speeding	17	4%
Fires	14	3%
Humans defecating	11	3%
Intimidated by presence of G&T / unable to use park	11	3%
Professional Dog Walkers	11	3%
Thefts	11	3%
Base: All respondents who suggested behaviours (n=433)		

A quarter of respondents (21 per cent, 91 people) who suggested a behaviour that a PSPO could or should be used to manage, mentioned abuse, intimidation and aggression. More than one in ten also mentioned;

- Dogs threatening or out of control (18 per cent, 78 people)
- Dogs defecating (13 per cent, 56 people)
- Alcohol consumption (11 per cent, 48 people)
- Noise including from generators, fireworks and or parties (11 per cent, 47 people)
- Vehicles / including taxing of vehicles (10 per cent, 43 per cent)

4.4 Final comments

At the end of the questionnaire respondents were asked if they had any final comments with regards the use of PSPOs in Brighton and Hove.

Of the 1,109 respondents a third (34 per cent, 373 people) gave a response to this question. Responses were similar to those for the question asking if respondents agreed or disagreed with the idea of PSPOs.

- It is a bad idea (64 respondents)
- Discriminating against / criminalising Gypsies/travellers (54 respondents)
- Need for enforcement if put in place (46 respondents)
- Discriminating against homeless people (36 respondents)
- Too punitive (28 respondents)
- Need safe spaces for gypsies/travellers to stay (23 respondents)
- Protect the parks / environment / wildlife (17 respondents)
- Need safe spaces for homeless people to stay (17 respondents)
- Waste of money / the cost / resource to enforce (17 respondents)
- Enable everyone / residents / visitors to use parks (16 respondents)
- Depends how it's enforced / could be misused (15 respondents)
- Will reduce costs / save money (13 respondents)
- Improve safety (12 respondents)
- Address anti-social behaviour (11 respondent)

Respondents also said that PSPO should be extended to other parks;

- All parks and open spaces (34 respondents)
- Specific parks and open spaces (50 respondents), most mentioned was Beacon Hill Nature Reserve (18 respondents) and Salt dean Park (10 respondents)

5. Respondents profile

When asked what is your ethnicity? Six respondents identified as coming from the Gypsy/Traveller community. Two identified as White – Gypsy or Irish Traveller, two as

White Other – New age traveller, one as White Other – Traveller and one as White Other – Scottish Tinker.

		Frequency	All respondents (%)	Who answered the question (%)
What age are you?				
Valid	18 to 24	18	2%	2%
	25 to 34	59	6%	7%
	35 to 44	188	18%	21%
	45 to 54	226	21%	25%
	55 to 64	201	19%	23%
	65 to 74	156	15%	18%
	75 and over	42	4%	5%
	Total	890	84%	100%
Missing	Not known	46	4%	
	Prefer not to say	123	12%	
	Total	169	16%	
Total		1059	100%	
What gender are you?				
Valid	Male	451	43%	48%
	Female	480	45%	51%
	Other	3	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Total	934	88%	100%
Missing	Not known	48	5%	
	Prefer not to say	77	7%	
	Total	125	12%	
Total		1059	100%	
Do you identify as the sex you were assigned at birth?				
Valid	Yes	856	81%	99%
	No	6	1%	1%
	Total	862	81%	100%
Missing	Unknown	87	8%	
	Prefer not to say	110	10%	
	Total	197	19%	
Total		1059	100%	
Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?				
Valid	Heterosexual / Straight	738	70%	90%
	Lesbian / Gay woman	18	2%	2%
	Gay man	40	4%	5%
	Bisexual	21	2%	3%
	Other	5	<0.5%	1%
	Total	822	78%	100%
Missing	Not known	61	6%	
	Prefer not to say	176	17%	
	Total	237	22%	
Total		1059	100%	

		Frequency	All respondents (%)	Who answered the question (%)
What is your religion or belief?				
Valid	I have no particular religion	363	34%	42%
	Buddhist	18	2%	2%
	Christian	308	29%	35%
	Jain	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Jewish	9	1%	1%
	Pagan	14	1%	2%
	Agnostic	22	2%	3%
	Atheist	100	9%	12%
	Other	11	1%	1%
	Other philosophical belief	23	2%	3%
	Total	869	82%	100%
Missing	Not known	52	5%	
	Prefer not to say	138	13%	
	Total	190	18%	
Total		1059	100%	
Are your day to day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last 12 months?				
Valid	Yes a little	106	10%	12%
	Yes a lot	60	6%	7%
	No	718	68%	81%
	Total	884	83%	100%
Missing	Not known	51	5%	
	Prefer not to say	124	12%	
	Total	175	17%	
Total		1059	100%	
What is your ethnicity?				
Valid	UK / British	836	79%	92
	Irish	13	1%	1
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Any other White background	48	5%	5%
	Asian or Asian - Indian	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Any other Asian Background	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Mixed - Asian & White	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Mixed - Black Caribbean & White	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Any other mixed background	4	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Arab	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Any other ethnic group	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Total	913	86%	100%
	Missing	Not known	40	4%

	Prefer not to say	106	10%	
	Total	146	14%	
Total		1059	100%	

		Frequency	All respondents (%)	Who answered the question (%)
Are you a Carer?				
Valid	Yes	104	10%	12%
	No	792	75%	88%
	Total	896	85%	100%
Missing	Not known	59	6%	
	Prefer not to say	104	10%	
	Total	163	15%	
Total		1059	100%	
With a connection to the Armed Forces				
Valid	Yes	79	7%	10%
	No	730	69%	90%
	Total	809	76%	100%
Missing	No response	163	15%	
	Prefer not to say	87	8%	
	Total	250	24%	
Total		1059	100%	
Q1. Which park or open spaces do you use most regularly?				
Valid	Preston Park	418	39%	42%
	Stanmer Park	390	37%	40%
	Seafront Including Black Rock to Hove Lagoon	252	24%	26%
	Wild Park	149	14%	15%
	Rottingdean Recreation Ground	107	10%	11%
	Hollingbury Park	88	8%	9%
	Queens Park	67	6%	7%
	The Level	62	6%	6%
	East Brighton Park	61	6%	6%
	Hove Park	61	6%	6%
	Sheepcote Valley	60	6%	6%
	Waterhall	56	5%	6%
	Happy Valley	50	5%	5%
	Saltdean Oval	47	4%	5%
	Beacon Hill / Nature Reserve	39	4%	4%
	Withdean Park	38	4%	4%
	Surrenden Field	36	3%	4%
	Lawn Memorial and adjacent land (Woodingdean)	34	3%	3%
	St. Ann's Well Gardens	31	3%	3%
	Hove Lawns	23	2%	2%
Rottingdean	20	2%	2%	
Blakers Park	18	2%	2%	

Hollingbury	18	2%	2%
East Brighton Park / Sheepcote Valley	14	1%	1%

	Frequency	All respondents (%)	Who answered the question (%)
Green Ridge / Coney Wood	12	1%	1%
Dyke Road Park	11	1%	1%
Greenway	11	1%	1%
Wish Park	11	1%	1%
Pavilion Gardens	8	1%	1%
St. Helen's Green	8	1%	1%
Rottingdean Park	7	1%	1%
Kipling Gardens	6	1%	1%
Rottingdean Windmill	6	1%	1%
Victoria Park	6	%	1%
Patcham Place Recreation Ground	5	1%	1%
Carden Park	4	<0.5%	<0.5%
Hollingdean Park	4	<0.5%	<0.5%
Hove Recreation Ground	4	<0.5%	<0.5%
Peacehaven	4	<0.5%	<0.5%
Race Hill / Course	4	<0.5%	<0.5%
William Clarke Park	4	<0.5%	<0.5%
Woodingdean	4	<0.5%	<0.5%
Woodingdean Bexhill Road	4	<0.5%	<0.5%
39 Acre	3	<0.5%	<0.5%
Devil's Dyke	3	<0.5%	<0.5%
Easthill Park	3	<0.5%	<0.5%
Ladies Miles Park	3	<0.5%	<0.5%
Peacock Park	3	<0.5%	<0.5%
Rottingdean Village Green	3	<0.5%	<0.5%
Vale Park	3	<0.5%	<0.5%
Benfield Valley	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Chatsworth Park	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Greenleas	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Hollingbury Golf Course	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Hollingbury woods	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Horsdean Recreation Ground	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Mile Oak Recreation Ground	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Old Steine	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Roedean / Cafe	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Stoneham Park	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Telscoombe Tye	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Valley Gardens	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Victoria Recreation Ground	2	<0.5%	<0.5%
Woodindean Park	2	<0.5%	<0.5%

Adjacent to Ditchling Road reservoir	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Barcombe Place	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Barn Rise Green	1	<0.5%	<0.5%

	Frequency	All respondents (%)	Who answered the question (%)
Behind Nuffield Woodingdean	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Benfield Hill Nature Reserve	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Bevendean Down	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Brighthelm	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Brighton Marina Parade	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Burstead Woods	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Bypass to Devils Dyke	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Castle Hill	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Coldean Woods	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Devil Dyke Road	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Dorset Road	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Downsman Pub	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Dyke Railway track	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Falter Hill	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Hangleton Park	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Hillingdean	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Hollingbury & Burstead Woods	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Hollingbury Fort	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Hove Museum Gardens	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Marina	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
New Steine Gardens	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Old allotments	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Open land at the top of Woodingdean	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Park Traveller	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Patcham Place	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Peace Park, Peasehaven	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Saunders Park	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
St Andrews Church	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
St. Nic rest gardens	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Sweet Hill Laybys	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
The cliff top from Saltdean to the Marina	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
The Copse	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
The Green - Westdene	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
The Lilac Garden	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Westdene Park	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Whitehawk	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Whitehawk Hill	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
Withdean Woods	1	<0.5%	<0.5%

	Woodingdean Windmill	1	<0.5%	<0.5%
	Total	985	93%	100%
Missing	No response	74	7%	
	Total	1059		

