

	Respondent	Summary of Main Comments	Response to Main Comments
1	Karen Hendrickx, Resident	Opposition to the plan to make North Road part of the conservation area. Property has had less adjustments in comparison to neighbours and it is unfair that we would not be able to do work on our property without additional planning obstacles. We bought our house with a view to modernising it considerably and I am concerned that the proposals would add expense and red tape to all our future projects	The former brewers housing on North Road and Southdown Road remain of historic interest due to their association with the brewery and development of the village. Southdown Road retains four semi-detached properties that are designated as locally listed buildings. They remain largely unaltered. They are of sufficient architectural and historic interest to merit inclusion in the area. The terraced housing on North Road have been subject to a higher level of alteration and consultation has shown that there is little local commitment to enhancing the historic character of the road. The historic interest of the road will be emphasised within the report, but it is no longer proposed to include the road in the conservation area.
2	Malcolm Gladdish, Resident	Disagreement with the inclusion of North Road in the proposed conservation area extension.	See comment 1 above. Due to the level of alteration and lack of local commitment, North Road is no longer proposed for inclusion in the area. The historic interest of the road will instead be emphasised further within the report.
3	The Victorian Society	No comment	Noted, no amendments required
4	Christina Liassides, Head of Network Management	No comment	Noted, no amendments required

5	Trevor Povey, Local Historian	Full support of the boundary changes, Article 4(1) policy and proposals. Believes more needs to be done to preserve, maintain, interpret and provide access to the Old Manor site. Areas of the Old Manor are in need of maintenance to prevent further decay. Although supports greater access, caution required as to some it no doubt represents an old pile of stones. When fence panel removed from Emmaus site, inundated with reports of children riding through the site and generally pulling off loose flints etc. Makes regular visits to the Manor and try to open it to the public whenever I can. Many express the fact that it and the village are a well kept secret. Would welcome a management strategy which included local people. Well aware of the financial constraints but is sure that with the right approach there are people within the community who would offer time and expertise to complement the Council's efforts.	Noted, these comments will help inform the production of a management strategy for the Old Manor site.
6	Paul Roberts, English Heritage	Most interesting. Notes the intrusive features in and around the site of the Church and would welcome opportunities to enhance the setting here, should opportunities arise.	Noted
7	Roger Amerena	Noted the association between the brewery in Portslade and in Brighton. Comments regarding the importance of Holm Oaks, flint walls, the decorative chimney base at the brewery and the importance of the Church and Manor complex	The appraisal will be amended to emphasise these points

8	Jan Cadge, Head of Operations and Performance	More specific management proposals for the Old Manor site	Noted, these comments will help inform the production of a management strategy for the Old Manor site.
9	Brian Johnson, Sussex Gardens Trust	<p>Welcomes appraisal and supports the recommendations for inclusion of additional areas and no objections to suggested deletions. Overall an excellent report on the present condition of the area. Comments made in regard to Easthill Park should be stronger in putting forward opportunities that exist in this public area to enhance its relationship with the former principal house to which it was the garden. Around the House unfortunate enclosures, minor developments and car parking areas have not been sympathetic to either the House or the Garden/Park. These features merit attention to improve the visual relationship. The opportunities in relation to the football pitch have been mentioned (and are supported) but no suggestions for integrating the obviously well used and popular play area into the landscape structure of the park have been put forward. At present the play area is a harsh, rigidly-bounded and prominent area that visually detracts from its surroundings.</p>	Noted, the appraisal will be amended to reflect these points

	<p>Similarly the land east of the former convent, clearly is in need of considerable maintenance if its character is not to be lost. Suggestions for enhancing this area would have regard to its sensitive past uses but unless some planning for its future is made it will further detract from the quality of the neighbourhood. Management by the current owners in a community project would seem to offer interesting opportunities.</p>	
<p>10 Brighton Society</p>	<p>Boundary Review: Support inclusion of areas A and D. No comment on removal of areas B and C. Oppose removal of Area E: This stretch of grass with mature trees in Easthill Way is directly contiguous with Easthill Park. It has been slightly degraded by the installation of one or two driveways but these are not conspicuous from the submitted viewpoint and the stretch is a significant visual amenity of the conservation area. It is difficult to see what merit is to be had by removing it from the CA except to satisfy some spurious notion of compactness.</p> <p>Policy and Proposals: Generally support. Some house numbers need checking</p>	<p>Area E is suburban in character - relating directly to the neighbouring housing - rather than to the historic character of the conservation area. It has no visual relationship with Easthill Park. Retention of this area would therefore dilute the distinct character of the conservation area. Tree Preservation Orders should be considered for the significant trees in this area; such a designation would more accurately reflect and protect the important features of this space.</p> <p>Noted. Will be checked. Number 75 High Street is also known as The Old Barn</p>

11	Vabz1	<p>Mention is made of the value of the original flint walls within the village. On this basis the area should be extended to cover the original flint walls to the south of the High Street, rising up the hill into Mile Oak Road, forming the perimeter of the Portslade Sixth Form Building. The building was formerly Portslade House, an 18th century construction.</p>	<p>It is agreed that these walls form an important part of the setting of the conservation area, as reflected in their inclusion in the council's list of buildings of local interest. However, they are located within a suburban context which is disconnected from the character of the conservation area and is of little special architectural or historic interest in itself. As such, it does not warrant inclusion in the conservation area. The interest and importance of Portslade House will be emphasised in the historic background section of the report.</p>
12	Carol Callingham-Woods	<p>Brilliant idea. I used to live in the old brewers cottages and they deserve conserving</p>	<p>See comment 1 above. Due to the level of alteration and lack of local commitment, North Road is no longer proposed for inclusion in the area. The historic interest of the road will instead be emphasised further within the report.</p>
13	Councillor Les Hamilton	<p>I agree with the proposed changes to the Portslade Conservation Area, although I have some reservations as to whether the houses in North Road should be included</p>	<p>See comment 1 above. Due to the level of alteration and lack of local commitment, North Road is no longer proposed for inclusion in the area. The historic interest of the road will instead be emphasised further within the report.</p>
14	Christine Mason, Resident Windlesham Close	<p>Could the flint walls round the Sixth Form centre and round St Helens, 33 Mile Oak Road be included in the conservation area? They give the stretch of road from the top of the High Street to almost the county boundary the same rural and historic impression given by the other flint walls in the conservation area near the church and along Locks Hill.</p>	<p>See comment 11 above. The flint walls will be further emphasised as an important part of the setting to the conservation area.</p>

		<p>Also, could the planning permission for the development on the St Helens site be reconsidered, especially in light of the present Government's decision not to encourage building on brownfield sites. The historic nature of the flint walls there would be lost if the walls were knocked down and rebuilt.</p>	<p>It is not possible to reconsider a planning application which has already been granted permission and new Government guidance/policy cannot be applied retrospectively.</p>
15	CAG	<p>Ms Roberts reported that there had been objections from residents to the inclusion of North Road, and would review whether this has the necessary architectural or historic interest, or sufficient local support to secure the desired improvements. The group felt that the North Road properties merit inclusion to prevent further harm to their appearance. Mr Amerena (Stanmer Preservation Society) felt that reference should be made of the top floor addition to the brewery building. The group welcomed the review, and congratulated Ms Roberts for her excellent work.</p>	<p>See comment 1 above. Due to the level of alteration and lack of local commitment, North Road is no longer proposed for inclusion in the area. The historic interest of the road will instead be emphasised further within the report. Reference is already made to the top floor addition to the brewery.</p>
16	Maggie Knight, Resident	<p>Concern over the impact of the article 4 direction on the ability to remove front boundary walls on North Road. As so few walls remain, there is not exactly a lot of character in them.</p>	<p>See comment 1 above. Due to the level of alteration and lack of local commitment, North Road is no longer proposed for inclusion in the area. The historic interest of the road will instead be emphasised further within the report.</p>

<p>17 Jim Appleton/Jo Buss, Resident</p>	<p>Our initial response is one of favour for the conservation area to include our property on Southdown Road. The reason we purchased the property six years ago was down to the character and wealth of original fetures to our property, since owning the property we have modernised but have always ensured we have protected the properties charm and character. The idea of the property now being considered of some interest has been positive. The only development that we would foresee in the future would be a drive way, I would hope that this would not be too complicated once the conservation status has been made as we are aware that on a practical level parking on the road continues to be a growing challenge, the addition of a drive would be useful for us but would also remove two cars from the street. On a positive note in relation to the property's character if we were successful in obtaining a drive a currently hidden feature would be revealed as currently the original iron railings surrounding the property are covered with plants and overgrowth.</p>	<p>We would be looking to include the provision of hardstanding and the demolition of boundary walls within the proposed Article 4(1) Direction. The relationship between these properties and the road is important to the character and appearance of the area. We would be looking to control the insertion of driveways in order to maintain a balance between hard and soft landscaping in the street. Any application would be considered on a case by case basis, and would need to be carefully detailed to preserve and enhance the character of the area.</p>
--	---	---

18	Jon Sayers, Resident	<p>Having been a resident for 35 years, we have always considered the idea of the POV conservation area as a necessary way of protecting the area and its history, especially since the loss of the conservation area status that was in place when we bought the property. ... We have discussed the idea in general conversation with a number of our neighbours and all liked the idea and were in favour of its introduction. We don't always do enough to protect our history so to lose an opportunity like this would be very sad!</p> <p>The brewery cottages in North Road are a great part of that history and it is important that we don't lose sight of that. Most of the buildings remain as they were originally built. Where replacement has been necessary, generally it seems to have been carried out in sympathy with the original. The buildings themselves have quite an illustrious pedigree having been built by renowned Brighton master builder, James Markwick. I don't know whether you had any further positive support for the inclusion of North Road in the conservation area, but please consider our support and those we have spoken to.</p>	<p>The conservation area designation for Portslade Old Village has remained unaltered since its designation in 1974.</p>
		<p>See comment 1 above. Due to the level of alteration and lack of local commitment, North Road is no longer proposed for inclusion in the area. The historic interest of the road will instead be emphasised further within the report.</p>	