



Summary of Representations received on Local Green Spaces and Local Community Spaces Designations in the Regulation 16 Submission version of the Lewes Neighbourhood Development Plan (LNDP)

1. Alongside the submission (Regulation 16) consultation on the Lewes Neighbourhood Plan, the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) undertook a focused consultation on the proposed Local Green Space and Local Community Space designations proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan from **Wednesday to 11 July to Monday 06 August 2018**. A letter was sent to all landowners affected to ensure that they were aware of these proposed designations and their purpose. Representations were submitted by 9 respondents.
2. Paper copies of the representations can be viewed on request at the South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst, West Sussex, GU29 9DH and at Lewes Town Hall High Street, Lewes, East Sussex BN7 2QS.
3. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised in the representations.

Reference	Name / Organisation	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
LGSI.	Sarah Flynn	23/07/18	Email	<p>Policy SS3: Protection & Enhancement of Green Spaces - Items 13 and 14: Landport Field 1 and Landport Field 2 have been removed from the map showing Green Spaces (p. 136), however, they are still listed in the table. I assume this is an error.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposed fields 13 and 14 are still being proposed then I have the following points to make: • Paragraph 10.20 has apparently been used to identify green spaces: objection: In respect of paragraph 10.20 neither of the fields are used by the community or are within the urban centre of the Lewes, nor are they within the current designated settlement area. Accordingly, <u>they already have protection from development under current National planning policies.</u>

Reference	Name / Organisation	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
LGS2.	Ellen Hockridge	23/07/18	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Local Green Spaces are already public access spaces with many public footpaths or community uses already in place. No.12 which I own, is a private fenced off area with no public access and SSSI site designation already in place. What is the rationale behind the LGS designation pertaining to No. 12? Can it be demonstrated as special to the community as it is private land? Where can I access the minutes of the meeting where these site designations were made? In assigning a Local Green Space designation to this SSSI site I think it would give the green light to members of the community to believe it is public land- thus causing more damage to the SSSI site. What are the duties / restrictions on Local Green Spaces? Why were owners not notified by letter, such as yours dated 11 July 2018, so we could have input before 11 July 2018? I believe local green spaces are a prerequisite to a happy, healthy community but I am at a loss to see how my steep private bank from my garden to the byway helps this.
LGS3.	Judith Norris, The Rural Planning Practice, on behalf of the Iford Estate	26/07/18	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are writing on behalf of the Iford Estate that owns part of Local Green Space (no 62) shown as part of the Lewes Draft Neighbourhood Plan. A plan is attached that identifies the extent of my client's ownership. We believe this land has been included in the designation in error and would be grateful to receive confirmation that it has been removed from LGS 62. We have never been consulted on the matter and I am sure this would have been the case if the ownership had been correctly identified.
LGS4.	Pat Stallwood, on behalf of, The Nevill Estate	26/07/18	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I write on behalf of Christopher George Charles Nevill, owner of the Bowling Green in Lewes and shown as No: 57 on the plan of proposed Local Green Spaces in support of Policy SS3. Would you please accept this e-mail as a formal representation to the effect that The Nevill

Reference	Name / Organisation	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
	Company Ltd. (as a landowner)			Estate does not wish the Bowling Green to be designated as a Local Green Space.
LGS5.	Elizabeth Thomas	13/07/18	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note for your records that the “owner” is the Baxter’s Field Company, registered charity. • Baxter’s Field is a private open space that has been open to the public since June 2004 during daylight hours. The field is regularly hired for private use e.g. for croquet, stoolball, archery, cricket as well as family parties and children’s birthday parties during the week / weekend. It is always open to all on Bank Holidays. • It is especially valuable as an open space for those with tiny or no gardens who live in the adjacent flats and it provides a peaceful lunch time space for busy office workers, a post school picnic spot, a safe open space for sports and nature study for the local St Anne’s nursery. • The steeply sloping wooded bank adjacent to Paddock Lane has developed as a copse and is normally kept locked up, except for managed visits as a mini nature reserve. it ‘hosts’ a foxes’ lair, grey squirrels dreys, and in previous years hedgehogs as well as nesting blue tits / great tits and is regularly used for foraging by black caps, local wrens, robins, blackbirds, pigeons and until this year pied woodpeckers. Numerous butterflies and moths are found on the field.
LGS6.	Hamish Elder, on behalf of Harveys	30/07/18	Email	<p>Hamish Elder Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My company, Harveys, owns the southern most 12 acres of the Chilly Brooks flood plain (no. 32 on the plan). • We have no record of any consultation or advertisement with regarding this designation. • This is an environmentally sensitive area there are already conflicts concerning the discretionary public access to this land (particularly dog walkers in respect of wildlife such

Reference	Name / Organisation	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
				<p>as nesting birds or the disturbing of grazing livestock) but also littering, health and safety regarding the river, etc. We would need to object to any initiative that might increase such access or present any liability, risk or cost to the landowner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learned, almost accidentally, about this proposal. How many other affected local owners are currently unaware of this scheme? • The site has a high environmental value and concerned there will be recreational disturbance from the public with their dogs, litter etc. • There is no proposal for development of this site, the owners positively embrace the site's conservation merits. Such designations as this (as we have learned with ACVs) act to dramatically undermine site value, inhibit investment, and therefore foster negativity in the property owner. <p>SDNPA Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even though extensive publicity had been carried out on the Neighbourhood Plan, the National Park Authority wanted to ensure that all landowners were aware of the Local Green Space and Community Space proposals while the Plan is in its draft stages and before it is examined. All representations received at this stage will be considered fully by the Examiner who will recommend, if necessary, modifications to the Plan. • The purpose of this designation is to protect valuable open spaces from development other than in very special circumstances. The designation of a site as a Local Green Space does not in any way require changes to the management of the site or allow public access. In fact, the Government's guidance on designating Local Green Space clearly states that Local Green Space designation in itself does not confer any rights of public access over what exists at present.
LGS7.	Robert Earl, on behalf of Southern	06/08/18	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not support the designation of these sites on our land. We are concerned that designation as Local Green Spaces will constrain our use and development of these sites from a planning perspective, where permitted development rights cannot be relied upon,

Reference	Name / Organisation	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
	Water			<p>and may constrain our ability to discharge our duties in our role as water and sewerage undertaker.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is our view that the policy test for proper designation of our sites as Local Green Spaces has not been met for our site. <p>Demonstrably Special - A designation must be supported by clear evidence that the land is demonstrably special to the local community. The dictionary defines “special” as meaning “better, greater, or otherwise different from what is usual”. This means that evidence must be produced to prove that proposed Local Green Space land is better, greater, or otherwise different from what is usual in the specific context of the site. We have not seen any evidence to this effect in relation to our sites.</p> <p>Extensive Tract of Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The designation that covers both our Houndean and Windmill Hill Water Service Reservoirs is extensive and forms a large tract of land; their removal from the designation (site 62) will still leave a large remaining area of green space. We note also that much of the area of designation is in the National Park and already has a high level of protection from development. • Should any of our land be designated as Local Green Space under the test above we consider that our overriding utility obligations should be accommodated within your policies. The policy on Local Green Spaces states that, "Essential small scale utility infrastructure may be permitted so long as the existing use and community value of the space is not detrimentally affected". In order to protect public health interests we propose the alternative policy wording, "Essential utility infrastructure will be permitted." • If our land becomes surplus to our requirements, this designation potentially affects its value for alternative subsequent use, as the land will be subject to a significant development constraint. We wish to maintain our land disposal options for these sites. We consider that the designation of such land as Local Green Space adversely affects the real estate value of the land, and thereby our ability to reduce customers' utility bills.

Reference	Name / Organisation	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
LGS8	Nick Stokes, N.J. Stokes Architect, on behalf of Mrs Ann Ffitch - Heys	20/07/18	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mrs Ffitch-Heys is the owner of part of the proposed Local Green Space: no 62 Lewes Battlefield. • The designation appears to be a late inclusion and not part of the original sites exhibited at the public meeting in May last year. • The designation is a blanket coverage of public and private land. The site is 27.5 hectares (68 acres) comprising different types of land use including the battlefield site, part of Landport Bottom – Local Nature Reserve, part of the Rails Gallop, a covered water reservoir and a woodland owned by Mrs Ffitch-Heys. • Different parts of the land are already covered by protective designations including the designated battlefield site, the Local Nature Reserve, South Downs National Park policies and an Article 4 Direction on the racecourse land. My client strongly objects to designation of her land as Local Green Space.
LGS9	Mr T Wolpe	Holding response 13/07/18 Full response 29/08/18	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Own part of the Ouse Brooks Meadows. • First objection is to the proposed designation on the grounds of a failure to consult properly with the concerned parties. • The mostly private land in question is extensive and so should not be included as these two fields alone are over eight acres, and form only a small part of the larger proposed LGS area. • The water meadows are not part of the town. They are separated from it by the Railway Land Wildlife Reserve to the north and by the river and railway to the east and west. • The meadows are not special they contain no exceptional plant life. • The proposed designation fails to differentiate the Railway Land Wildlife Reserve to the north from the agricultural land to south-east, where my two fields lie. • Lack of local knowledge is highlighted by the positioning of Local Community Space 32 in the middle of one of my fields. Yet an actual firesite and fields on the other side of the

Reference	Name / Organisation	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
				<p>railway, which were subject to a recent pre-planning proposal, are not being considered for either Local Community Space or Local Green Space designation. There has never been a bonfire site in any location on my fields. What other mistakes have been made?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on private interests. By giving this land a new designation, it may well ultimately affect the land's value. There has been insufficient time to investigate this issue. Will I be indemnified against a fall caused by its new status? • Any recreational value for the fields comes thanks to the goodwill of the landowners. There is a permissive footpath across them, provided by the landowners for the public benefit. If this designation is pursued, for my part I may seriously consider whether to continue with this status quo.