

Report to	Planning Committee
Date	13 September 2018
By	Director of Planning
Title of Report	Clayton Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP)
Purpose of Report	To present the draft Clayton CAAMP for adoption by the National Park Authority.

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to adopt the Clayton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, attached as Appendix I to this report, for the purposes of Development Management and to inform the other activities of the National Park Authority and its partners.

1. Summary

- 1.1 Clayton is a small village in Mid-Sussex District between Brighton, seven miles to the south, and Hassocks, a mile to the north. It falls within the parish of Hassocks.
- 1.2 The village is a 'spring-line village' stretching along Underhill Lane which, as its name implies, lies at the foot of the Downs scarp slope.
- 1.3 A six week consultation was undertaken from 6 February 2017 to 20 March 2017. Letters notifying the residents of the consultation were sent to all the households within the Conservation Area and separate consultations were sent to the Parish, District and County Councils.
- 1.4 The draft document concluded that the Conservation Area was in reasonable condition and no changes to its boundaries are proposed.

2. Consultation Responses

- 2.1 Comments were received from Hassocks Parish Council, Mid-Sussex District Council and five residents of the village. These are tabulated below.
- 2.2 A concern about the traffic along Underhill Lane emerged consistently from the responses. The draft document has been amended as far as possible to address all the comments received.
- 2.3 To an occasional visitor to the village, Underhill Lane appears relatively quiet but the Parish Council and a number of residents have reported that its use is more extensive, that it is used by delivery lorries as a 'rat run', that vehicles travel at inappropriate speeds, and that the banks and hedges are suffering damage. A more specific concern was also expressed about the use of poor quality paving stones at the back of each drain cover as part of works to improve the drainage along the lane.
- 2.4 Subsequent discussions with West Sussex County Council, as the Highway Authority, have revealed that these issues have already been drawn to its attention. It does accept that the edges of the lane are heavily eroded and that little maintenance has been undertaken, which

reflects the status of the lane within the County's road network and the financial constraints within which the Highway Authority must operate.

- 2.5 On the other hand, the Highway Authority is not persuaded that the volume of traffic or the speed at which it travels are issues. It believes that any HGVs are going to farms and businesses on the lane rather than 'rat-running' and that most vehicles do not exceed 25mph. It believes that the few problems that do occur are occasional and mostly happen when diversions or problems elsewhere result in more traffic going down the lane.
- 2.6 There is clearly a difference in perception between the Highway Authority and the Parish Council and village community. What seems a lot of traffic to residents of a small community might be relatively minor when viewed from a County-wide perspective. In the absence of firm evidence, a traffic survey would help to clarify the issue and the community would be best placed to undertake this, albeit with assistance from the County Council.
- 2.7 If such a survey supports the community's concerns, a form of traffic management would have to be developed. Some minor physical interventions, such as rumble strips at key points, might help although Underhill Lane is so narrow and, at the eastern end of the village, so twisty, that it is in effect naturally traffic-calmed. Other forms of management, speed restrictions, traffic regulation orders and 'Quiet Lane' status for example, may be more appropriate tools in this instance.
- 2.8 Whatever form the traffic management might take, it would have to meet the community's concern, to be acceptable to the Highway Authority, and to be appropriate to the Conservation Area status of the village. To this end an Action is included in the Management Plan to try and bring all parties together to find a way forward.

Parish Council	Overall environment has deteriorated.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP, and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
	Underhill Lane has become dangerous & noisy in recent years.	
	The verges & banks are in a poor state. Unofficial parking places have appeared & parking places are insufficient, causing cars to park inappropriately.	
	Underhill Lane should be given 'Quiet Lane Status, with a 15 mph limit.	
	Para 3.10 There is a farmstead in Clayton Village. Fox Hole Farm on Ditchling Road with a gate also on Spring Lane.	Text amended.
	Para 2.2. Should the reference to Lewes actually be to London?	Text amended.
	Figure 9: The photo of this building does not show it as it is currently.	Noted.
Mid-Sussex District Council Conservation Officer	Enjoyed reading the appraisal and had no comments or suggestions to add.	Noted.
Resident of Conservation Area	There is still a working farm in the village, Foxhole Farm.	Text amended.
	Underhill Lane has become a 'rat run' and has suffered damage to banks & hedges.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.

	The County Council has not responded positively for requests to provide a Traffic Regulation Order.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
	The implementation of an Article 4 direction would be unfair.	Noted.
	SDNPA should exercise its influence over Mid-Sussex District Council & West Sussex County Highways to ensure that they are fully engaged in protecting the Conservation Area.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
	The suggested undergrounding of the wires would prevent power outages but is likely to be costly.	Noted.
	A square concrete slab placed vertically at the exit to an underground pipe is very unsightly and probably unnecessary.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
Resident of village – without the Conservation Area	Biggest concern is about the volume of traffic using Underhill Lane, including inappropriately large vehicles.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Pan.
	Cheap manufactured paving slabs have been used in addressing drainage problems within the village. These look like cheap grave stones and are totally out of keeping with the Conservation Area.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
Resident of Conservation Area	Agrees that Underhill Lane has a quiet rural feel but feels that it is plagued by cars, motorbikes and particularly delivery lorries that drive fast down the lane with scant regard for the safety of other road users.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
Resident of Conservation Area	CAAMP presents a rather rosy picture and disagrees that Clayton survives in largely good order.	Noted.
	Debris from unkempt hedges and banks create an unsightly & muddy mess along the lane, which is also a danger to pedestrians & cyclists.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
	Underhill Lane is on a downward spiral, with cars abandoned and a large van using informal lay-bys for parking.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
	Requests that the SDNPA (or other appropriate body) ensure or require that all hedges, banks and verges along the (village part of) lane be recovered and properly maintained.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
	Supports Action 5 (to underground wires) but disagrees with comments regarding close-boarded fences which are attractive, in good order, and in	Noted.

	no way detract from the quality of the area.	
Resident of Conservation Area	Document paints a rather rosy picture of Clayton village.	Noted.
	Underhill Lane has become a hazardous road and needs a sensible traffic management plan as a matter of urgency to preserve the Conservation Area.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
	Recent drainage work along the lane was a good thing but the cheap and nasty paving slabs used at the back of each drain cover have been used with no respect for the work being in a conservation area.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
	The CAAMP for Clayton does not reflect the character of the Conservation Area as it is in March 2017. The proposed Management Plan gives a generic suggestion which does not address the main concern of residents i.e. the lack of a traffic management plan for Underhill Lane.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
Resident of Conservation Area	Shares concerns of other villagers over number and speed of vehicles using Underhill Lane and the potential for accidents that presents.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.
	Suggests imposing a 20 – 30 mph limit.	See Section 2 of this report, report, paragraph 5.4 of the CAAMP and Action 6 of the Management Plan.

2.9 The CAAMP has therefore, been amended as far as possible to address the comments received and it is now considered fit for adoption as set out in the recommendation.

3. Other Implications

Implication	Yes/No
Will further decisions be required by another committee/full authority?	No
Does the proposal raise any Resource implications?	Once the document has been adopted it will be made available as a downloadable PDF document from the Authority's website so will not incur any printing costs. By providing advice to the public and the Development Management team, the CAAMP should improve the quality of planning applications and reduce the time taken to determine them. The Management Plan contains a number of recommendations but none directly requires a financial input from the Authority.
Has due regard been taken of the South Downs National Park Authority's equality duty as contained within the Equality Act 2010?	The community has been consulted on the development of the Management Plan, and the actions contained within the Management Plan are not considered to have either a positive or negative impact on any protected characteristics.

Are there any Human Rights implications arising from the proposal?	None.
Are there any Crime & Disorder implications arising from the proposal?	None.
Are there any Health & Safety implications arising from the proposal?	It is considered that the proposal does not raise any Health and Safety implications.
Are there any Sustainability implications based on the 5 principles set out in the SDNPA Sustainability Strategy: 1. Living within environmental limits 2. Ensuring a strong healthy and just society 3. Achieving a sustainable economy 4. Promoting good governance 5. Using sound science responsibly	Principle 1 - Living within Environmental Limits Principle 3 - Achieving a Sustainable Economy

4. Risks Associated with the Proposed Decision

- 4.1 Risk – The lack of an up-to-date Appraisal and Management Plan for Clayton will leave both applicants and officers lacking sufficient information to make informed planning decisions.

Mitigation – adopt the draft document now presented.

TIM SLANEY

Director of Planning

South Downs National Park Authority

Contact Officer: David Boyson, Conservation Officer
Tel: 01730 819233
email: david.boyson@southdowns.gov.uk
Appendices 1. Draft Clayton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management plan
SDNPA Consultees Legal Services; Chief Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer; Director of Planning
External Consultees Hassocks Parish Council, Mid-Sussex District Council, West Sussex County Council, Residents of Conservation Area
Background Documents Correspondence including comments and observations on the draft document received from individuals and other authorities.

