

## Appendix I: Summary of consultation feedback and officer response

In total, there were 92 consultation responses received on-line, and 19 in writing, which are tabulated in two sections below.

The first section includes the written representations, which are largely the responses of organisations rather than individuals. It is here that the comments received from Historic England, Lewes District Council, Lewes Town Council, and Friends of Lewes can be found.

The second section presents the on-line responses and is organised around the structure of the questionnaire.

### Section I: Summary of consultation feedback received in writing and officer response.

Consultee	Comment	Response
<b>HISTORIC ENGLAND</b>	Has reviewed the document within the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Historic England Advice Note 1: Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management (2019).	Noted.
	The document responds well to the Advice Note 1.	Noted.
	Considers that the draft is a clear and well laid out document, and its digital format makes it very user friendly.	Noted.
	Welcome the inclusion of important views.	Noted. Key views are mapped in each character appraisal, with the introduction of a new views map not considered necessary at the moment.
	Regards the description of the setting of the conservation area in section 4 as a positive inclusion and suggest that the section devoted to new development within the setting conservation area could identify factors which should be taken into account	Noted. The HE Advice Note 3 is referenced on page 146.

	when designing new development. Refers to HE Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Asset.	
	Welcomes the identification of Buildings of (Townscape) Merit and suggests that these could be listed in a separate table and their qualities explained.	The term 'Buildings of Townscape Merit' has been replaced with 'Positive Buildings'. Buildings can be identified as positive for many reasons and there isn't any particular need to identify the specific reasons for each of them in advance – this would be a huge task for Lewes. What matters is that they are flagged up as positive, which allows consideration for the specific reasons behind this to be identified/considered as required.
	Should consider identifying those buildings and spaces that detract from the conservation area and why they do so.	A decision was made in discussion with SDNPA Officers at an early stage to avoid the negative connotations of 'detracting' and instead refer to them using the more positive term 'Areas for enhancement'. These are shown on each character area map.
	Welcome the Management Plan and support its clear recommendations.	Noted.
<b>LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL</b>	The History Section at the start of the CAAMP is too long and does not explain how the history of the town has produced the town we see today	The revised version has moved most of the historical information to an Annexe at the back of the document, and a more focussed and shorter section included early in the document.
	The CAAMP should provide guidance on dormers, windows, roof/tile/slate replacement, paint colour, extensions, brownfield development, new buildings in historic environment with a consistent character, climate change and retrofitting (Particularly solar panels and slimline double-glazed windows), rain harvesting, biodiversity, trees, air source heat pumps, new products on the market, sustainable construction, shopfronts, railings, paving.	These are all important issues but to address them all in the CAAMP would turn it into a detailed Design Guide and a very unwieldy document.  Written advice on the issues would be very useful in some cases and this is particularly true for the upgrading of the thermal performance of houses - solar panels, double-glazing etc. However, that issue, and many of the others identified, are National Park and nationwide rather than specific to Lewes.

	<p>Maps should be included in the document in order to provide a quick overview of different character elements. They should be created so as to be useful to the planning process. The maps might show: Building heights in metres and storeys; Building widths in metres; bays and number of doors; Number of storeys/actual height given huge difference in floor to ceiling heights; Floor to ceiling heights; Roof pitches/roofscape; Materials; Colours; Uses; Location of doors and windows; Proximity to the street; Ground floor design – very important solid/void ; Visual stimulation on the ground floor/active frontages; Parking; Urban grain; Wall to window proportions – windows are increasingly small in current buildings.</p>	<p>This approach has been adopted in some conservation areas, but these tend to be small ones and areas which were developed over a short period of time. To produce mapping of this kind for a large and very heterogeneous Conservation Area like Lewes would be a huge task. It is questionable if the benefits that would accrue would justify the resources required.</p>
	<p>The role of industry is not mentioned or not given sufficient prominence.</p>	<p>The revised document gives industrial heritage more prominence in the Summary of Special Interest, Conservation Area Appraisal, History, and Character Area Assessments.</p>
	<p>The document is extremely difficult and tiring to read.</p>	<p>The formatting has been changed to improve readability, with the font changed to Calibri and increased to 13pt. This makes it more readable on laptop screens and when printed out at A4.</p>
	<p>Bad design and designs that detract from character and appearance should be illustrated. Examples may include: loss of horizontal and vertical subdivision in windows; loss or original glazing patterns; large section frames which are out of keeping with the adjacent buildings/original character top and bottom hung windows; large dormers; shed dormers; ill placed dormers; replacement doors, large rooflights; rooflights without a vertical bar to provide a sense of verticality; aluminium or uPVC windows in an historic building</p>	<p>This has been addressed to some degree with changes incorporated into Theme I: Maintenance, Repair and Alterations of Buildings in the Managing Change section.</p>

	Although there is some analysis of street surfaces and furniture this could be more robust, and some history attached to the surfaces.	Further information offered on surface finishes has been added to the Character Assessment and each Character Area's issues and opportunities section.
	The photos are often not related to the text. They are often very large with very little text and there is little connection between the text and images. Images should reinforce and expand upon the text, not just show examples of some points.	Longer captions added to some images to clarify connection to text.
	The CAAMP needs to say more about building and other traditional materials.	The materials section has been expanded substantially, with comments added about their use and contribution to the Conservation Area. No materials map has been produced due to the heterogeneity of the Conservation Area, which would make such a map of considerably less utility.
	The maps in the character areas highlight buildings of townscape merit. What are they? Who chose them and on what basis and when? Based on what documentation? Nowhere in the document is townscape merit defined. How were the selected? Are they non-designated heritage assets? Locally listed?	It is the case that most buildings in a Conservation Area should be either listed or make a positive contribution to the character of the area; if this isn't the case, a question mark could hang over the Conservation Area designation.  The phrase 'buildings of townscape merit' has therefore been replaced by 'positive buildings', and all that is being identified is that the buildings in question do make such a positive contribution. It is not necessary to identify the specific reasons for them doing so.
<b>LEWES TOWN COUNCIL</b>	Some inaccuracies that need correcting, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Priory Lodge on Southover High St does not exist (5.338);</li> <li>2. the Town Hall is not largely late Victorian (4.14);</li> <li>3. the Lewes Priory site is not a public garden(4.35).</li> <li>4. Spelling of Anne of Cleves and Nevill (not Neville)</li> <li>5. St Anne's Church is a Norman foundation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Priory Lodge is a Grade II listed building located between No. 20 and the Rectory on Southover High Street. See <a href="#">PRIORY LODGE, Lewes - 1286575   Historic England</a></li> <li>2. Reference removed.</li> <li>3. The text did not actually say that the Priory site was a public garden.</li> </ol>

	<p>6. Southover Church was originally not the chapel to a hospitium as stated, but the hospitium itself.</p> <p>7. Lewes Priory was not 'turned into a manor house after the dissolution' – completely incorrect.</p> <p>8. Priory St and Priory Crescent were built in the second half of the 19th century, not the first.</p> <p>9. Priory Gardens is not the correct name for the site of Lewes Priory – incorrectly named throughout.</p> <p>10. The Mount or Mound, not the Calvary Mount.</p>	<p>4. Text amended.</p> <p>5. Text amended.</p> <p>6. Text amended.</p> <p>7. Text clarified.</p> <p>8. Text amended.</p> <p>9. Text amended.</p> <p>10. Text amended.</p>
	<p>Identify individual roads where red tiles predominate.</p>	<p>This would be disproportionate in terms of the resources required, the additional complexity for the document against the relatively small utility. No Change proposed.</p>
	<p>Should reference content of Neighbourhood Plan more, including more key views.</p>	<p>References to the key views identified in Lewes NP is made in paragraph 4.129 and to views more generally in 6.68 d.</p>
	<p>Some extra notes on the history of the town.</p>	<p>The history section is fairly comprehensive, has already been criticised by some for its length and so further extensions need to be resisted.</p>
	<p>Add map of topography of town.</p>	<p>Topography of Lewes is now covered in paras 4.2-4.6 and figures 21 and 22.</p>
	<p>The history section should be put in an appendix to strengthen the focus on the planning function of the document.</p>	<p>The main history section has been moved into an appendix at the back of the main text.</p>
	<p>Revise the Malling CAAMP at the same time.</p>	<p>Malling Deanery is a separate designation and has an Appraisal and Management Plan that is still up to date, having been adopted in March 2106.</p>
	<p>Add reference to R Ouse as important open space.</p>	<p>4.65 now says this.</p>

	<p>Paragraph 4.38 could seek Article 4 protection for the local foundry made iron street furniture – manholes, drainage covers and storm overflows, especially the Every ones.</p>	<p>Items of street furniture do not have PD rights.</p>
	<p>In the important views sections, views along the river and from the bridge should be included.</p>	<p>Views both along and across the River Ouse are included in 4.128, and relevant character area sections under ‘key views’.</p>
	<p>In the Landmark Buildings section, include Shelleys, Fitzroy House, Anne of Cleaves, All Saints. Labels be in black rather than grey.</p>	<p>The text is now black.</p>
	<p>Provide guidance on appropriate materials for roof works and a palette of pre-approved colours for a front door, as other local authorities have for their conservation areas.</p>	<p>These are two issues, among many others that consultees have identified as needing guidance. All are important issues but to address them all in the CAAMP would turn it into a detailed Design Guide and a very unwieldy document.</p> <p>However, that issue, and many of the others identified, are National Park wide rather than specific to Lewes and would be better addressed with a suite of park-wide guidance notes.</p>
	<p>Provide more advice on improving sustainable credentials of buildings, both mitigating for and adapting to climate change</p>	<p>The Management Plan, specifically Theme 6 Sustainable Development and Climate Change, has been considerably expanded to include more information, advice and guidance on measures to enhance energy efficiency within dwellings and the CA more widely Paragraphs 6.120-6.152 .</p> <p>This includes changes/ upgrades to windows, solar panels, other renewables such as heat pumps, changes to the public realm including EV charging points and the incorporation of SUDS in new development. Further information relating to encouraging and catering for walking and cycling also included. More detail provided on the negatives and carbon cost of uPVC windows/ doors. Where consents are likely to be needed this is included.</p> <p>An approach to responsible retrofit, with accompanying diagrams, is provided to give clear, digestible guidance to home</p>

		and business owners on energy improvements within the context of the holistic ‘whole building approach’.
	The floodplain forms a character area itself (and should be included as such) because this was the heart of industrial Lewes.	Quite a bit of the floodplain is not actually in the conservation area and the existing division into seven character areas is considered sufficiently fine-grained.
	It would be helpful to add any sources for grants available from the SDNP and others so that owners of properties needing restoration can get help (and the correct advice).	At present, there is little available from public funds to help owners restore normal domestic properties and this is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future. Bigger projects on buildings of major significance may be able to apply for Heritage Lottery Funding but this is beyond the scope of the CAAMP.
	Boundary review – areas should not be removed because there are incidences of similar development in other areas.	This proposal has been removed from the revised document.
	The introduction needs to identify the users: Development Management teams at both District and Park level; planning applicants, both householders and developers.	The document is available to the public and can be used for any purpose, subject to copyright. The statement on the inside front cover makes it clear that its primary purpose is as a reference tool for anyone considering or making a planning application or developing other projects in Lewes. The relevant professionals are well aware of the importance of CAAMPs in their role.
<b>FRIENDS OF LEWES</b>	Supports the review of the CAAMP but question why it is limited to the town conservation area and excludes mention of the adjoining Malling Deanery conservation area.	Malling Deanery is a separate designation and has an Appraisal and Management Plan that is till up to date, having been adopted in March 2106.
	Are disappointed that the CAAMP does not reference the previous and thorough character appraisal, adopted in 2007 and The Lewes Conservation Area Management Plan adopted in July 2013 and omits most of the useful guidance to developers.	These documents will be superseded by the current document.

	<p>Request that the draft be amended to respond to the climate emergency by setting out how the energy efficiency of buildings can be improved to reduce carbon emissions and how measures seeking to reduce surface water run off can be incorporated.</p>	<p>The Management Plan, specifically Theme 6 Sustainable Development and Climate Change, has been considerably expanded to include more information, advice and guidance on measures to enhance energy efficiency within dwellings and the CA more widely. Paragraphs 6.120-6.152</p> <p>This includes changes/ upgrades to windows, solar panels, other renewables such as heat pumps, changes to the public realm including EV charging points and the incorporation of SUDS in new development. Further information relating to encouraging and catering for walking and cycling also included. More detail provided on the negatives and carbon cost of uPVC windows/ doors. Where consents are likely to be needed this is included.</p> <p>An approach to responsible retrofit, with accompanying diagrams, is provided to give clear, digestible guidance to home and business owners on energy improvements within the context of the holistic 'whole building approach'.</p>
	<p>Request that the important relationship with the town's civic society and the Conservation Area Advisory Group are re-established, together with a commitment to make available to them all pre-application consultations. Without this commitment it is difficult to see how their respective roles as 'the eyes and ears' of the town can be usefully continued.</p>	<p>There is no intention that this relationship will change, nor that of other bodies and groups which make an important contribution to the planning process. There is no real reason to make specific mention of the CAAG.</p>
	<p>That the SDNPA set outs indicative levels of planning officer, conservation officer and enforcement officer support that they intend to provide to this part of the South Downs National Park.</p>	<p>This is not a matter for a CAAMP.</p>
	<p>That the review of the document takes account of its useability by householders, developers, architects, and other professionals to provide clearer guidance on the highlighted</p>	<p>This issue is addressed in paragraph 6.12 of the main report.</p>



	issues within the conservation area, and of the relationship to the SDNPA Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.	
	That on the available evidence, the Friends of Lewes DO NOT SUPPORT the reduction to the boundaries of the conservation area, which appear inconsistent with the previous enlargements and would seem to suggest that new development has not achieved the policy requirements in design quality.	This proposal has been removed from the final version of the CAAMP.
	Request a reconsideration and more assessment work to clarify the appropriateness and scope of changes to the Article 4 Direction.	The consultation on the A4 Direction was to test the water in advance of a more formal consultation and this work will be undertaken at that time.
	Request the SDNPA to commence a dialogue with the Highway Authority to review the 1969 experimental traffic management arrangements and especially the maintenance of highways in the town in order to maintain the town's attractiveness to visitors and residents - consistent with reasons for the designation of the conservation area.	Issues relating to traffic and highways have been mentioned in the CAAMP. Discussions with the Highways Authority are, however, beyond the scope of the document.
<b>Chair, Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Committee</b>	Restates his disappointment that Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAG) has not been mentioned in the draft document.	Noted.
<b>Imogen Makepeace - Deputy Mayor, Town and District Councillor for Priory Ward</b>	As a Councillor whose ward covers much of the conservation area, she is hearing that residents are frustrated and bewildered by the restrictive stance of SDNP in preventing them from improving the energy efficiency of their homes.	Noted.

	Refers to work of ACAN, Historic England, and other local authorities.	Noted.
	Urges the revised CAAMP to support the approach of ecological retrofit to conservation grade buildings.	Upgrading the thermal performance of buildings of traditional construction is a complex matter which has both aesthetic/conservation issue and technical issues relating to the impact on the way that the fabric of traditional buildings perform.  It is a significant issue and there is already much advice available on-line, most notably a suite of documents produced by Historic England.
<b>Architect, on behalf of Deeper Green - based in Lewes</b>	Scope of review is nowhere near ambitious enough.	CAAMPs have a recognised scope and the current document accords with this.
	Review should use it to look proactively and responsibly at the ways in which heritage assets can be better adapted to let owners achieve affordable warmth and lower their carbon emissions.	Upgrading the thermal performance of buildings of traditional construction is a complex matter which has both aesthetic/conservation issue and technical issues relating to the impact on the way that the fabric of traditional buildings perform.  It is a significant issue and there is already much advice available on-line, most notably a suite of documents produced by Historic England.
	Suggests SDNP and consultants look at the Architects Climate Action Network's (ACAN) Conservation Area Toolkit, launched in December 2022.	The consultants were aware of this.
	Also refers to Kensington and Chelsea's draft consent order relating to solar panels.	Noted.

<p><b>Lewes Resident and co-ordinator of ACAN</b></p>	<p>Concerned that the draft CAAMP offers little guidance on how building owners can retrofit their properties to improve their energy efficiency in a way that is sensitive to the historic environment.</p>	<p>Upgrading the thermal performance of buildings of traditional construction is a complex matter which has both aesthetic/conservation issue and technical issues relating to the impact on the way that the fabric of traditional buildings perform.</p> <p>It is a significant issue and there is already much advice available on-line, most notably a suite of documents produced by Historic England.</p>
	<p>Refers to ACAN's climate emergency conservation area toolkit and examples of other projects undertaken by various local authorities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Lewis &amp; Co on behalf of Generator (Eastgate Street) Ltd, owner of the bus station site</b></p>	<p>In the 2007 Appraisal (page 42), the bus station site is identified as one of several large modern buildings which "impinge on the streetscene".</p>	<p>The Area for Enhancement has been reinstated to its original extent in the final document.</p>
	<p>The draft Appraisal does not include the earlier analysis of this part of the conservation area and there is no direct reference to the former bus station.</p>	<p>The Area for Enhancement has been reinstated to its original extent in the final document.</p>
	<p>The former bus garage remains within the "Area for Enhancement" but the former bus station is no longer included. This change does not reflect changes to the site itself, the recent heritage status review or the adoption of Local Plan Strategic Policy SD57.</p>	<p>The Area for Enhancement has been reinstated to its original extent in the final document.</p>
	<p>The new Appraisal should reflect the strategic objectives of SD57.</p>	<p>The Area for Enhancement has been reinstated to its original extent in the final document.</p>

<p><b>WS Heritage on behalf of Generator (Eastgate Street) Ltd, owner of the bus station site</b></p>	<p>The view of the LPA concerning the former bus station site and its near environs has changed from 2007, without any discussion or justification.</p>	<p>The Area for Enhancement has been reinstated to its original extent in the final document.</p>
	<p>The bus station itself is no longer within the identified Area for Enhancement, for which there is no explanation</p>	<p>The Area for Enhancement has been reinstated to its original extent in the final document.</p>
	<p>The former bus station site in its entirety should continue to be considered an Area for Enhancement in its entirety.</p>	<p>The Area for Enhancement has been reinstated to its original extent in the final document.</p>
	<p>A modest area of car parking to the east of Albion Street is now considered a 'key view', without any justification. The view doesn't offer any particular value to the conservation area. Moreover, it is protected by virtue of its contribution to the setting of the grade II listed Nos 2-10 Albion Street.</p>	<p>A key view was already identified to the east of Albion Street (see the map of the lower half of the Lower High Street character area). As such it is not a new key view and is an important gaps site that allows views of the Downs to the east of Lewes.</p>
<p><b>Resident of Lewes</b></p>	<p>Objects to the proposed removal of Area 1 from the conservation area</p>	<p>The proposal to remove two areas from the Conservation Area has been dropped in the final version of the CAAMP.</p>
<p><b>Residents of Lewes</b></p>	<p>Strong opposition to proposed removal of Area 1 from the conservation area.</p>	<p>The proposal to remove two areas from the Conservation Area has been dropped in the final version of the CAAMP.</p>
<p><b>Residents of Lewes</b></p>	<p>Objects to proposed removal of Area 1 from the conservation area.</p>	<p>The proposal to remove two areas from the Conservation Area has been dropped in the final version of the CAAMP.</p>
<p><b>Resident of Lewes</b></p>	<p>Objects to proposed removal of Area 1 from the conservation area.</p>	<p>The proposal to remove two areas from the Conservation Area has been dropped in the final version of the CAAMP.</p>
<p><b>Resident of Lewes</b></p>	<p>Objects to proposed removal of Areas 1 and 2 from the conservation area, particularly Area 2</p>	<p>The proposal to remove two areas from the Conservation Area has been dropped in the final version of the CAAMP.</p>

	Would support removal of the County Hall	The Conservation Area was actually extended in date to include County Hall. This was to give the LPA greater ability to influence the form and design of any replacement should a redevelopment proposal ever emerge. This reasoning remains valid.
<b>Resident of Lewes</b>	Objects to proposed removal of Area I from the conservation area.	The proposal to remove two areas from the Conservation Area has been dropped in the final version of the CAAMP.
<b>Resident of Lewes</b>	Objects to the use of a photograph of her house.	The photograph has been removed from the final version.
<b>Resident of Lewes</b>	<p>Comment specifically on the Article 4 Direction</p> <p>Concerned at the omission of “the exterior painting of previously unpainted surfaces or changes to colour.”</p> <p>This would allow the proliferation of garish colour schemes and/or murals through the historic town</p>	The consultation on the A4 Direction was to test the water in advance of a more formal consultation and this work will be undertaken at that time.
	Also concerned that the revised A4 fails to extend protection beyond dwelling houses to include flats, commercial premises etc.	Flats and commercial premises do not enjoy the PD Rights removed in the current Article 4 Direction and their inclusion was erroneous.

**Section 2: Summary of consultation feedback received on-line and officer response.**

**Opposition to/support for the removal of Area I (Cluny Street, Monk’s Lane, Verrall’s Walk, Anne’s Path and Morley Close)**

Section of Document	Consultee	Comment	Response
<p><b>Opposition to the removal of Area I (Cluny Street)</b></p>	<p>52 no. local residents, 3 no. Town/ County councillors, Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group, Friends of Lewes, Lewes Town Council</p>	<p>Reasons for wishing to retain Cluny Street in the conservation area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater control and protection of the important amenity areas in the Cluny Street area.</li> <li>• Greater control and protection of several important mature trees.</li> <li>• Greater protection and control of the design of buildings in the estate which many residents find aesthetically positive and wouldn’t welcome greater flexibility for change.</li> <li>• Some other retained elements in the conservation area, such as 20 garages built nearby in 1989, are far less attractive than the Cluny Street houses, which many consider are a fairly sympathetic design response to the adjacent historic townscape.</li> <li>• The area is of historical significance.</li> <li>• Concern that the proposed removal from the conservation area would not protect the ‘setting’ of The Malthouse in Cluny Street and Southover House which backs onto Cluny Street.</li> <li>• Some residents have made their choice to live in the area, partly due to the protections the conservation area status can bring.</li> </ul>	<p>Area I is to be retained within the Conservation Area on the grounds of public support for its retention and its contribution to the special interest of Southover.</p>

<p><b>Support for the removal of Area 1 (Cluny Street)</b></p>	<p>12 no. local residents</p>	<p>Reasons for wishing to retain Cluny Street in the conservation area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is of little architectural interest.</li> <li>• The planning restrictions which arise from inclusion in a Conservation Area are unnecessary in this area.</li> </ul>	<p>Area 1 is to be retained within the Conservation Area on the grounds of public support for its retention and its contribution to the special interest of Southover.</p>
--	-------------------------------	--	--

### Opposition to/support for the removal of Area 2 (Wallands Park Rise)

<p><b>Opposition to the removal of Area 2 (Wallands Park Rise)</b></p>	<p>14 no. residents, 2 no. Town/County Councillors, Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group, Friends of Lewes, Lewes Town Council, Lewes District Council</p>	<p>Reasons for wishing to retain Wallands Park Rise in the conservation area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forms part of Lewes' historical development</li> <li>• The area for removal is in close proximity to the Conservation Area and is visible from many areas within the Conservation Area</li> <li>• The design of the housing on Wallands Park Rise could be improved by retention in the Conservation Area</li> </ul>	<p>Area 2 is to be retained within the Conservation Area on the grounds of public support for its retention and its intervisibility with and close proximity to the Conservation Area.</p>
<p><b>Support for to the removal of Area 2 (Wallands Park Rise)</b></p>	<p>11 no. residents</p>	<p>Reasons for wishing to remove Wallands Park Rise from the conservation area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is of little architectural interest.</li> <li>• The planning restrictions which arise from inclusion in a Conservation Area are unnecessary in this area.</li> </ul>	<p>Area 2 is to be retained within the Conservation Area on the grounds of public support for its retention and its intervisibility with and close proximity to the Conservation Area.</p>

## Proposed removals from the Conservation Area

<b>Removals from the conservation area</b>	3 no. residents	The retail area including Boots, Waitrose, Argos, etc. should be reviewed for removal.	<b>No action taken.</b> This is part of the medieval town, and its removal would be inappropriate given its central location and historical and archaeological interest. The planning controls that Conservation Area designation.
		Tanners Brook and Court Road should be reviewed for removal.	<b>No action taken.</b> Court Road presently sits beyond the Conservation Area. Tanners Brook is highly visible from a number of important streets in the Conservation Area around the station and Southover and should be retained within it.
		County Hall should be reviewed for removal.	<b>No action taken.</b> Although County Hall is of limited architectural merit, it occupies a large site in close proximity to the Conservation Area. Conservation Area designation ensures that works to the building will serve to sustain and enhance the Conservation Area's special interest.

## Proposed extensions to the Conservation Area

<b>Extensions to conservation area</b>	2 no. residents	<p>Stanley Turner Ground is an important amenity space.</p> <p>The historic part of the Stanley Turner Ground's clubhouse is of architectural interest.</p>	<b>No action taken.</b> Stanley Turner Ground would be better served by another designation or protection than incorporation into the Conservation Area.
--	-----------------	---	--



<b>Extensions to conservation area</b>	Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group	The neighbouring Malling Deanery Conservation Area should be cross-referenced in Lewes Conservation Area Appraisal.	Malling Deanery now noted as part of the Conservation Area's setting. Paragraph 4.158. Moreover, it is a separate designation and has an up-to-date Appraisal & Management Plan.
--	--	---	--

### Summary of Special Interest

<b>Lewes' Special Interest</b>	12 no. local residents, 1 no. Town/County Councillor, Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group, Lewes Town Council, Lewes District Council	The survival of medieval/later buildings behind Georgian facades is a notable part of the character and not sufficiently emphasised.	The survival of medieval fabric behind later frontages is further emphasised in the Summary of Special Interest. Paragraph 2.3.
		St Anne's Church is a Norman foundation.	Removed distinction between Norman and medieval developments to ensure clarity. Paragraph 2.3.
		Boundary walls are an important part of the town's character.	The importance of walls to the twittens now mentioned in the Summary of Special Interest. Paragraph 2.7.
		The importance of industry is not sufficiently represented.	The importance of industry is now mentioned in the Summary of Special Interest. Paragraph 2.9.
		The houses in the Wallands are best referred to as Arts and Crafts or Mock Tudor, not Queen Anne style.	Amended. Paragraph 2.10.
		There are uniform Victorian and Edwardian terraces in the Wallands.	<b>No action taken.</b> Captured in the Summary of Special Interest. Paragraph 2.8.
		No mention currently made of open spaces and the Pells Pool. The leafy environment of the town draws birds to the area.	Open spaces are now mentioned in the Summary of Special Interest. Paragraph 2.11.

		<p>The amenity spaces in the Southover Manor Estate should be mentioned.</p>	<p><b>No action taken.</b> Open spaces are now mentioned in the Summary of Special Interest (Paragraph 2.11), but the Southover Manor Estate is not significant enough to the Special Interest of the Conservation Area as a whole to merit specific identification.</p>
		<p>Battle of Lewes likely occurred within the Conservation Area.</p>	<p><b>No action taken.</b> Battle of Lewes is an important part of the town's history but has not been included in the Summary of Special Interest to ensure brevity.</p>
		<p>The high level of cultural and artistic activity should be mentioned.</p>	<p>Lewes' connections to writers, artists and philosophers are now mentioned in the Summary of Special Interest. Paragraph 2.13.</p>
		<p>Lewes Priory is part of a bid for World Heritage Site designation.</p>	<p>Note added to the Landmark Buildings section of the Conservation Area Character Appraisal rather than the Summary of Special Interest to ensure brevity. Paragraph 4.151.</p>
		<p>Lewes's setting is very important and should be emphasised further.</p>	<p>Further emphasis given in the Summary of Special Interest. Paragraph 2.12.</p>
		<p>Lewes Bus Station should be mentioned.</p>	<p><b>No action taken.</b> Lewes Bus Station does not make a significant contribution to the Special Interest of Conservation Area at large and so has not been mentioned in the Summary.</p>

		The images in the Summary of Special Interest do not summarise the Special Interest of the Conservation Area.	<b>No action taken.</b> The images are intended to show the diversity of Lewes Conservation Area and reinforce the points made in the Summary.
		Transport issues should be mentioned.	<b>No action taken.</b> Transport issues are mentioned elsewhere in the document, as they do not contribute to the Special Interest of the Conservation Area. (Section 6, Theme 7)

## Historic Development

<b>Changes to the Historic Development section</b>	7 no. local residents, 2 no. County/Town Councillors,  Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group,  Lewes Town Council,  Lewes District Council	The history section should be more concise and related more specifically to the town's development. The longer history could be moved to an appendix.	A new summary, concise history section has been written, with the more detailed history section moved to an appendix. Section 3, Appendix A.
		The extent of the town's medieval origins and the survival of medieval buildings within it is not sufficiently emphasised.	The survival of medieval fabric within or beneath buildings has been elaborated further in the updated history section. Paragraphs 3.16 and A.26
		Importance of the army's presence in the town's growth.	<b>No action taken.</b> Mentioned at Paragraph A.18.
		More information of breweries, the town's industrial past and working-class heritage should be included.	Further emphasis is placed on Lewes' industrial and brewing history. Workers' housing now explicitly mentioned. Paragraph 3.20.
		The bridge over the Ouse was built in 1726/7 and by-passed in 1969.	<b>No action taken.</b> Mentioned at Paragraph A.21.

		Lewes Prison was built in 1853.	<b>No action taken.</b> Beyond the confines of the Conservation Area. Mentioned in the Upper High Street Western Road Character Area History at Paragraph 5.208
		Pell's Pool was opened in 1860.	<b>No action taken.</b> Mentioned in the Pells Character Area History at Paragraph 5.273.
		The history of environmentalism in Lewes should be mentioned.	<b>No action taken.</b> The history of environmentalism in Lewes does not overlap significantly with the Conservation Area's special interest.
		More emphasis should be placed on the separation between Lewes, Southover and Cliffe prior to their incorporation into Lewes Borough Council in 1881.	Further emphasis on the separation between Lewes, Cliffe and Southover has been added, as well as further emphasis on their unification in 1881. Paragraphs 3.11 and 3.21.
		The Verrall's Malthouse on Cluny Street should be mentioned.	The Verrall's Malthouse is mentioned in the summary history and elsewhere in appraisal. Paragraph 3.19, 4.100, and 5.384.
		The Cluny Street/Southover Manor Estate development should be mentioned.	The Southover Manor Estate development is mentioned in the Southover Character Area Summary History. Paragraphs 3.23 and 5.386.
		The importance of horse racing to the town should be noted.	Further emphasis has been added to the mention of horse racing. Paragraph A.30

		Tradition of costume making and dress-making should be mentioned.	<b>No action taken.</b> Relatively limited impact on the form and character of Lewes.
		The importance of the Ouse, the Cockshut and Winterbourne Stream is not sufficiently captured.	<b>No action taken.</b> The importance of the Ouse to the development of trade and industry is captured. Paragraph 3.19 and A.34. The contribution of the Cockshut and Winterbourne Stream to the history is less substantial than that of the Ouse.
		Question whether the 1840 date given in the timeline refers to the Victorian development along New and Paddock Roads.	Amended to refer to the area north-west of the castle (i.e. the Pells) rather than the area to the north, for clarity. Summary of Historic Development Timeline.
		Note the importance of Roland Hawke Halls and the Arts and Crafts character of the Wallands.	Hawke Halls is now mentioned and the importance of the Arts and Crafts to the Wallands is noted. Paragraph A.40.
		Amend timeline to acknowledge the extension of the Lewes Conservation Area c. 1992 to include The Wallands.	Amended. Summary of Historic Development Timeline.
		Plans to introduce a relief road along East Street in the 1970s were important to the development of the town.	<b>No action taken.</b> Captured in Paragraph A.42.

### Conservation Area Character Appraisal

<b>Character Appraisal</b>	9 no. local residents,	The Southover Manor Estate/Cluny Street development reflects Lewes' history.	<b>No action taken.</b> Of limited interest in the context of the Conservation Area as a whole. Mentioned in the Southover Character Area Appraisal.
----------------------------	------------------------	--	--

<p>2 no. County/Town Councillors, Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group, Lewes Town Council, Lewes District Council, Historic England</p>	<p>Lewes' rural setting has been undermined by recent developments.</p>	<p><b>No action taken.</b> Despite some change in the setting of the town long views to the rural Downs and Lewes Brooks beyond the town remain a key element of the town's special interest.</p>
	<p>Lewes does not have a role serving local settlements.</p>	<p><b>No action taken.</b> The reference to Lewes serving surrounding rural settlements refers to its historic prominence as a local market town.</p>
	<p>More emphasis should be placed on the influence of topography to the town's historic development and how it impacts views in the town and the visibility of the backs of buildings. A map of topography would help to illustrate this.</p>	<p>Topography section amended in response to these comments, with new LiDAR mapping provided to better illustrate the topography of Lewes. Paragraph 4.3-4.6, Figs. 20 &amp; 21.</p>
	<p>The interest in environmentalism in Lewes should be added.</p>	<p><b>No action taken.</b> Limited relevance to the character of Lewes Conservation Area as a whole.</p>
	<p>The section is overly focused on historical characteristics, which may need to change to accommodate building upgrades in response to climate change. Buildings where more substantial changes could be made should be identified.</p>	<p><b>No action taken.</b> Historical characteristics are central to the special interest of the Conservation Area. Further guidance on climate change-related adaptations has been added to Managing Change.</p>
	<p>More information on building uses, materials, architectural features and views should be provided.</p>	<p>Section overhauled to provided significantly more information on the character of the Conservation Area. Section 4.</p>

		<p>A closer definition of Lewes's setting is necessary as this significantly impacts the Conservation Area.</p>	<p><b>No action taken.</b> Whilst the description offered is not exhaustive it presently captures the key facets of the Conservation Area's setting.</p>
		<p>The industrial character of the town is not adequately captured.</p>	<p>Industrial buildings are now specifically included in the Character Assessment. Paragraph 4.41 and 4.100.</p>
		<p>Boundary walls should be mentioned.</p>	<p>Additional note identifying the importance of flint boundary walls added to the materials section of the Character Appraisal. Paragraph 4.53.</p>
		<p>Key views for example have been identified in the Lewes Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Reference now made to the views in the Lewes Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph 4.129.</p>
		<p>Kinetic views are overly referenced, with too little attention placed on fixed views.</p>	<p>Kinetic views are an important feature of Lewes and are a key part of how the town is experienced as people move through it. Fixed views are elaborated on in the Key Views section of the Conservation Area Character Assessment and Character Area Assessments. Further clarification on the importance of kinetic/street views added and the sensitivity of key views to the Downs and of the Castle. Paragraph 4.130-4.132.</p>
		<p>The contribution, location and sensitivity of key views to and from landmark buildings and landscape features should be included.</p>	<p>The importance of the landmark buildings and landscape features is presently noted in the Character Area Appraisal and views within character areas are mapped and</p>

			identified in the Character Area Appraisals. The sensitivity of views to the Castle and Downs is now noted. Paragraph 4.134 and 4.136.
		In the important views' sections, views along the river and from the bridge should be included.	<b>No action taken.</b> The importance of the river is established in the Riverside Setting section of the Character Assessment, and views are identified in the relevant Character Area Appraisals.
		More buildings should be identified as landmark buildings: Lewes House, High Street St Michael's Church, High Street All Saints Centre, Friars' Walk Shelley's Hotel Anne of Cleves House	St Michael's Church and the All-Saints Centre are now identified as landmark buildings. Lewes House, Shelley's Hotel and the Anne of Cleves House are identified as focal buildings in their respective areas but lack the townscape prominence to be landmarks in the context of the Conservation Area as a whole. Paragraph 4.132 and 4.152.
		Add reference to the designer of war memorial.	Amended. Paragraph 4.139.
		Amend to remove reference to Lewes Prior Park as a Lewes Priory Gardens.	Amended. Paragraph 4.106.
		Amend to reflect the multi-phase nature of the town hall's development.	Amended. Paragraph 4.141.
		Lewes District Council have now vacated Southover House.	Amended. Paragraph 4.30.
		Baxter's Field and the Paddock are two green spaces separated by a pony paddock.	Map amended to distinguish between Baxter's Field and the Paddock as two



			discrete areas of public open space. Figure 86.
		The Battle of Lewes probably extended beyond the area mapped in the plan showing the 1264 Battle of Lewes Registered Battlefield.	<b>No action taken.</b> Paragraph 4.14 refers to the Battle of Lewes Registered Battlefield, rather than the historic site of the battle. The Registered Battlefield is a designated heritage asset, the boundary of which has been established by Historic England.
		The subdivision of Lewes, Southover and Cliffe into a number of discrete parishes could be drawn out.	The distribution of the parishes is better represented in this section and the History section has been amended to refer to the historic parishes. Paragraphs 3.11 and 3.21.
		The medieval character of many buildings in the Conservation Area, apparent in the Lewes Neighbourhood Plan is not evident in the character appraisal.	Document updated to better align with the Lewes Neighbourhood Plan and significantly greater emphasis given in the Materials and Architectural Details sections on medieval buildings and their extensive survival in the town. Paragraph 4.47 and 4.75.
		Division of schools between different parishes should be mentioned.	Amended to provide a reference to the former parochial education system in Lewes. Paragraph 4.38.
		Importance of clay tiles to medieval and Arts and Crafts buildings should be further highlighted.	Greater emphasis placed on the character and nature of roofs in the Character Assessment. Paragraphs 4.69-4.72.

		Shallow roof pitches and broader frontages key to why late 20 <sup>th</sup> century buildings do not sit well within the streetscape.	Amended to highlight the impact of broader frontages and deeper plans. Paragraph 4.104.
		Late 19 <sup>th</sup> and early 20 <sup>th</sup> century villas and larger houses reflect the increasing middle-class prosperity, with people locating away from the industrialised Ouse Valley.	Comment added to reflect this move in the History section. Paragraph 3.22.
		Mention should be made of the Wallands inclusion in the Conservation Area being targeted towards preserving its tree-lined streets and large plots.	Incorporated into the Wallands Character Area Appraisal. Paragraph 4.108 and 5.364.
		The Local Plan seeks to improve access to the River Ouse. At present it is largely inaccessible.	Amended to mention lack of public space along the riverside with further updates to the Managing Change section, flagging the desirability of introducing new riverside public realm. Paragraph 4.109.
		Reference could be made to the need to preserve historic paving treatments and gutter. Further information about historic paving should be provided.	Amended to provide further information on historic paving and street surfaces. Paragraphs 4.110-4.119.
		Article 4 protection for the local foundry made iron street furniture (manholes, drainage covers and storm overflows) could be suggested.	Street Furniture does not have PD rights. It is presently noted that they are important and contribute to character of the Conservation Area. As such, their preservation should be accounted for in planning decisions.
		Mention softer yellow LED lighting.	Amended to highlight improvement relating to use of softer yellow LED lighting. Paragraph 4.124.

		The Ouse is a natural system not a ‘feature’– architectural terminology is not suitable to describe it.	<b>No action taken.</b> The term feature is used to refer to the distinctive quality of the Ouse as it relates to the Conservation Area.
		The photo on page 56 (NB assume pg. 57) shows wrongly blocked access to the river and the detrimental impact of unsympathetic development on the river.	A note has been added about the lack of public access to the banks of the Ouse in the Trees and Open Space section. The relevant area is identified as an Area for Enhancement in the Lower High Street Character Area Appraisal. Paragraph 4.109.

### Character area appraisals

<b>Cliffe</b>	3 no. local residents, Lewes Town Council, Lewes District Council	Points to add or amend in the Cliffe Character Area included: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cliffe’s strong riverine history should be emphasised.</li> <li>2. Cliffe had its own commissioners who set the south side of Cliffe High Street back to widen the roadway.</li> <li>3. Car parks should not be allowed on riverbanks and should be targeted for amenity and cultural use and the public realm improved generally.</li> <li>4. The shop fronts and ancient buildings are key to the area’s character.</li> <li>5. Heavy traffic along Chapel Hill is detrimental to buildings and historic surfacing.</li> <li>6. Modern buildings built in the Conservation Area along the Ouse highlight issues which enforcing planning control in the Conservation Area.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further emphasis placed on Cliffe’s location on a former flood plain, and the need to drain the land in the medieval period. Paragraph 5.4.</li> <li>2. Further emphasis placed on the role and impact of the Paving Commission. Paragraph 5.6.</li> <li>3. Statement added about introducing public realm along the riverbanks. The poor quality of the public realm elsewhere in Cliffe is already identified. Paragraph 5.58.</li> <li>4. <b>No action taken.</b> Their importance is already identified in the Character Area Appraisal. Paragraph 5.53.</li> <li>5. <b>No action taken.</b> The detrimental impact of traffic on</li> </ol>
---------------	---	---	--

			<p>Chapel Hill is already identified. Paragraph 5.64.</p> <p>6. <b>No action taken.</b> The Character Area Appraisal seeks to inform planning decisions by unpicking the character of Cliffe, which can be used to inform development proposals.</p>
<p><b>Lower High Street</b></p>	<p>2 no. local residents, 1 no. Town/County Councillor, 2. no agents</p>	<p>Points to add or amend in the Lower High Street Character Area included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The public toilets by the Depot are a prominent eyesore.</li> <li>2. The streets are not cleaned regularly and rubbish bins are a prominent feature.</li> <li>3. Congestion is a major issue in the area.</li> <li>4. Poor maintenance and inappropriate repairs to historic surface finishes.</li> <li>5. Improvements to the Precinct’s public realm and rear of the Precinct buildings could be made.</li> <li>6. Pedestrian movement between the Station and High Street should be improved.</li> <li>7. The Bus Station should be considered an Area for Enhancement alongside the Garages as no justification was offered for the change from a detracting area to a neutral area from the prior appraisal.</li> <li>8. A new key view is identified looking east over an area of car parking from Albion Street.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Issues and opportunities amended to refer to the toilets which are in the Southover Character Rea. Paragraph 5.444.</li> <li>2. Note added to Issues and Opportunities about relocating bins off pavements. Paragraph 5.131.</li> <li>3. Note added about the detrimental impact on congestion in Issues and Opportunities. Paragraph 5.134.</li> <li>4. Note added about the importance of good maintenance and repair in Issues and Opportunities. Paragraph 5.128.</li> <li>5. The desirability of these improvements is now noted. Paragraph 5.135.</li> <li>6. <b>No action taken.</b> Access along Friars’ Walk is good.</li> <li>7. Amended to reflect the prior appraisal given the site’s presently detracting character. Figure on pg. 70.</li> <li>8. This key view was established in the prior Conservation Area</li> </ol>

			Appraisal (see map I of the Lower High Street Character Area) and is an important gap providing a view of the Downs. New view added along East Street to reflect the importance of this view. Figure on pg. 70.
<b>Middle High Street</b>	4 no. local residents,  Lewes Conservation Area Appraisal Group,  Lewes Town Council	Points to add or amend in the Middle High Street Character Area included:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The walled character of the area, the importance of twittens, and the castle’s impact on the street pattern should be further emphasised.</li> <li>2. Buildings in the area are grander, some occupying large plots. Often buildings conceal older fabric.</li> <li>3. Should comment on long views of the Castle.</li> <li>4. Congestion, empty buildings, and ill-repaired buildings (especially the Crown Court) should be identified.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Importance of town, castle and twittens walls noted. Impact of the castle on the lack of twittens to the north of the area is noted. Paragraph 5.154 and 5.155.</li> <li>2. <b>No action taken.</b> Presently captured in the appraisal. Paragraph 5.159.</li> <li>3. Importance of the Castle has been articulated in more detail. Paragraph 5.188.</li> <li>4. <b>No action taken.</b> All three factors are presently captured in the Issues and Opportunities section, although the Crown Court is not individually identified.</li> </ol>
<b>Upper High Street and Western Road</b>	3 no. local residents,  1 no. Town/County Councillor,  Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group,	Points to add or amend in the Upper High and Western Road Street Character Area included:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The boundary of the Character Area should be moved west to St Anne’s Church to create a more homogenous character area.</li> <li>2. All of the High Street should form part of the same Character Area as Lewes is a linear town.</li> <li>3. South side of Grange Road should be in the Upper High Street and Western Road Character Area.</li> <li>4. Shelley’s Hotel should be mentioned.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>No action taken.</b> The boundary is located along Eastgate Street to follow the line of the town walls. Furthermore, the character along the section of the High Street between the Bottleneck and St Anne’s has a distinct character compared to the High Street to the east – more open and historic residential character.</li> </ol>

	<p>Lewes Town Council</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The future of the East Sussex County Offices and Astley House is important to the character area.</li> <li>6. Flint walls have been falling down due to bad weather, and heritage assets in the area should be audited to check condition.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <b>No action taken.</b> The character of the High Street varies significantly – breaking it down into different areas allows for a better identification of these differences.</li> <li>3. <b>No action taken.</b> The south side of Grange Road is much more similar to the terraces in Southover, whilst the north side is more similar in building type and plot size to the villas along Rotten Row to the north.</li> <li>4. Shelley’s Hotel has been given greater prominence in the document as a whole, and the need to bring it back into use is flagged in the Issues and Opportunities section. Figure on pg. 83, Paragraph 5.258.</li> <li>5. <b>No action taken.</b> The Astley House development is flagged in the Managing Change section. Paragraph 6.62.</li> <li>6. <b>No action taken.</b> Beyond the scope of the document.</li> </ol>
<p><b>The Pells and East Street</b></p>	<p>1 no. Town/County Councillor,  Lewes Conservation Area Appraisal Group,</p>	<p>Points to add or amend in the Upper High and Western Road Street Character Area included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The industrial use of the waterways in the Pells and the area’s industrial associations have been missed.</li> <li>2. Should mention the history of Lewes Little Theatre.</li> <li>3. The Celtic, Romano-British and Saxon origins of the Pells area have been omitted, as has its 18th century history.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amended to refer to the former papermill on the Papermill Cut and the role of industry in the development of the Pells. Paragraph 5.272.</li> <li>2. Lewes Little Theatre added to the summary history. Paragraph 5.276.</li> </ol>

	Lewes Town Council	4. The Pells became a key area for recreation in the Victorian period due to piecemeal grants and gifts.	<p>3. Summary history amended to provide further information about the development of the area. Paragraph 5.266 and 5.267.</p> <p>4. Gradual change to the open space better captured in the updated summary history. Paragraph 5.273.</p>
<b>The Wallands</b>	1 no. Town/County Councillor, Lewes Conservation Area Appraisal Group, Lewes Town Council	<p>Points to add or amend in the Wallands Character Area included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wallands Park Rise should remain in the Conservation Area.</li> <li>2. The specific character of the Arts and Crafts buildings in the Wallands is not captured, especially in the case of clay tiled roofs.</li> <li>3. The Abergavenny Estate and parts of the Nevill Estate could be included, given County Hall is included in the Conservation Area.</li> <li>4. Further advice should be given about what changes can be made to buildings like the houses in the Wallands to extend or alter them to improve their environmental performance.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wallands Park Rise is to be retained in the Conservation Area.</li> <li>2. Further clarity on the roofs in the Wallands has been provided and the specific details which make Arts and Crafts buildings of interest are identified in the Character Assessment for the Conservation Area. Paragraph 5.357.</li> <li>3. <b>No action taken.</b> County Hall was added to Conservation Area in 2012, along with the very important open space of Lewes Cemetery to the west. The Abergavenny Estate and Nevill Estate are considered to lack the necessary architectural and historic interest to be included in the Conservation Area.</li> <li>4. <b>No action taken.</b> Further guidance has been provided for applicants, agents and planners in the Managing Change Section.</li> </ol>
<b>Southover</b>	19 no. local residents,	Points to add or amend in the Southover Character Area included:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted, and further clarity given in the history section, where the</li> </ol>

	<p>I no. Town/County Councillor, Lewes Conservation Area Appraisal Group, Lewes Town Council</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lewes Station dates to the 1889 – it is the third station to be built in Lewes.</li> <li>2. There is no building called Priory Lodge on Southover High Street.</li> <li>3. HGV traffic is causing damage to historic buildings at the western end of Southover High Street.</li> <li>4. The Southover Manor Estate development and former Verrall’s Malthouse should be mentioned.</li> <li>5. St John the Baptist Church in Southover was not the chapel to a hospitium but the hospitium.</li> <li>6. Only the chancel of the chapel to St James’s Hospital survives.</li> <li>7. Southover was an important stop of pilgrimage routes. The Priory and its associated buildings were key to the development of Southover.</li> <li>8. Remove reference to ‘supposed’ 11<sup>th</sup> century foundation of Lewes Priory.</li> <li>9. Mention both Southover School and Western Road School, and Southdown Sports Club and Convent Field. Amend name of Lewes Priory Park from Lewes Priory Gardens.</li> <li>10. Include Southover Grange as a focal building.</li> <li>11. Southover Manor should be mentioned.</li> <li>12. Better description needed of the memorial to the Battle of Lewes in Lewes Priory Park.</li> <li>13. The Mound/Mount is not referred to as the Calvary.</li> <li>14. Where medieval buildings have been refronted this is presented negatively in the character area appraisal.</li> <li>15. Priory Street and Priory Crescent were built in the second half of the 19th century, not the first.</li> <li>16. Lewes Priory was not converted into a manor house after the Dissolution of the Monasteries.</li> </ol>	<p>station’s development is covered. Paragraph A37 - A38.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <b>No action taken.</b> Priory Lodge is located between No. 20 and the Rectory on Southover High Street.</li> <li>3. Flagged in Issues and Opportunities and the Managing Change section. Paragraph 5.446 and 6.159.</li> <li>4. Adjusted to mention the development and malthouse. Paragraphs 5.384 and 5.386.</li> <li>5. Amended. Paragraph 5.379.</li> <li>6. Amended. Paragraph 5.380.</li> <li>7. Amended to reflect the importance of the Priory in leading development, and the role of Lewes Priory on pilgrimage routes. Paragraph 5.379.</li> <li>8. Amended. Paragraph 5.379.</li> <li>9. Amended to include both schools and sports grounds. Paragraphs 4.401 and 5.426.</li> <li>10. Amended. Figure on pg. 102.</li> <li>11. Southover Manor’s construction by the Verralls is now noted in the summary history. Paragraph 5.384.</li> <li>12. Amended to provide more detail about the sculpture. Paragraph 5.428.</li> <li>13. Amended to refer to it as the Mount throughout. Referred to as the Calvary on the town map of 1775.</li> </ol>
--	--	---	--



			<p>14. Altered to more explicitly highlight why the refronting of buildings is a central part of the character area's interest. Paragraph 5.388.</p> <p>15. <b>No action taken.</b> Date taken from Harris' Historic Character Assessment Report of Lewes. Priory Crescent was begun in 1835.</p> <p>16. Amended to refer to the Priory's conversion to a residence post-Dissolution (see for example Paul Everson's 'Lewes Priory, Sussex: The post-Dissolution mansion and gardens of Lords Place' for English Heritage.) Paragraph 5.382.</p>
--	--	--	--

### Changes to character area boundaries

<p><b>Changes to character area boundaries</b></p>	<p>7 no. local residents, 1 no. Town/County Councillor, Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group, Lewes Town Council</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Twittens are not included – focuses presently on streets not areas.</li> <li>2. New character area including the Station, Pinwell Road, Station Road, and the Depot.</li> <li>3. Retain the gardens and buildings in the Southover Manor Estate in the Southover Character Area and Conservation Area.</li> <li>4. Create a new character area associated with the floodplain along the Ouse.</li> <li>5. The boundary of the Character Area should be moved west to St Anne's Church to create a more homogenous character area.</li> <li>6. The Conservation Area has been too subdivided.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>No action taken.</b> Twittens are identified in the character areas they are evident in. Character areas cover streets, built forms and areas at present.</li> <li>2. <b>No action taken.</b> Further subdivision not deemed necessary. Station Road has much in common with Fisher Street/Market Street to the north. Pinwell Road isn't in the Conservation Area.</li> <li>3. <b>No action taken.</b> The Southover Manor Estate is to be retained in the Conservation Area and Southover Character Area.</li> <li>4. <b>No action taken.</b> Cliffe and Lewes High Streets have differing</li> </ol>
--	--	---	--

			<p>characters and historically formed part of two separate jurisdictions. Separating the two allows a greater appreciation of this division.</p> <p>5. <b>No action taken.</b> The boundary is located along Eastgate Street to follow the line of the town walls. Furthermore, the character along the section of the High Street between the Bottleneck and St Anne’s has a distinct character compared to the High Street to the east – more open and historic residential character.</p> <p>6. <b>No action taken.</b> The Character Areas seek to draw out the different features that make each area distinctive. This is in line with best practise published by Historic England.</p>
<b>Managing change</b>	Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group,  Lewes Town Council	The CAAMP has neglected much of the guidance and policies within the Lewes Neighbourhood Plan, an approved development plan document.	Guidance and policies within the Neighbourhood Plan have now been better integrated into the CAAMP with clear references made to specific policies in Section 6 Paragraphs 6.70, 6.119, 6.153 and 6.168.
<b>Managing change</b>		<p>Errors or clarifications relating to Management Recommendations 2, 5 and 7.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “02 Proposals for extension, alteration and new development should preserve or enhance the special interest of the Conservation Area, or where the public benefits would outweigh any harm.” - meaning?</li> <li>2. Remove recommendation 7 from the Traffic, Parking and Connectivity section. Not appropriate in this section and</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Error in recommendation 2 amended Paragraph 6.15.</li> <li>2. Recommendation 7 retained but tweaked to accommodate for areas as well as buildings to cover car parks/ street car parking Paragraph 6.15.</li> </ol>

		<p>repeat from previous section - include recs on traffic/parking.</p> <p>3. “Development within the setting of the Conservation Area should ensure the green and rural nature of the setting, which contributes to its special interest, is maintained.” - definition of setting in spatial terms required.</p>	<p>3. Setting defined within recommendation 5 Paragraph 6.15, recommendation 4 similarly clarified Paragraph 6.15.</p>
<b>Managing change</b>	<p>2 no. local residents, Lewes District Council</p>	<p>Comments relating to Theme 1 Maintenance, Repair and Alteration of Buildings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need practical advice on building care</li> <li>2. Lack of maintenance and repair of buildings major issue in Conservation Area – serious deterioration of prominent buildings (eg Shelleys hotel).</li> </ol>	<p><b>No action taken.</b> Practical information and guidance relating to maintenance and repair of buildings is already set out in Section 6, Theme 1: Maintenance, Repair and Alteration of Buildings.</p> <p>This includes general advice, Historic England guidance, particular issues/ opportunities and recommendations.</p>
<b>Managing change</b>	<p>1 no. local resident, Lewes District Council</p>	<p>Comments relating to Theme 3 New Development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New developments should respect remarks made on detracting buildings.</li> <li>2. Reference SDNPA guidance for heritage statements.</li> <li>3. Use of traditional materials</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New Development now moved to follow Detracting Buildings and Areas owing to the link between these themes – as opportunities arise to replace detracting buildings or area there is potential for sensitive new development. Paragraph 6.58-6.64.</li> <li>2. Noted and included within Theme 7 New Development Paragraph 6.71.</li> <li>3. Noted in Opportunities, Theme 6 Paragraph 6.135.</li> </ol>
<b>Managing change</b>	<p>Local resident</p>	<p>Comments relating to Theme 5 Open Spaces, Public Realm and Interpretation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Street name boards</li> <li>2. Include discussion of visual interpretative provision.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Presumably this refers to street name signage, whether fixed to elevations or freestanding. The section on public realm within Section 6 refers to inconsistency in road signage and a further opportunity has been added to</li> </ol>

			<p>the Opportunities section to introduce more cohesive signage as opportunities arise. Paragraphs 6.107 and 6.116.</p> <p>2. Added note about the potential for digital interpretation in the future. Paragraph 6.116.</p>
<p><b>Managing change</b></p>	<p>9 no. residents, 2 no. Councillors, Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group, Lewes Town Council, Friends of Lewes, Lewes District Council</p>	<p>Many comments relating to Theme 6 Sustainable Development and Climate Change and the need to address climate change and retrofitting in a greater level of detail considering the climate emergency:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scope not ambitious enough considering SDNPA's commitment to tackling the climate emergency.</li> <li>2. Should explore retrofittable energy improvements that enhance thermal efficiency and respect historic built fabric.</li> <li>3. Should give property owners practical, readily available, consistency advice, what is and is not acceptable.</li> <li>4. Guidance/ advice needed on replacing single glazing with double, secondary glazing, solar panels, solar tiles, air source heat pumps, ground source heat pumps.</li> <li>5. Critique of Article 4 meaning planning permission needed for solar panels.</li> <li>6. More information needed on the negatives of uPVC.</li> <li>7. Should reference all relevant Historic England guidance relating to energy efficiency/ historic buildings.</li> <li>8. Should draw on best practice guidance, other LPA's guidance on energy efficiency and ACAN's Conservation Area Toolkit.</li> <li>9. Other elements need more consideration for example: encouraging walking, cycling (routes,</li> </ol>	<p>The Management Plan, specifically Theme 6 Sustainable Development and Climate Change, has been considerably expanded to include more information, advice and guidance on measures to enhance energy efficiency within dwellings and the CA more widely. Paragraphs 6.120-6.152.</p> <p>This includes changes/ upgrades to windows, solar panels, other renewables such as heat pumps, changes to the public realm including EV charging points and the incorporation of SUDS in new development. Further information relating to encouraging and catering for walking and cycling also included. More detail provided on the negatives and carbon cost of uPVC windows/ doors. Where consents are likely to be needed this is included.</p> <p>An approach to responsible retrofit, with accompanying diagrams, is provided to give clear, digestible guidance to home and business owners on energy improvements within the context of the holistic 'whole building approach'.</p> <p>The section gathers the most useful best practice guidance as a source for further</p>

		<p>facilities, bike storage and shelters), promoting biodiversity/ tree planting, support on EV charging points, introduction of SUDS into new development.</p>	<p>reference including Historic England guidance and advice notes and advice provided by SPAB and Building Conservation. Other LPA CAAMPs and guidance on energy efficiency have also been referred to.</p>
--	--	---	---

## General comments

<p><b>General comments</b></p>	<p>10. no local residents, Lewes Conservation Area Advisory Group, Lewes Town Council, Lewes District Council, Historic England</p>	<p>General comments raised included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The consultation was not publicised sufficiently and too short.</li> <li>2. The Conservation Area Advisory Group was not consulted or mentioned in the document.</li> <li>3. Greater accountability for turning opportunities into actions is desired.</li> <li>4. The document should identify its end users more clearly.</li> <li>5. The CAAMP is too long and breaks the town up too greatly.</li> <li>6. The document is hard to read on a phone or tablet. The accessibility of the document should be improved.</li> <li>7. Add captions to the photos at the start of each section.</li> <li>8. The date when photos were taken should be added.</li> <li>9. The Issues and Opportunities sections are repetitious.</li> <li>10. Mapping of building uses, materials and massing, street or plot layouts, building widths and proportions, roof pitches, etc should be provided.</li> <li>11. Images appear to be unrelated to text.</li> <li>12. Positive contributors to the Conservation Area should be tabulated and information about their positive contribution provided.</li> <li>13. Negative contributors to the Conservation Area should be identified.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The consultation ran for 10 weeks, over and above the usual 6 weeks that the SDNPA usually consult on CAAMPs for. An exhibition and drop-in sessions were both advertised on posters and social media. Further information about the consultation process can be seen at paragraphs 1.15-1.21.</li> <li>2. This is inaccurate. An email was sent directly to the Chair of the CAAG and two members attended one of the drop-in sessions. CAAG's valuable contribution to the consultation of the document is now reflected in Paragraph 1.20.</li> <li>3. The CAAMP shall be circulated to ensure relevant bodies are aware of its objectives.</li> <li>4. Addressed in the much-expanded Managing Change section.</li> <li>5. <b>No action taken.</b> Lewes is a complex town, with a varied character and rich history. The sections the CAAMP is divided into are established in Historic England's best practise guidance.</li> </ol>
--------------------------------	---	--	---

		<p>14. The SDNPA should resume discussions with East Sussex Highways Authority regarding traffic management, outline its allocation of planning resources within Lewes, and engage with local amenity groups.</p>	<p>6. The document can be printed at A4 and is readable in format. Other planning documents, like the Local Plan and Design Guide are A3 landscape documents. This forms part of that suite. To improve readability and accessibility changes to the font style, size and formatting have been made.</p> <p>7. Captions added.</p> <p>8. Note added at the start of the document stating when all the photos were taken.</p> <p>9. <b>No action taken.</b> The identification of common issues and opportunities within each character area, even if they are duplicating other areas serves to demonstrate the particular pressures on each area.</p> <p>10. Whilst mapping would be beneficial the scale of the exercise in an area of Lewes' size and complexity would add significantly to the length of the CAAMP document. Benefits would also be disproportionate to the extensive work involved.</p> <p>11. Longer captions added to some images to clarify connection to text.</p> <p>12. <b>No action taken.</b> Beyond the scope of this CAAMP at present but a highly useful task.</p> <p>13. <b>No action taken.</b> Detrimental areas are presently identified in the document.</p>
--	--	---	---

			14. <b>No action taken.</b> Beyond the scope of the CAAMP.
--	--	--	--

