

**Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area Appraisal
Consultation Responses**

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
1	Historic England	4. The historic development of Hurstpierpoint and its surroundings	We feel the box features are particularly engaging in drawing out areas of historic interest that are part of the area's special interest, to make the document more accessible to decision makers it might be helpful to number these and include them as a separate list of time on the contents page. We recommend using a list of bullet points or a short overarching statement at the start of this section to draw out the particular special historic interests of the conservation areas, to which the subsequent analysis provides depth and exposition.	Agree - change proposed. Box features numbered and an index added to the contents page, as suggested. A summary page listing key characteristic of each Conservation Area added towards the beginning of the document.
		15. Boundary Reviews	We have reviewed the proposed boundary changes, which we are happy to confirm we see as appropriate to the special historic or architectural interest of each area and the character or appearance that is desirable to preserve or enhance. Nevertheless we recommend reviewing this element of the document to ensure the that the areas are clearly identified as either sharing the special historic or architectural interest of the main conservation area or adding additional special historic or architectural interest that merits their inclusion.	Noted – no change proposed. It is considered that the text already adequately describes the justification for the various proposed boundary extensions in these terms.
		Page 61	It would be helpful for example to	Agree – change proposed.

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
			replace phrases such as "characterful buildings" with "buildings with architectural interest" on page 61 and elsewhere, for example, to make it very clear that these features contribute to the reasons for the area's extension.	Wording amended as appropriate.
2	Natural England	-	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Review.	<i>Noted – no change proposed.</i>
3	Iceni	15. Boundary Review	<p>It is our general view that the barn does not retain significant historical interest for inclusion, and that the character of the former agricultural building has been eroded through development to such a degree that it is no longer a sufficient candidate for inclusion in the proposed extension.</p> <p>Given that the barn has been converted and is now in residential use, there is a degradation in both its character and setting, which has shifted from an agricultural building with a maintained agricultural use (most recently as part of a riding school), to private residential accommodation. This limited interest is demonstrated by the omission of the barn as part of the initial designation, as well as the subsequent review of the</p>	<p><i>Disagree – no change proposed.</i></p> <p>Hurst Wickham Barn is one of the earliest buildings in the hamlet, marking the site of the original Wickham Farm and predating the substantial growth of the hamlet to the north.</p> <p>It is an attractive and characterful building which is prominent in views from College Lane.</p> <p>While the building has been converted into a private residence, it retains its agricultural character and features of interest including brickwork in a rat trap bond.</p> <p>This surviving character together with its prominent position contribute significantly to the southern entrance to the Conservation Area. The Barn is a key gateway feature at the transition between the more open land to the</p>

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
			Conservation Area boundary in 2010. The barn, at present, makes a limited contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which is instead characterised by dense, residential development of a domestic scale, within a semi-rural setting.	south and the hamlet of Hurst Wickham. Its inclusion will add to the special interest of the Conservation Area in including within it one of the earliest buildings in the hamlet, which has narrative value in terms of the development of Hurst Wickham, as well as being an attractive, characterful and prominent building in a key gateway position.
4	Highways England	-	We do not wish to make any comments on this consultation document, however please continue to notify us of future consultations.	<i>Noted – no change proposed.</i>
5	Southern Water	-	I can confirm that we have reviewed the document, and that we have no comments to make at this stage.	<i>Noted – no change proposed.</i>
6	Mr G. Jeffcott	9. Hurst Wickham Conservation Area	By 1873 Hurst Wickham was a much larger affair than stated above, which should have included: At least 22 dwellings <i>[listed by respondent]</i> . Most surprising of all is that The Goose House, also known as Goose Lease – Layton Villa – Two Trees & 36 College Lane, which was built in the early 1700s and plays possibly the largest part in the history of Hurst Wickham gets no mention at all.	<i>Agree – change proposed.</i> Having consulted the relevant historic maps the text of the appraisal has been amended in respect of the historical development of Hurst Wickham.
		15. Boundary Review	On the subject of changing the Hurst	<i>Disagree – no change proposed.</i>

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
			<p>Wickham boundaries, I most strongly protest to the inclusion of 16 -18 - 20 College Lane. Including these buildings into the conservation area would effectively make Hurst Wickham contiguous with Hurstpierpoint, this was a ploy used by a developer quite recently in an attempt to try and build next to the conservation area. I also object to the removal of number 82 from the conservation area. Removing the conservation protection would open up the chance of further development in the field behind.</p>	<p>16, 18 and 20 College Lane as a group address College Lane, and read as part of the hamlet of Hurst Wickham - like Hurst Wickham Barn opposite they mark the entrance into the hamlet. The development immediately to the south is of a different character and turns its back on College Lane, facing instead onto Highfield Drive- trees and hedges mask this development from view from College Lane, so that with their more open frontage 16,18 and 20 appear as the first buildings in the settlement at Hurst Wickham. This in conjunction with their architectural character (as noted in the appraisal), mean that they merit inclusion in the Conservation Area and represent a logical extension to the boundary.</p> <p>A conservation area boundary would not affect the contiguous relationship between Hurst Wickham and Hurstpierpoint in planning terms as both reside within the same built up area boundary.</p> <p>Removing 82 College Lane from the conservation area would have no effect on the chances of development in the field behind this house. The Conservation Area Appraisal is only a material consideration to planning applications.</p>

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
7	Ms J. Bonny	9. Hurst Wickham Conservation Area	The historic dates and facts contained in the CAA summary for Hurst Wickham are inaccurate and incomplete. By 1873 the Hamlet of Hurst Wickham was far more developed than the appraisal indicates.	Agree – change proposed. Having consulted the relevant historic maps the text of the appraisal has been amended in respect of the historical development of Hurst Wickham.
		15. Boundary Review	Regarding the boundary changes for Hurst Wickham, I believe Hurst Wickham Barn should be included as this clearly played an important role in the history of the Hamlet. However, I do not think 16-20 College Lane should be included as they extend beyond the twitten that 'marks' the start of Hurst Wickham on the West side and have no connection with the history of Hurst Wickham. This tiny gap still plays an integral part in separating Hurst Wickham from Hurstpierpoint.	Disagree – no change proposed. 16, 18 and 20 College Lane as a group address College Lane, and read as part of the hamlet of Hurst Wickham - like Hurst Wickham Barn opposite they mark the entrance into the hamlet. The development immediately to the south is of a different character and turns its back on College Lane, facing instead onto Highfield Drive- trees and hedges mask this development from view from College Lane, so that with their more open frontage 16,18 and 20 appear as the first buildings in the settlement at Hurst Wickham. This in conjunction with their architectural character (as noted in the appraisal), mean that they merit inclusion in the Conservation Area and represent a logical extension to the boundary. A conservation area boundary would not affect the contiguous relationship between Hurst Wickham and Hurstpierpoint in planning terms as

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
				<p>both reside within the same built up area boundary.</p> <p>Removing 82 College Lane from the conservation area would have no effect on the chances of development in the field behind this house. The Conservation Area Appraisal is only a material consideration to planning applications.</p>
8	Mr M.D. Shute	15. Boundary Review	I particularly agree that the proposed amendments to the Hurst Wickham Conservation Area.	<i>Noted – no change proposed.</i>
9	Mr J.K. Birtles	15. Boundary Review	<p>Yes I do agree with the boundary alterations to Hurst Wickham. However you should be aware that you have drawn a boundary for Hurst Wickham Barn which includes No.1 Hurst Wickham Close and the garages of Nos 1 and 2 Hurst Wickham Close. You have not clarified that point in the text. Both the Barn and its stable buildings should be included in the Conservation area. My house (2 Hurst Wickham Close) shares a boundary with the eastern block of stables. This is an original wall mainly constructed in flint interspersed with some courses of brick.</p>	<p><i>Noted – change proposed.</i></p> <p>Boundary amended to more accurately follow residential curtilages.</p>
10	Mrs C.A. Birtles	15. Boundary Review	You should explain why No.1 Hurst Wickham Close has been included. It may be necessary in order to draw	<p><i>Noted – change proposed.</i></p> <p>Boundary amended to more</p>

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
			<p>an inclusive boundary. In any event the whole curtilage of Hurst Wickham Barn including the stables needs to be included. (As you have done in the plan). These are historic farm buildings date back to the early Victorian era and display some fine Sussex brickwork (Rat trap bond) and a long section of flint work on the other side of the east stable wall.</p>	<p>accurately follow residential curtilages. The boundary is proposed to include nos. 1 and 2 Hurst Wickham Close to create a more consistent and logical boundary to the area, and to more closely reflect the historic extent of the farmyard to Hurst Wickham Farm, as well as including what may be a historic flint and brick boundary wall around the former farmyard. Including 1 Hurst Wickham Close also means that all of the street frontage onto College Lane north of Hurst Wickham Barn leading up into the hamlet would now be within the Conservation Area.</p>
		-	<p>Tighter regulation of building control to ensure that the repairs and improvements are in sympathy with the period features. The design of Street lighting columns and lights should be appropriate for the location. There should be better road signage and markings to warn motorists of the narrow section ahead in Hurst Wickham. Perhaps there should be more parking restrictions in the immediate vicinity of Hurst Wickham. This would prevent some of the jams occurring.</p>	<p><i>Noted – no change proposed.</i> These are not matters which can be addressed by the Conservation area Appraisal. No change required.</p>

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
11	Ms J. Hill	15. Boundary Review	<p>I would like consideration be given to extending the boundary south of the village to include the Allotments at the end of Pitt Lane as part of the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area. The allotments are a village amenity and have been in existence for many, many years. They were originally part of the Danny Estate, until it was sold during the 1980's.</p> <p>I think that it would be beneficial to the village in the future if these allotments were also included in the Significant Open Space area. It is vital that the southern aspect of the village be protected as there is a truly stunning view up on to Wolstonbury Hill.</p>	<p><i>Disagree – no change proposed.</i></p> <p>These allotments, which are located to the south of the recreation ground beyond Hillbrow Bungalow and the tennis courts, were in use by 1900. While they are an attractive feature of the setting of the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area and contribute positively to views along the public footpath leading up onto Pitt Lane, they share only one boundary with the existing Conservation Area and would create a protrusion from the existing fairly consistent boundary line. For the most part due to the presence of Hillbrow Bungalow they are not contiguous with the public open space of the recreation ground. They contain no buildings which it would be desirable to preserve. It is therefore considered that conservation area designation is not merited in this case, although it is suggested that the text of the appraisal relating to the setting of the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area is amended to better reflect the contribution that the allotments make to its setting. Any development proposals affecting the allotments would be considered in light of the impact on the setting of the Conservation Area.</p>

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
12	Natural England	-	Natural England does not consider that this Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Review poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	<i>Noted – no change proposed.</i>
13	Gatwick Airport	-	I can confirm that we have no comments with regard to the above mentioned document from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective.	<i>Noted – no change proposed.</i>
14	Ms D. Greer-Perry	-	We were astonished and not a little dismayed to find our property named in the consultation paper as potentially to be included in an extended conservation area without any contact with ourselves. Is this normal practice? At present we are not sure what we feel but that any implied restrictions on future alterations to our home are of concern.	<i>Noted – no change proposed.</i> Email response sent 08/05/2018. There is no legal requirement on the Council to notify individual property owners if their property is under consideration for inclusion within a Conservation Area, although if the designation is agreed a formal notification would be sent. Although certain permitted development rights will be removed by Conservation Area status, necessitating a planning application (and fee payment), that is not to say that permission will not be granted for the development provided that the proposal preserves the character and appearance of the area and meets other relevant planning requirements. Please see also the body of the report where this issue is addressed in more

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
				detail.

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
15	Mrs H. Arlidge	-	<p>The then council (2000-2002) aided the designer and builder of Trinity Court to make it a very special enclave. Everyone who comes here remarks on the design and layout and say how extremely attractive it is. Although it is still quite 'new-build' Trinity Court ought to be considered for conservation for those reasons and because the design won a prize. I hope you will add Trinity Court, Brown Twins to your conservation list. It is also adjacent to our beautiful Millennium Garden.</p>	<p><i>Partly agree – change proposed.</i></p> <p>Trinity Court was built in 1999 as a retirement complex by the developer Hillreed. It is an attractive development set in good quality mature landscaping and contributes positively to the setting of the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area. The Millennium Gardens, which wrap around Trinity Court and St George's Church to the west, north and east, are a very attractive and well used public open space, offering extensive views across the countryside to the north of Hurstpierpoint towards the College. Both Trinity Court and the Gardens occupy part of the former grounds of St George's House on Hassocks Road.</p> <p>However, although these areas are considered to contribute positively to the setting of the Conservation Area, they are not considered to merit designation at this time.</p> <p>The Appraisal has been amended to emphasise the contribution that Trinity Court and the Millennium Gardens make to the setting of the Conservation Area. Development within that setting would be considered in light of the impact on the Conservation Area.</p>

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
16	Mrs N. Boruch	-	No comment <i>[respondent is satisfied with the document, as indicated throughout the tick boxes of the consultation response form].</i>	<i>Noted – no change proposed.</i>
<i>Other Comments Received</i>				
17	Hurstpierpoint Parish Council	Page 5, Map 2 - Significant Views	Can I suggest that the blue vista markings which point North off St Georges Lane be moved further north to the junction in the hedgerow between St Georges Green and The Millenium Garden as that is where the view exists, and not from behind the wall in St Georges Lane.	<i>Agree – change proposed.</i> This map amended due to the suggested alterations to the boundary extension- see 15 above.
		Page 11	The significant houses on Hassocks Road on the North side up to and including Eastern House, and Hampton Lodge on the south side were started and probably completed in the period 1826 to 1837. So we should I believe acknowledge them as Georgian with further Victorian villas as well on Hassocks Road e.g. Photo 13 has one of each period. Many, obviously, also had further significant changes during the Victorian period and later.	<i>Agree – change proposed.</i> The annotation to Photo 13 amended.
		Page 16	Gothic House is correctly shown in Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area: Listed Buildings map as a listed building, but then it is also marked in the map titled "Non-listed buildings	<i>Agree – change proposed.</i> The relevant map amended.

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
			with local architectural and historic interest". Either the title of the latter needs to be amended or Gothic House should be greyed.	
		Page 18 - Hurstpierpoint Footpath Map	The purpose of this map is not immediately clear as it is not a map of all the significant footpaths that exist in Hurstpierpoint. I suspect it is there to show the routes into the National Park on foot. If that is its purpose then it should be retitled as such.	Agree – change proposed. The map amended to show all footpaths within the village.
		Page 24	Duplicate sentence: 'Adjacent to this is Greenock House which dates from the early 19th century and is Grade II listed.'	Agree – change proposed. Duplicate sentence removed.
		Page 43	Number 23-25 (no 25 is currently silent) was built as 2 houses around 1830 and not as one villa. We have found no evidence to date the facade was ever "Roman Cement". Whilst it is currently faced on the south and east elevations in cement of various eras and mixes, with ashlar block markings of differing quality, there is evidence to suggest that it was initially finished in lime render.	Agree – change proposed. The relevant text amended.
18	Hurstpierpoint Society	3. Location and Setting of the three Conservation Areas	The right hand column seems to lack some words before "Greensand ridge...". Just below that, Hurst Wickham does not lie to the west of the village centre but east.	Agree – change proposed. Missing text added.

Number	Respondent	Section of document	Summary of Comment	Officer Recommendation
		Photo 5	The post marks the route of the Roman Road near where it crosses New Way Lane.	Agree – change proposed.
		Page 9	"by 1660, when the feudalism was abolished" does not make historical sense to me. Feudalism had gone by the 15th century.	Agree – change proposed. Text amended.
		Page 13	"lead" should be "led".	Agree – change proposed. Text amended.
		Page 14	Hurstpierpoint at War. Should it not be Colonel Campion, not Champion?	Agree – change proposed. Text amended.
		Page 17 - map	"Principal" not Principle route	Agree – change proposed. Text amended.
		Page 23	Above photo 29. Some miss-typing starting "The inn is an important...".	Agree – change proposed. Text amended.
		Page 25	Paragraph about Greenock House is repeated.	Agree – change proposed. Repeated text removed.
		Page 45	Top of right column: principal not principle	Agree – change proposed. Text amended.
		Page 46	Photo 98 is of the old forge in Pitt Lane, not the twitten.	Agree – change proposed. Text amended.
19	MSDC	Section 5 Page 16	The draft appraisal contains a map showing unlisted buildings of local architectural and historic interest for the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, but not for either of Langton or Hurst Wickham Conservation Areas.	Agree – change proposed. Having reviewed the areas concerned a map has been added to the appraisal highlighting buildings of local architectural and historic interest in the Langton Conservation Area.

