

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

No

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

No

H2 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Positively Prepared, Justified

H2 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

The site has never been formally released from the Stanmer Estate - the Stanmer boundary wall is still visible along Coldean Lane - and yet it was described to the Planning Committee as 'formerly part of the Stanmer Estate', which was misleading.

Similarly, there is no official documentation formally releasing the land from agricultural use - it was farmed within living memory. Upon being questioned about this, the Planning Solicitor stated that 'Application ref. BN2018/03541 ... was a composite application for both operational development and change of use.' This is, to say the least, a dangerous precedent, if the Council is able to grant itself change of use for a piece of land without any official consultation or documentation.

The South Downs National Park lodged an objection to the plans for this site, on the grounds that it would be 'an inappropriate scale and density for this hillside urban fringe location within the setting of the SDNP' and said that 'it would also appear to conflict with Policy SA4 of the City Plan Part One, and with the proposed designation of the site as a Local Nature Reserve'.

Policy SA4 states that development on the urban fringe can only be permitted if a countryside location can be justified and the proposal has regard to the downland landscape setting of the city. Development of the Coldean site would indeed appear to conflict with this requirement.

H2 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

To be legally compliant and sound, the land would need to be formally released from the Stanmer Estate and from agricultural use and the planning process begun again from scratch, with proper consideration given to the objections voiced by the SDNP.

H2 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

H2 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

[Redacted]

Sent: 30 October 2020 20:37
To: PlanningPolicy
Subject: Comments regarding City Plan Part Two

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This email originates from outside of Brighton & Hove City Council. Please think carefully before opening attachments or clicking on links.

I would like to draw the Consultation's attention to this Change.org petition with over 1,500 signatures regarding the Joint Venture Housing Development planned for the site at Coldean. As far as I know, this has not been presented to the Council, so I feel it's important that these objections are included in the Consultation:

<https://www.change.org/p/planning-authority-and-council-refuse-permission-for-the-proposed-buildings-which-would-devastate-wildlife-and-green-space-at-coldean-local-wildlife-site-and-instead-please-designate-this-land-a-local-nature-reserve-and-a-local-green-space>

I would also like to draw the Consultation's attention to the following newspaper articles highlighting local opposition to the Coldean development and laying out some of the reasons for that opposition:

<https://www.brightonandhovenews.org/2020/09/30/we-must-grasp-this-last-lifeline-to-save-coldeans-green-spaces/>

<https://www.theargus.co.uk/news/18755185.residents-final-stand-save-green-land-development/>

https://www.theargus.co.uk/news/18805884.fury-council-deny-whitehawk-hill-coldean-speeches/?fbclid=IwAR1JwhYoQZZ6u1gxY9cx9q98L5YVHrp03lwTO_NN1lisGd8_aJ2oHoqBYKs

Finally I would like to add a link to the Latest TV interview with representatives from Coldean Residents' Association and Stanmer Preservation Society about the Coldean site:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?reload=9&v=KbzL3O948PE&feature=youtu.be>

I do hope you will take all of the points made in the links above into consideration.

[Redacted Signature]

Coldean Residents' Association

[REDACTED]

Sent: 30 October 2020 21:31
To: PlanningPolicy
Subject: Submission to the Consultation on City Plan Part Two

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This email originates from outside of Brighton & Hove City Council. Please think carefully before opening attachments or clicking on links.

Further to my comments in a previous email, I would also like to present to the Consultation the attached link to [REDACTED] most recent interview with Latest TV, detailing why Coldean Residents' Association and Stanmer Preservation Society believe that due process was not followed when presenting the case for the proposed housing development site at Coldean to the Planning Committee:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P96auyKxglA&feature=youtu.be>

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Coldean Residents' Association

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

No

H2 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified

H2 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

Hasn't been released from stanmer estate it's not needed it's not released from agricultural use and the planning developers were not aware of the fact it was also a change of use as well as a development

H2 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

H2 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

H2 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

No

H2 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Justified

H2 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

The site has never been formally released from Stanmer park estate and not released from agricultural use.

H2 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

H2 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

H2 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

No

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

No

(DM20) 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Justified, Consistent with National Policy

(DM20) 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

Building at Coldean is building residences in a public park. The park extended to Coldean Lane, itself only a farm track until the Council estate was constructed in 1950.

The A 27 by-pass was allowed to cut through the park as this was thought to be the best route between the town and university.

Two footbridges were installed to allow park users to cross over the road whilst underpasses of tube form were placed under the A27 road for badgers. The proposed development site was always one of the major sites for badger setts as is the Coldean Wood on the South side of the Varley Halls where a badger A27 underpass exists. Many badgers have been killed by cars on Coldean Lane which has wide lawn type verges, used for worm hunting at times of drought. Since badgers have been physically excluded from the proposed development site they are more often found in Coldean gardens.

(DM20) 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

Cancel the building of housing in the park.

(DM20) 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

(DM20) 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

DM26 Conservation Areas

(DM26) 1. Do you consider this policy is: (tick as appropriate)

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

(DM26) 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Justified, Consistent with National Policy

DM26 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

DM26 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

DM26 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

Not Answered

DM26 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

DM30 Registered Parks and Gardens

DM30 1. Do you consider this policy is: (tick as appropriate)

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

DM30 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

DM30 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

DM30 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

DM30 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

Not Answered

DM30 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

DM34 Transport Interchanges

DM34 1. Do you consider this policy is: (tick as appropriate)

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

DM34 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Justified

DM34 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

Access to the proposed site has to be on the East side of Coldean lane which currently has one into Stanmer Park, a feeder slip road onto the by-pass and access to Varley Halls, a university centre.

The proposed access is at a narrow C class road used by heavy traffic including buses. It is a steep hill. Emerging and turning right or turning right into the access road will require some form of control such as traffic lights.

Coldean Lane is an important link between the Lewes and London roads. The downtown through roads are closed off.

DM34 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

DM34 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

Not Answered

DM34 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

DM42 Protecting the Water Environment

DM42 1. Do you consider this policy is: (tick as appropriate)

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

No

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

DM42 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Justified, Consistent with National Policy

DM42 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

Brighton Corporation bought the Stanmer estate in 1947 as it was realised that the town needed the water underneath for the increasing number of residents, from under the countryside. Protection of this source of water was presumably legally documented for all time. Therefore it cannot be legally compliant to devise a policy which destroys the countryside unnecessarily, not for a highway of benefit to the city but just a residential development blotting out the rainwater catchment area.

DM42 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

No further spoiling of the water catching area of Stanmer, already seriously damaged by construction of the ever expanding University of Sussex with high demands on water and the A27 road driven right through the protected water catching parkland.

DM42 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

DM42 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

I understand it is a public hearing, open to all?

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

No

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

No

H2 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy

H2 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

The land has never been formally released from the Stanmer Estate, or from agricultural use, and the Planning Committee were misled about this, and not specifically told that the application was a 'composite application both for development and for change of use' (the explanation given to us by the Planning solicitor in retrospect).

Also the South Downs National Park's objection was not given sufficient weight - they stated that it would be 'an inappropriate scale and density for this hillside urban fringe location within the setting of the SDNP' and said that 'It would also appear to conflict with Policy SA4 of the City Plan Part One, and with the proposed designation of the site as a Local Nature Reserve. (Policy SA4 states that development on the urban fringe can only be permitted if a countryside location can be justified and the proposal has regard to the downland landscape setting of the city).

H2 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

H2 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

H2 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

No

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

No

H2 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy

H2 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

The land has never been formally released from the Stanmer Estate, or from agricultural use, and the Planning Committee were misled about this, and not specifically told that the application was a 'composite application both for development and for change of use' (the explanation given to us by the Planning solicitor in retrospect).

Also the South Downs National Park's objection was not given sufficient weight - they stated that it would be 'an inappropriate scale and density for this hillside urban fringe location within the setting of the SDNP' and said that 'It would also appear to conflict with Policy SA4 of the City Plan Part One, and with the proposed designation of the site as a Local Nature Reserve. (Policy SA4 states that development on the urban fringe can only be permitted if a countryside location can be justified and the proposal has regard to the downland landscape setting of the city).

H2 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

H2 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

H2 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

(DM7) 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

(DM7) 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

(DM7) 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

Not Answered

(DM7) 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

H2 Housing Sites – Urban Fringe

H2 Which urban fringe site(s) does your representation refer to? (Tick all that apply to your submission)

Land to north east of Coldean Lane, Land north of Varley Halls, Coldean Lane

H2 1. Do you consider this policy is: (tick as appropriate)

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

No

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

No

H2 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Justified

H2 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

H2 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

H2 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

Not Answered

H2 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

No

H2 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified

H2 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

More flats where there will be more cars and traffic in a very steep part of the area which was deemed undevelopable anyway makes no sense. The wildlife has already suffered and the air quality during development will be terrible let alone afterwards. The building will be technologically and environmentally unfit in the coming years as we work out more sustainable ways of living. The noise pollution will add to the A27 noise.

H2 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

none. Do not set this plan out

H2 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

H2 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

Response ID ANON-8ZMD-Y4AQ-2Submitted to **City Plan Part Two (Proposed Submission)**

Submitted on 2020-10-24 14:02:54

Your details

What is your name?

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation/individual, please provide the name of that organisation or individual below.

Organisation:

Please let us know if you would like to be notified of any of the following:

Notification matrix - The City Plan Part Two has been submitted for independent examination:

Yes

Notification matrix - The publication of the recommendations of the Inspector who carries out independent examination of the City Plan Part Two:

Notification matrix - The adoption of the City Plan Part Two:

Due to the process of having an Independent Examination, any information and/or responses made are not confidential. This means we need your name, or organisation name, so that the comments can be made available for the public inspection. Once your comments have been logged, all names, company names and associated comments submitted as part of the formal consultation process will be made available to view in due course on the BHCC website. BHCC will not share or publish postcodes or email addresses. BHCC will however have to pass on all contact details to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). Details of the PINS privacy policy can be seen below. Please tick to reinforce that you have read this disclaimer and have read the PINS Privacy Notice below

Yes

Date Response Submitted

Date Response Submitted:

Not Answered

DM37 Green Infrastructure and Nature Conservation

DM37 1. Do you consider this policy is: (tick as appropriate)

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

No

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

Yes

DM37 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Justified, Consistent with National Policy

DM37 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

I object to this policy because it is contrary to paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Compared to the 2005 Local Plan and earlier versions of the City Plan Part 2, protection is diminished. Including this phrase is likely to lead to the undermining of local nature reserves and important wildlife sites like Whitehawk Hill.

It would allow developments to be agreed on allocated sites which would greatly damage their integrity.

Referring to the ecology of the site as contained in the Urban Fringe assessment is not longer a viable justification as it is no longer fit for purpose and outdated

DM37 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

In the paragraph entitled 'Locally Designated Sites', the phrase

'Unless allocated for development in the City Plan'

that is situated at the beginning, should be deleted

DM37 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

DM37 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

DM38 Local Green Spaces

DM38 1. Do you consider this policy is: (tick as appropriate)

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

No

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

Yes

DM38 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy

DM38 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

Whitehawk Hill meets all the criteria to qualify as a the Local Green Spaces, as set out in Paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework and yet it has been excluded as a designated site from City Plan Part 2.

There is no evidence why some sites were selected as Local Green Spaces in the 2014 Urban Fringe Assessment, from which the City Plan 2 is derived and nothing to justify the exclusion of Whitehawk Hill.

Whitehawk Hill clearly meets the criteria set out in Paragraph 2.293 of the City Plan Part 2, as an important green wedge in the city as is claimed for the four other areas that do qualify.

Therefore it is totally unacceptable that Whitehawk Hill has not been designated and the decision is unjustifiable, unfair and not consistent with national policy

DM38 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

There is no question but that Whitehawk Hill merits inclusion in the list of Local Green Spaces. This should be changed.

DM38 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

DM38 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

H2 Housing Sites – Urban Fringe

H2 Which urban fringe site(s) does your representation refer to? (Tick all that apply to your submission)

Land at and adjoining Brighton Race Course, Land at South Downs Riding School & Reservoir Site, Land north of Warren Road (Ingleside Stables)

H2 1. Do you consider this policy is: (tick as appropriate)

Legally compliant sound - Legally Compliant:

No

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

Yes

H2 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy

H2 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

The proposal breaks up the Whitehawk Hill area which contains many sections that are habitats for rare species, many of which are listed as endangered. It is also an area defined as of Principal Importance for invertebrates such as the brown carder bee and the and. The habitat in many at risk butterflies.

No impact assessment has been made of the species specific gorse areas which are important habitats for many birds such as the Red Listed Linnet . Inaccurate description of the cha k lands as ripe for tree planting is inaccurate as this is a very important, rare area of grassland. These assessments are wrong and dangerous to rely on. As a volunteer working to restore the natural grassland, it will destroy all the work we have achieved.

The inclusion of Tenantry Down conflicts with enclosure deed. These are common lands.

It contradicts Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework

It will be detrimental to diversity and not improve it as claimed and will break up wildlife corridors and habitats

It will damage the aesthetic pleasure of this area which has been allocated over centuries for the enjoyment of people from Brighton

Local councillors are also unhappy about inclusion of this space

H2 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

The following areas should therefore be deleted area land at and adjoining Brighton Race Course, land at South Downs Riding School & Reservoir Site and area north of Warren Road (Ingleside Stables) and removed from the list of allocations in policy H2

H2 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

H2 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

Legally compliant sound - Sound:

No

Legally compliant sound - Meets the Duty to Co-Operate:

No

H2 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Consistent with National Policy

H2 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

How can these developments be consistent with national policy when the government recently announced its intention to be world leaders in environmental practises? How does that fit with bulldozing fields and woods.? How does it fit in with the ethos of a Green council such as Brighton's? Stanmer society gave the land to Brighton in good faith. So far Varley Halls has been built on it and the intention is to completely eradicate what's left of that section of the woods with two further builds

H2 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

Development should not be considered on ANY green space in Brighton, but especially not in the realms of a national park

H2 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

H2 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

Do not wish to participate

SA7 2. If you consider the policy to be unsound is it because it is not: (tick as appropriate)

Positively Prepared, Effective, Justified, Consistent with National Policy

SA7 3. If you consider the policy is not legally compliant or is unsound, please give details in the box below. Please be as precise as possible. If you support the policy and feel it is sound and/or legally compliant, please also use the box below to set out your comments.

response box for legal compliance, soundness and duty to cooperate:

I am contesting the development of Benfield Valley as outlined in section 3.6 of the plan document and refer to section 5.6 in the Sustainability Appraisal document for CPP2.

The most problematic part of this is that, as outlined in section 5.6 of the Sustainability Appraisal, there are a number of aspects that are deemed to have a 'significant adverse impact' on the local wildlife and area that have been skirted over.

In my eyes, having read the Sustainability Appraisal as it applies to Benfield Valley, section 5.6 of the CPP2 Sustainability Appraisal does not go far enough to recognise the value of this space. I will go through the main issues here. Firstly, it cites that,

'Although the policy was found to have potential for adverse effects for biodiversity in the short term, it was found to have positive effects for biodiversity and open space in the longer term, as whilst the policy supports housing delivery on two parts of the site, the policy was found to have overall benefits these objectives, as it seeks to secure funding to protect and enhance the remainder of the site for nature conservation and open space purposes. It is also noted that the areas for development have been assessed as having lower ecological value than other parts of the site which should help to minimise ecological losses.'

No local conservation group or Ecologist not driven by financial gain would agree that any of this statement is true and I cannot understand how something so counter-intuitive could end up in an official document such as the CPP2 - why do we need to build on this space in order for it to have value and deserve protection and therefore access to funding? Allowing my true feelings to show now, I am incensed by the final sentence of this paragraph in particular. No area in a space like Benfield Valley is of 'lower ecological value' and I would appreciate the evidence for this being presented to the local community conservation and wildlife groups.

In the natural world, every space has value. Whether it's the fungi that grows on the woodland floor and nourishes the earth through its mycelium, or the foraging and living space that it provides for local wildlife such as the now threatened hedgehog,

rare Wasp Spiders,

Common Lizards, which are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 and are priority Species under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework (see video and highlighted images),

red Foxes,

butterflies of many species including the Common Blue and Red Admiral, Adders, Lime Hawkmoths, Buff Ermine Moths, Peach Blossom moths, Swallow-tail Moths, Buff Arches moths and Buff-Tip moths (please see link of evidence for images and videos of each of these sightings in the accompanying document, all taken by local residents and community groups from in and around the areas marked for development),

as well as the homes that the canopies of the trees in this area provide for local birds such as

robins,

sparrows,

skylarks,

blackbirds,

blue tits (to name just a few!)

and also our community of climate-indicators, Pipistrel bats.

If this space is seen as having 'lower ecological value' it is only because it has not been properly managed or cared for: paths have not been maintained, rubbish has not been cleared, tree canopies have not been tended to so as to provide more light to the woodland floor and encourage further growth and biodiversity. Why the council feels it could only do this if the land were to be 'developed' (and I use that term ironically), as mentioned in the Sustainability Appraisal, is anyone's guess.

The Impact on Mental Health

To continue on from the Sustainability Appraisal,

'Delivery of housing, particularly affordable housing can help reduce housing-based deprivation and also contributes towards economic growth. The policy was found to have potential for significant adverse impact for landscape in the short term, although impacts should improve over time, as the areas of the site suitable for housing have been assessed as having potential for significant landscape effect¹²⁰ based on a lower amount than proposed in the policy and therefore a higher amount could have a greater significant landscape effect particularly in the short term whilst any screening mitigation is ineffective. Impacts become less significantly adverse in the longer term as mitigation becomes more effective.'

The irony here is that working class people, ethnic minorities (who are statistically more likely to face socioeconomic disadvantage), and those facing 'housing-based deprivation' (if we are talking about housing deprivation in this sense and not in the 'let's-get-as-many-people-onto-the-property-ladder-as-possible-and-make-as-much-money-as-we-can' sense) are those most likely to suffer the long term mental health effects of a lack of good quality, accessible green space (and this does not include sports pitches) as those lower income households are more likely to live in urban areas, which generally have with less uninterrupted green space.

A 2014 OECD report based on the results of a project conducted 2010-2013 states that, 'what we do know about living in cities is that it increases our risk of mental health problems...(and that)...cities have both health risks and benefits (such as accessible health care and social support), but mood and anxiety disorders are more prevalent in city-dwellers and the incidence of schizophrenia is much higher in people born and raised in cities.'

Studies prove that the human brain needs natural biodiversity for so many reasons. US researcher, Richard Taylor and his team, found that natural shapes and repeated patterns in nature (known as fractals) prompt the alpha and beta waves in the brain, suggesting a 'relaxed but focused state' when out in good quality green spaces. This was supported by recent study by the University of Derby, which demonstrates a greater level of activity in the parasympathetic nervous system when in a natural setting. The parasympathetic system is also known as the 'relax and restore' system and is the state that humans need to be in in order to feel and be well, rather than in the sympathetic nervous system, which prompts the 'fight or flight' response in the brain, raising levels of adrenaline and cortisol in the blood, thereby depressing the immune system and causing physical and mental health problems.

An OECD report in 2019 reported that the NHS spends approximately £94billion (give or take a pound or two!) per year on mental health conditions; if something as simple as natural green spaces can help and actually improve the mental health of human beings, eventually saving the council and NHS money, then why get rid of them at such a rate?

Moreover, thanks to the law of Trespass, 92% of land in the England is privately owned, meaning that unless you are privileged enough to call an expanse of green space your back garden, you only will have access to 8% of good quality green space in England. We must hold onto to whatever spaces we have with both arms, not sell it off to the highest bidder who cares for nothing but profit at the expense of public health.

The Last 1% of Chalkland in the South Downs is Here...

Alongside this, the suggestion here if we look at the second sentence is that we are better off with these plans because '...based on a lower amount than proposed in the policy and therefore a higher amount could have a greater significant landscape effect particularly in the short term whilst any screening mitigation is ineffective. Impacts become less significantly adverse in the longer term as mitigation becomes more effective.' My argument would be that no section of the Valley should be built on - be that 100 dwellings or more - due to its ecological value. The whole of the Valley is part of the last 1% of chalkland (known as a priority habitat) that we have in the South Downs. From the National Trust website,

'Wildflower meadows on chalk downland are sometimes called Europe's tropical rainforest. They're home to an incredibly rich and diverse range of plant and insect life...Up to 40 species of flowering plants can be found in one square metre of chalk grassland – also called lowland calcareous grassland. Many species grow nowhere else, including many beautiful orchids and wildflowers. In turn, they attract many insects and rare butterflies such as the Adonis Blue and Duke of Burgundy...Lime-rich, but low in nutrients, the thin soil holds little water and heats up quickly. These stressed conditions stop the dominant lush grasses from taking over. This allows a diverse range of smaller herbs and lower plants to flourish.'

Anyone who has walked from the bottom end of the Benfield Valley all the way to the top at the South of the A27 on a Summer's day will know this to be true. Attached are images of just a few of the species to be found on the section of land marked for development and include Pleated Inkcap, Spindle, Hawthorn, Apple tree, Blackthorn/Sloe berries, Agrimony, Ribbed Melilot, Common Mallow, Old Man's Beard, Clover, Wild Carrot, Creeping Thistle, Yarrow and Teasel. We cannot afford to lose any of this space and the council is setting a dangerous precedence by allowing any of it to be built upon.

Air Quality

Before I begin this section, did you know that it takes seven trees to provide enough oxygen for one person?

As stated in the Sustainability Appraisal, 'The policy was found to have potential for significant adverse impacts for air and noise quality. The site suffers from road noise, which could impact upon occupier amenity and which could worsen through any increase in transport movements. Although outside the AQMA, delivery of 100 dwellings on the site could result in an increase in vehicle movements that has a significant effect on air quality.'

This statement is the most problematic of all. The area to the south of the Benfield Valley, at the bottom of the A293, is stated on the 2020 Brighton and Hove Air Quality survey as being an AQMA (see map attached). It stands to reason that with a significantly reduced number of trees to absorb carbon emissions from the passing traffic, air quality could not only worsen the situation further but also put more pressure on the local NHS services. As stated in the 2018 government guidance document 'Health Matters: Air Pollution,'

'Air pollution has a significant effect on public health, and poor air quality is the largest environmental risk to public health in the UK. In 2010, the Environment Audit Committee considered that the cost of health impacts of air pollution was likely to exceed estimates of £8 to 20 billion.'

We already know from cases such as the death of nine year-old Ella Kissi-Debrah in 2014 as the result of a fatal asthma attack thought to have been brought on by spikes in nitrogen oxide and PM10s near to her home in South London, that high levels of air pollution have the potential to cause serious health damage. Especially in the times we are facing now, councils should be helping with constituents to remain healthy and safe, not decimate one of the few, uninterrupted green spaces we have left in the borough. If we are to reach Carbon Neutral by 2030, we are not moving any closer to that by concreting over our local green spaces.

For all of the reasons stated, I consider that the plans for Benfield Valley neither meet the duty to cooperate (due to the ignoring of legally protected species and their needs) nor sound.

SA7 4. Please set out the change(s) you consider necessary to make the policy legally compliant and sound in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in Q3 above. Please be as precise as possible.

modifications to the policy to make sound and legally compliant:

There is funding and support available outside of town councils for protecting green spaces such as Benfield Valley and by tapping into these, working with local rangers, Ecologists and Conservation and Community groups, this space could be something even more wonderful than it already is, drawing in visitors from around the country, perhaps becoming a stopping off point for walkers visiting the South Downs Way, which runs nearby, and becoming a centre for environmental/conservation education for young people and students as well as the wider community.

The grade II listed barn (also a home for our Pipistrel bats) on the north site could be restored by local builders to become a community arts and learning hub, perhaps providing an opportunity for local conservation and community groups to convert the garden behind it into a 'wild garden' to teach and learn about permaculture and biodiverse gardening in small spaces.

By designating the Benfield a Local Green Space, adding it to the list of Conservation areas, creating a Field in Trust, or saving the space and transforming it into a legally-protected Nature Reserve in the way that the Worthing and Adur Council have done for the New Salts Farm the council would be protecting the health and wellbeing not just of our local ecosystem, but of our children, who want so much to grow up in a world rich with biodiversity and wildlife. This space also provides an opportunity for 'green jobs' for locals for many years to come, contributing to the local economy in innovative and creative ways.

The current leaseholders do not care for this space as the local residents do, and as the council should (and my thoughts on that could write another four page letter entirely!). Spaces such as the Benfield Valley should not be held to ransom in this way. It is dangerous, it is unethical and it is just a small (but no less significant) part of what seals our fate as a species. All it takes is imagination, community engagement and the courage to do things differently.

SA7 5. If your representation is seeking a change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing session(s)? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

SA7 6. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions during the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Why wish to speak:

I have set up a group called the Benfield Valley Project and we are moving towards becoming a constituted community group to help celebrating and 'speak for' the Benfield Valley, the people who love it and the wildlife that lives in it.

I have written an open letter to relevant councillors and MPs (attached to this response), which has also been sent to the media and interested parties such as fellow local groups. It would be great to provide a non-political voice for the local residents who also feel passionately about protecting this space.

Upload Supporting Information to your representation(s)

Do you have any supporting information to add to your submission?

upload box:

Public Consultation Letter Opposing Development of SA7 Benfield Valley - [REDACTED] was uploaded

Dear Mr Kyle, Ms Lucas and the Members of the Brighton and Hove City Council Planning Committee,

RE: The planned development of Benfield Valley as stated in the CPP2 Proposals

As I begin this letter, it is 4.27am on a Tuesday morning and I cannot sleep. I have been wanting to write this email to you for weeks but have not been able to find the words, so I will just write it anyway. It's a long one (and yes it has attachments and footnotes!) but please read until the end. **I would also be grateful for a response to the points I have raised as this has taken a significant amount of my time to put together and I would be grateful if this could be respected.**

Six months ago, at the beginning of lockdown, I heard about the CPP2 plans to develop a section of the Benfield Valley (Special Area 7 on the CPP2) via a school whatsapp group for the parents of my [REDACTED] class. I felt so impassioned by what I found out that I spoke to a number of local individuals, community groups - including [REDACTED] the Benfield Wildlife and Conservation Group (who look after the site to the north of the A27), HK Hedgehogs, The Hangleton and Knoll Project, our local Bat Group and Moth and Butterfly group, and the Hangleton Community Centre - and set up the Benfield Valley Project, a community group to support and protect the wildlife, flora and fauna of the Benfield Valley for generations to come. Going forward we will be working with [REDACTED] HK Project to become a Constituted Community Group and provide social and conservation activities for the land and local residents.

This group has gained a lot of traction and has shown how passionate the community in Hangleton and the greater Brighton and Hove area are about protecting this space. Our local Councillor Dawn Bennett set up a petition to contest the development, which, back in June, had almost 1500 signatures and this has been growing over the weeks. I was asked to speak on a local online group, [REDACTED] about the project and this led to further interest and signatories.

You see, fellow residents (and I address you here as 'fellow residents' because that is what you are and this is in all of our interests), the fact is that people become attached to natural spaces; lockdown strengthened this attachment for local residents - and, I would add, not just local residents, people come from Patcham and all around B&H to walk their dogs and enjoy this uninterrupted (but for the FootGolf) green space. The CPP2 threatens not just the mental health of those that use this space - something that could arguably lead to greater expenditure by the local NHS in caring and providing for those whose mental health may suffer as a result of seeing this land carved up for profit - but the wildlife that lives there, the trees that grow there and which do an incredible job of absorbing the emissions from the neighbouring A293 (the lower section of which is an AQMA as detailed in Brighton & Hove's Air Quality Report 2020, see below for further detail) and the busy A27.

We cannot keep needlessly carving up our landscape, nonchalantly claiming, 'oh, it's just a little bit,' and expect our natural world to recover from the damage we have already done to it. No-one is disagreeing that we need affordable housing, of course we do, but, if as local Councillor Stephen Bell said in the Argus recently, deleting the urban fringe sites such as Benfield and Whitehawk Hill from CPP2 will still bring Brighton and Hove council 1,900 dwellings above their target, then building on a green space which is the last green lung that connects the Old Shoreham road to the South Downs, is senseless and destructive. There are plenty of unused dwellings (and perhaps some recently vacated office spaces?) within and around B&H which can serve this purpose; **but once any section of the Benfield Valley is concreted over, however much we try to 'make room for nature' (which I hope would be up there on the list of top priorities should the council go against consensus and dangerously continue with the plans), the fact is that those trees will no longer exist.** Ecologists tell us that our land is now so depleted that re-planting trees is not the same as allowing old ones to continue to grow, we cannot recreate the conditions that the trees initially grew under so anything that follows is, whilst still better than nothing, of less value to the biodiversity of the area:

'The older the tree, the more vital to wildlife it becomes.' (The Woodland Trust)

The Sustainability Appraisal

Every Space Has Value

In my eyes, having read the Sustainability Appraisal as it applies to Benfield Valley, section 5.6 of the CPP2 Sustainability Appraisal does not go far enough to recognise the value of this space. I will go through the main issues here. Firstly, it cites that,

*'Although the policy was found to have **potential for adverse effects for biodiversity in the short term**, it was found to have positive effects for biodiversity and open space in the longer term, as whilst the policy supports housing delivery on two parts of the site, the policy was found to have overall benefits these objectives, as it seeks to secure funding to protect and enhance the remainder of the site for nature conservation and open space purposes. **It is also noted that the areas for development have been assessed as having lower ecological value than other parts of the site which should help to minimise ecological losses.***

No local conservation group or Ecologist not driven by financial gain would agree that any of this statement is true and I cannot understand how something so counter-intuitive could end up in an official document such as the CPP2 - ***why do we need to build on this space in order for it to have value and deserve protection and therefore access to funding?*** Allowing my true feelings to show now, I am incensed by the final sentence of this paragraph in particular. No area in a space like Benfield Valley is of 'lower ecological value' and I would appreciate the evidence for this being presented to the local community conservation and wildlife groups. ***In the natural world, every space has value.*** Whether it's the fungi that grows on the woodland floor and nourishes the earth through its mycelium, or the foraging and living space that it provides for local wildlife such as the ***now threatened hedgehog, rare Wasp Spiders, Common Lizards, which are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 and are priority Species under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework¹ (see video and highlighted images), red Foxes, butterflies of many species including the Common Blue and Red Admiral, Adders, Lime Hawkmoths, Buff Ermine Moths, Peach Blossom moths, Swallow-tail Moths, second is Buff Arches moths and Buff-Tip moths (see images and videos attached as evidence - all taken by local residents and community groups from in and around the areas marked for development), as well as the homes that the canopies of the trees in this area provide for local birds such as robins, sparrows, skylarks, blackbirds, blue tits (to name just a few!) and also our community of climate-indicators, Pipistrel bats.*** If this space is seen as having 'lower ecological value' it is only because it has not been properly managed or cared for: paths have not been maintained, rubbish has not been cleared, tree canopies have not been tended to so as to provide more light to the woodland floor and encourage further growth and biodiversity. Why the council feels it could only do this if the land were to be 'developed' (and I use that term ironically), as mentioned in the Sustainability Appraisal, is anyone's guess.

The Impact on Mental Health

To continue on from the Sustainability Appraisal,

*'Delivery of housing, particularly affordable housing can help reduce housing-based deprivation and also contributes towards economic growth. **The policy was found to have potential for significant adverse impact for landscape in the short term**, although impacts **should** improve over time, as the areas of the*

¹<https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/wildlife-explorer/reptiles/common-lizard>

site suitable for housing have been assessed as having potential for significant landscape effect¹²⁰ based on a lower amount than proposed in the policy and therefore a higher amount could have a greater significant landscape effect particularly in the short term whilst any screening mitigation is ineffective. Impacts become less significantly adverse in the longer term as mitigation becomes more effective.'

The irony here is that working class people, ethnic minorities (who are statistically more likely to face socioeconomic disadvantage), and those facing 'housing-based deprivation' (if we are talking about housing deprivation in this sense and not in the 'let's-get-as-many-people-onto-the-property-ladder-as-possible-and-make-as-much-money-as-we-can' sense) are those most likely to suffer the long term mental health effects of a lack of good quality, accessible green space (and this does not include sports pitches) as those lower income households are more likely to live in urban areas, which generally have with less uninterrupted green space. A 2014 OECD report² based on the results of a project conducted 2010-2013 states that, **'what we do know about living in cities is that it increases our risk of mental health problems...(and that)...cities have both health risks and benefits (such as accessible health care and social support), but mood and anxiety disorders are more prevalent in city-dwellers and the incidence of schizophrenia is much higher in people born and raised in cities.'**³

Studies prove that the human brain needs natural biodiversity for so many reasons. US researcher, Richard Taylor and his team⁴, found that **natural shapes and repeated patterns in nature (known as fractals) prompt the alpha and beta waves in the brain, suggesting a 'relaxed but focused state' when out in good quality green spaces. This was supported by recent study by the University of Derby⁵, which demonstrates a greater level of activity in the parasympathetic nervous system when in a natural setting. The parasympathetic system is also known as the 'relax and restore' system and is the state that humans need to be in in order to feel and be well, rather than in the sympathetic nervous system, which prompts the 'fight or flight' response in the brain, raising levels of adrenaline and cortisol in the blood, thereby depressing the immune system and causing physical and mental health problems.**

An OECD report in 2019 reported that the NHS spends approximately £94billion (give or take a pound or two!) per year on mental health conditions⁶; if something as simple as natural green spaces can help and actually improve the mental health of human beings, eventually saving the council and NHS money, then why get rid of them at such a rate?

Moreover, thanks to the law of Trespass, **92% of land in the England is privately owned**, meaning that unless you are privileged enough to call an expanse of green space your back garden, you only will have access to 8% of good quality green space in England. We must hold onto to whatever spaces we have with both arms, not sell it off to the highest bidder who cares for nothing but profit at the expense of public health.

The Last 1% of Chalkland in the South Downs is Here...

Alongside this, the suggestion here if we look at the second sentence is that we are better off with these plans because **'...based on a lower amount than proposed in the policy and therefore a higher amount could have a greater significant landscape effect particularly in the short term whilst any screening mitigation is ineffective. Impacts become less significantly adverse in the longer term as**

² E. Hewlett & V. Moran, 'Making Mental Health Count' (OECD, 2014)

³ L. Jones, *Losing Eden* (Allen Lane, 2020)

⁴ C.M. Hagerhall, T. Laike, R.P. Taylor, M. Kuller, R. Kuller and T.P. Martin, 'Investigations of Human EEG response to viewing fractal patterns,' *Perception*, (2008) pp. 1488-94

⁵ M. Richardson, K. McEwan, F. Maratos, D. Sheffield, 'Joy and Calm: how an evolutionary functional model of affect regulation informs positive emotions in nature.' *Evolutionary Psychological Science* (Dec 2016)

⁶https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/health-at-a-glance-2019_4dd50c09-en

mitigation becomes more effective.' My argument would be that no section of the Valley should be built on - be that 100 dwellings or more - due to its ecological value. The whole of the Valley is part of the last 1% of chalkland **(known as a priority habitat)** that we have in the South Downs. From the National Trust website,

'Wildflower meadows on chalk downland are sometimes called Europe's tropical rainforest. They're home to an incredibly rich and diverse range of plant and insect life...Up to 40 species of flowering plants can be found in one square metre of chalk grassland – also called lowland calcareous grassland. Many species grow nowhere else, including many beautiful orchids and wildflowers. In turn, they attract many insects and rare butterflies such as the Adonis Blue and Duke of Burgundy...Lime-rich, but low in nutrients, the thin soil holds little water and heats up quickly. These stressed conditions stop the dominant lush grasses from taking over. This allows a diverse range of smaller herbs and lower plants to flourish.'⁷

Anyone who has walked from the bottom end of the Benfield Valley all the way to the top at the South of the A27 on a Summer's day will know this to be true. Attached are images of just a few of the species to be found on the section of land marked for development and include **Pleated Inkcap, Spindle, Hawthorn, Apple tree, Blackthorn/Sloe berries, Agrimony, Ribbed Melilot, Common Mallow, Old Man's Beard, Clover, Wild Carrot, Creeping Thistle, Yarrow and Teasel.** We cannot afford to lose any of this space and the council is setting a dangerous precedence by allowing any of it to be built upon.

Air Quality

Before I begin this section, did you know that it takes seven trees to provide enough oxygen for one person?⁸ As stated in the Sustainability Appraisal,

'The policy was found to have potential for significant adverse impacts for air and noise quality. The site suffers from road noise, which could impact upon occupier amenity and which could worsen through any increase in transport movements. Although outside the AQMA, delivery of 100 dwellings on the site could result in an increase in vehicle movements that has a significant effect on air quality.'

This statement is the most problematic of all. The area to the south of the Benfield Valley, at the bottom of the A293, is stated on the 2020 Brighton and Hove Air Quality survey as being an AQMA (see map attached). It stands to reason that with a significantly reduced number of trees to absorb carbon emissions from the passing traffic, air quality could not only worsen the situation further but also put more pressure on the local NHS services. As stated in the 2018 government guidance document 'Health Matters: Air Pollution,'

'Air pollution has a significant effect on public health, and poor air quality is the largest environmental risk to public health in the UK. In 2010, the [Environment Audit Committee](#) considered that the cost of health impacts of air pollution was likely to exceed estimates of £8 to 20 billion.'⁹

We already know from cases such as the death of nine year-old Ella Kissi-Debrah in 2014 as the result of a fatal asthma attack thought to have been brought on by spikes in nitrogen oxide and PM10s near to her home in South London, that high levels of air pollution have the potential to cause serious health damage¹⁰.

⁷(<https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/features/whats-special-about-chalk-grassland>)

⁸<https://www.sciencefocus.com/planet-earth/how-many-trees-does-it-take-to-produce-oxygen-for-one-person/>

⁹(<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/health-matters-air-pollution/health-matters-air-pollution>)

¹⁰<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-48132490>

Especially in the times we are facing now, councils should be helping with constituents to remain healthy and safe, not decimate one of the few, uninterrupted green spaces we have left in the borough.

So where do we go from here and what could the space become? Some ideas.

My offer to you then is to come to the Benfield Valley, to see the section the planning committee has marked for development, and allow me to walk you around it, showing you everything that is there and the potential it offers us for becoming a nature reserve that could be a source of pride for Brighton and Hove and East Sussex as a whole (this outdoor meeting would not be a contravention of any current government restrictions and could take place at a time of your convenience).

There is funding and support available outside of town councils for protecting green spaces such as Benfield Valley and by tapping into these, working with local rangers, Ecologists and Conservation and Community groups, this space could be something even more wonderful than it already is, drawing in visitors from around the country, perhaps becoming a stopping off point for walkers visiting the South Downs Way, which runs nearby, and **becoming a centre for environmental/conservation education for young people and students as well as the wider community.**

The grade II listed barn (also a home for our Pipistrel bats) on the north site could be restored by local builders to become a community arts and learning hub, perhaps providing an opportunity for local conservation and community groups to convert the garden behind it into a 'wild garden' to teach and learn about permaculture and biodiverse gardening in small spaces.

By designating the Benfield a Local Green Space¹¹, adding it to the list of Conservation areas, creating a Field in Trust¹², or saving the space and transforming it into a legally-protected Nature Reserve in the way that the Worthing and Adur Council have done for the New Salts Farm¹³ the council would be protecting the health and wellbeing not just of our local ecosystem, but of our children, who want so much to grow up in a world rich with biodiversity and wildlife. This space also provides an opportunity for 'green jobs' for locals for many years to come, contributing to the local economy in innovative and creative ways.

The current leaseholders do not care for this space as the local residents do, and as the council should (and my thoughts on that could write another four page letter entirely!). Spaces such as the Benfield Valley should not be held to ransom in this way. It is dangerous, it is unethical and it is just a small (but no less significant) part of what seals our fate as a species. All it takes is imagination, community engagement and the courage to do things differently.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. Please do let me know if you would like to take me up on my offer of introducing you to and guiding you around the space.

In hope,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

¹¹ (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#Local-Green-Space-designation>)

¹² (<http://www.fieldsintrust.org>)

¹³ (<https://www.theargus.co.uk/news/18696946.new-salts-farm-shoreham-bought-kept-nature-reserve/>)

References

<https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/wildlife-explorer/reptiles/common-lizard>

E. Hewlett & V. Moran, 'Making Mental Health Count' (OECD, 2014)

L. Jones, *Losing Eden* (Allen Lane, 2020)

C.M. Hagerhall, T. Laike, R.P. Taylor, M. Kuller, R. Kuller and T.P. Martin, 'Investigations of Human EEG response to viewing fractal patterns,' *Perception*, (2008) pp. 1488-94

M. Richardson, K. McEwan, F. Maratos, D. Sheffield, 'Joy and Calm: how an evolutionary functional model of affect regulation informs positive emotions in nature.' *Evolutionary Psychological Science* (Dec 2016)

https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/health-at-a-glance-2019_4dd50c09-en

(<https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/features/whats-special-about-chalk-grassland>)

<https://www.sciencefocus.com/planet-earth/how-many-trees-does-it-take-to-produce-oxygen-for-one-person/>

(<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/health-matters-air-pollution/health-matters-air-pollution>)

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-48132490>

(<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#Local-Green-Space-designation>)

(<http://www.fieldsintrust.org>)

<https://www.theargus.co.uk/news/18696946.new-salts-farm-shoreham-bought-kept-nature-reserve/>

Figure 20 Hove and Portslade NO₂ Diffusion Tubes 2018



Note: Labelled sample sites are those active in 2018. Archive monitors (before 2018) are not labelled but included as points on the background map. Blue, green and yellow monitoring locations indicate compliance with the Air Quality standards for nitrogen dioxide NO₂. Red and purple exceed the NO₂ limit in 2018.



































DAY 5











