

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 July 2022 22:55
To: reviews
Subject: Re: Major concerns regarding the limited draft recommendations for Brighton & Hove City Council

Categories: [REDACTED] Submissions

Hello again.

Just to add further context to why I am concerned with renaming parts of Patcham as Hollingbury when they should not be, here is a historical article referencing the boundaries between Hollingbury and Patcham and the private estates that made up the community.

"Modern Patcham^[edit]

Sir Herbert Carden, a prominent Brighton solicitor who was mayor for three years from 1916 and served on the council from 1895 until 1941, was responsible for the boundary changes on 1 April 1928 which brought Patcham within the "Greater Brighton" area. To commemorate this, two large stone pillars, known as the "Pylons", were erected on the A23 just north of the village of Patcham, marking the new boundary line.^[2] The land around the village was mostly undeveloped at this time, but many houses were later built. Many of the estates built around the old village date from the 1930s. The Ladies Mile Estate, built around the former drove road from the village to Stanmer Park,^[3] is an example; it is separated from Hollingbury to the southeast by Carden Avenue, named after Sir Herbert.

The roads around the Mackie Avenue estate (all with Scottish names) were named by the Scottish builder George Ferguson who developed the estate. He also planted the Scots pines on the Ladies Mile Open Space."

You can find the rest of this article for reference here - <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patcham>

Hope that this is helpful information in keeping Patcham together and avoiding an unnecessary and unwanted split of the Patcham community.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

On Sat, Jul 9, 2022 at 11:59 AM [REDACTED] > wrote:
Hello,

I gather from discussions on the Patcham Community Noticeboard that this is the correct email address to raise concerns regarding the recently proposed new boundary changes that will split Patcham (where I live) in half and associate parts of it with a different area and community instead.

Aside from breaking up a thriving community that has existed since the 1930s it is unworkable politically, a large part of Patcham does not have any physical links with Hollingbury, being divided by a nature reserve, I can speak from personal experience that I do not use Hollingbury's facilities so would not be in a position to express an opinion on decisions affecting their amenities and any investments being made to improve that area. However I do use the facilities that are close to me, such as the Waterhall and Coney Woods parks, I also want to continue to be able to have a say on matters such as the proposed housing development at Horsedean and the proposals to build on the old farm at the top of Vale Avenue, by dividing Patcham in the manner proposed we would be reducing our ability to have a say on local matters that affect us which feels very wrong. By keeping Patcham as a whole we retain a single majority of voters empowered to have a say on the matters that directly affect where we live rather than areas that we have no concern for.

I have lived in Patcham for [REDACTED] years and have no intention of ever calling it Hollingbury, I have extremely limited interest in what happens in Hollingbury but do care for the area I live in and what happens there, the previous proposal to create a jointly named ward covering Hollingbury and Patcham at least did not draw a dividing line through the Patcham Clock Tower breaking up our community and meant that the Patcham could remain as one body rather than moving half of it to Westdene.

I know that many people are commenting on the Patcham Community groups regarding this proposal and are against it, I only hope that more people contact yourselves to express those concerns so that we are not divided based on arbitrary lines drawn on a map and the areas reflect the actual communities instead.

Please do not destroy our community by going ahead with the most recent plans.

Many thanks for your consideration of this objection.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]