APPLICATION FOR CONSENT TO CARRY OUT WORKS ON COMMON LAND

Commons Act 2006: Section 38

National Trust Act 1971: Section 23

Greater London Parks and Open Spaces Order 1967

Return completed application to:

The Planning Inspectorate
Room 3/25B, Hawk Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Tel: 0303 444 5408
Fax: 0117 372 6241

E-mail: commonlandcasework@pins.gsi.gov.uk
• Before you apply for consent you should consult informally and widely about the proposed works as this may help you identify and overcome any objections.
• Answer all the questions on this form in full, tick all relevant boxes and use a separate sheet where there is insufficient space for your answer.
• Refer to separate Notes on completing this form (the "Notes") and Guidance Sheets (list at Annex F of notes) before applying.
• Read Guidance Sheets 1a, 1b and 1c for all Section 38 cases.
• Read Guidance Sheet 2a if the land is owned by the National Trust.
• Read Guidance Sheet 2b if the land is owned and/or managed by a London borough, or registered as a town or village green.

Legislation

This application is made under:
☑ Section 38: Commons Act 2006
☐ Section 23: National Trust Act 1971
☐ Article 12: The Greater London Parks and Open Spaces Order 1967
☐ Article 17: The Greater London Parks and Open Spaces Order 1967

SECTION A – The common land (see Note 1)

1. Name and full address of common
   Iping Common, Iping, West Sussex
   Trotton Common, Trotton, West Sussex

   CL no or VG no
   CL100 (Iping) and CL101 (Trotton)

   Commons Registration Authority (Usually the county council or unitary authority)
   West Sussex County Council

SECTION B1 – The applicant

2. Forename
   Jane

   Surname
   Willmott (on behalf of)

   Organisation (if appropriate)
   Sussex Wildlife Trust

   Title (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Dr)
   Ms

   Full Postal Address
   Sussex Wildlife Trust
   Woods Mill
   Henfield
   West Sussex

   Postcode
   BN5 9SD
Telephone No/Mobile 07557 162406
Email address janewillmott@sussexwt.org.uk

3. Do you prefer to be contacted by  □ Post  □ Email
   (ignore if you are using an agent)

SECTION B1a – The agent (where relevant)

3a. Forename
Surname
Organisation (if appropriate)
Title (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Dr)
Full Postal Address

Postcode
Telephone No/Mobile
Email address

Do you prefer to be contacted by  □ Post  □ Email

SECTION B2 – The owner of the common land

4. Forename
Surname
Organisation (if appropriate) Sussex Wildlife Trust
Title (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Dr)
Full Postal Address Sussex Wildlife Trust
Woods Mill
Henfield
West Sussex

Postcode BN5 9SD
Telephone No/Mobile 07557162406
Email address janewillmott@sussexwt.org.uk
SECTION C – Area of common and common rights (See Note 2)

5. If the land is registered as a village green is it regulated by an Act under the Commons Act 1876 confirming a provisional order of the Inclosure commissioners or subject to a scheme of management under the Metropolitan Commons Act 1866 or the Commons Act 1899?

   Yes ☐  No ☐

If No, why are you applying for consent under section 38 of the Commons Act 2006?

Land not registered as village green

5a. What is the total area of the common as registered? (ping 167 acres (67.5ha) Trottin 76 acres (30.7ha))

   What common rights, if any, are registered? (e.g. number and type)

   Iping - None (see Maps 2 & 3 and Attachment 2)
   Trottin - single rights owner (see Map 3 and attachment 3)
   Property at "Steps", Trottin "to cut and take tree loppings, gorse, furze, bushes or underwood".

6. Are the common rights ever exercised?

   Yes ☑  No ☐

If yes, please give details e.g. which commoners are active, which rights are exercised and how frequently?

   The occupiers of "Steps", Trottin, exercise their right to take tree loppings, gorse, firs, bushes or underwood from time to time.

7. Give details of any relevant leaseholders, other occupiers, those holding any relevant charges or those with rights of access over the land.

   Mineral rights under 29 acres of the S-W part of Iping Common (CL100) held by Viscount Cowdray.
   Mineral rights under 21 acres of Trottin Common (CL101) held by Viscount Cowdray (see attachments 2 & 3 and maps 2 & 3). Right of Way held by the owner of "Steps" over Trottin Common to the Midhurst-Trottin-Rogate Public Highway (A272).

   A list of the owners of Iping and Trottin Commons with each area numbered is shown on Map 1 and Attachment 1.
SECTION D1 – The proposal (See Note 3 - 6)

8. What works are proposed? (tick all that apply)
   ✔ fencing
   ☐ building(s)
   ☐ other structures(s)
   ☐ ditch(es), trench(es), embankment(s)
   ☐ sealed paths, roads or tracks (e.g. concrete or tarmacadam)
   ✔ other works, please specify:

   Gates and Safety Corral associated with the proposed fencing.

9. What area (in square metres) will the works occupy or the fencing enclose?
   How long (in metres) will the works/fencing be?
   782.000
   4285

10. Are the proposed works permanent or temporary?
    ✔ permanent
    ☐ temporary
    ☐ mixed permanent and temporary
    If temporary, how long will they be needed?

11. Is this application, or any part of it, for works that have already been carried out?
    ☐ Yes  ☑ No

12. Describe the proposed works below including the dimensions and materials to be used and make clear which works, if any, have already been carried out. (If the works are only for fencing go straight to Section D2)

   See separate sheet.
13. Explain why the proposed works are needed and how they fulfil the criteria set out in Section 39 of the Commons Act 2006. If the proposed works include fencing, please also complete section D2.

See separate sheet

14. Give details of any measures proposed to mitigate the visual impact of the works.

See separate sheet

SECTION 02 – Where the proposed works include fencing (temporary and permanent)
(If your proposal does not include fencing, go straight to Section E)

15. Please give details of the type(s) of fence proposed, including the height and the materials used.

See separate sheet
16. Please explain why the fencing is needed and how it fulfills the criteria set out in Section 39 of the Commons Act 2006. This should cover: why fencing of this type is needed, what the aim of the fencing is, and why it is the length proposed. You should also explain what other types of fencing, if any, have been considered and rejected. If you are applying for permanent consent please explain why temporary consent is not appropriate.

See separate sheet

17. Please say what other measures (if any) you have considered (i.e. alternatives to fencing) and explain why these are not suitable.

See separate sheet

18. Give details of any measures proposed to mitigate the visual impact of the fencing.

See separate sheet
19. Give details of the number, type and location of stiles, gates, gaps or other means of access.

See separate sheet

SECTION E – Planning permission (See Note 7)

20. a) Is planning permission needed for your proposal?  □ Yes  ☑ No
   b) If yes, has planning permission been given?  □ Yes  □ No
      If yes to b), please enclose a copy of the planning permission.  □ Copy enclosed.

SECTION F – Designations (See Note 8 – 9 and Guidance Sheet 8)

21. Is the proposal in or near a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) a Special Protection Area (SPA) or a wetland listed in accordance with the Ramsar convention?  ☑ Yes  □ No
   If yes, please give details and identify this area on the map (see Section J).
   Iping Common SSSI. Includes Trotton and Stadham Commons in all 124.6 ha. Notified in 1954, revised in 1980. Wet and dry heath with a rich moss flora and acid grassland. Supports a rich invertebrate fauna including notable rarities and important local populations of some species. Of county importance for breeding birds (see Map 7 and attachment 5)

22. Will the proposal affect a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?  ☑ Yes  □ No
   If yes, please give details and identify the location of the SAM on the map (see Section J).
   There are 11 Scheduled Monuments on Iping and Trotton Commons (see map 10). English Heritage (now Historic England) have been consulted as have the County and District Archaeologists and the South Downs National Park. We have been informed that the proposals would not impact on any known archaeology, but recommend that we note any features when excavating fence post holes and inform them of any findings.

23. Is the proposal in a National Park?  ☑ Yes  □ No
   If yes, please give the name of the National Park.  South Downs, see map 12 for area of National Park
   Is the proposal in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)?  □ Yes  ☑ No
   If yes, please give the name of the AONB.
   Will the proposal affect an area of special landscape value or World Heritage Site?  □ Yes  ☑ No
   If yes, please give details and identify the area on the map (see Section J).
SECTION G – Existing works and adjacent common land (See Note 10)

24. Are there any existing buildings, roads, fences or other constructions on the common? □ Yes ☑ No
   If yes, please give details. Please also identify these on the map (see Section J).

25. Does any area of common land or village green of a different registration number adjoin the common on which the works are proposed? ☑ Yes □ No
   If yes, please give details. Please also identify the boundaries on the map (see Section J).

   Stedham Common (CL192) and Mitchell’s Common (CL309) adjoin Iping Common to the east. Stedham Common is owned by the applicants, Sussex Wildlife Trust (see Map 11)

Section H – Public access (See Notes 11 - 12)

26. a) Do the public have a right of access to the common for air and □ Yes ☑ No exercise under section 193 of the Law of Property Act 1925?
   b) Is the common subject to an Order of Limitation made under Section 193? □ Yes ☑ No
      If yes to b), give its date, and send us a copy of the order.

      Date of the order ____________ ☑ Copy enclosed.

27. Will the works exclude (rather than simply restrict) any right of access for any person (e.g. fencing that crosses a public right of way or road)? Rights of access for persons includes access on foot, horseback or in vehicles.
   If yes, please explain what exclusions you seek.

   Where the fence line crosses a public right of way appropriate gates will be provided. Permission for these gates has been granted by the Highways Authority. See Attachment 9. A small pit of 0.3 ha in the south-west corner of Iping Common (CL100) is to be fenced off for safety but the fence will retain a gate for access.

SECTION I – Advertisement and consultation (see Notes 13 - 16)

28. You must advertise your proposal in one main local newspaper and at the main points of entry to the common (or, if there are none, at a conspicuous place on the boundary of the common) within 7 days of making your application. Use the draft notice at Annex A of the Notes.

   ☑ A notice has been prepared following the format at Annex A.
29. You must also send a copy of the notice, application form and map (using the letter at Annex C, C1 or C2 of the Notes) to the following:

☑ the owners of the land (if different from the applicant)
☑ the commons council or commoners’ association (if there is one)
☑ all active commoners
☑ others with a legal interest e.g. tenants, those with easements, or other rights over the land and any other person occupying the land
☑ the Commons Registration Authority
☑ the relevant parish council, where known
☑ Natural England
☑ English Heritage
☑ National Park Authority (if the proposal is in a National Park)
☑ AONB Conservation Board or Joint Advisory Committee (if the proposal is in an AONB)
☑ Open Spaces Society
☑ the local authority or other body in which the management of the common is vested under a scheme of management made under the Metropolitan Commons Act 1866 or the Commons Act 1899 or any other regulatory scheme or Act for the common (if there is any such scheme or Act)
☑ the local authority archaeological service

30. Which newspaper will the advertisement appear in?

Midhurst and Petworth Observer

On what date?

Thursday 29 October 2015

On what date will the representation period end?

Monday 30 November 2015

This date must be at least 28 days from the date the application is advertised. Incorrect notices are a common problem and may result in you having to re-advertise, so please read note 13 carefully.

Section J – Maps (See Note 17)

31. Please enclose two copies of the map that meets the requirements set out in Note 23. The map should show everything required by sections F and G of this form, and it must clearly show what you are proposing to do and where. Incorrect or unclear maps are a common type of problem with applications for works, so please read note 17 carefully.

☑ Two copies of the map have been prepared.
Section K – Checklist (tick to confirm)

32. For all applications:
   I have read the relevant Notes and Guidance Sheets. ☑
   I have answered all the questions on this form in full. (Where appropriate.) ☑
   I have enclosed a map (2 copies) that meets the requirements of Note 17. ☑
   I have enclosed a copy of the commons register in respect of this common, where registered, i.e. details of the land, rights, ownership and the register map. ☑
   I have enclosed a copy of any document mentioned in answering the questions on this form (e.g. planning permission, etc.) ☑
   I understand that any of the application papers may be copied to anyone who asks to see them. ☑

33. For Section 23 (National Trust Act 1971) only:
   I have enclosed a letter from the National Trust confirming its view that the proposed works are "desirable" under Section 23(1) ☐

34. I will, as soon as possible:
   Advertise the proposal in one local newspaper ☑
   Post a copy of the notice at the main entry points to the common ☑
   Send a copy of the notice, application form and map to all those listed at Section I ☑
   Place a copy of the notice, map and application form at the inspection point ☑
   Write to you using the letter at Annex D of the Notes, to confirm that the advertising requirements have been met. ☑

Signed [signature]

Name Jane Willmott

Date 22 October 2015

You should keep a copy of the completed form.

Data Protection Act

Your application will be in the public domain. Therefore all documents (both paper and electronic) associated with it may be disclosed during the application process to others, including other Central Government Departments, public bodies, local authorities, other organisations and members of the public.

A copy of this form and any accompanying documents may be disclosed following a request for information under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.
APPLICATION FOR CONSENT TO CARRY OUT WORKS ON COMMON LAND

Iping and Trotton Commons Fencing Application

Separate Sheet Sections 12-19

12. Describe the proposed works below and make clear which works, if any, have already been carried out.

The application is for consent to construct a livestock fence around the perimeter of the contiguous block of heaths that comprise Iping Common. This block of heathland includes part of Trotton Common, Fitzhall Heath and Bridgeland Plantation with the location shown on Map 4. The application map is included as Map 5 with the boundaries of the common in green and the fence line in red with gates and corral. Some small sections of the registered Iping Common unit (CL100) on each side of the A272 road are not included (See Map 1, Attachment 1, area nos. 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13). As these are not within the ownership or management control of Sussex Wildlife Trust. Similarly, parts of the registered Trotton Common unit (CL101), (Map i areas 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7) forming the western edge and NW corner of the site are excluded, again falling outside the ownership and management control of SWT. The Trust approached the owners of this part of the Common to explore whether they could be included within the application and overall management scheme but this was not accepted. A further section of 9ha including the main car park (area 2 on Map 1) is owned by the Leconfield estate and held under a lease to West Sussex County Council and sub-leased to SWT. The estate were also approached and although they are not opposed to the scheme they have declined to give landowners consent for fencing on their land and this area has also had to be excluded from the fencing scheme. See Map 1 and Attachment 1.

All areas not included within the fencing, the reasons for this and future management where this is the responsibility of SWT are detailed on Map 6 and Attachment 4. in all cases access will remain open to the public from the Common or from the highway.

At present there are no livestock fences in place. The fence-line will accommodate all formal rights of way with appropriate gates for pedestrian, horses and management vehicles, and will similarly provide gates to allow continued use of all other identified informal paths.

None of the works have been carried out.
13. Explain why the proposed works are needed and how they fulfil the criteria set out in Section 39 of the Commons Act 2006. If the proposed works include fencing, please also complete section D2.

13.1 Background
The common land of Iping Common, encompassing the adjoining blocks of Trotton Common, Fitzhall Heath and Bridgelands Plantation, in total amounting to 87 ha, is managed by the Sussex Wildlife Trust (SWT). Most of the land is owned by SWT. Some 9ha including the main car park is owned by a private estate and held under a lease to West Sussex County Council and sub-leased to SWT. Sussex Wildlife Trust acquired the majority of the Iping Common complex in 2005, to manage as a nature reserve with full public access. The Wildlife Trust also manages extensive common land immediately to the east at Stedham Common (36.1ha) and Graffham Common (38.5ha, not all registered as common), some 7km further to the west. All these areas of heathland in the Sussex Weald are within the South Downs National Park. These heathlands are cultural landscapes and are important wildlife sites, supporting a number of uncommon heathland species. They are also much valued open space and are used by local communities for exercise and recreation.

Like other heathland commons in Sussex and elsewhere, the common lands at Iping were subject to centuries of exploitation for fuel and for grazing which kept them open and predominantly heath-covered. Traditional uses declined and disappeared in the 19th Century so that, more latterly, management aimed at conserving the open heathland has been necessary. This has included removal of trees and scrub and control of bracken. Grazing is also seen as an essential part of the management of the site. Cattle have been extensively and effectively grazed by SWT at Stedham Common since 2000.

13.2 Nature conservation interest
Iping Common is part of a network of important heathland commons, along the southern edge of the Western Weald, on the acidic silty clays and medium to coarse-grained sands and sandstones of the Sandgate and Folkestone Beds, with seams of pebbles and clays and veins of hard iron-rich sandstone. Both of these formations are part of the Lower Greensand deposits of the Weald. These commons reflect the poorer soils that characterise these geological formations, in contrast to the better soils to the north and south that today support more productive agriculture. The significance of these heathland habitats, where they survive, has often been acknowledged in both national and international nature conservation designations.

The importance of Iping and Trotton Commons for nature conservation was recognised by its designation as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), along with the adjoining Stedham Common, as early as 1954, in the first such schedule for the county (See Map 7 and Attachment 5). The three commons were declared a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) in 1978 and Sussex Wildlife Trust has acquired the land at Iping and Trotton Commons under direct purchase or lease since 2005. The Trust manages the Commons as a heathland nature reserve along with Stedham Common. At Stedham Common SWT has re-instated low-intensity cattle grazing, with significant benefits to the heathland habitat and its wildlife. Part of Graffham Common was also designated as SSSI in 1954 but the designation was not confirmed under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act due to the amount of conifer cover causing loss of heathland and its biodiversity. Graffham Common is now under active
management by SWT, with the introduction of grazing planned, to restore heathland and its associated rich wildlife interest.

Following considerable historical loss from invasion by secondary woodland, restoration in recent years has significantly increased the extent of lowland heathland on these commons. The heathland at Iping is dominated by ling and dwarf gorse with bell heather, wavy hair-grass and purple moor-grass with scattered stands of common gorse. Bracken, birch, pine and oak all require management control to maintain the open heathland. Such open heathland supports a range of characteristic fauna. The specialist lowland heathland birds – woodlark, Dartford warbler and nightjar – also breed on the SSSI of Iping and Stedham Commons. There are 7-8 pairs each of woodlark and nightjar with 1 or 2 Dartford warblers usually breeding in recent years.

The site is also one of the richest sites for heathland invertebrates in Sussex and the spider fauna in particular is of great importance. Recent surveys, to check the status of this group have shown that the SSSI remains of very high value with 204 spider species present, representing some 30% of the entire British spider fauna. This assemblage on the SSSI includes a number that are nationally scarce. There are further rare or nationally scarce species present on the two Commons including silver-studded blue butterfly, hornet robber-fly, mottled bee-fly, and a spider-hunting wasp.

The SSSI also supports populations of the nationally rare heath tiger beetle and field cricket, confined to a very few heathland sites in southern England, and several scarce heathland plant species, including bristly bent grass, common cotton grass, oblong-leaved and round-leaved sundews and marsh club moss (not recorded on the ungrazed compartments for at least 10 years). Unfortunately the field cricket population is declining and in danger of extinction on this site primarily due to lack of grazing.

13.3 Visiting
As common land, there is full public access on foot to the site under the Countryside and Wildlife Act 2000 and several bridleways and public footpaths (Maps 8 and 9). Iping Common is a popular destination for local walkers and dog walkers, while others come to see or study the wildlife, ride horses or cycle on the bridleways or just enjoy the peace and quiet and the fine views of this great cultural landscape, within close reach of Midhurst.

13.4 Condition assessment and statutory responsibilities
The condition of SSSI land in England is assessed by Natural England, using categories agreed across England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland through the Joint Nature Conservation Committee. There are six reportable condition categories: favourable; unfavourable recovering; unfavourable no change; unfavourable declining; part destroyed and destroyed.

For condition assessment, Iping & Stedham Commons SSSI is divided into 3 units, all of which were assessed by Natural England on 31 October 2013. The assessment found that one unit (Unit 1, Stedham Common) in ‘favourable condition’ and the remaining two (Units 2 & 3, Iping Common and Fitzhall Heath) in ‘unfavourable recovering condition’.

Units 2 and 3 not attaining ‘favourable’ condition are related to lack of pioneer heathland and dominance of Molinia (Purple moor grass), the amount of birch and failure to meet targets for
mosses and lichens. (the heather life cycle is usually defined as ‘pioneer’, ‘building’, ‘mature’ and ‘degenerate’ as plants move through their life cycle).

Natural England has been given powers under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 in respect of the management of SSSIs to require the restoration or conservation of the flora and fauna for which the land is of special interest by formulating a management scheme for the land. NE must consult with owners and occupiers before serving them with a copy of the scheme, and must consider any representation or objections before confirming the scheme with or without modifications.

Where it appears to NE that the owner or occupier is not giving effect to the scheme and as a result the flora and fauna for which the land is of special interest is not being adequately restored or conserved, it may serve a management notice requiring the carrying out of work on the land. The owner or occupier can appeal against the notice to the Secretary of State, but in the absence of any action or loss of an appeal against the notice, NE may enter the land and carry out the work and recover the costs of carrying out the work from the owner and occupier.

The existence of these legislative powers indicates the Government’s determination to see SSSIs properly managed for the benefit of their wildlife. With reference to Iping Common SSSI, Natural England has entered into a management scheme in the form of a Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) scheme, with Sussex Wildlife Trust. This has been designed to incorporate all the factors necessary to deliver favourable condition.

Natural England is responsible for administering the Higher Level Stewardship Scheme, under which money is available both for capital work and ongoing payments towards the cost of putting, and keeping, SSSIs in favourable condition. Lowland heathland habitats have been given priority under this programme, and NE has made it clear through its Integrated Site Assessment and prescriptions within the HLS agreement that it regards grazing as an important part of the future management of the commons (see Attachment 6). The commons were entered in to a ten-year HLS agreement that started in 1 November 2007. In addition, the HLS prescriptions state that grazing of the heathland is expected.

The introduction of grazing at Stedham Common satisfies this grazing requirement and the current application is intended to facilitate the completion of the grazing over the rest of the Common under the control of SWT.

13.5 Cultural landscape
The characteristic landscape of this part of the Sussex Weald is heathland, in stark contrast to the nearby chalk downland landscape of the South Downs. Though now neglected or destroyed across most of the area, such heathland had long been an area of practical value. Well into the 19th century this heathland was used in common by local inhabitants for the traditional practices of fuel gathering and grazing – activities that had taken place on heathland commons throughout the area over the centuries, being part of a sustainable system of utilising the land.
Most heathland in southern England is thought to have been created from the Late Stone Age through clearance of the primary woodland that once cloaked the country, to create temporary arable plots and clearings for stock grazing. At Iping there is evidence of such human activity and use of the landscape from as far back as 7000 BC, in the form of worked flint scatters. Clearance - often repeated many times as areas were abandoned to woodland and then re-occupied - exposed and degraded the naturally thin, acidic soils, creating the impoverished conditions favoured by heathland. Later settlement of the site is clear from the number of Bronze Age (2500-1400 BC) round barrows or tumuli. All of the recorded tumuli are Scheduled Monuments. Further archaeological remains exist in the form of the section of Roman road across the Common, linking Chichester with Silchester, constructed in the 1st century AD. This is also a Scheduled Monument. (See map 10 for details).

Following the conversion of woodland to heathland, the heaths were kept open down the centuries by intensive uses, including continued grazing and burning, removal of turves, bracken and scrub for fuel and animal bedding, cutting of timber and exploitation of other heathland products. These activities prevented woodland from re-establishing and also resulted in the continual removal of nutrients from the system, maintaining the nutrient-poor soils and their characteristic heathland vegetation. Abandonment and conversion of heathlands to other uses, has meant that more than 80% of heathlands across southern Britain have now been lost and this is especially acute in West Sussex where 91% of the heath present in 1813 has since been lost.

Changes in agriculture and the availability of cheap fuel brought most traditional heathland management to an end by the beginning of the 20th century, although one commoner was still grazing at Iping and Stedham until WWII and shortly after. The Common was heavily used during the war, for military training in preparation for D-Day and traces of this period of activity can still be seen on the site.

13.6 Recent management history
For decades, there was probably little intentional management of the land - the need to manage heathland was not generally appreciated and the spread of trees onto the open heathland took place gradually and did not cause great concern. There was an extensive and serious fire in the summer of 1976. However, by the 1980s there was a growing appreciation nationally that large amounts of heathland had been lost in previous decades by lack of management.

After designation of the Local Nature Reserve, West Sussex County Council, then the South Downs Joint Committee managed Iping and Trotton Commons for its heathland wildlife. Since the Sussex Wildlife Trust acquired Iping and Trotton Commons, from 2005, a variety of management techniques have been employed including invasive species control, controlled burns and turf stripping. A large area of conifer plantation known as Bridgelands plantation was cleared and scraped to restore the area to heath. Surveying and monitoring of breeding birds, invertebrates and vegetation has been carried out.

A trial grazing pilot on Iping was conducted in 2012 and 13 with a view to comparing Iping, Trotton and Stedham Commons grazed and ungrazed areas. Initial results indicated that appropriate grazing results in a greater variety of invertebrates particularly predatory spiders. This indicates a healthy population of other invertebrate species that the spiders are feeding on and suitable food for insectivorous birds. Many rare and valuable species were recorded including protected species and
ones never recorded in Sussex before. Unfortunately the trial had to be stopped after a couple of incidents where gates were propped open. Generally there was positive feedback about the grazing cattle being on Iping Common and several people said they were disappointed to see them go.

13.7 Benefits of grazing
Extensive grazing can create botanical and structural diversity and enhance species diversity. It can also help to mitigate the effects of atmospheric nutrient deposition through the removal of vegetation (Fottner et al 2007). Grazing affects the relative proportions of dwarf shrubs (heathers, bilberry and dwarf gorse) and grasses in heathland. Generally, light grazing leads to an increase in dwarf shrub cover and heavy grazing leads to the replacement of heather with grassland species. Structural diversity may be maximised by light grazing which may stimulate young growth while not adversely affecting mature or degenerate plants and has benefits for heathland fauna.

Heathland seed banks may be exposed by light levels of livestock trampling resulting in the germination of species of conservation value. Cattle grazing and trampling increases the structural diversity of both wet heath and valley mire swards, and increases the amount of microtopographical relief, providing opportunities for characteristic wet heath and valley mire species. Grazing and trampling can also play a role in suppressing scrub and bracken, creating bare ground and reducing litter.

Grazing has been reintroduced to a large number of UK lowland heathland sites in the last few years and there is research evaluating the success of grazing in achieving conservation aims (Byfield & Pearman 1995; Bullock & Pakeman 1997; Lake 2002).

Grazing has generally been found effective at reducing the cover of purple moor-grass Molinia caerulea (Edwards 1985; Tubbs 1986; Diemont & de Smidt 1987; Hulme et al. 2002; Fottner et al. 2007). These studies on wet heath communities generally showed declines in the abundance of Molinia after grazing. Lake, Bullock & Hartley (2001) interviewed eleven managers of lowland heath who felt that Molinia was being controlled through grazing on their sites.

Studies on grazing and tree encroachment on heaths suggest that growth may be inhibited by heavy grazing pressures, that tree seedling recruitment can be reduced by grazing and that extent of control will also be dependent on the type of livestock used (Lake, Bullock & Hartley, 2001). Generally grazing may help to reduce tree and scrub encroachment but will not control it without other active management measures.

Generally grazing will only result in small reductions in nutrient levels on lowland heath unless the animals are removed at night or with cattle, if some tree cover is available. Cattle will graze on heathland during the day and move to woodland at night (Bokdam 2002). SWT monitoring indicates that extensive grazing increases suitable habitat for invertebrates and spiders in particular, by diversifying vegetation structure. It is also creates bare ground by poaching wet areas and therefore increases the suitable conditions for marsh club-moss as has occurred at Stedham Common. Marsh club-moss returned to bare cattle-poached ground but not to mechanically scraped areas.

This proposal for Iping Common will bring heathland under grazing management, alongside other continuing management techniques. Developing heathland, for instance in more extensive patches where trees or scrub are removed, can be subject to heavy invasion by woody species such as gorse, birch and pine as well as weeds of disturbed ground and the spread of shade tolerant species such as
purple moor-grass. Grazing can help control these problems during the restoration of heath cover as well as in its long-term management.

The removal of some of the tree cover and the re-creation of heathland will improve the visitor experience by opening up views, restoring an attractive heathland landscape and diversifying the wildlife to be seen and enjoyed. Not only will this open heathland landscape be maintained (as in the past) by grazing, but the Trust's experience suggests that once accustomed to grazing animals, visitors enjoy seeing them, particularly where grazing is in natural surroundings using traditional cattle breeds.

13.8 Future grazing scheme
The Common is already subject to management action to control woody species and maintain a predominantly open heathland habitat and landscape. Continued removal of such species – birch, willow, pine – will continue, along with periodic coppicing to regenerate gorse. The Common is, in places at least, heavily dominated by grasses – purple moor-grass in wetter areas and wavy hair-grass in the drier heathland – and management/control of woody species will not cope with the grasses. Mechanical mowing has, in some places, lead to an increase in grassy species. Additional control of woody regrowth, as needed, would be factored into the plan from the outset: Livestock alone will not control birch and pine regeneration.

Grazing, which favours heathers by preferentially targeting the grasses, needs to be introduced and maintained. Grazing will also help to check the spread of scrub and trees which would, over time, convert the site to woodland. A programme of tree and scrub clearance from time to time will also be needed but grazing will slow the rate of re-colonisation and reduce the need for intervention management. The heathland management will be by extensive grazing by suitable livestock. (Extensive grazing means a low number of animals over as wide an area as possible at densities which are far lower than would be expected, for example, on improved grass fields.) Choosing the right animals at the right stocking rate will help to create an intimate mosaic of different heights of heathers, grasses and bare ground, encourage trampling of bracken and help to control some of the birch and pine regeneration. Traditional breeds of cattle are suitable due to their grazing habits. Hardy pony breeds might also be considered in the future.

The Trust has extensive expertise in managing its Nature Reserve by grazing and has been grazing them since the 1970s. Since 2002, SWT has employed a professional farmer as a Grazing Officer who has built up the Trust's livestock to around 700 sheep, 80 cattle and 10 hardy ponies. The Trust has its own infrastructure to manage these stock, grazing over 20 of our own reserves as well as providing grazing support, advice and livestock to other organisations including Horsham District Council, Hasting Borough Council, South East Water andViridor. All of the reserves have extensive public access on foot, with most also providing bridle routes. Many are popular dog walking areas some of which are close to urban populations. The grazing is supported by around 25 trained volunteer lookers from local communities. Now with two dedicated staff and the support of the rest of the Land Management Team, the Trust would be able to provide the necessary resources to manage a grazing scheme at Iping and Trotton Commons.
13.9 Summary of the proposals
The application is for 4285m of fencing, 11 field gates, 17 bridle gates, 8 kissing gates, 1 pedestrian gate and 1 safety corral including an additional 2 field gates. It would enclose 78.2ha of common land.

13.10 Interests of the neighbourhood
1. The proposed fencing lines have been carefully designed, following extensive consultation with users, including both pedestrians and horse riders. The proposals allow access along the bridleway on the south-west side of the site outside the grazed area for riders who wish to avoid grazing animals.

2. The fencing line has been pulled back from the roads to screen the fence among the trees and scrub on the road side; and placed around old pits and quarries near the south-west corner to reduce impact and exclude potentially dangerous features (See notes in Attachment 4 referring to areas Map 6 also Map 13)

3. On the north side of the Common, against the A272 road, the fence line and bridleway gates will be set back from the road and at one point a post and rail corral constructed, to improve safety for riders and to provide space for horses to manoeuvre See Map 6 for location of corral and Attachment 7 for corral design.

4. Grazing on land facilitated by this fencing will contribute considerably towards its management. It will help to maintain its character by reducing domination by grasses, weeds and scrub and enhance its biodiversity, including plants, birds and invertebrates, so benefitting wildlife and improving the experience of visitors to the nature reserve.

5. In conjunction with grazing, the continued gradual removal of trees and other heathland management techniques will restore and maintain the open character of the area and improve public access within the Common.

6. An improvement to the open character of the common will open up the views and improve the opportunities for appreciating this ancient landscape.

7. The provision of pedestrian and equestrian gates of appropriate design will maintain full access onto the Common and onto adjoining area.

8. Grazing will support the long term management of the heathland, keeping it open for visitors and enhancing the experience of a unique cultural landscape.

13.11 References All or any of these references can be copied to the Inspector should they be required.


13.12 Public consultation
The management plan for Iping and Stedham Commons is due for renewal and as part of the process of deciding the most appropriate techniques and actions for future management of the nature reserve Sussex Wildlife Trust carried out a public consultation.

First consultation

The first phase of this consultation was conducted in July and August 2013. This was undertaken under the guidance of Footprint Ecology (an independent consultancy specialising in commons and with many years’ experience of consultations on commons’ management), and was based on the principles set out in ‘A Common Purpose, a guide to agreeing management on common land’ (Short et al., 2005). This publication was originally produced by Gloucester University for a consortium of countryside organisations including the Open Spaces Society and Natural England. (Footprint Ecology was closely consulted on a recent revision). The guide sets out best practice guidance on consultations over the management of common land.

A large number of people responded to the first phase of the consultation by means of an on-line and paper version questionnaire. A background paper explaining the need for management and the potential techniques available was made available (see Attachment 8) while two ‘drop-in’ days and two guided walks were programmed to facilitate discussion. The consultation was advertised in the local parish magazines, on the Trust website and notices were put up and maintained at access points on Iping, Trotton and Stedham Commons, and at other local outlets and notice boards in Midhurst, Stedham, Iping, Trotton Elsted and Rogate. In all, 25 notices were posted. A large number of local and national bodies were also consulted including Natural England, The Open Spaces Society (whose General Secretary visited the site), other Official bodies and NGOs including the Local Access Forum, National Park Authority and District and Parish Councils.

A full report of the public consultation and an analysis of the results were prepared. In all 86 questionnaires were submitted and 5 emails/letters. In response to that part of the questionnaire which dealt with management by grazing and fencing, grazing was the favoured management technique (73%) followed by mowing (50%) and with controlled burning (44%) and turf stripping (47%) slightly less least popular choices. The greatest uncertainties were about mowing, burning and turf stripping with least uncertainty about grazing. If grazing were to be adopted the choice of
livestock was most in favour of cattle (74%) or a combination of livestock e. g. cattle, sheep and ponies (71%), with rather fewer favouring ponies (64%) and sheep alone (60%).

For containment of any grazing livestock there was a clear preference for a perimeter fence with all access points maintained (73%), followed by shepherding for sheep (57%). Fenced enclosures within the Common were less favoured – 30% for small enclosures and 27% for large enclosures.

Second Consultation

Based on the need to manage the Common for wildlife and taking account of the views of those organisations and individuals from the first consultation; a set of recommendations was made to Sussex Wildlife Trust for management of the Commons in a report by Footprint Ecology (this is available in full should the Inspector wish to refer to it). SWT responded accepting the recommendations and, in line with one of the recommendations, embarked on a second round of consultations, in particular focussing on one of the proposals – to re-establish grazing at Iping Common. Such a management technique, though traditional for heathland commons, would in the modern-day context require the need for containment of livestock by fencing and this formed the main subject of the second consultation.

The alignment of a proposed fence line was shown on a map of Iping and Trotton Commons, together with the suggested location for gates and type of gates (pedestrian, equestrian, management vehicles).

The second consultation ran initially from late October until 9 December 2013. As well as information sent to those who had commented on the first consultation, the consultation was advertised at the same locations as for the first phase. There was also a ‘drop-in’ session at Stedham Village Hall during the late afternoon/evening of 18 November and a guided walk on the Common, specifically to discuss the fencing proposals, on 16 November.

The second consultation produced 25 responses in support or with no objection and 24 responses from objectors. The supporting responses were mostly from individuals but included two from organisations – RSPB and South Downs National Park Authority. Stedham with Iping Parish Council and the Open Spaces Society did not object. The objections all came from individuals.

Second Consultation extension

There were complaints from some objectors that information about the consultation had not been adequately publicised. Sussex Wildlife Trust decided therefore to extend the consultation period for a further two months, until end February 2014. News of this extension was circulated to all previous consultees and respondents, sent to every household in the three neighbouring parishes (666 in total), advertised on posters at the previous sites, in parish magazines, and with an article in the local press. Again this was accompanied by two drop-in sessions (at Elistead on 8 February and Stedham on 10 February) and a site visit on the Common specifically for horse riders. SWT also produced an information sheet with frequently asked questions and answers, in an attempt to correct some misconceptions about the proposal.

The drop-in sessions were attended by SWT staff and consultants and altogether 56 people called in to see and discuss the proposals. The walks/site meetings were led by SWT staff and 37 attended
(although some people came to more than one session). Many left brief written comments and some had suggestions for amendments such as additional gate positions and design.

The extension period elicited 26 letters of support and 11 of objection. Four of the supporters and one of the objectors had also responded during the initial period of second round consultation. These were all from individuals except for one in support from the South Downs Local Access Forum that has representatives from landowners, user groups e.g. the Ramblers and BH5 and wildlife organisations. The total of respondents to the second consultation was 80 with 59% in support or neutral.

Several of those in support of the perimeter fencing and grazing proposal were happy with the idea of cattle grazing but had reservations about the possible use of ponies for grazing, mainly because of the unpredictability of ponies and the risk that they would pester horse riders. Some of those in support were also horse riders but saw no problem with the proposed gates or cattle grazing.

Whilst the majority of supporters were happy with the scheme proposed, some did suggest amendments: Two new gate locations have been proposed from local walkers and a safety corral has been proposed for bridle gates along the main road; a riding organisation has suggested lighter metal gates, or hydraulic gates should be considered; longer bridlegate handles should be installed and a safe permissive riding route has been suggested running east/west connecting the north/south bridleways off the A272. One respondent wanted dogs to be better controlled, while another objected to the way they had been asked to keep their dog under control by others. There were mixed views about whether gates should be kept open when livestock were not present. Some bridleway improvements were also suggested.

The main reasons for objection were the sense of enclosure that perimeter fencing would bring; a feeling of loss of freedom; loss of enjoyment; suburbanisation of the countryside; the inconvenience and difficulty of negotiating gates, especially for riders; fear of cattle; waste of money; wanting the site left alone; concern over animal welfare/whether there would be enough for livestock to feed on; lack of evidence and the continued misconception that grazing would require dogs to be kept on leads. One responder was concerned about stepping in cow dung. An issue of legal right to apply for permission to erect a fence was raised. Several also cited discontent with existing heathland management such as the removal of trees and the use of tracks for timber extraction by the neighbouring estate that had made some paths badly rutted.

A meeting was held on site with horse riders on 8th February 2014. At this meeting concerns specific to horse riders were expressed. These were that: There were no other options in the area for those who did not like to ride in sites with cattle or had difficulty with gates; grazing by ponies was seen as unacceptable; it would be impossible to ride and at the same time lead ponies through gates; children would not be able to open the gates. One attendee who rides on Blackdown and Stedham Common said she had had no problems with cattle or gates, while others said they did.

Various other concerns were raised about the consultation and the management of the Common but all those present said they had already written to the Trust, raising their concerns. The detail of the gates has been discussed with one of the local riders who agreed to consider the detailed designs and with the local representative of the British Horse Society.

Unfortunately, the landowner of approximately 9ha of land in the north east corner including the car park although not opposing the scheme, felt unable to support the application for fencing the common. The proposed fence line has therefore been adapted to go around the perimeter of their land. This land is still with the management of SWT.
14. **Give details of any measures proposed to mitigate the visual impact of the works.**

See Map 13 for the annotated locations of these measures. The fence-line if granted consent will be set back from the road edge along the northern and southern sides, being concealed by vegetation and trees and in many cases the topography of the land, such as banks and hollows. For part of the eastern side the fence will be set back within the common to go around land owned by Leconfield Estate. As far as possible the line will be chosen within existing trees and scrub and/or low points and vegetation would be allowed to grow up to mitigate visual impact across the common. Along the south-western side the fence will exclude the bridleway, to provide for a riding route that avoids entering the grazed area. This fence-line will also be set back into vegetation where possible and will go around features such as former quarries.

On the northern side, where access off bridleways is onto the A272 road, the fence and gates will be set back considerably (25 – 40 metres) for safety reasons, to provide space for horses to be manoeuvred before road crossing. A fenced corral, of wooden post and rail construction will be provided, at the bridleway access on the northern length of fence beside the A272, to avoid setting the fence back as it would be intrusive in the landscape; again to allow for safer road crossing for horses and riders (see Q15 below).

All posts and gates will be wood (see below) which will weather and become inconspicuous compared to the use if say, concrete posts or galvanised metal gates.
15. Please give details of the type(s) of fence proposed, including the height and the materials used.

New fences
Fencing material to be pressure treated softwood (to BS 4072) or winter-cut peeled sweet chestnut.

Straining posts 2.3m minimum, 150mm minimum at butts and spaced as required. Ends of lines to have box section strainers with 2 straining posts and horizontal strut except for lines without post driver access which will have single straining posts dug in and footed.

Intermediate posts min 1.8m long, full round at a minimum 75-100mm diameter and spaced no more than 4.6m. Struts to be 2.1m long 125-150mm and morticed into straining posts with 0.6m anchor plates. Two top wires to be 3.15mm galvanised high tensile plain wire connected to high tensile galvanised stock-netting with boundary clips. All fixed with galvanised staples.

Height of fence
1.2m

New field gates (To facilitate access for management)
Erected in accordance with BS3470. Field gates to be wooden 5 bar gates, at least 4m (12ft) wide (for emergency access) hung between 2.4m x 175mm x 175mm wooden posts by adjustable hinges and with self-locking gate catch and striker. They would be set back at least 5m from the highway for safety. They would be padlocked to prevent unauthorised vehicle access.

New pedestrian/equestrian gates
All access gates to be wooden, sourced from Centrewire or similar and conforming as appropriate to British Standards.

Bridle gates are proposed on all bridleways and main tracks that could be used by horse riders. They would be wooden, Henley design one-way opening self-closing type with easy opening trombone handles. Height 1.2m, width post to post 1.9m, gate 1.6m (gap approx 1.5m). They would be set back at least 10m from the highway for safety. Bridle gates will also be suitable for use by pedestrians.

Kissing gates for pedestrians would be wooden, self-closing design and would be the large Oxford design suitable for push chairs and wheelchairs, but not motorbikes. Treated timber mortised posts, rails, gate post and gate, 45 degree. Height 1.2m; length in fence line 3.05m; width 1.6m. (http://www.centrewire.com/oxford.htm).

Pedestrian gate (only into quarry area) would be wooden, self-closing design and would be the Aston design one-way opening self-closing type with easy open handles. Height 1.2m, gate 1.2m wide.

The safety corral in the northern fence line, against the A272, would be constructed of wooden post and rail, with bridle gate access onto the common, providing a space of 5x20m for riders to wait safely before crossing the road. Two field gates would be provided as part of the design to allow maintenance of the area and prevent it from becoming overgrown. (See Attachment 7).
The proposed gates on rights of way have all been consented by the Highways Authority (See Attachment 9)
16. Please explain why the fencing is needed and how it fulfils the criteria set out in Section 39 of the Commons Act 2006. This should cover: why fencing of this type is needed, what the aim of the fencing is, and why it is the length proposed. You should also explain what other types of fencing, if any, have been considered and rejected. If you are applying for permanent consent please explain why temporary consent is not appropriate.

**Necessity for fencing**

Fencing of a type suitable to contain livestock is required because:

1. The benefits of grazing as part of heathland management are well established and SWT has successfully grazed the nearby Stedham Common with cattle since 2000. Various studies have shown the benefits of grazing for wildlife and it is the view of heathland experts and managers across the UK and Europe that this is a traditional and sustainable form of management. There are busy roads nearby including ones forming the northern and eastern boundaries of the Common so roaming, un-enclosed animals would be a danger to traffic.
2. The Common on its western border adjoins areas of woodland/plantation and a small part of the heathland common (not within SWT ownership or management control) and without fencing livestock could wander and cause damage and inconvenience.
3. The Common and other compartments of the nature reserve are visited by walkers, many with dogs. This increases the risks of livestock being chased off the Common in the absence of fencing.
4. The containment of the animals allows them to be kept safe and regularly checked.

**Alternatives considered.**

**Full perimeter electric fencing**

Electric fencing around the boundary of the Common has been considered. Because such fencing is far less robust than permanent fencing and abuts onto an A-road, it would need checking daily which would be impractical and expensive. For a perimeter electric fence vegetation would need to be cleared regularly to prevent shorting so it would of necessity remain highly conspicuous. There would need to be intrusive health and safety notices at regular intervals, special arrangements for access would need to be made at each entrance and path, particularly for horses. By its very nature, electric fencing, though easily repairable, is temporary and would be likely to have only a short life. It also could easily be damaged, turned off, broken or stolen. The conclusion is that electric fencing around the Commons would be more intrusive than permanent fencing and more labour intensive, could cause health and safety problems for people and animals and would have no advantages over more permanent fencing.

**Temporary electric fencing enclosures**

The authorisation under Schedule 1 of the Works on Common Land (Exemptions) [England] Order 2007 to enclose up to 10% of each common unit or 10 ha, whichever is the less, is not appropriate to this proposal as only a small part of both common units could be grazed in any one season, even if the temporary electric fencing was moved frequently. This would entail crossing rights of way, with the need for extra gates, and with all the limitations of electric fencing cited above. The temporary fence lines would need to be mown to prevent shorting prior to fence erection. When fences were up they would constitute an intrusive presence on the open common and once removed, would
leave behind grazed and mown areas in contrast to the surrounding ungrazed heath. This type of fencing was not favoured by the consultees.

Full perimeter “invisible” fencing

A type of fencing entailing installing an electric underground cable and fitting cattle with collars so that if attempting to cross the cable the livestock would receive a deterrent shock. This would have the advantage of making no visible change to the common and no requirement for gates to be opened/closed on entering the common. However, this equipment is still in early days of development and although being used on a few sites already, it does have major drawbacks. The cattle have to be trained to know where the cable is which means that it can be very time-consuming particularly if the same livestock are not used regularly. Both the collars and the electric cable can fail leaving the cattle with access to the busy A272 which would be very dangerous. If frightened or chased by dogs, it would be very unlikely that the cattle would stop at the cable and again, could run out into the main road. Once outside the cable the cattle would be reluctant to re-enter the Common unless the cable was turned off as they would receive a deterrent shock from the cable if they tried to do so or an attempt was made to drive them back onto the common across the cable. The common is heavily used by dog walkers and not all dogs are under close control. There are also still limitations on the length of cable that can be used to maintain the necessary voltage.

Permanent consent.

The reason the application is for permanent fencing is that human management of lowland heathland, primarily by grazing, has for centuries maintained the open heath, and when grazing has stopped, invariably the heathlands have started to scrub up and revert to tree cover. Such heathlands have been prevented from succeeding to their natural condition as climax woodland only by human intervention in the past and that situation is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. Since the middle of the last century heathlands have been seriously affected by atmospheric nitrogen deposition from industry, transport etc. and this has resulted in the encouragement of grasses at the expense of heather on most heaths. These effects are likely to continue well into the present century and grazing is the only means by which this change can be mitigated as grazing animals favour grass over heather and reduce the competitive abilities of the former and thus encourage the latter. We would therefore expect grazing management to continue indefinitely as well as the need for livestock containment by fencing.

However, should it be decided that such circumstances would not be sufficient to obviate the necessity for a review in the future and that a temporary permission is therefore appropriate, we would ask that such permission is for 25 years as this is the expected life of the fencing (if properly maintained), and as the initial cost is likely to be considerable, we would wish to obtain the greatest benefit from this for as long as reasonably possible.
17. Please say what other measures (if any) you have considered (i.e. alternatives to fencing) and explain why these are not suitable.

Under some circumstances livestock can also be managed by shepherding and tethering

Shepherding
We are not aware of any examples of a successful shepherding scheme for cattle in the UK. Shepherding systems used on lowland heaths in Holland and Germany and at Ashdown Forest in Sussex and on a fenced common in Nottinghamshire have all been operated with sheep. It is not considered that sheep are suitable as grazers for the Iping Common scheme, as they would not adequately control the growth of coarse grasses such as purple moor-grass or effectively trample bracken; and established grazing of other nearby sites has shown cattle to be effective.

Tethering
Tethering involves attaching an animal, usually with a head halter, to a 6m rope which is tied to a peg driven into the ground. Each animal so tethered must have enough food, water and shelter and be within sight and sound of other animals. Animals must be inspected at least twice a day, and more frequently during cold, windy or hot weather. They should be brought in when the weather is very bad. They need to be moved regularly to access fresh forage ~ frequently on an unproductive site such as this. Tethering is not suitable on wet ground or for young cattle (under 6 months). These conditions are recommended in a number of codes of practice, and tethering is not normally recommended for conservation grazing by the Grazing Advice Partnership (GAP) on welfare grounds.

Given these welfare concerns, the extremely onerous requirements in terms of manpower and time and the difficulties of obtaining a balanced grazing regime rather than intensively grazed circles, it is not considered to be a practical option here.

18. Give details of any measures proposed to mitigate the visual impact of the fencing. See Q 14 above.
19. How will you ensure the public and others with rights (e.g. common rights holders) will have access to the land after the fencing is in place? Give details of the number, type and location of stiles, gates, gaps or other means of access.

Full public access will be maintained, with all rights of way and other identified informal routes provided with gates. The locations of these gates are shown on the accompanying plans. In all 11 field gates, 17 bridle gates, 8 kissing gates, 1 pedestrian gate and 1 safety corral (with a bridle gate and two field gates) will accommodate this access provision. (The details of the gate type are given in Q15 above). On passing through a single gate in the fence-line, the entire Common will be accessible, as at present.

20. Planning consent. Is Planning permission required? - see Attachment 10

Jane Willmott, Living Landscapes Officer, On behalf of Sussex Wildlife Trust

Signed Jane Willmott

Date 22 October 2015
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## Attachment 1 Iping and Trotton Commons fencing Application

### Schedule of owners of Iping and Trotton Commons (refer to Ownership map for details)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parcel no</th>
<th>landowner</th>
<th>Approximate area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sussex Wildlife Trust (SWT)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leconfield Estate, tenanted to West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and sublet to SWT</td>
<td>9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Duke, Fernbank</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Homan, Spring Cottage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ryder, Steps</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cowdray Estate</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Berenc, Cocksparrow Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WSCC</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>unknown owner</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trustees of Bepton Estate</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Unknown owner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unknown owner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WSCC</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Register of Commons

**LAND SECTION—Book No. 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. and date of entry</th>
<th>Description of the land, reference to the register map, registration particulars etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The piece of land called Iping Common (including Fitcham Heath) in the Parish of Iping in the County of Sussex as marked with a green verge line inside the boundary on sheets 29 and 37 of the register map and there distinguished by the number of this register unit. Registered pursuant to application No. 308 made 10th December 1967 by Iping Parish Council acting by William Edward Wright, of Little Thriggott, Arundel, Sussex, their Clerk and duly authorised to act for this purpose. (Registration provisional.) 24:10 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th January 1968</td>
<td>24:10 and for that parcel of land as marked with a green verge line inside the boundary on sheets 29 and 37 of the register map and there distinguished by the number of this register unit. Registered by the Registration Authority without application. (Registration provisional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The additional piece of land, part of Iping Common on the north side of highway A.273 comprising part of O.S. parcel 204 on O.S. Maps sheet 441:13 (25th edition 1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st March, 1970</td>
<td>24:10 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th Dec. 1971</td>
<td>Registration amended. See Notes entry no. 4 overleaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The registration at entry No. 1 above, being now undisputed became final on the 14th September, 1979.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I HEREBY CERTIFY THIS TO BE A TRUE COPY OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

[Signature]

Authorised for

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. and date of entry</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 18th September 1969</td>
<td>The Rt. Hon. WESLEY ANTON JOHN CHURCHILL, VISCOUNT COWDRAY, of Cowdray Estate Office, Midhurst, Sussex, in the Parish of Berchtesgaden, obtains the ownership of all minerals in or under 20 acres of the south eastern part of Cowdray Common and all rights incident thereto. Noted pursuant to application No. 452 dated 23rd June 1968 made by the aforesaid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 16th October 1970</td>
<td>The objection by PENFOLD BUILDERS, MERCHANTS LIMITED, acting by John Littlejohn, Lower Woodham, Bards Hill, Oxford, made 29th September, 1970 is noted in respect of part of the registration entry no. 1 in this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 21st December 1970</td>
<td>The objection by William Charles Stuart, MARRION, County Surveyor, of County Hall, Chichester, Sussex, made 30th September, 1970 is noted in respect of part of register entry no. 4; and 2 in this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 17th Dec. 1971</td>
<td>The Register entry nos. 1 and 2 overlap are amended to exclude a width of highway verge on the north and south-east sides of the carriageway known as the Elsted Road from being crossroads to Mitchells Farm, and the A. 328 from the A. 328 crossroads to Trotton, and the width excluded from the register is defined in the Schedule comprised in Objection No. 358 submitted by the County Surveyor to the effect that the highway boundary is situated on a line to accord with the measurements (based on distances from the centre of the present carriageway contained in such Schedule and as more particularly delineated by concrete posts embossed &quot;highway boundary - W. S. C. O.&quot;&quot;) set into the soil on the boundary of the highway verge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 30th May 1972</td>
<td>The Notes entry no. 4 above is amended to exclude all reference to concrete posts by the deletion of that part from and including the word &quot;and&quot; in line 8 to the word &quot; verge&quot; at the end of the note. (Minutes No. 29/75 of the Roads and Transportation Committee at the West Sussex County Council refers.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Register of

Rights Section—Sheet No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. and date of entry</th>
<th>No. and date of application</th>
<th>Name and address of every applicant for registration, and the superior in which he applied</th>
<th>Particulars of the right of common, and of the land over which it is exercisable</th>
<th>Particulars of the land (if any) to which the right is attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: This section contains the registration of every right of common registered under the Act as exercisable over the whole or any part of the land described in the land section of this register unit.

Registration authority: [Name and details]

Register work No.: [No.]
Edition No.: [No.]

See Overleaf for Facts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. and date of issue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Every objection to the registration whether as common land or as a town or village green, of any land comprised in this register unit has effect as an objection to any registration (whether made) under Section 4 of the Common Registration Act 1965 of any rights over that land, whether that registration appears in this register or in the Register of (Town or Village Green). If any of the land is also registered as (a town or village green)*, a note to that effect will appear in each section of this register unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st December 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Register of Commons Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. and date of entry</th>
<th>No. and date of application</th>
<th>Name and address of person registered as owner</th>
<th>Particulars of the land to which the registration applies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>The Rt. Hon. W. S. CHURCHILL VISCOUNT COWDRAY</td>
<td>The whole of the land verged in red and lettered A and B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th August</td>
<td>19th June</td>
<td>Cowdray Estate Office, Milburn, Skipton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>The TRUSTEES OF LECONFIELD ESTATE,</td>
<td>The whole of the land verged in red and lettered C on the register map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th February</td>
<td>2nd December</td>
<td>acting by John Scott LUARD, the agent,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Registration provisional).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>The registrations at entry Nos. 1 and 2 above became final on the 14th September, 1979.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th February</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. and date of note</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 22nd June 1970</td>
<td>The registrations at entry nos. 1 and 2 overleaf (blotted A and C on the register map) have been amended under Section 12 of the Act (now shown edged black on the register map). The land to which it applied having been registered under the Land Registration Acts 1925 and 1936.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 18th June 1973</td>
<td>THE PART OF THE LAND LETTERED ( \text{H} ) ON THE REGISTER MAP HAS BEEN REGISTERED UNDER THE LAND REGISTRATION ACTS 1925 TO 1936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. and date of entry</td>
<td>Description of the land, reference to the register map, registration particulars etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The piece of land called TROTTON COMMON in the Parish of Trotton in the County of Sussex as marked with a green verge line inside the boundary on sheet 34 of the register map and there distinguished by the number of this register unit. Registered in consequence of application No. 311 (rights) made 22nd December 1967 by Patrick Terence Neasand DOREGAN and Elizabeth Rose DOREGAN of Whitnot Farm, Trotton, Rogate, Petersfield, Hants. (Registration provisional.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The registration of entry No. 1 above, being now undisposed became final on the 2nd November, 1979.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. and date of vote</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1968 29th February</td>
<td>The application of TROTTON PARISH COUNCIL acting by their Clerk, Mrs. Shirley Allen BURG, of 2 Horse Hill, Trotton, Petersfield, Hants, in the County of Sussex is noted in respect of the registration at entry No. 1. Noted pursuant to Application No. 217 dated 8th January 1968 made by the aforesaid Mrs. Shirley Allen BURG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1968 28th August</td>
<td>The Rt. Hon. WESSTMAN JOHN CHURCHILL VISCOUNT COWDRAY, of the COWDRAY ESTATE OFFICE, Midhurst, in the County of Sussex, claims the ownership of all minerals in or under 21 acres of the southern part of the land comprised in this register unit, and all rights incidental thereto. Noted pursuant to Application No. 461 dated 29th June 1968 made by the aforesaid Rt. Hon. WESSTMAN JOHN CHURCHILL VISCOUNT COWDRAY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1969 26th November</td>
<td>Mrs. Kathleen Mary LOURIE, of &quot;Stags&quot;, Trotton, Petersfield, Hants, in the Parish of Trotton in the County of Sussex, claims for herself and her successors to be entitled to a right of way at all times for all purposes with or without vehicles or animals over the track leading to or from the Midhurst-Trotton-Stagnall public highway at Trotton east or over the land comprised in this register unit to or from the property called &quot;Stags&quot;, Trotton, Petersfield, Hants. Noted pursuant to Application No. 653 dated 29th August, 1969 made by the aforesaid Kathleen Mary LOURIE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1970 10th October</td>
<td>The objection no. 399 by PENFOLDS BUILDERS MERCHANTS LIMITED, acting by John Littledale of Lower Woodton, Bosham Hill. Oxford, made 29th September, 1970, is noted in respect of part of the land in registration entry no. 1 in this section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1970 5th November</td>
<td>The objection no. 411 by William Charles Stuart HARRISON, Surveyor to the West Sussex County Council, County Hall, Chichester, Sussex, made 30th September, 1970, is noted in respect of part of registration entry no. 1 in this section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Date of Application</td>
<td>Name and Address of Every Applicant for Registration, and the Capacity in Which He Applies</td>
<td>Period of the Right of Common, and of the Land Over Which It is Exercisable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31st December 1868</td>
<td>Patrick Vernon, Messrs. DONGAN, and Elisabeth Howse, DONGAN, Whitemite Farm, Trotton, Sussex.</td>
<td>To graze 54 cattle, 34 pigs, and 34 sheep, to cut and take turf and peat, to cut and take underwood, burn bracken and fern over the whole of the land comprised in this register unit. (Registration Provisional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25th November 1869</td>
<td>Mrs. Kathleen Mary LOUISE, Steps, Trotton, Sussex, Owner.</td>
<td>To cut and take free foliage, gorse, faggots, bushes and underwood.  (Registration Provisional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23rd February 1890</td>
<td>The registration at entry No. 1 above being disputed became void and registration entry No. 2 above being now undisputed becomes final both on the 2nd November, 1899.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. and date of note</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The objection no. 56 of The Rt. Hon. Viscount John Churchill, 7th March, 1965. As notice was given in respect of part of the land to which register entry no. 1 in this section refers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The objection no. 596 by the Rt. Hon. Viscount John Churchill, 31st July, 1972. Notice was given in respect of register entry no. 2 in this section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. and date of entry</td>
<td>No. and date of application</td>
<td>Name and Address of person registered as owner</td>
<td>Particulars of the land to which the registration applies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3rd June 1968</td>
<td>The Rt. Hon. W. S. Churchill, Viscount Cowdray, Conway Estate Office, Midhurst, Sussex. (Registration provisional.)</td>
<td>The whole of the pieces of land shown verged in red and lettered A and B on the map of area to the register map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22nd February 1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>The part of the land comprised in this register unit shown verged red and lettered A on the register map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1st February 1982</td>
<td></td>
<td>The part of the land comprised in this register unit shown verged red and lettered B on the register map.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The registration at entry No. 1 above, became final on the 2nd November, 1979.

The West Sussex County Council are hereby registered as owners pursuant to the direction under Section 8(2) of the Commons Registration Act 1965 by the Commons Commissioner dated the 14th day of January 1982.

The registration at entry No. 3 above, became null and void by decision of the Commons Commissioner on 27th February 1992, and is replaced by entry No. 5.

The West Sussex County Council are hereby registered as owners pursuant to the decision under Section 8(2) of the Commons Registration Act 1965 by the Commons Commissioner dated the 27th February 1992.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. and date of note</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>THE PART OF THE LAND LETTERED 'C' ON THE REGISTER MAP HAS BEEN REGISTERED UNDER THE LAND REGISTRATION ACTS 1925 TO 1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18th June 1993
## Schedule for areas excluded from fenced area of Iping and Trotton Commons
See map 6 for locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
<th>Proposed Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Area of Trotton Common to west of Nature Reserve not under SWT ownership. Owners not willing to graze.</td>
<td>As current use and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, C ,E and G</td>
<td>Several strips of the common lie to the north side of the A272 and are not in SWT ownership. Cattle grids across the road with cattle grazing freely would be very dangerous</td>
<td>As current use and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A strip of grass verge and a steep bank under West Sussex County Council (WSCC) Highways control. Siting the fence at the bottom of the bank in the open grass verge adjacent to the highway would be visually intrusive.</td>
<td>As current use and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>A WSCC Highways storage area has been excluded as it would not be appropriate or safe for cattle to enter the area</td>
<td>As current use and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Area of Iping Common to east of Nature Reserve not under SWT ownership. Owners not willing to support application.</td>
<td>As current use and management (managed by SWT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A small area of the common used as a car park will be excluded to separate the cattle from the cars.</td>
<td>As current use and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>An old disused quarry to be excluded for safety reasons.</td>
<td>To be fenced off but with public access provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K and L</td>
<td>A narrow strip of land to the west of the common containing an old track with bridleway rights on it is not under SWT ownership. The landowners are unwilling to have a fence set back onto their land. Also having the bridleway outside the proposed fence would allow riders who do not wish to enter the grazed area to cross Trotton Common. The fence is set back from the track behind a bank and old quarry to reduce any visual impact on the landscape.</td>
<td>As current use and management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fence is generally set back at least 5m from the highway within existing vegetation to reduce any possible visual impact of the fence. | Tree safety inspections |
COUNTY: WEST SUSSEX

DISTRICT: CHICHESTER

SITE NAME: IPING COMMON

Status: Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) notified under Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Part of this site is a Local Nature Reserve (LNR)

Local Planning Authority: CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

National Grid Reference: SU 856219 Area: 124.6 (ha.) 307.9 (ac.)

Ordnance Survey Sheet 1:50,000: 197 1:10,000: SU 82 SW, SE

Date Notified (Under 1949 Act): 1954 Date of Last Revision: 1980

Date Notified (Under 1981 Act): 1986 Date of Last Revision: —

Other Information:
The site lies within the South Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This is 'A Nature Conservation Review' site.

Reasons for Notification:
This site includes Trotton, Iping and Stedham Commons as well as Fitzhall Heath. It is one of the richest examples of heathland remaining in West Sussex and is of particular interest for its invertebrate fauna which includes several rare spiders. The site is of county importance as a breeding site for heathland birds, and is the only site in Sussex for an uncommon species of grass.

As is typical of the Sussex commons, this heathland has developed on soils derived from the lower greensand. The majority of the heath is 'dry' although there are also smaller, wetter areas. Other habitats present include woodland, scrub, grassland and two ponds in the north of the site.

The site was extensively damaged by fire in 1976. Although much of the fauna was lost at the time, this has provided a rare opportunity to study the rate of heath recolonisation, and has particularly encouraged the regeneration of heather Calluna vulgaris.

The majority of the heath is dominated by heather and bell-heather Erica cinerea with dwarf gorse Ulex minor also present. Where drainage is impeded on north Trotton and part of Stedham Commons this dry heath grades into a wetter heathland type where an increase in cross-leaved heath Erica tetralix and purple moor-grass Molinia caerulea is found. Where surface water is permanently present purple moor-grass becomes dominant with deer-grass Trichophorum cespitosum and heath rush Juncus squarrosum locally abundant. These areas of wet heath also support a rich moss flora which includes Polytrichum commune, Sphagnum tenellum and Dicranum spatum.

Grassland is mainly confined to the rides which cross the site. Creeping and common bent grasses, Agrostis canina fera and Agrostis capillaris respectively, dominate drier areas; purple moor-grass and soft rush Juncus effusus on wetter areas. Iping Common is the only Sussex site for bristle bent grass Agrostis curviseta, a record not verified recently.

The site supports a rich invertebrate fauna. Prior to the fires of 1976 109 spider-species (Arachnida) had been recorded, including such notable rarities as Centromerus aequalis a species new to Britain, Micaria silesiaca and Prosopotheca conticaulis. Amongst the butterflies there were important local populations of the silver-studded blue Plebejus argus and the grayling Hipparchia semele. The dragonflies Odonata were also well-represented.
The Commons are of county importance for breeding bird’s; typical heathland species include nightjar and stonechat.
13th Nov 2013

Our ref: WGS/IPING/SSSI/OO
Your ref: AG00280616

Mr James Power
Sussex Wildlife Trust
Woods Mill
Shoreham Road
Henfield
BN5 9SD

Dear James Power

Integrated Site Assessment (ISA) Iping Common SSSI units 1, 2 & 3

As part of Natural England’s program to assess the condition of designated sites, the above SSSI underwent an integrated site assessment (ISA) on 24th October 2013.

The assessment takes various habitat features and surveys them against targets for favourable condition, as set out in the common standards monitoring technique, specified by the Joint Nature Conservation Council (JNCC). In this way we are able to evaluate the condition of the SSSI against qualifying criteria. This allows Natural England to offer valuable advice to landowners/managers based on up to date information to either continue with or make changes to the current management regime to achieve favourable condition.

I can confirm that Iping Common SSSI units 2 & 3 have been assessed as “Unfavourable Recovering” whilst Unit 1 remains “Favourable”

Units 2 & 3
The main issues of concern within units 2 and 3 are birch regeneration in the south west of unit 2 and into unit 3, the low levels of pioneer heather (common across the SSSI as a whole) and the closed Molinia dominated sward and lack of disturbance within the wetter areas. All of which can be remedied by some disturbance and grazing ideally by cattle. I am aware that the site is currently undergoing consultation for fencing to enable increased grazing so that the minor issues which remain on units 2 and 3 can be addressed.

Unit 1
There were some issues highlighted by the ISA over herb species diversity but given the time of year the visit took place and the general species poor characteristics of heathland it was not surprising that only a few fairly common species were seen. I am aware that there are some areas of species diversity in and around mire/bog pools which were not reflected in this assessment. The unit also fails on cover of dwarf shrubs in the mires and marginally failed on cover of bracken end native tree/scrub, but as the unit is grazed and there is a regime of scrub/tree control I am happy that the correct management is in place to secure further improvement to the sites condition into the future. As such the unit continues to maintain Favourable condition.

The site as a whole meets most of the targets set out for heathland SSSI’s and it is clear that the ongoing management for the site which includes heather cutting, turf stripping and native scrub/tree control, although not something that can be achieved quickly, continues to move it in the right direction towards overall favourable condition.
Natural England hopes that you continue to build on the positive management already achieved and see further habitat quality improvement. If you have any further questions, or would like to discuss the above, please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Matthew Taylor
Adviser
Land Management
Mail.Taylor@naturalengland.org.uk
Iping & Trotton Commons Fencing Application

Attachment 7 Safety Corral proposal for Iping Common

Corral made from wooden post and 3 wooden rails

- 10m from road
- 4m wide gap
- Can be closed
- 5m with locked field gate in
- Mounting block 1m long
- 3m
- 2m
- 12m
- 5ft Bridle gate
- 20m long
- 5m with locked field gate in
Sussex Wildlife Trust is reviewing its management of Iping and Stedham Common Nature Reserve (which includes part of Trotton Common, Bridgelands Plantation and Fitzhall Heath). This background paper outlines the issues and options for the future management of the reserve and includes an appraisal of the choices for Sussex Wildlife Trust as owner and manager of the Commons. Details of where to get further information and send your comments are at the end of the paper.

Lowland heathland – the principal habitat type at Iping and Stedham Common – is internationally scarce and only occurs with suitable soils on the Atlantic fringes of NW Europe. The climate of UK is especially suited to heathland and the UK supports some 20% of the remaining European heaths. Losses of heathland in the past two centuries have been massive across all of its natural range, through agricultural change, conifer planting, development pressures and neglect. Although West Sussex only has a small area of heath compared with Hampshire, Dorset and Surrey, the county still supports some 1.2% of the UK total.

Iping, Stedham and Trotton Commons are at the core of the most extensive surviving area of heathland in West Sussex – remnants of a chain of heaths that once stretched virtually unbroken through the Weald for 40km. These heaths have formed on soils derived from Lower Greensand, here made up of the Folkestone beds, which predominantly consist of poorly-consolidated sands with seams of pebbles and clays and veins of hard iron-rich sandstone.
Most heathland in southern England is thought to have been created from the Late Stone Age through clearance of the primary woodland that once cloaked the country, to create temporary arable plots and clearings for stock grazing. At Iping there is evidence of such human activity and use of the landscape from as far back as 7000BC, in the form of worked flint scatters. Clearance - often repeated many times as areas were abandoned to woodland and then re-occupied - exposed and degraded the naturally thin, acidic soils, creating the impoverished conditions favoured by heathland. Later settlement of the site is clear from the number of Bronze Age (2500-1400BC) round barrows or tumuli. Further archaeological remains exist in the form of the section of Roman road across the Common, linking Chichester with Silchester, constructed in the 1st century AD.

Following the conversion of woodland to heathland, the heaths were kept open down the centuries by intensive uses, including continued grazing and burning, removal of turves, bracken and scrub for fuel and animal bedding, cutting of timber and exploitation of other heathland products. These activities prevented woodland from re-establishing and also resulted in the continual removal of nutrients from the system, maintaining the nutrient-poor soils and their characteristic heathland vegetation. Abandonment and conversion of heathland commons to other uses, has meant that more than 80% of heathlands across southern Britain has now been lost and this is especially acute in West Sussex where 91% of the heath present in 1813 has been lost.

Changes in agriculture and the availability of cheap fuel brought most traditional heathland management to an end by the beginning of the 20th century, although one commoner was still grazing at Iping and Stedham until WWII. The Commons was heavily used during the war, for military training in preparation for D-Day and traces of this period of activity can still be seen on the Commons. Today Iping and Stedham Commons is a popular destination for local walkers and dog walkers, while others come to see or study the wildlife, ride horses or cycle on the bridleways or just enjoy the peace and quiet and the fine views of this great cultural landscape, within close reach of Midhurst.
The importance of Iping, Stedham and Trotton Commons for nature conservation was recognised by its designation as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) as early as 1954, in the first such schedule for the county. The site was declared a Local Nature Reserve in 1978 and Sussex Wildlife Trust has acquired the land under direct purchase or lease since 1985, to manage the Commons as a heathland nature reserve. Some 9ha including the main car park is owned by a private estate and held under a lease to West Sussex County Council and sub-leased to SWT.
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The SSSI known as Iping, but including the other commons is one of the richest sites for heathland invertebrates in Sussex and the spider fauna in particular is of great importance. Recent surveys, to check the status of this group have shown that the SSSI remains of very high value with 204 spider species present, representing some 30% of the entire British spider fauna. This assemblage on the SSSI includes a number that are nationally scarce. There are further rare or nationally scarce species present on the two Commons including silver-studded blue butterfly, hornet robber-fly, mottled bee-fly, and a spider-hunting wasp.
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The SSSI also supports populations of the nationally rare heath tiger beetle and field cricket, confined to a very few heathland sites in southern England, and several scarce heathland plant species, including marsh club-moss. The specialist lowland heathland birds – woodlark, Dartford warbler and nightjar – also breed in reasonable numbers on the site.
SSSIs are sites of national nature conservation importance and their condition is subject to regular monitoring by the government’s statutory advisor, Natural England. The objective is for all SSSIs to reach and be maintained in favourable condition. Such assessments for heathland SSSIs nationally rely on these main generic criteria:

Dry heaths
- Tree and scrub cover should be less than 15% by area
- Cover by area of European gorse to be less than 25%
- Bracken cover to be maintained at less than 10%
- Cover of bare ground to be 1-10% by area
- Dwarf shrub cover of at least two species of 25-90% by area
- A mixture of 10-40% cover of pioneer, 10-40% cover of building/mature and 20-80% cover of degenerate phase dwarf shrubs and less than 10% of dead ericaceous cover
- Cover of mosses and lichens to be maintained
- Recently burnt areas to be less than 5% by area
- At least 10% of the dwarf shrub heath by area should not be burnt at any time
- Requirement for a mix of dwarf shrubs, grasses/sedges and other herbs and flowers, with maximum cover of exotic species less than 1% and weeds such as nettles and thistles less than 1%
- Maintain soil cover with vegetation, (but with reductions in tree, scrub and bracken cover) over archaeological features

Wet heaths
- Presence of ericaceous species in all stages of growth
- Cover of bare ground to be 1-10% by area
- If naturally present more than 10% cover of Sphagnum spp, and more than 5% cover of lichens
- Purple moor grass to be no more than occasional
- European gorse cover less than 10%
- Dwarf shrub cover of at least two species of 25-90% by area
- Requirement for a mix of dwarf shrubs, grasses/sedges and other herbs, with maximum cover of exotic species less than 1% and weeds such as rushes, and thistles less than 1%.
- Tree and scrub cover should be less than 10% by area
- Trampling/paths less than 1%, and no silt or leachate or artificial drains

The current condition assessment for Stedham Common is Favourable, while Iping is Unfavourable Recovering due to the predominance of grasses and lack of species diversity.
The SSSI is part of a cultural landscape of open, largely heather-covered land which has been maintained for centuries by cutting, burning, grazing and other human activities. The encroachment of scrub and trees onto the open heath, as well as domination by coarse grasses need constant attention; both can result in a build up of leaf litter that further suppresses heathland vegetation. These changes are particular problems nowadays, since the traditional management practices that created and maintained heathlands over many centuries have largely ceased.

Today, management for the wildlife of the Common encounters two major problems: Continued spread of scrub and trees across the open heathland; and the slow conversion of heath to grassland. Without regular management, most heathlands will rapidly be lost to either grass/bracken-dominated communities or to encroaching trees and scrub. Invasion by trees and scrub has been one of the main threats to heathland in recent years.

Airborne nitrogen arising from the burning of fossil fuels in industry, road traffic, shipping, aviation and agriculture poses one of the greatest threats to heathland in Europe. Many heathland plants can only survive and compete successfully on acid soils with low nitrogen availability. The addition of nutrients in rain or dust particles increases the nitrogen in the vegetation, leaf litter and upper soil layers, and this builds up over time. Heather can initially benefit from inputs of nitrogen, but this also causes more rapid ageing of the plants and greater susceptibility to drought, frost and insect attack. Where the heather is weakened or is not rejuvenated by management then grasses gain a competitive advantage both from the higher nutrient levels and from the increase in light. This triggers a conversion from heather to grass or bracken-dominated vegetation with the loss of many wildlife and plant species dependent on heather-dominated heaths. On the drier heath, wavy hair-grass can come to dominate, while on damper ground, purple moor-grass takes over. Higher nutrient levels can also be signalled by increases in bramble and the spread of bracken.

Studies have shown a decline in heather and an increase in the dominance of grasses on many heaths across Europe. Following considerable research, it has been suggested that harmful effects of nitrogen inputs (such as conversion to grass) can occur on heathlands and mires above a threshold of 10-20 kg of nitrogen deposition/hectare/year.

One of the main aims of management is therefore to reduce the deposition levels that have built up from past years and to counter the annual increments that are still occurring. If the Commons are not to become a mixture of closed woodland, and with heather replaced by coarse grasses and bracken, a substantial amount of management will be needed to encourage heathland plants and suppress competition from other species. There are various ways of managing heathland to achieve these objectives; these are not mutually exclusive but each has advantages and disadvantages.
Tree and scrub clearance

The cutting and removal of birch, oak and other scrub species will help retain the open heathland and grassland and prevent succession to woodland. Some follow-up management by stump treatment or grazing may be required for broad-leaved trees and shrubs. Tree and scrub removal must be sensitively done to retain sufficient scattered trees and scrub to enhance the biodiversity and landscape value of the commons.

European gorse is a valuable breeding habitat and year-round foraging habitat for a number of birds including stonechats, linnets and Dartford warblers. Stands of gorse scattered across the heath will provide maximum territorial and feeding opportunities and is best maintained on a 10-12 year cutting cycle. Bracken will need to be cut or sprayed to prevent it swamp ing more desirable plant communities.

Mowing

Frequent mowing creates an even sward and can encourage grass dominance over dwarf shrubs such as heather. This is because grasses are better adapted to regular cutting or grazing than dwarf shrubs. Mowing removes the standing vegetation but leaves the lower parts of the vegetation and leaf litter layer intact, so the effect on the accumulated nutrient stores is modest. On acid grassland mowing can maintain a short sward and benefit low-growing plants that would be shaded out by tall growth. Generally mowing is a useful restoration measure, with subsequent maintenance through grazing, and it can be valuable in promoting age diversity in heather; it can also be a useful way of maintaining low vegetation for firebreaks. On Iping we have found that the regular mowing of rides has changed the sward from heather to grass.

Mown material must be removed off site to reduce nutrients, and it can be difficult and costly to find suitable disposal sites for large amounts of cut material. It can in some instances provide a seed source for restoration of heather. In one study of mowing the amount of nitrogen removed from the system was equivalent to about five years of atmospheric input. Calculations from inputs and stored nitrogen levels in South East England suggest that mowing and leaf litter removal could remove about 22% of stored nitrogen or 6-7 years of inputs.

Mowing uses machinery, which is less sustainable than burning. It also risks the possibility of soil compaction and possible erosion or damage to archaeological sites. On some parts of the Commons, mowing and the removal of cuttings would be impractical because of the wet or uneven ground.
Turf-stripping

Turf-stripping removes the vegetation, leaf litter and organic layers, and depending how low the machinery is set, part of the top layer of the underlying soil. This is an extremely effective way of reducing nutrients, as high levels of nitrogen are stored in the organic layer and top layer of the soil. This has been calculated as removing over 50 years of nitrogen input. Removing turf can increase species-richness, and can reduce the cover of grasses but can also deplete heathers persisting as seed in the soil, acidify groundwater and cause increases in soil ammonium that can inhibit seed germination and reduce seedling survival.

Turf removal creates patches of bare ground that are early successional habitats and important components of heathland communities as they support a range of rare species, including invertebrates which need bare or open ground, such as solitary wasps and mining bees. Turf-stripping on a large scale can be expensive, produces large volumes of material for disposal and can be unsightly and damage surface archaeology unless done sensitively and on a very small scale.

The expense, disposal problems and temporary landscape effects make wide-scale turf-stripping an option only in exceptional circumstances. These could arise if no other options for heathland restoration were available and large scale turf-stripping was a last resort, as has happened in The Netherlands. On a smaller scale, turf-stripping is a practical option on small areas of rare habitat and for creation of bare ground for invertebrates, or where species are threatened by nutrient-driven spread of grasses. It has been used on a small scale quite successfully on Iping with turves removed going to re-create heathland in other locations locally.

Burning

Controlled burning is used to break up even-aged heather areas and re-start the heather growth cycle for the benefit of associated wildlife. It can remove some of the accumulated nutrients from the heath, but can encourage grasses and bracken if carried out too often. Planned burning usually takes place in late winter and covers small areas within firebreaks that have been mown beforehand. Burning slows nitrogen build-up; it does not stop it. After burning, watercourses can be affected by nutrients and fires can also increase soil acidity. Burning by itself can increase the dominance of grasses and reduce the frequency and dominance of heather.

Burning of grassland areas has limited benefits unless followed by grazing. On heathlands wild fires can provide some diversity, but unplanned wildfires all too often happen in spring and summer, are often extensive and very damaging to wildlife. A planned, rotational burning programme followed by grazing may reduce this risk.
Results of burning can be variable; burning of old stands of heather can reduce diversity and fires can cause damage to moss and lichen communities. The presence of the roads and power-lines abutting the site would restrict areas of potential burning and there could be health and safety issues and concerns that controlled winter burns might encourage arsonists at other times. Nevertheless, burning on rotation is a traditional form of heathland management, undertaken to provide a flush of fresh growth for grazing animals. This is still the practice in upland areas and in the New Forest and has been carried out successfully on occasion at Iping. If continued at Iping and Stedham Commons, burning needs careful consideration and preparation, has to be on a small scale, careful selection of the areas, including assessments of potential impact on protected species such as reptiles, and the effects on areas used by visitors.

**Grazing**

Grazing creates structural diversity in vegetation, and enhances species-richness. Grazing and trampling by livestock reduce the dense thatch that has accumulated from previous years of growth, in the absence of management. This creates a mosaic of micro-habitats with small areas of short vegetation and open ground that can be colonised by low-growing, light-demanding plants such as sundews and marsh club-moss on damper soils.

Grazing has also been shown to be effective at mitigating the effects of atmospheric nitrogen and phosphorus deposition through the gradual and continual removal of vegetation. It can also play a role in suppressing scrub and bracken, creating bare ground and reducing leaf litter. Generally light grazing leads to an increase in heather cover and heavy grazing can lead to the replacement of heather with grassland species. Light grazing can remove about 15 Kg per hectare per year of nitrogen, so it could approximately balance the annual input of nitrogen. Further action would be needed to reduce accumulated nitrogen from previous inputs.

The use of grazing however requires effective control of livestock. Under new legislation only 10 ha (or 10% by area, whichever is less) of a Common can be enclosed at any one time without consent from the Planning Inspectorate. For grazing to be practical fencing would be required to contain cattle or ponies but if sheep were used, control might be through shepherding or fencing. However, sheep are vulnerable to attacks from dogs and they are ineffective grazers of tall vegetation such as purple moor-grass, but could be used after controlled fires or cutting.

Sheep tend to crop closely. They avoid wet grassy habitats, especially coarse vegetation such as purple moor grass straw and prefer short grass turf. They would have very limited impact on tall grass swards. On drier ground, sheep grazing could help to maintain a balance between dwarf shrubs and grasses. Sheep can damage young heather by pulling up the seedlings as they graze. Some primitive breeds (e.g. Hebridean) will browse tree saplings but most sheep are not browsers. Sheep are selective grazers and can damage the growing tips of heather particularly in late summer and autumn but with their lighter weight are less likely to cause damage by trampling. With their small hooves, sheep do not provide the same range of hoof print regeneration niches as cattle and ponies. In conclusion, sheep grazing is less likely to control purple moor-grass and more likely to cause heather damage from grazing than other stock types.
Cattle are less selective grazers than sheep but preferentially select grassy habitats to forage. In summer they are likely to concentrate on grassland and wet heath and will reduce rank vegetation such as tussocky purple moor-grass which they will readily eat particularly in early summer. They will also eat dead purple moor grass ‘straw’ which reduces the effects of deep litter on smaller plant species, some of which are scarce or rare on wet heathland. A reduction in litter build up also lowers fire risk.

Cattle can damage heather by trampling but generally only use dry heath either when moving between feeding sites or for resting. Cattle trampling provides regeneration niches for a range of heathland plant species and has been recommended as a valuable component for the conservation of rare heathland plants and invertebrates. Surveys in 2012 looked at the invertebrate faunas of the recent grazing trial plots at Iping compared with a similar non-grazed area on the Common, and also Stedham Common where grazing has been in place for more than 10 years. The richest area of the three was Stedham but even after just 3 months of the Iping grazing trial there were some differences compared with the non-grazed areas, in particular increases in species associated with bare ground, dung and nectar sources. The shorter, more flower-rich grass areas in the grazed plots accounted for the last noted increase.

Especially if they have young calves with them cows can be aggressive towards dogs, and young stock can be boisterous but are rarely aggressive. People do not normally feed cattle so they do not develop the sort of behaviour sometimes found in ponies. Careful choice of animals is therefore important.

Ponies are less efficient at digesting plant matter than cattle and therefore have a larger throughput of vegetation. Ponies also preferentially select grasses on heathland and will travel further into mire communities than other stock and will eat more poor quality forage including dead leaves and stems. The diet of ponies has been found to be 50% grasses throughout the year and more in summer. They are considered highly suitable for grazing purple moor-grass in wet heath and will also browse gorse in both summer and winter and regeneration from cut downy birch in summer. A study of pony grazing on a valley mire in Dorset over 10 years showed an increase in small species such as sundews and bog asphodel as well as bog mosses and a general reduction in vegetation height.
Ponies may congregate around areas such as car parks if visitors feed them and can become a nuisance or even a danger if aggressively seeking food, but again these problems can be overridden with careful selection of animals and no feeding. They are also perceived to pose a problem for horse riders.

On heathlands with purple moor-grass, the bulk of the grazing should normally take place between May and October. Where wavy hair-grass is present, as this grass is winter green, grazing can take place all year. Both ponies and cattle will graze purple moor-grass. Because of their different digestive systems, ponies of a similar size have a considerably greater throughput of vegetation than cattle, but both will eat a proportion of dead grass. Cattle and especially ponies will also browse gorse in winter. On some heaths a system has been adopted of grazing cattle in the summer and ponies all year round.

Reference to historic stocking rates is often of limited value to the modern site manager, as the effects of nitrogen deposition and, in some areas, mineralization of peat soils, has resulted in greater vegetation growth and more rapid successional processes than would have taken place in the past. Most heathland managers err on the side of caution and use low stocking rates to start with, slowly building up numbers in the light of experience and results on the vegetation. On Stedham the Trust has now been grazing cattle since 2000 and has found that grazing 6 British White cattle for varying months and lengths of time works well. This has been confirmed by the SSSI condition assessment and site monitoring. If grazing were used at Iping, about 15 or 20 cows (or ponies, or a combination) or 100 sheep would be suitable to graze the whole of the common.

Grazing by cattle and ponies requires careful selection of breeds. Cattle grazing takes place on many heavily-visited sites and people often enjoy seeing grazing animals in a natural environment. Despite this, some visitors are nervous about visiting areas with livestock, especially when accompanied by dogs. Traditional cattle breeds are however generally docile and ignore dogs and people. Horse riders can be wary of free-grazing ponies, and riders and their mounts have special requirements where there are gates.

Traditional breeds are generally used on heathland as they are better adapted to grazing rougher vegetation, hardy and docile, and tolerant of dogs. Most sheep are susceptible to attacks by dogs although Jacob sheep will see off some dogs. Hebridean and Welsh Mountain sheep both do well on poor vegetation and will browse developing scrub, but both are vulnerable to dogs. Sussex Wildlife Trust has much experience of grazing with British White cattle and these have successfully been grazing several heathlands in the area, including Stedham Common.

For grazing to be a practical choice of heathland management, effective containment of livestock would be necessary. Shepherding is only workable with sheep and then works best on large sites, where dog walkers have to keep their dogs on leads, and where there are no busy roads, or the roads are fenced. Temporary fenced enclosures are limited to 10ha or 10% by area of a common unit and may only be in place for six months in any twelve so would not achieve grazing of the whole site. More natural behaviour by grazing animals can be achieved with perimeter fencing, as animals can choose which areas to graze or which vegetation to eat depending on season and availability of forage, and which areas to lie up in at night. Such a system would be ‘extensive’ and this is what the Trust has used at
Stedham Common. This required consent of the Planning Inspectorate and the same is required for all commons, including Iping if it were to be implemented. Though more expensive initially, permanent fencing is more robust and less prone to damage or theft than electric fencing; indeed a standard post and wire fence could be expected to last for some 20 years. Any perimeter fence on a common would need to make provision for full access, with all entrance points suitably gated, but once inside the entrance gate the heath remains open and uncluttered.

There is therefore a range of management techniques available to the heathland manager, including cutting, burning, grazing and turf-stripping, or a combination of these. Each technique seeks to replicate the effect of systems that often operated for centuries, albeit for a different purpose that were usually closely linked to the rural economy and making a livelihood. In today’s context each technique has advantages and disadvantages in relation to nutrient removal, prevention of succession to woodland, creation of structural diversity and species biodiversity, financial costs, landscape considerations and public perceptions of the site.

All these management techniques are already in use to a greater or lesser degree on Iping and Stedham Common Nature Reserve. Grazing was introduced on Stedham Common some 12 years ago and is now well established and has helped to put the common into favourable condition. Other techniques such as scrub clearance are already practised on both commons but grazing has been confined to a small demonstration area only on Iping. We are interested in obtaining views on the way existing managements are carried out, how you believe these improve or take away from your enjoyment of the Commons and what further improvements you would like to see. In consulting the public on future management, the Trust is aiming to strike a balance between all these considerations. It aims to manage the Reserve in a way that reaches and maintains favourable condition for the whole site, whilst attracting a wide measure of public understanding and support.

Sussex Wildlife Trust will be holding drop-in events for you to discuss the issues with them and staff from our consultants on Tuesday 9 July from 1.30 until 6.30pm and Monday 22 July from 4 until 9pm at Stedham Memorial Hall, Stedham, nr Midhurst, West Sussex, GU29 0NL. There will also be walks on the reserve that will give you a chance to discuss issues with managers on Sundays 21 July and 11 August. Staff will be available in Iping Common car park from 1pm with a walk around the reserve from 2 until 4pm. More information on the management and wildlife of Iping and Stedham Common Nature Reserve can be obtained from Sussex Wildlife Trust at sussexwildlifetrust.org.uk

Please complete the online questionnaire by Monday 19 August. For a paper copy of the questionnaire please phone 01273 492630.
Dear Jane,

Iping and Trotton Common Fencing Proposals

Bridleways 914, 3341, 3342, 3343, 3344
Footpath 913

I am writing to you with regards to your application to install 10 new gates on the above paths. Considering the proposals to change the use of this land to enable permanent grazing I am happy for WSCC to consent to the structures under section 147 of the Highways Act 1980.

Consent will remain in place for as long as the fencing is necessary to prevent stock egress or ingress.

I would appreciate being kept informed of any timescales for these works as and when they are available.

Yours sincerely,

Helen Chalk
Rights of Way Access Ranger

Iping & Trotton Commons Fencing Application

Attachment 9 Highways consent for gates on Public Rights of Way
Dear Sir/Madam

Applicant: Sussex Wildlife Trust
Proposal: Erection of livestock fencing and access gates at Iping and Trotton Commons.
Location: Iping Common, Fitzhall Road, Iping, West Sussex

Thank you for the submission of the ‘Do I Need Planning Permission’ enquiry, received on 17 July 2014. Following an assessment of the details contained within the submitted form I can confirm that planning permission would not be required for the proposed Erection of livestock fencing and access gates at Iping and Trotton Commons.

This is subject to the following conditions:-

1. Planning permission is not required for the erection of permanent fencing as proposed and the development can therefore be completed under permitted development. It is worth bearing in mind that under the Commons Act 2006, the erection of fencing will require consent from DEFRA, the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Such applications are dealt with by the Planning Inspectorate.

Please note this is an informal opinion given by an Officer based on the information provided within the completed form. If you require a formal legal determination as to whether planning permission is required, then a Certificate of Proposed Lawful Development/Use should be submitted. A fee would be payable.

It would be advisable to contact the Building Control department at your Local Authority to check if building regulation approval is required.

Yours faithfully,

Mr Rory Moores
Assistant Planning Officer

Iping & Trotton Commons Fencing Application
Attachment 10 Letter confirming no Planning Permission required