

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP01	Landscape	no opinion	no opinion	I believe the develop of the building proposed for North Lane recreation field would seriously damage the landscape - be of danger to children's play area and any further development to this project should be abolished	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan	None
WHP01	Landscape	support	oppose	The Highbrook Playground next to my house, Battens, has been identified as a 'formal viewpoint' on Map B. My husband and I have never thought of this space as a 'formal viewpoint' but rather that it benefits from a borrowed view across our front garden, field and neighbour's field, at Brook House Farm, which is enjoyed at our's and our neighbour's discretion. There are no covenants in the deeds to our house or the Playground which stipulate the maintenance of a view and as all of our neighbours in the Highbrook Conservation area have high hedges and trees giving their front gardens privacy and security we expect to be able to implement the same right if we deem that our enjoyment of our property warrants doing so.	The Highbrook playground is identified as a "formal recreational space" in fact. A viewpoint is identified in that general area which is also viewable from Hammingden Lane and the public footpath.	None
WHP01	Landscape	mostly support	support	I can't believe that the important and widely used recreational area of Gravetye Woods has been omitted from Map B. This leisure facility is possibly used by more people, more frequently, than any of the other areas on Map B. (It has been threatened in the past by the suggestion of a C319 West Hoathly & Sharpthorne bypass.) Selsfield Common and Blackland Farm also appear to have been wrongly omitted from the Map.	Gravetye Woods is indeed an important informal amenity. Should be discussed with William Robinson Trust	Consider adding some/all of the space to map B
WHP01	Landscape	mostly support	support	Strongly support policies on protecting the landscape and enhancing footpaths.	Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	mostly support	support	Are the owners of the Informal Recreational Areas happy for them to be so designated. I was not aware of such an area between Selsfield Road and Gravetye.	Some comments received in this consultation re first point. The space is part of the William Robinson Trust land used for tobogganing(?) but no objection raised.	
WHP01	Landscape	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	mostly support	support	Does this conflict with other policy suggestions? eg housing	No known such conflicts with identified sites / viewpoints	
WHP01	Landscape	mostly support	support	Support, Oppose, No Opinion - where's the 'Unbelievable' option in the drop-down menu? Unbelievable should be an option for WHP1 and WHP3, because despite the Parish Council (or working groups) suggesting that this policy should, over the next 5-20 years, prevent development that impacts openness, landscape character and informal recreational use enjoyment... within 6 months from now, it seems that the same Parish Council could be contemplating an unnecessary community shop, unnecessary cafe, and unnecessary 15-space car park development on North Lane Recreation Ground that does all three of these things. Like I said, unbelievable. Such a contradiction in behaviour/action. I hope that the democratic decision that has yet to be made, regardless of both project's timescales, supports this policy NOW, TODAY, and from adoption of The Neighbourhood Plan.	An unbelievable option didn't seem to be that useful in the consultation. Support for this Plan noted.	
WHP01	Landscape	mostly support	support	SUPPORT	Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	mostly support	support	Proposed development at W.Hoathley North Lane Rec Ground is contrary to this policy. Existing buildings could be found to house a shop rather than develop land set aside for recreational purposes.	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan	
WHP01	Landscape	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	no opinion	support	I am strongly opposed to development of land given to the village for recreational purposes. Other development not on recreational land should be considered on individual merit. I am very much favour of protecting our recreational spaces and keeping them car-free. The rush to get permission for a development on North Lane Recreation ground before this plan comes into force shows cynicism on the part of those supporting the development & makes me question the value of this plan if wishes expressed by villagers can be ignore with such ease.	Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	strongly oppose	support	No building on North Lane Rec	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan	
WHP01	Landscape	support	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	support	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	support	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	support	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	support	support	Further protected views should also be considered to reflect the statement made in Section 14	Noted - but which views specifically?	Email Farleys and ask.
WHP01	Landscape	support	support		Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP01	Landscape	support	support		Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	support	support	Would like the landscape to stay mostly unchanged as this is an area of outstanding beauty but tweaking can be beneficial.	Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	support	support	Map B. Strategic Gap between West Hoathly and Sharpthorne. I believe this was a feature in previous district plans but doesn't seem to have found its way into the draft WH NP. If this is not in the District Plan, I suggest this information is added. At the same time perhaps Shagswell Wood on the north side of The Hollow, together with the William Robinson woodlands could be shown as informal recreation space (and coloured light green) and added?	"Local Gaps" identified in the 2004 MSDC Local Plan were invalidated by the introduction of the South East Plan. In reviewing the new draft District Plan it was concluded that the provisions for the countryside outside village built-up areas were sufficient. Gravetye Woods is indeed an important informal amenity. Should be discussed with William Robinson Trust. Ownership of Shagswell Woods?	Consider adding some/all of the Shagswell / Gravetye Woods space to map B. Seek advice from MSDC on "Local Gap"
WHP01	Landscape	support	support	Shame this is not in place to stop development of recreational ground into shop etc	Noted	
WHP01	Landscape	support	support	Agree that it is very necessary not to spoil the character of the landscape.	Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	no opinion	no opinion	In principle I support this although each one has to be looked at individually	As and when an affected planning application is looked at by MSDC it will be looked at on its merits	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	no opinion	no opinion	See my comment for WHP1	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	no opinion	I don't understand what this means. If it refers to CHANGES to the "access, boundaries, lanes" then I agree with WHP2. If it refers to the volume of traffic along these, WHP2 could be used to stop any development on the basis that it will have an impact. For example WHP13, site adjacent to Cookhams development of up to 24 dwellings, could be prohibited because of possibility it will create some additional traffic along Selsfield Road.	This policy relates to the appearance of the lanes, not the actual traffic.	Consider clarification of policy and surrounding text wording
WHP02	Historic Lanes	mostly support	oppose	Development along these lanes will adversely impact the AONB. Further, development in these areas will increase the volume of traffic. There are already frequent accidents at the junction of Top Road and Grinstead Lane - this situation will worsen if there are developments in this area.	Although the policy is opposed, the comment appears to be in support. Potentially a wording change may clarify. Development doesn't necessarily mean new dwellings - it could be new/changed access to an existing one.	Consider clarification of policy and surrounding text wording
WHP02	Historic Lanes	strongly oppose	oppose	All further development will certainly impact on our lanes. You just have to read the hoathly hub to understand the upset already prevalent in this village about the increase in speed and volume of traffic, particularly along the road through Sharpthorne which is becoming so heavy it is in danger of splitting our village and community. As many families live on the Hamsey Road side of the road then if it is not safe for them to walk to school the parents will a) use their cars adding to the traffic b) then they may as well use a different school thus further reducing the school numbers.	Although the policy is opposed, the comment appears to be in support. Potentially a wording change may clarify. Development doesn't necessarily mean new dwellings - it could be new/changed access to an existing one. NB this policy only applies to the lanes marked on Map A.	Consider clarification of policy and surrounding text wording
WHP02	Historic Lanes	mostly support	support	HGV's need to be kept to a minimum in these lanes as well as on the c319. Traffic a big problem. Could we not have calming in Sharpthorne as they have in Hartfield? They still have cars parked as an added deterrent.	Noted, but this comment seems to be more applicable to WHP9. Such measures as suggested may well form part of the implementation.	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	mostly support	support	It is not clear whether this proposal refers only to developments along the parish lanes, or to all developments in the parish. Some of the historic parish lanes noted on Map A form the parish boundary. What steps will be taken to ensure that neighbouring parish plans have similar proposals?	This comment may again stem from lack of clarity in the policy wording. Grinstead Lane forms the ESCC / Forest Row Parish boundary both of whom have been consulted but not commented to date. MSDC's jurisdiction would only apply to the West side.	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	mostly support	support	Current traffic, particularly connected to the quarry already damages verges and pavements near The Bowls Club, near the church and in Church lane.	Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	mostly support	support		Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP02	Historic Lanes	mostly support	support	Support WHP2, but we must support local businesses who may already be in these lanes - allowing them to survive, and thrive! ----- Re bus services using our lanes (WHP2?). I've spoken to a number of elderly people in the last few days about bus services, some of whom can only just physically get on the bus (I travelled on the 84 to East Grinstead and back today). Compared to a year ago, I thought the number of people travelling by bus had increased - many more elderly use it than I thought. I also spoke to an elderly lady near the Cat Inn at the weekend, and she expressed concern and anger that the bus service no longer uses North Lane. Can we therefore not look into sharing a mini-bus service with a neighbouring Parish that focuses on getting elderly folk from/to North Lane areas to East Grinstead during the week? Alternatively, can those needing transportation to/from nearby facilities/shops/amenities/services, not list themselves with someone confidentially, who can then find them a lift from someone. Those willing to be that lift could also register themselves. This is in addition to the existing list of volunteers on the back of The Chronicle. Just a few ideas...	The draft Plan supports local businesses and employment (WHP18). Changes by businesses and domestic premises would both be subject to this policy's provisions. Bus service comments noted	Ideas for a voluntary transport service noted.
WHP02	Historic Lanes	mostly support	support	SUPPORT	Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	mostly support	support	Think Map A should also include the lane that links Chilling Street to Cinder Hill - there are magnificent views across from this lane.	There are some errors on the lanes map which need correction	Correct Map A re "lanescapes"
WHP02	Historic Lanes	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	no opinion	support	See my comments on WHP1	Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	support		Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	support		Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	support	No development would appear to be appropriate from either Church Hill or The Hollow.		
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	support		Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	support		Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	support		Noted	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	support	I applaud the determination to preserve the lanescape, but, in view of recent changes in planning regulations, I am anxious as to which body would be the final arbiter on what developments are permitted, and which denied.	MSDC is the local planning authority for this parish and are responsible for planning decisions (subject to appeal to the planning inspectorate). A finalised parish Neighbourhood Plan would be given equal weight by MSDC to the District Plan.	
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	support	Some of the so-called lanescapes might benefit from particular protection. It is not that any one tree may be worthy of a TPO but that where a number provide a canopy over the road that the group of trees need to be protected. I am not sure TPO's provide the answer but I would like the deeply gouged sections of our lanes with tree canopies recognised and protected.	Such differentiation of different stretches of lane should be made as part of individual planning decisions.	Consider policy surrounding wording to emphasise this point. WHPC could separately review the need for Tree Protection Orders in key locations
WHP02	Historic Lanes	support	support	We live on one such lane and would not want anything to spoil this.	Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	mostly support	no opinion	The Neighbourhood plan is quite clear in stating that no buildings on recreational space or builds that create even more traffic will be allowed. What a joke that a shop/cafe/carpark is being proposed on North Lane Rec at this moment in time. Do not believe for one moment that our villagers will differentiate between the timing of the Plan and the timing of the shop proposal, because they almost certainly wont. This makes the Plan, which overall is a pretty good one, look completely at odds with what is being promoted currently. Make up your minds please, much, much more traffic and a building on our Rec or not! Not everyone in this village lives in a detached house with a large garden. Every bit of our Recreational space is precious to those who have little or no garden for their children to play and relax in. Leave their recreational space alone! <!--[Duplicate comment posted as General comment]-->	Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	no opinion	no opinion	See my comment for WHP1	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	strongly oppose	oppose	Any use of recreational spaces. Village shop at Sharpthorne is adequate -perhaps delivery to those unable to drive/walk or key people that could deliver an order on a volunteer basis.Would be more than happy to join like minded people to enable this.	Policy is opposed but comments appear to be in support of the policy. Volunteering offer noted.	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	oppose	Re WHP1 The area marked to the south of Map B is not 'informal recreational spaces' as suggested in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2030 but privately owned agricultural land. This land forms part of the property Winstons, Church Hill, West Hoathly, RH19 4PN. There is a Public Footpath passing along the eastern boundary of the area marked on Map B which is used by hikers and dog-walkers but the land itself has no 'informal recreational use' as mistakenly suggested by the Draft Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2030. The land is used to graze cows and other livestock and to grow crops. Deer and vermin control is carried out and game shooting in season and it is important that the public keep to the Public Footpath. Egg rolling and sledging take place occasionally on Bun Hill and is welcome on permission of the landowner. When this area is removed from the map as 'informal recreational spaces' I/we will be able to support WHP1 and wider Draft Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2030.	Noted - point taken	Adjust Map B accordingly
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	oppose	At first the idea of a village shop in west Hoathly sounded a great idea, now seeing the amount of area it would take up is awful ! if you start to build on recreational spaces like that, you lose valuable areas for the children to play.	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan. Comment supports policy but policy opposed?	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	oppose	The recreational spaces are for the use of the full community. A new community hall on Finches Field would be an appropriate use of this space and not detract from its other uses. It would also be of great benefit to both West Hoathly and Sharpthorne and be easily accessible to Highbrook.	Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	oppose	Objection to any planning on the north lane recreation ground more so now that the outline has been painted out and the whole expanse can be seen and just how far the parking spaces extend towards the playing area for children.	Policy is opposed but comments appear to be in support of the policy.	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	oppose	We oppose the siting of the proposed village shop. We cannot understand why this could not be an annex to the existing football pavilion.	Policy is opposed but comments appear to be in support of the policy. Comment re pavilion noted.	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	mostly support	support	I can't believe that the important and widely used recreational area of Gravetye woods has been omitted from Map B. This facility is possibly used by more people, more frequently, than any of the other areas on Map B. (It has been threatened in the past by the suggestion of a C319 West Hoathly & Sharpthorne bypass.) Selsfield Common and Blackland Farm also appear to have been wrongly omitted from the Map.	Gravetye Woods is indeed an important informal amenity. Should be discussed with William Robinson Trust	Consider adding some/all of the space to map B
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	mostly support	support	Perhaps an exception should be to provide some new parking spaces on part of the two West Hoathly recreation grounds.	Noted	Pass to WHPC for consideration
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	mostly support	support	I ditto my comments in WHP1. Material harm is something that WILL happen to North Lane Recreation Ground if the proposed community shop, cafe and car park goes ahead. Removal of grassed recreational areas is material harm. Oh, and please no more re-defining of recreation! We all know what it really means...	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan. Support for policy noted.	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	mostly support	support	SUPPORT No development on rec's	Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	mostly support	support	This policy should clearly permit the community shop development on the NLR and enlargement/improvement of the pavilion.	Noted	Consider the aspect of WHPC owned pavilion future changes / upgrades
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	mostly support	support	As per previous comment re WHP1 - Proposed development at W.Hoathley North Lane Rec Ground - Existing buildings could be found to house a shop rather than develop land set aside for recreational purposes.	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan. Support for policy noted.	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	mostly support	support	The main problem in West Hoathly now is the proposal to build a shop, cafe, car park in North Lane recreation ground which I strongly oppose as I feel there is more behind the scheme than we are told.	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan. Support for policy noted.	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	no opinion	support		Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	no opinion	support	I support this and oppose development of any pedestrian spaces	Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	no opinion	support	See my comments on WHP1	Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	strongly oppose	support	Shop? We support a shop in the original location. We are much less happy about a shop on the Rec. If the shop doesn't succeed at any point then I can see it's footprint being used to develop housing in it's place. I am also very unhappy about some of the postings on the hub re the village shop: they have a mandate from the village to EXPLORE THE POSSIBILITY of introducing a new shop - not to put one in come-what-may as circumstances change. I am certainly of the school that was pro a shop but I am not pro a shop on the Rec and I am sure there are others also in this position.	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan. Support for policy noted.	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	strongly oppose	support	Although only having lived in the village for 2 years I feel that the 'village' feel that my husband and I looked for when relocating to Sharphorne will be lost.I also feel that traffic, already heavy through the village, will increase as will problems when pulling out of drives/entrances.	Support noted but unclear to what these comments are related?	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	strongly oppose	support	No building on North Lane Rec	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan. Support for policy noted.	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	strongly oppose	support	Recreational spaces must be retained for just that purpose, not to be chipped away at for car parking spaces, this is an area of outstanding natural beauty, lets keep it that way.	Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	support			
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	support	While I support the need for a community shop I feel the proposed location on North Lane Rec. is not suitable as present design is too intrusive and far too large. It would be far better sited, albeit in a smaller form, either within a revamped football pavilion, which we as a parish own and on which money would need to be spent, or as a free standing building adjacent to it. By repositioning the path between the pavilion and the toilets(which in its present form is wholly inadequate anyway) a limited number of parking spaces could then be provided.	Noted, but no building proposed for NLR in this Plan. Support for policy noted.	Comments re pavilion passed to WHPC
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	support		Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	support		Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	support	See WHP1 (Shame this is not in place to stop development of recreational ground into shop etc)	Noted	
WHP03	Recreational Spaces	support	support	Although we are surrounded by beautiful open countryside it is very necessary to retain the designated recreational spaces, particularly those devoted to sport which is very necessary for younger people.	Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	mostly support	no opinion		Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	mostly support	oppose	The aim of this policy is supported, but the wording should be changed from "Footpaths" to "Public Rights of Way". Footpaths are only available for walkers to use, bridleways (multi-use) paths can be used by walkers, cyclists and equestrians (all vulnerable road users). Using the wording "public rights of way" instead of "footpaths" is more inclusive, and leaves the way open for whichever status is appropriate for a given situation.	Reasonable point	Consider amending text accordingly
WHP04	Footpaths	mostly support	support	We are fortunate to have many well-maintained footpaths in the area. Anything that can be done to enhance and extend the footpath network is very welcome and a legacy for future generations.	Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	mostly support	support	The term "footpaths" should be replaced. The MSDC Plan talks about "making new or existing rights of way multi-functional to allow for benefits for a range of users. (Note: "multi-functional will generally mean able to be used by walkers, cyclists and horse-riders)."	Reasonable point	Consider amending text accordingly
WHP04	Footpaths	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	mostly support	support	Entrance? Is this an opportunity to improve access and/or alter existing rights of way? The much used path by the Legion Club along the ancient boundary is overdue for proper maintenance	Noted	Passed to WHPC
WHP04	Footpaths	mostly support	support	SUPPORT	Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	no opinion	support		Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP04	Footpaths	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	no opinion	support	New footpaths should be created, if possible, as art of the existing network of PROW. Please make bridle paths, instead of footpaths, to help keep horses off road.	Bridlepath point reasonable. Remainder noted	Consider amending text accordingly
WHP04	Footpaths	support	support		Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	support	support		Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	support	support	Subject to these footpaths being in keeping with the local character	Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	support	support		Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	support	support		Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	support	support	I think the plan does insufficient to recognise the multiple uses of the countryside. Can some thought be given to bridleways as many people are forced to ride on lanes with cars travelling at speed. This is unsafe and given that it is hard to slow the vehicles down, perhaps we can do more to provide a safe place for horses (and walkers).	Bridlepath point reasonable.	Consider amending text accordingly
WHP04	Footpaths	support	support	Any increase in footpaths would be welcome and it would be hoped that the new development would not inhibit this.	Noted	
WHP04	Footpaths	support	support	Need to expand footpath network, especially on the East side of the village. A path towards Forest Row would be very useful.	Noted	Passed to WHPC
WHP05	Visualisations	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	mostly support	support	What development or extensions to existing building will be allowed?	Covered by WHP12	
WHP05	Visualisations	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	mostly support	support	SUPPORT	Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	mostly support	support	This is essential, in particular access onto Top Road and parking spaces would need to be shown. This would be imperative for the proposed development at Cookhams WHP13.	Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	no opinion	support	Please see my comments against WHP4	Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support		Noted	
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support	Whilst I agree with this, it should be remembered that computer visualisations can be very idealised. Soft landscaping is key to the visual impact of residential developments and takes time to grow (and hence changes over time). Many softening features look good on a computer image but are hard or expensive to maintain and deteriorate with age. Non-traditional materials (especially roofing and walling materials) do not generally weather well and should not be allowed within the Conservation Area.	Conservation Area materials covered by the MSDC policies. Visualisations won't remove the need for careful review of planning applications particularly in sensitive locations	
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support	Good idea.	Thank you!	
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support	It would be helpful if plans indicated (perhaps in a different colour) all development to the site that has already been granted planning permission, even if it has not yet been started/completed.	This is really a matter for MSDC Planning Control WHPC could try to focus on such complex situations when submitting their comments to MSDC	Passed to WHPC
WHP05	Visualisations	support	support		Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	strongly oppose	no opinion	nb on-road parking (as in Sharpthorne) plays a significant role in the traffic calming process.	Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	mildly oppose	oppose	Sort out the traffic problems first before considering building new homes.question "whats happening about the proposed east Grinstead bypass"?	Taken as opposition to new homes rather than opposition to this specific policy. Re EG bypass this is a matter for WSCC and EGTC	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	mostly support	oppose	All developments must have no of beds + 1 off road parking ie, 1 bed - 2 parking places, 4 bed - 5 parking spaces. Agree with this SC	Noted	Consider whether parking space algorithm should be introduced

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	mostly support	oppose	A minimum of two spaces per dwelling would only be adequate depending on the size of the dwelling. A developer will always work to the minimum criteria. There should be at least the same number of parking spaces as there are bedrooms, with the exception of a one bedroom dwelling, where there should be a minimum of two spaces, as many couples live in one bedroom dwellings due to the cost of living. There is no clarity re the proposed development at Cookhams (WHP13) with regard to parking, type of dwellings to be built (starter homes, one bedroom flats etc), number of bedrooms per dwelling, access to Top Road, affect on existing traffic issues and existing utilities network.	Noted	Consider whether parking space algorithm should be introduced
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	oppose	Not all homes need 2 spaces per dwelling. New housing should prioritise homes for younger and older people (often single person households) that need only one space (at most).	Noted	Consider whether parking space algorithm should be introduced
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	mostly support	support	Two spaces per dwelling is certainly not enough when houses are extended as the family grows up. People often park in the road even when they have off road parking. Perhaps direct communication from the PC could be used to discourage this.	Noted	Consider whether parking space algorithm should be introduced
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	mostly support	support	Most family homes have more than two cars. Looking to the future a three bedroom house will require parking for a minimum of four cars if public transport does not improve. Also safe access onto the C319 must be a consideration	Noted. This policy doesn't relate to C319 access	Consider whether parking space algorithm should be introduced
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	mostly support	support	Garages beneath houses should be encouraged, saving space and improving insulation and cellarage	Noted - not sure if local area suitable to impose this as a policy but it is always open to an applicant to use this approach subject to other local building and environmental considerations	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	mostly support	support	Whether I agree with new housing in rural areas or not, I understand that this Parish must be seen to be 'doing their bit' for housing. There are apparently locals wanting new housing for various reasons (don't know anyone personally in need of this but I don't doubt there are some). It must be kept to a minimum. WHP6 is 'modern' common sense - many households have two cars now, and anyway, if you don't provide two spaces per household, they'll be doing off-road parking causing more damage to the landscape.	Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	mostly support	support	With children often living longer in the parental home, it is highly probable that an average of two parking spaces per dwelling will be inadequate. It should also be borne in mind that many garages are used for storage or are converted to another room, rather than used for parking a car. A realistic estimate would be three to four parking spaces per dwelling, with anything less likely to lead to unsightly and, perhaps, dangerous parking elsewhere.	Noted	Consider whether parking space algorithm should be introduced
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	mostly support	support	A) Ensure local residents(Selsfield Rd especially) park adjacent to their properties and not in the dangerous corner of North Lane/Selsfield Road junction B) Provision of "no parking" at this junction of North Lane/Selsfield Road. Yellow lines adopted as recommended as the "only" solution by local police	A - This isn't a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan B - Noted	B - Pass to WHPC
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support	Of significant importance to all on Top Road; as is WHP7.	Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support		Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support		Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support	Revised comment 21/5/13 to replace my previous comment. Do one bedroom dwellings or sheltered housing for the elderly require a minimum of two spaces? If not, suggest after "minimum two spaces per dwelling" add "for dwellings comprising two or more bedrooms" and add "Should the demand for one bedroom dwellings arise, parking for one bedroom dwellings must be at a minimum of ... per dwelling. Should the demand for sheltered housing for the elderly arise, parking for any such development must be at a minimum of ... per dwelling". (I don't know whether there is any demand for either one bedroom or sheltered dwellings, I ask the question because it is hoped this plan will only need minor changes during the next 20 years).	Noted	Consider whether parking space algorithm should be introduced
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support	New property parking allocation should be commensurate with the nature of the property eg it would not be appropriate for 2 parking spaces for a 1 bed flat or a 6 bed house.	Noted	Consider whether parking space algorithm should be introduced
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support	This is very important	Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support		Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support	Some support for new housing depending on the location and parking facilities as houses in the area do not have sufficient parking for the number of cars per household at the moment.	Noted	
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support	In view of the scarcity of public transport, I feel that any new homes should have a minimum of 3-4 parking spaces, as many young people acquire a car long before they leave the parental home.	Noted	Consider whether parking space algorithm should be introduced
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support	With respect I do not think this is well expressed by reference to 'younger families and older people'. The issue is not age nor is it whether they are in families or otherwise. The issue is that there is insufficient diversity of housing. In particular there is now insufficient housing for those looking for smaller, and often cheaper, housing. This is not an age specific requirement. The fastest growing sector for housing demand is for single person homes. Some of these people are elderly but many more are adults who are not living with families (separated, divorced, not yet married, etc). So could this be re-phrased to describe the property type that is needed and not the resident type by age please.	This seems to relate to WHP11. Reasonable point	Consider wording of Section 16 and WHP11
WHP06	New Homes - Parking	support	support	As stated, parking in all our villages is a real problem and it is very important that any new development can take this into account.	Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	no opinion	no opinion	This does not make sense	Noted	Clarify wording
WHP07	Protection of Parking	no opinion	no opinion	What constitutes a "recognised" parking space and "recognised" by whom?	This will be judged by MSDC Planning officers when a planning application is assessed. Input from WHPC would also be taken into account by them.	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	strongly oppose	no opinion	So how on earth, then, did the Intrepid Fox get planning permission to build the house on the carpark? This kind of planning consent knocks everyone's confidence in the system and shows a massive lack of foresight which I would not like to see happen again on the Rec or with the new housing development. The lack of a carpark is now causing pedestrian safety issues which need to be addressed with rural and suitable traffic calming before someone is hurt. Vinols Cross patrons should be asked to park in Finches Field and a suitable crossing put in between the bottom of the footpath and the pub for the protection of the school children and hikers (Duke of Edinburgh).	Well, this plan wasn't in force then and is exactly the sort of problem it is designed to address.	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	mostly support	support	The Cat and The Vinols are two past prime examples of violation of this policy. Will the future be any better?	This plan wasn't in force then and is exactly the sort of problem it is designed to address.	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	mostly support	support	Common sense...	Thank you!	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	mostly support	support	SUPPORT	Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	mostly support	support		Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP07	Protection of Parking	mostly support	support	North Lane parking at school opposed	Noted , but this plan doesn't propose anything about parking in North Lane.	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	support	support		Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	support	support		Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	support	support	excellent	Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	support	support	To give the same allocation as WHP6 above.	Noted	Consider whether if any adjustment to WHP6 that similar is reflected in WHP7
WHP07	Protection of Parking	support	support		Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	support	support		Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	support	support	Good idea	Noted	
WHP07	Protection of Parking	support	support		Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	no opinion	Optimistic - difficult to enforce & combats with other policy proposals	Can be enforced through the planning system and planning conditions on approved applications. Not clear where it conflicts with other policies.	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	no opinion	We neither support or oppose this as the major issue is through traffic; not - for example - Combers lorry. We're reluctant to restrict what little employment opportunities exist within the villages when the vast majority of HGV traffic originates elsewhere. See next comment re.WHP9.	This does not seek to restrict existing business use although significant changes would need to be assessed individually	Consider clarifying re existing businesses
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	oppose	The volume of goods traffic along Top Road is already at an unacceptable level and no further increase should be countenanced.	The majority of Top Road traffic (75% or so estimated) is through traffic. Some limited additional which support local employment should be possible.	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	oppose	Top Road can not cope with any more HGV/LGV traffic - the current number of vehicles passing through already has an "unacceptable impact on residents" - the road is just too narrow to cope with HGV/LGVs as it is. And the issues of current safety surely must be considered let alone even considering allowing more heavy traffic. How can this be considered when the next point WHP10 wants to reduce volume and speed?	The ongoing C319 traffic issue is a matter being handled by WHPC with WSCC	Passed to WHPC
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	strongly oppose	oppose	More development will generate more traffic	The majority of Top Road traffic (75% or so estimated) is through traffic. Some limited additional which support local employment should be possible.	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	oppose	Requiring a transport assessment for any new developments seems very weak. Any reasonably proficient developer would be able to successfully complete such a requirement in their favour.	The majority of Top Road traffic (75% or so estimated) is through traffic. Some limited additional which support local employment should be possible.	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	oppose	No development should be permitted which generates additional HGV/LGV traffic - any at all would be unacceptable. We need to reduce the traffic, particularly the very large HGVs that use the road. Can we lobby WSCC to put signage from Wych Cross cross-roads and at the turn off to Sharpthorne from Turners Hill that the road is unsuitable for HGVs over a certain weight? These vehicles are dangerous and also break up the road	The majority of Top Road traffic (75% or so estimated) is through traffic. Some limited additional which support local employment should be possible. The ongoing C319 traffic issue is a matter being handled by WHPC with WSCC	Passed to WHPC
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	oppose	The brickworks provide valuable employment but size of lorries along with other goods vehicles is becoming a much larger problem as vehicles becoming even bigger.	This does not seek to restrict existing business use although significant changes would need to be assessed individually	Consider clarifying re existing businesses

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	oppose	As a resident of Top Road, I feel any development which increases HGV/LGV traffic would be detrimental, as we already suffer from an excess of large, heavy vehicles which are totally unsuitable for our road structure.	The majority of Top Road traffic (75% or so estimated) is through traffic. Some limited additional which support local employment should be possible.	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	support	It is not clear whether this proposal refers to traffic generated during construction of the development, or when it is in use - or both.	This policy was intended to be about on-going rather than construction-related traffic. Conditions re construction traffic are a matter for planning conditions on an approved application.	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	support	Support the policy, but concerned that there is no strategy to reduce the volume and speed of traffic on C319. What can be done to stop this road being the fastest cut through from the A22 to the M23?	WHP9 is what covers this concern	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	support	The quarry extension application certainly does not include an adequate transport assessment. The current quarry traffic is already unacceptable and must not be allowed to get worse. The problem with traffic assessments is that they can be wildly inaccurate but by the time this is apparent it is too late.	This is part of the reason for this policy	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	support	We need to define what reasonable traffic might be regarding HGV/LGV traffic. Local residents, understandably, will always find reason why new HGV/LGV traffic is unacceptable to them - nobody wants it, unless... - it benefits them personally, e.g. employment or financially - they know, understand and appreciate the local need/s - they fully appreciate the needs locally - they accept that the reasons for the traffic were there in the Parish before they were (where the new development is additional to existing businesses/dwellings) We really must support local businesses.	Noted - this is what this policy is intended to do	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	support	SUPPORT	Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	support	This policy needs to be highlighted when considering the proposed development at Cookhams WHP13.	The WHP13 policy is related to residential development. Construction traffic would be	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	support	But, how will any enforcement be carried out on any through traffic. WHPC to support where possible the East Grinstead bypass	Through HGV traffic restriction was vigorously pursued by WHPC with WSCC but will not be possible	Pass to WHPC
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	mostly support	support	HGVs opposed	The majority of Top Road traffic (75% or so estimated) is through traffic. Some limited additional which support local employment should be possible.	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	no opinion	support	We should not encourage any more HGVs - the access is not suitable in our ?	The majority of Top Road traffic (75% or so estimated) is through traffic. Some limited additional which support local employment should be possible.	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	no opinion	support	Any further increase in HGV is unacceptable to me. This house shakes from road vibration every day	Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	strongly oppose	support	The HGV/LGV traffic is plays a large part in the erosion of our verges which is allowing the traffic to speed up. Could they be asked to contribute to re-building them?	There is no direct mechanism to allow this	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support		Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support	Obviously a lot of work has been put into the preparation of the plan by some dedicated people who deserve our thanks. The C road through Sharpthorne continues to be used as a M23-A22 link road. I consider the priority to be reducing this use.	Thanks appreciated. This is the purpose of WHP9 and WHPC's focus on the C319 with WSCC	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support		Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support	I would ban these from our villages, however I do recognise that at times it is necessary for them to make deliveries in the area. Maybe these could be at restricted times of the day? there is another issue though I have not seen raised and that is coaches using the main road through the villages en route to Blacklands. I have witnessed very near misses especially when the coaches turn into Grinstead Lane from Tyes Cross. I have even seen them coming to Blacklands from E Grinstead down the hill, winding road. I can't think of any solution to this though as Blacklands forms part of our community and I wouldn't want to detract from them in any way.	Through HGV traffic restriction was vigorously pursued by WHPC with WSCC but will not be possible	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support		Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support	Partly support. Soem developments such as the community shop will generate HGV traffic and I do not see this as a problem	Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support	I travel from Sharpthorne to East Grinstead. Heavy Goods / Vans are dangerous and inconsiderate road users. Any plan to reduce volumes of these vehicles would greatly improve our travel experience.	Through HGV traffic restriction was vigorously pursued by WHPC with WSCC but will not be possible	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support		Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support	Excellent.	Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support	I imagine this would also apply to the Community Shop proposal. I support the shop & would like to point out that I & many others from West Hoathly drive to Costcutters, so a shop in West Hoathly would actually cut traffic on the C319 & most residents of West Hoathly would walk to the shop. Any HGV/LGV traffic would be no more than there was for the old shop opposite the proposed site.	No building proposed for NLR in this Plan. Support for policy noted.	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support		Noted	
WHP08	Goods Vehicle Traffic	support	support		Noted	
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	no opinion	More conflict likely	Not clear with what/whom?	
WHP09	Road Improvements	no opinion	no opinion	This seems like urbanisation of a pretty village. Where is the extra land for the extra pavements coming from?	Such changes can be implemented sympathetically and the more "villagey" the appearance the more effective such measures are likely to be	
WHP09	Road Improvements	no opinion	no opinion	Sounds great but where are you planning to put extra pavements? "Well being" of residents is vague!	Investigations currently underway with WSCC re highway widths and opportunities for pavements	
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	oppose	No additional costs should be placed on "low-cost" housing, especially as they will need extra parking - see WHP6	Affordable housing is not subject to CIL payments	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP09	Road Improvements	strongly oppose	oppose	I am extremely concerned about the additional volume of traffic on Top Road. Cars are often speeding along this road, the top speed has been recorded as 69 miles per hour. Serious concerns about the volume of traffic on this road is one of the main reasons that this site has not been developed before, despite planning applications in the past. The Futures Survey confirmed that traffic speed and safety is "still a big concern for the community". The addition of 24 houses could potentially increase the traffic volume by 200 movements per day which would be unsustainable. There is a blind spot on Top Road opposite Glenheim Place, so how can you have cars coming onto Top Road from this site? It sounds extremely dangerous and possibility of accidents occurring on a regular basis will increase. Have the Parish Councillors thought this through? If they use this road on a regular basis or lived opposite like I do they would have a better opinion and realise the danger of what has been suggested.	This is exactly the purpose of this policy (WHP9). No design for an access onto the WHP13 site has yet been put forward. If and when it is a full WSCC Highways assessment will take place.	
WHP09	Road Improvements	strongly oppose	oppose	There should be another way to raise funds other than from a levy from developers	There may be other potential sources and these will be tapped if possible but local government funding continues to be reduced year on year.	
WHP09	Road Improvements	strongly oppose	oppose	I support all road improvement in our parish especially on the C319. What I don't agree with is that any improvement seems to be directly linked to development on the top road site. I would welcome and SUPPORT a plan that addresses some real traffic calming measures without a shot gun to the head tactic. PLEASE LISTEN to the community and work with us to really address these issues.	This policy is not directly linked to that development specifically. It relates to all funds which may accrue from even individual new dwellings elsewhere in the parish	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	oppose	Reducing traffic volume and speed has been identified as number one concern of local residents. This proposal is dependant on Community Infrastructure Levy raised from new developments. It should be a matter of priority regardless of whether new development go ahead or not. There is no definite proposal to combat traffic levels. Why Not?	It is an ongoing matter of priority for WHPC (eg currently scheduled Vinols Cross junction changes). The fact is that other sources of funding are difficult to access and are declining	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	oppose	I pay enough in road taxes and general taxation to pay for this without funding from new developments	I think this is more a matter for George Osborne	
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	support	As before, support the policy, but would like to see more of a strategy to REDUCE the volume and speed of current traffic on the C319. Simply asking for transport assessments on new developments will not tackle the current problem. There should also be specific proposals to tackle the lethal junction at the Vinols Cross pub.	The implementation details are a matter of ongoing work with WSCC but these are constrained by very limited funding opportunities. Changes to the Vinols Junction are already in plan for 2013-14 council year	
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	support	What about preventing parking on existing pavements and verges near the Bowls Club and outside the church.	This is not a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan	Passed to WHPC
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	support	Not only drain improvements, we need decent road foundations that cope with the heavy vehicles that pass through the villages. Proper speed reduction needs to be actioned either in traffic islands or pedestrian lights as using parked cars ie Image Cross, is a movable and non efficient control.	The implementation details are a matter of ongoing work with WSCC but these are constrained by very limited funding opportunities.	
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	support	Seems like a tall order. Where is the space to improve the provision of pavements and access for pedestrians and cyclists?	Space is limited but these are the priorities for what is hoped can be achieved	
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	support	This should also be made available for the improving of recreational facilities in the Parish.	There was no call for this priority in any of the research carried out so far in the Neighbourhood Plan project	
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	support	This is imperative, but the policy wording should give examples as to how traffic calming measures/speed restriction measures are to be enforced. This has been identified as a major issue, particularly on Top Road, and yet nothing definite is proposed in this policy.	The implementation details are a matter of ongoing work with WSCC but these are constrained by very limited funding opportunities.	
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	support	I am worried that the money to pay for this vital part of our environment will come from the Community Infrastructure Levy. Surely will need to identify other sources of revenue to ensure we adequately protect our environment and the safety of everyone.	The fact is that other sources of funding are difficult to access and are declining	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP09	Road Improvements	mostly support	support	Support the schemes to reduce speed and volume but why does this need to be raised from new developments which will only increase the volume of traffic? More developments, more traffic and yet more danger to pedestrians (often children going to and from school)and residents. No more traffic please just a good solid scheme to reduce volume and speed. Improvements to pavements - great idea but have you ever tried walking up the hill towards the Vinols on the pavement with a young child when speeding lorry comes round the corner at the top? It would have to be a very wide and much improved pavement to make any sort of difference.	It is an ongoing matter of priority for WHPC (eg currently scheduled Vinols Cross junction changes). The fact is that other sources of funding are difficult to access and are declining	
WHP09	Road Improvements	no opinion	support	Very few adhere to the 40mph speed limit on the C319. Far to many HGV vehicles using it - needs a weight restriction	Through HGV traffic restriction was vigorously pursued by WHPC with WSCC but will not be possible	
WHP09	Road Improvements	no opinion	support	Traffic must be top of lists. Speed and volume much to high	Noted	
WHP09	Road Improvements	strongly oppose	support	In the Lake District I have seen footpaths separated from the roads by hedging. This adds enormously to safety whilst keeping the area rural and would be possible along many of our lanes on children walk to school (Michael Hall on the Plaw Hatch road).	Roadside space is typically very limited and usually privately owned. Which householders are going to want to give up someof their land to enable this.	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	Not sure about the source of finance but one things for sure: if we don't deal with the issue of through traffic, especially HGV, racing through our joint village, there's going to be a tragedy..... In our judgement (and experience!) the only effective means of controlling the speed of through traffic is to establish AN AVERAGE SPEED ZONE FROM THE ENTRY POINT OF WEST HOATHLY TO THE EXIT POINT OF SHARPTHORNE. This would work: and might even have the side benefit of encouraging drivers to find another route.	The average speed monitoring idea has recently been explored with WSCC Highways and the PC's own Highways consultatnt by the PC's Highways and Transport Committee. The conclusion was that it would be unsightly, the road layout is unsuitable and would require installation and enforcement by the Police.	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support		Noted	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	Average speed check cameras (specs) problem more or less solved ! Speed reduced and volume of traffic, as its going to be a real pain having to come through the village doing the speed limit ! Chicanes are another great idea for reducing traffic as they would be a hindrance but I think for some reason they feel this could be dangerous due to lack of street lighting ,although the council obviously doesn't think that parked cars on the side of the road in the dark is dangerous !!!	The average speed monitoring idea has recently been explored with WSCC Highways and the PC's own Highways consultatnt by the PC's Highways and Transport Committee. The conclusion was that it would be unsightly, the road layout is unsuitable and would require installation and enforcement by the Police. Chicane(s) are one of the ideas that is being actively considered.	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	The 2 entry and exit roads by Courtlands Nurseries at the Sharpthorne end of Chilling Street can be quite dangerous. It might be helpful to have the larger of the two roads as the ONLY exit road onto Top Road (it affords a slightly better view of on-coming traffic) and to have the smaller of the 2 roads as an entry road when coming from Gristead Lane/Plaw Hatch.	Worth exploring	Passed to WHPC
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	Good idea, will be interested to see what can be done to reduce traffic speeds and volume - chicanes?	Chicane(s) are being considered as a possible option	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	The use of the CIL for footpaths etc is good. The restriction of HGV/LGV that pass through the village should be addressed as a seperate matter. The safety and enjoyment within the village is being severly compromised by both the number and speed of these vehicles passing through. Vehicles that are either not associated with companies within the villages or making deliveries to properties within the villages should be restricted by some means.	Through HGV traffic restriction was vigorously pursued by WHPC with WSCC but will not be possible	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	A 20 MPH speed limit in both West Hoathly and Sharpthorne would be desirable, including the C319 if possible.	This maybe a future possibility but the advice received to date indicates that it would not be suitable as a first next step	Passed to WHPC
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support		Noted	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support		Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	The road down through the hollow is in desperate need of improvement to the surface. Speed is an issue but not sure how you will stop this as it is a rat run from Wych Cross to Selsfield Road and even local people do not adhere to the speed restrictions.	The implementation details are a matter of ongoing work with WSCC but these are constrained by very limited funding opportunities.	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	This is a very worthwhile objective which, like motherhood and apple pie, I support. My well being would be improved if all the rush hour traffic on Station Approach moved onto the Top Road. It would not do much for the residents of the Top Road however. The answer lies in slowing the traffic down and that requires a national commitment to extending speed controlled areas to rural lanes. The traffic in Station Approach hurls passed walkers, horses and cyclists at up to 60 mph. This can't be right. We don't need a pavement but more considerate motorists -	Noted	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	Any improvement would be welcome	Noted	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	These improvements are overdue and essential due to the increasing volume and speed of traffic through the village. Again, a safe footpath through the village, both East and West would be very helpful.	Noted	
WHP09	Road Improvements	support	support	This should be the major policy of the Parish Council to reduce both the speed and volumes of heavy goods vehicle traffic	The implementation details are a matter of ongoing work with WSCC	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	no opinion	no opinion	This will bring in extra traffic to Station Road - pedestrian access only	Noted	Consider policy changes to incorporate
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	no opinion	no opinion	Nice idea but I am concerned about the impact of traffic / parking on Station Road. Not practical.	Noted	Consider policy changes to incorporate
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	oppose	Much as I personally would like to be able to board a train in Sharpthorne, I do not believe that a halt can be established here. The parking problems would appear to be insurmountable: one has only to drive past Balcombe Station (to cite a small station with insufficient parking spaces) to see the overflow of parked cars all along the verges on the road, and in surrounding streets. The ideal solution would be to run a shuttle from a designated car park (would that one could be found!) down to the halt and back to pick up and drop off passengers.	Noted	Consider policy changes to incorporate
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	oppose	Having young children, we are regular users and supporters of the Bluebell Railway. However, we are totally against this halt or station. It is unnecessary because Kingscote is not far away, and Horsted Keynes is a short drive too. Both stations offer get on/get off facilities, although parking is already a problem at Kingscote. Introducing a halt or station at West Hoathly (Sharpthorne) won't help the Bluebell Railway, nor local residents. We wouldn't use it - there is great interest at Sheffield Park and Horsted Keynes because of additional facilities and workshops. I think a halt would do the Parish more harm than good. Additional traffic and parking problems - noise and air pollution too.	Noted	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	oppose	The railway should be forced to build a full station with a car park for 50+ cars on the land they use to dump their equipment opposite the brickworks. A halt is a "cop-out" by WHPC & the railway. Agree SC	Noted. Any halt/station development would be funded by the Bluebell Railway and it is not an option to force them to do one thing or the other.	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	oppose	No basis in the Neighbourhood plan for support of a halt in Sharpthorne and no consideration of the effect of cars and coaches parking in Station road, Hamsey road and Bluebell lane on the residents of Sharpthorne when people come to the halt (station) in order to board or alight the train. No comment or consideration of the effect of vehicles parking in the above roads with regards the Ibstock brickworks or New Coombe farm. Surely there must be some commitment provided by the Bluebell railway as regards how they will stop problems occurring when future passengers park in Sharpthorne, and this must be done before approval is given in the Neighbourhood plan.	In fact the interest in this came from the workshop meetings and the earlier all-parish survey in Spring 2012.	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	oppose	This policy wording is too vague. There needs to be detail on the benefits/impact to the community and the undertaking to complete an assessment on the impact on local residents regarding traffic, parking, noise pollution, and additional vehicle pollution.	Noted	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	oppose	While it might be convenient for residents to be able to access East Grinstead by rail, I am very concerned that the Bluebell Railway would only embark on this if it were to perceive a financial advantage to it. I am, therefore, very concerned about the additional road traffic and parking problems such a development would engender.	A thriving Bluebell Railway is recognised as a key tourist industry attraction of Mid Sussex as it could be to businesses within West Hoathly Parish itself	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	strongly oppose	oppose	This will bring more traffic onto Station Road which is already dangerous. What goes down has to go up the same way	Noted	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	oppose	Can't see what benefit this will bring to the village. Realistically I can't see it being used by commuters and will add to the traffic on Station Road. Has anyone looked at running a cycle path next to the track - in my opinion that would bring benefit and allow a safe relatively flat route into EG for residents.	Not intended for commuters. A cycle/walk way alongside the track was explored with the Bluebell Railway but safety concerns rule out new extended access such as this	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	oppose	Has any research been done on how many local people would use the halt on a regular basis. What about the extra traffic it would attract. When the Bluebell railway first reached Sharphorne the Parish Council didn't want a station or halt because it was felt it wouldn't be used by local people on a regular basis, and a station or halt would increase traffic into the village from recreational users of the railway. Any proposals for a station or halt should be assessed on its merits by the parish council at the time.	The link to East Grinstead and stations beyond completely changes the nature of the Bluebell Railway and opens up opportunities for local residents and our hospitality businesses.	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	support	Strongly support re-opening station.	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	support	Perhaps an arrangement with the Bluebell Line for reduced fares for locals would discourage some driving to East Grinstead.	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	support	Access problems. Would a halt benefit the parishioners? A horse-drawn taxi up the hill?	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	support	What Parking facilities would be provided? Would there be opportunities here to provide a few homes?	There are already several new homes approved but not yet built around the old station site.	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	mostly support	support	Great idea but again visitor parking?	Noted	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	no opinion	support	Be great to have a station or halt. At the moment we have the trains, but can't use from here	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	How lovely.... a terrific idea!	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support		Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	A halt at the previous West Hoathly station site would provide useful additional public transport to East Grinstead and beyond if affordable rates could be set for residents of the village. However, consideration would have to be given to parking.	Noted	Consider policy changes re traffic and parking
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	This would be a wonderful idea .	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	Strongly agree with this proposal	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	This would be great	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	The proposal to provide a "halt" at the West Hoathly station site would be very advantageous for "shoppers" to go by train to East Grinstead, therefore reducing the need for road use, and parking facilities in the town.	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support		Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	There is a reduced ticket price for local residents. I have a life time pass for the Bluebell which offers free travel and for anyone planning to be in the area for 5 years plus it offers excellent value. I do hope a halt is provided and that there are early morning/late evening trains. These need not be steam trains. The Railway was preserved because people did not accept that there was no demand for the transport it offered. Over the years people have lost sight of the original vision and now believe it is about preserving steam trains - it was never intended to do that but to prevent the loss of a rail transport link.	The train schedule is a matter for BRPS	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	could the Bluebell Railway provide a couple of commuter trains morning & afternoon. Useful for commuters to London, workers in East Grinstead & school children, especially those doing after school activities.	Recent discussions with BRPS indicate thi is unlikely but the schedule is a matter for them	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	That would be a huge plus for the area and would enable connection to London-bound East Grinstead trains, as well as access to East Grinstead.	Noted	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	Strongly feel that it would be extremely useful to have a halt at the station for easy access to E Grinstead/London. Also, in long term would be even better to hold a commuter service, if this is found to be practical. Would save on pollution / car use / car parking.	Noted. Timetable is a matter for BRPS	
WHP10	Bluebell Railway	support	support	It would be nice if we could access the Blubell Railway within the Parish for social, leisure purposes.	Noted	
WHP11	Infill Housing	no opinion	no opinion	Each should be assessed on its own individual merit	Noted. Every planning application is assessed on its own merits vs the established Distirct plan (which in future could include the Neighbourhood Plan)	
WHP11	Infill Housing	no opinion	no opinion	New development should be assessed on individual merits - not a blanket decision.	Noted. Every planning application is assessed on its own merits vs the established Distirct plan (which in future could include the Neighbourhood Plan)	
WHP11	Infill Housing	mostly support	oppose	Very feww sites allow for adequate parking unless the number planned is greatly reduced. Safe access to and from the C319 must be addressed in thw planning stages	Parking spaces are covered by WHP6. access to C319 or other highways for any infill sites would be addressed by WSCC Highways	
WHP11	Infill Housing	mostly support	oppose	I do not agree with rural infill housing unless there is evidence to suggest that this is needed, AND it contributes to the character of the area. If there are young families here locally who are desperate for new housing, their voice is not being heard this end of the Parish. Happy to be corrected.	Infill refers to additional dwellings within the current village built-up area as shown on map C. The parish Housing Needs Survey in 2012 identified specific needs. The Initial NP survey and earlier workshops in Spring 2012 supported this need too.	
WHP11	Infill Housing	strongly oppose	oppose	The draft neighbourhood plan says that the number one issue for the parish is controlling volume, speed and scale of the traffic through Sharpthorne Village. How will building a housing estate offering two car parking spaces per property help this already overloaded and dangerous road.	In a plan such as this there are a variety of issues to addressed and aspirations for improvements. The hope is that overall this plan seeks overall to optimise the outcome for the parish. WHP9 gives the top priority in terms of parish infrastructure to the issues on the C319	
WHP11	Infill Housing	strongly oppose	oppose	I strongly object to the building of 24 houses on Top Road in Sharpthorne - my primary concern is the road. I have young children and am a keen cyclist - with 50 reported injuries to people on this C road since 1998 my concerns are that this figure will only increase as the volume of traffic does. Do we need a fatality before we can see that the traffic on this road needs to be reduced not increased.	Noted. Clearly the priority of WHP9 is exactly to do with the issues of traffic on the C319	
WHP11	Infill Housing	strongly oppose	oppose	Under Visions and objectives - Challenges facing West Hoathly Parish the top three concerns listed according to The 2012 survey of parishioners were..... Reducing traffic speed volume and weight on the C319 Improving pedestrian and cyclist safety on the C319 Protecting the Parishes natural environment..... The idea of building 24 houses in Sharpthorne on the C319 goes against the priorities of the parishioners. It is a dangerous place to build for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers alike on this already overused road putting and destructive to one of the only green spaces we have left in our village.	These concerns and priorities were not in any particular priority sequence and also included adjusting the housing mix for for particular groups of residents, being able to retain and enhance key public and commercial services and supporting an ageing population. It is a matter of trying to balance these differing and potentially conflicting pressures into a plan which overall creates a more sustainable community. The road dangers can be mitigated through further traffic calming measures and careful design of access ways. The subject land in WHP13 has never been highlighted as a valued green space in the parish as part of the research on this project.	
WHP11	Infill Housing	strongly oppose	oppose	No more building. It will bring more traffic	Noted	
WHP11	Infill Housing	mostly support	support	In addition there needs to be some restriction on these houses being extended. Otherwise there will still be no small houses only their gardens and parking spaces will be smaller.	Noted but covered by WHP12	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP11	Infill Housing	mostly support	support	As long as enough parking spaces are provided. i.e. couple with older children might have 4 cars +	Noted but covered by WHP6	
WHP11	Infill Housing	mostly support	support	Provided that details are shown in the planning applications regarding the traffic calming measures re Top Road, safe access to Top Road, adequate parking facilities etc.	Noted	
WHP11	Infill Housing	mostly support	support	There needs to be some qualification to the current wording, which currently suggest no limit on numbers.	Since this would be within the established builtup areas as shown on map C there are very few known spaces for such development so specific numbers should not be necessary	
WHP11	Infill Housing	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP11	Infill Housing	support	support	WHP 11-15 in general have our support. Better to deal with this thorny issue at parish level - if we have such an opportunity - than have it imposed from outside district level or worse central HMG. To simply say no is - in our judgement - unrealistic in view of previously stated local and national policy.	Noted	
WHP11	Infill Housing	support	support			
WHP11	Infill Housing	support	support	More terraced cottages such as those on North Lane would be useful and relatively low-cost dwellings for young couples/small families	Noted	
WHP11	Infill Housing	support	support	Revised comment 21/5/13 to replace my previous comment. Comment 1. When I add this comment on the website, WHP11 has the summary title "infill housing". Does WHP11 apply only to infill housing - from the paper copy of the neighbourhood plan I assume it applies to all development including the site specified in WHP13. Comment 2. "provided they have a range of house types" could be used to prevent a development of 1 and 2 bedroom flats and 3 bedroom houses. Suggest replace "house types" with "dwelling types". Comment 3. This could be used to prevent a development comprising only one bedroom properties intended either for older residents or as low-cost homes. This may be the intention, but if not suggest change "provided they have a range" to "provided they include one bedroom dwellings or have a range". (I don't know whether there is any demand for a development of one-bedroom dwellings, I ask the question because it is hoped this plan will only need minor changes during the next 20 years).	Infill refers to individual or very limited development within the established built-up areas in Map C. Dwelling types expression is a reasonable idea. One bedroomed dwellings are not excluded if that suits the location and intended market / user	Consider "dwelling type" wording
WHP11	Infill Housing	support	support	Consideration should also be given to the first time buyer needs	This is part of the intention of the policies of the plan.	
WHP11	Infill Housing	support	support		Noted	
WHP11	Infill Housing	support	support		Noted	
WHP11	Infill Housing	support	support	see my earlier comments about defining housing types by reference to the age of the occupants - this is sub-optimal.	Noted	Consider policy wording
WHP11	Infill Housing	support	support	Very necessary, providing the sites are well selected.	Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	no opinion	no opinion	Each should be assessed on its own individual merit	They would be in the planning approval process	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	no opinion	no opinion	With the government's proposed relaxation of building regulations will the parish council still have control of all new developments?	The Parish Council doesn't "have control" of any developments however if the parish can agree a Neighbourhood Plan it would have our priorities and policies used to assess planning applications. Where new "permitted development rights" are introduced by the government there would be no planning application needed but in the AONB there are more restrictions on this than in the country as a whole	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	no opinion	no opinion	See my comment on WHP11	Noted. Every planning application is assessed on its own merits vs the established Distirct plan (which in future could include the Neighbourhood Plan)	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	strongly oppose	oppose	I strongly oppose WHP12, these decisions are too important for PC level	The decisions on planning applications would be taken by MSDC but using their own and our (if agreed) Neighbourhood Plan policies.	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	support	oppose	I think this should really be a District Council level policy. I don't see how WH parish is any different to any other rural parish. If however WHP12 is to remain as a NP policy, then it may be appropriate to require demolition and rebuilding to also be executed "in appropriate design appearance and scale to the location".	The reason this policy is here is that it isn't in the new draft District Plan but was thought to be an important issue in this parish due to the loss of smaller homes	Consider policy wording re replacement dwellings
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	mostly support	support	How do we keep some small houses for the single occupier or small family if extensions are not restricted?	Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	mostly support	support	As long as they don't impose on neighbours.	This is covered in the MSDC draft District Plan	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	mostly support	support	The existing wording needs to be qualified so as to make reference to the impact on neighbouring properties.	This is covered in the MSDC draft District Plan	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	no opinion	support	Careful planning needed	Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	support	support		Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	support	support		Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	support	support		Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	support	support		Noted	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	support	support	I am not bothered by extensions to properties as housing needs to be flexible. I am on the other hand bothered by applications to make two houses into one home by knocking through. This should be opposed as it undermines the objective to increase the number of smaller housing units.	As far as we know there is no evidence of this being a common / significant problem in WH Parish	
WHP12	Dwelling Extensions	support	support		Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	no opinion	A limited amount of building would be acceptable subject to tight control by the parish and the need of local people	Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	no opinion	no opinion	Each should be assessed on its own individual merit	Noted. Every planning application is assessed on its own merits vs the established Distirct plan (which in future could include the Neighbourhood Plan)	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	no opinion	no opinion	See my comment on WHP11	Noted. Every planning application is assessed on its own merits vs the established Distirct plan (which in future could include the Neighbourhood Plan)	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	We feel that a development of this size (up to 24 houses!) would have a negative impact on our village. If rubber stamped this concentrated development would compromise the majority of policies and proposals the neighbourhood plan stands for. There is also the question of whether the local roads and utility services could physically cope with this scale. Any future housing needs to be in keeping to preserve our village community. The only real way to achieve this is with a more "scattered" approach sharing any future development equally between the three villages West Hoathly, Sharpthorne & Highbrook, i.e. not placing the burden in any one specific area.	Highways and Utilities issues would need to be investigated and addressed at the planning approval stage. The policy is not necessarily in conflict with the other policies	Consider addressing more specifically the issues raised by this policy

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	Top Rd. is already a very busy and fast road and sometimes it takes 5 mins to get out of our driveway in the morning due to the weight of traffic. Extra housing on top Rd. is only going to add to the traffic and congestion. My wife and I strongly oppose the development of the site adjacent to Cookhams which also happens to be an area of woodland and fields - we appreciate the need for new housing but until all brownfield sites have been developed fully, there should be no need to develop greenfield areas.	WHP9 is intended to address the issues of traffic speed and volume. The majority of traffic is through traffic and this would cause a minor change. Our parish is entirely surrounded by AONB countryside and only a very small proportion is developed. No "brownfield sites have been brought forward for further development.	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	If this development goes ahead the houses should be kept well back from the road behind an effective screen of trees. Getting out of this estate at rush hour will be a nightmare whatever is done .	The access issue will be for WSCC Highways to investigate and address as part of planning. The layout is yet to be put forward but opportunities for screening at the "rear" (from the open countryside) and from Top Road are potentially available	Consider addressing more specifically the issues raised by this policy
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	Retirement flats and bungalows would better serve the community and free up family homes in the village. A bus stop already serves this area. There is plenty of room in development area for visiting family parking as well. With a good footpath to Cost Cutters and the post office this is an ideal site for the development of our aging community who wish to stay in the village	The parish Housing Needs Survey found that dedicated older people homes were not required nor desired.	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	Traffic problems Lack of local services	Traffic issues can potentially be address by WHP9 and WSCC Highways will need to approve a safe access junction.	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	The road at the top of Station Road is already a hazardous place and to have further traffic emerging immediately afterwards would greatly add to this.	Traffic issues can potentially be address by WHP9 and WSCC Highways will need to approve a safe access	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	I wish to raise an objection to the planned development of houses on land adjacent to Cookhams. Firstly, this site is a greenfield site and the last one in the main part of the village of Sharpthorne, it has never been developed in the past for good reasons. Originally it was used for pasture but the owners have now let it become overgrown. Looking at old photographs the land was, at one time, kept in good condition and pleasant to look at. Behind the brambles are new oaks and wildlife. How can the Council support concreting over this site. It conflicts with the Futures Survey which was completed by 65% of all households in the parish. Secondly, is there really a demand for a lot of new housing in Sharpthorne? Looking on Rightmove's website there are currently 10 houses up for sale. Some have also been taken off the market because they can't sell. This plan could be the thin edge of the wedge, particularly for this end of the village. One site had an application for 90 houses turned down a while ago. We should all look at Crawley Down which was once a small village but has now developed to the extent that nearly every open space has been built upon. I believe that there is enough development in villages around us without opening up the possibilities of losing another village to the developers. It is my view that once planning is allowed for one area, it will only be short space of time before every single green space in Sharpthorne has been developed, despite the Neighbourhood Plan. What about the increased traffic problems with an additional 100 cars pouring out on to this part of the village every day. By all means build housing specifically for the elderly to downsize if they want to, at an affordable price, but let us not imagine that we need 3 and 4 bedroom houses as well. I could mention many other points but there is not enough room here and I am sure others will have their views to express on this subject.	Whilst a greenfield site this was the only viable site that was put forward for development in the parish in the Neighbourhood Plan project despite efforts to identify other viable and available sites. The Futures survey identified the need for affordable homes which this policy would help to provide (30% of the iup to 24 would be affordable). There are identified needs in WH Parish for new homes of particular kinds. There is also the desirability of additional homes of certain types to help free up houses currently occupied by older owners looking to "downsize" and to encourage some more younger families. The current Rightmove information should be seen in the context of the current lacklustre housing / mortgage market. By allocating one site such as this the parish is much better positioned to reject others thereby ensuring development is contained.	Build in affordable percentage in this policy wording.
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	Because more green space gets taken away. Then again in another 20 years...	Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	I think this is too many. Not opposed to the development but must have enough off road parking & plans for "snow" parking that happens on Top Road.	This development would need to demonstrate that it was self-sufficient in parking	Consider explicitly reflecting this in wording
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	The wording here is too vague and no plans seem to be available to adequately describe what type of dwellings are planned. As per our previous comments: There is no clarity re the proposed development at Cookhams (WHP13)with regard to parking, type of dwellings to be built (starter homes, one bedroom flats etc), number of bedrooms per dwelling, access to Top Road, affect on existing traffic issues and existing utilities network.	Noted	Consider tightening policy wording to reflect these points

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	The access to such a site would be situated on or near the brow of a hill and close to the already busy and dangerous junction of Top Road and Station Road. Twenty four dwellings will mean anything up to one hundred additional vehicles with multiple daily movements. All in all, it is too much.	The precise access point is not been identified and would need to satisfy WSCC Highways on safety grounds	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	oppose	Top Road can not cope with the traffic as it is let alone with a further 24 houses being built on this small piece of land. The amount of traffic and the speed at which it passes through is already way beyond what the road can cope with at this time (is the fact that the road is sinking in to great holes a sign?). If the building lorries that pass through the village at this time are anything to go by then contractors will have little respect for speed and volume of traffic during the building process.	WHPC is working with WSCC Highways to address the traffic speeds and volumes along Top Road	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	no opinion	oppose	We recently told the Parish council, through the Futures Group Survey (Report October 2009), what we want in our village. We told the Parish Council that we did not want large scale development on greenfield land, such as the proposed site on Top Road. We told them that if any new housing is needed it should go on brownfield land which has already been used for building purposes. The Survey says; "the great majority of responses were opposed to the development of additional housing on greenfield sites with some 75% against and only 7% for" (page 6). Why has the Parish Council chosen not to listen to us and to ignore the findings of their own report?	In 2012 further data gathering took place specifically related to the Neighbourhood Plan project. There are no "brownfield" sites available. The Parish Futures Study identified the need and desire for more affordable homes which since 2009 has not made any progress. With this plan and policy up to 8 new affordable homes would be available	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	no opinion	oppose	Our villages have grown enough. We are a village.	Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	no opinion	oppose	Objections to proposed building development. 1)Building on "Green Field" site. 2)Increased traffic on an extremely busy road for a village. 3)Considerable HGV/LGV movements during protracted building phase. 4)We are an area of outstanding natural beauty. 5)This development would change the openness and character of the landscape. 6)Habitat of Nightjar (Red conservation status) and Dartford Warbler (Amber conservation status) 7)Sewage Farm already at Max capacity.	1. But no brownfield available. 2. Other policies intention is to address general traffic issues. 3. Subject to planning conditions controls to minimise environmental impact. 4. Yes and HW AONB have been consulted and would be consulted on a specific development application. 5. The layout could minimise this impact. 6. This would be investigated during a planning application. 7. This would be investigated as part of a planning application.	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	strongly oppose	oppose	Although we asked specifically what was planned for the site, John Downs was unable to give any information. The Neighbourhood plan doesn't say very much at all except that there will be 24 houses. What does that mean? How long will it take to build the houses? Will they be two story? How much disruption will there be to residents? The Parish Council can't expect the residents to have an opinion if they are not giving clear instructions of what is planned for the site.	The policy allows for "Up to 24 dwellings". The precise details will be subject to our finalised policy and choices and priorities of the developer/owner. All the information currently available has been made available to residents. If the parish waits for all details it will be too late to specify our needs and get a Neighbourhood Plan in place.	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	strongly oppose	oppose	i have read and re-read the neighbourhood plan, but cannot understand why the Parish Council has concluded that we need 30 new houses in the parish over the next five years and then further periodic five year reviews after that. the villages of the parish have grown gradually in recent times- increase of 3% since 2000 (according to the draft plan) small scale new housing has occurred. what is wrong with letting the natural and gradual growth trend continue?	The issues are an ageing community (+3 years on average in the last 10 years), a "sticky" house market, unaffordable houses for young people and families and threatened local services due to this pattern. The 3% growth quoted is in population but given the ageing profile this is not sufficient to be a sustainable community.	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP13	Site for New Homes	strongly oppose	oppose	<p>As a mother of a school child who was knocked down by a car overtaking the school bus close to this proposed site a year ago, my main objection to the new homes is the increased traffic it will bring in an already dangerous area. Those of us who live within a few hundred metres of this proposed siting can tell you that the village is already a hazardous rat run for thousands of car cutting through here daily. What the council don't recognise is that extra obstacles (cars turning, pulling out, school and public buses stopping on Sharpthorne/Top road) are treated as mere inconveniences by the impatient and speeding 8,000 cars and lorries that traverse this road daily, and the presence of more drivers in new homes needing to use this narrow pass will lead to more accidents and potential deaths (my son was airlifted to hospital in London with a head injury and broken leg, my neighbour's daughter was put into a coma in a separate incident of a car overtaking the school bus on Top Road). Make no mistake, this is not about the addition of 30 cars into the village using a road alongside 8,000 others daily, it's about the life-threatening hazard these cars will pose as they make multiple journeys in and out of the turning to navigate through the village - while speeding drivers rush to dodge and overtake them.</p> <p>In addition to the traffic issue, those of us who live near the proposed siting were shocked that such a proposal could be made in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This siting is on the edge of the Ashdown Forest, famous for AA Milne's Winnie the Pooh character, and we enjoy tourism (particularly from Americans) who visit the natural beauty of the place (and nearby Pooh Bridge). The biodiversity that an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty allows mean that we often enjoy watching wild animals in our back garden which adjoins the Ashdown Forest - Wild Boar, Wild Deer, rabbits, foxes, ducks, pheasants. Quite apart from the disruption of construction in this protected AONB, what affect will this disruption and the impact of new homes have on this delicately balanced site. It seems inconceivable that while hundreds of thousands of pounds of government subsidies are spent on the "Re-Wilding" project at Knepp Castle in Horsham, introducing native species to 3,000 acres there, in an already wild area of West Sussex, where this biodiversity exists naturally, the council is proposing to interfere with birds and wild animal's habitat, right next door to the Sussex Border Path public walkway enjoyed by millions of ramblers over the years.</p>	<p>This is why WHP9 is a fundamental part of this plan. This seeks to address the issue of the 8000 vehicle movements which is the main issue. The vast majority of this parish area is undeveloped AONB countryside and will remain so due to MSDC and parish Neighbourhood Plan policies if eventually approved. If any threatened habitats exist on this site they will need to be appropriately addressed.</p>	
WHP13	Site for New Homes			<p>These are my main concerns with the Site for New Homes - both of which are unique to this particular area, and would not affect other "brownfield" sites such as Haywards Heath or other relatively urban areas. Children's lives are at risk from this proposed siting, and so is the natural habitat of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the land area of this parish is undeveloped AONB countryside.. The opportunities to address C319 traffic issues in WHP9 have the potential to significantly improve children safety</p>	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	strongly oppose	oppose	<p>I do not believe we have need for this housing.</p> <p>This housing will spoil the views from many directions (when did you last walk the path from Horsted Keynes to Sharpthorne: it is beautiful but won't be if this development happens) and may reduce the number of walkers who come and use our pubs, cafes and shops.</p> <p>This housing will affect the traffic on the road, which is already probably the key area of concern on the hoathly hub. This housing will strongly impact of the lives of those living near by, affecting their quality of life and financial value of their properties.</p> <p>Adding further recreational and play facilities will dilute the use of those we already have!! (see 18, which should also include the scout hut.)</p>	<p>There are several pieces of evidence to support this need - the parish Housing Needs Survey, the 2009 parish Futures, the workshops and survey for the Neighbourhood Plan in 2012. The treatment of the site should be sensitive to the views into the site from the footpath. Policy WHP9 is intended to address the major problem which is the 8000 vehicle movements a day on the C319 - 75% of which are through traffic. The Sharpthorne "Old Rec" is not the most accessible space for young children and we can do better.</p>	<p>Consider footpath issue in policy wording</p>
WHP13	Site for New Homes	strongly oppose	oppose	<p>i have two comments/questions for the Parish Council in respect of their role representing the people of the whole parish.</p> <p>The road through the village of Sharpthorne follows an old ridge line, in the past the planners have been extremely keen to ensure the ridge line is not completely developed, limiting developments along it and protecting its tree line, why would this not continue?</p> <p>Also Top Road is already one of the busiest C roads in West Sussex, known as the unofficial East grinstead By-pass, with traffic already often queuing through and out of the village. i presume that the Parish Council oppose the increase in traffic and look to implement any measures that will protect the safety of the parish children and community?</p>	<p>First point - the layout of this site is yet to be put forward but there is space to ensure that it is well screened when looking towards the ride from the countryside. Second point - yes, WHP9 and the ongoing WHPC discussions and work with WSCC Highways are intending to address this.</p>	<p>Consider layout specification for site</p>

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP13	Site for New Homes	strongly oppose	oppose	<p>A petition against the proposed development on Top Road - signed by more than 200 residents of the parish over the past 3 weeks - will be handed in to the parish clerk on Monday, June 3rd. It has attracted support from all areas of the parish - and we are still hearing from people who wish to sign it! Many of the comments in the petition express serious concerns about safety and increased traffic on Top Road.</p> <p>Given that the draft Neighbourhood Plan is moving through a consultation process, it is very much to be hoped that the parish council will take into account that this is a very unpopular policy which requires some rethinking by the Council.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The parish has grown 3% since 2001 (reference page 2 of the plan). Why not allow such natural small-scale development to continue? There are several such developments under way already. Why force development against the wishes of a large number of parishioners?</p> <p>The parish council met with the property developer in March 2013 (before the Neighbourhood Plan was issued). The council's record of that meeting indicates that only the road half of the site was intended for development. I am strongly against any development of this site but, in light of the above, I wonder why the Neighbourhood Plan includes a map which highlights the entire area of the site - some 1.6 hectares - as the proposed development site? Neighbourhood plan commentaries state that such plans can be used to identify and protect important local green spaces. The draft plan does not do this at all. Why not?</p>	<p>The petition has been received and analysed. Approximately 23rds of those who commented were concerned about the traffic and access related issues which will need to be addressed during a planning application anyway. This policy is by no means universally unpopular and there are sustainability advantages for the parish in having some development. The parish has grown in population by 3% in the last ten years to 2011 - but it has also aged by 3 years and this is indicative of the long-term trend that gives rise to some of the sustainability challenges for the parish. The precise layout of the site has not been put forward but the expectation was that approximately half would never be developed. Policies WHP1 and WHP3 do identify important greenspaces in fact.</p>	<p>Consider specifying more detail about development layout and restrictions on site use.</p>
WHP13	Site for New Homes	strongly oppose	oppose	<p>I STRONGLY oppose the top road development of 24 houses. Firstly why when Sharpthorne represent 30-40% of the population is 80% of the alleged housing needs being shoe-horned into one site. Secondly why is there only one site that has been put forward for development and being pursued by the parish. And has anyone not noticed how busy and dangerous Top Road is. Are we seriously proposing to add to this rat run between the A22 and M23. I urge you all to consider these points seriously. We should be focussed on fixing the traffic issues NOT adding to them.</p>	<p>This site has been put forward since it was the only viable site that was put forward as available and it has one of the best assessments vs the parish sustainability objectives. WHP9 and the Parish Council's current activities with WSCC Highways is very definitely geared to fixing the C319 traffic issues.</p>	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	oppose	<p>Clearly there is a need for affordable housing for young families and the elderly in our villages and the lack of suitable sites makes this difficult. A major difficulty with this site is the danger of significant additional volume of traffic entering Top Road at a point where sight line is short. Perhaps a smaller development with careful consideration of how entering/exiting traffic is to be managed could be considered.</p>	<p>Access and safety concerns would need to be addressed as part of a specific application and would involve WSCC Highways to approve the approach used.</p>	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	oppose	<p>This is a bad idea from the start. I wonder why they are not pushing for Highbrook or West Hoathly or shall I answer that one..</p> <p>If you want to keep Sharpthorne a village then vote against the development site proposed in this so called "Neighbourhood Plan".</p> <p>If you allow this to go ahead it will be too late for regrets and we will be stuck with this nightmare. What will it be next? street lighting, speed cameras as an appeasement to the already speeding traffic along Top Rd? Spread the load to the Neighbouring villages and not just Sharpthorne!!</p> <p>Vote against this Plan and you won't regret it !!</p>	<p>This site has been put forward since it was the only viable site that was indicated by the owner as being available. It also has one of the best assessments vs the parish sustainability objectives.</p>	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	oppose	<p>It would be complete madness to develop any site on Top Road in its current state .</p> <p>Top road simply can't take anymore traffic. !</p> <p>Just echoing someone else's comment about Crawley Down. I was born and bred there and now live on Top Road. Crawley Down is unrecognisable today from how it was many years ago . When my mother first moved there it was mostly green fields ,now look at it ,sprawling with houses ! My mother after moving ,still visits and cant believe how built up it has become . I know we are a long way off that but sadly once you let a little building development go ahead the rest just follows and before you know it you have another Crawley Down .</p> <p>Crawley Down in years to come will lose its village status. I hope this never happens years down the line to our beautiful village .</p>	<p>WHP1 and WSCC are already working to address the traffic related issues on Top Road and WHP9 supports this aim. The whole point of having a Neighbourhood Plan is to specify and restrict development to that which we have a need for to create a sustainable community. Far less control would be in place without such a plan.</p>	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	oppose	I would support with a limit of 50-70% of the current proposed dwelling of 24 max. This would be in order to reduce traffic exiting onto Top Road together with speed calming features. I accept that more affordable housing is required but I would like to see provision for first time buyers for the younger residents in our community also given some consideration.	The challenge on Top Road is the 6000 through traffic movements. Those from this site are minor in comparison. It would be hoped that first-time buyer opportunities would exist on this site	Consider tightening types of dwellings definition
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	oppose	Unacceptable disruption to local residents. Unacceptable increase in HGV traffic during development and private cars once occupied. Suggest sheltered accommodation for an aging local population.	No demand or evidence of such demand for sheltered elderly accommodation was identified in the research - in fact it was specifically NOT wanted.	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	oppose	I am concerned about the increase in traffic from such a development and the problem of egress with regard to visibility and the site being on the brow of a hill.	Egress safety would need to satisfy WSCC Highways as part of a planning application. The main traffic volume issue is the through traffic on Top Road.	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mildly oppose	support	Using up "GREEN SPACE" which we do not have enough of.	This is hard to support given that the vast majority of this parish is undeveloped AONB countryside.	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	support	In principle I support the idea of a SMALL development of houses (less than 24 homes) on the Top Road site near Cookhams, BUT feel the proposed close goes too far back behind "the building line" of other properties and would impact on those, and also open the way to similar over-development onto green fields in future years. If houses are built here, it should not be an expensive crowded close such as is being built on Grange Road, Crawley Down: the village needs reasonably-priced homes for local people. Road access is the main problem with this proposal as vehicles coming over the brow of the hill will not have time to give way to traffic emerging from the site.	No specific layout has yet been put forward for this site. The "reasonably priced homes" idea is what we are after but the site also needs to be economically viable. 30% of the dwellings would need to be affordable homes anyway. Road access is yet to be put forward and would need to be approved by WSCC Highways at the time of a specific planning application.	Consider specifying more detail about development layout and restrictions on site use.
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	support	This policy seems to me to provide for a balanced form of development near Cookhams. The land has lain derelict for far too long. I note that the 24 dwellings is a maximum; fewer houses would be quite acceptable provided that the mix criteria and other requirements were met.	Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	mostly support	support	I am worried about the possible size of this development and the siting of the proposed houses. Any high density housing would be inappropriate for this site. I have always thought there must be a good reason why our forefathers did not build on a particular site. Today it is because of the high volume of traffic that goes through the village which would make this site unsuitable making it a dangerous spot to exit. I am also concerned that any development fits in with the other properties adjacent to the site.	Access and safety concerns would need to be addressed as part of a specific application and would involve WSCC Highways to approve the approach used.	Consider specifying more detail about development layout and restrictions on site use.
WHP13	Site for New Homes	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support		Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	Very much in favour of this - we need young families if we need to survive as a village and keep the facilities we have. Don't want this to get bogged down in the "green" agenda - we need the houses and families regardless of how they are built	Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support		Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support		Noted	

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	We note the requirement for housing in the area. Ibstock are well placed to supply bricks to these properties and consider that the use of products from West Hoathly would support the overall thrust of the National Planning Policy Framework including the "presumption" in favour of sustainable development. In addition to being a supplier of a high quality building product suitable to the local vernacular, Ibstock would like to promote Bluebell Woodland (located adjacent to the northern part of Station Road, Sharpethorne and to the west of the brickworks) as a suitable residential site. The site consists of woodland and has a total area in the region of 7.50 acres. The ground undulates throughout the site suggesting it has been subject of some earthworks in the past. The site is located to the north of Sharpthorne and would provide an excellent opportunity for a residential development sympathetic to the locality. Ibstock have made a number of representations over the years to promote the woodland specifically to Mid Sussex District Council in respect of their local plans. We would like to take this opportunity to work with the local community in order to promote the site for residential development. Additionally we will be making further representations to the District Council including one this month regarding the draft District Plan.	This is a matter for the developer and the specific planning application. The use of local materials would seem to be attractive. Blebell Woods site will be assessed as part of the NP project.	Consider wording re materials usage
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	Development of the site seems appropriate - the density does not seem to be commensurate with the village character.	Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	I fully support this part of the parish for redevelopment, whilst appreciating it may not be popular with some residents it is an ideal location.	Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support		Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support		Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	A site this large could have a very large negative impact on the village. To be of benefit, it must contain a mix which meets the need of people within the village - younger families, single people and older couples and individuals. A standard developer mix including 4 bedroom housing and flats would not serve the community's needs. For any development, layout, house design and soft landscaping will be key if it is to be integrated and the Parish should put major focus on these matters as well as on the mix of housing units. Whilst any development itself will have only a minor impact on the serious traffic issues on Top Road, the problems of these means the priority for any Section 106 funds arising from any development should be to improve safety for village users of Top Road (and especially pedestrians)	Safety - this is the intention of WHP9	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	I strongly support this.	Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	This land is privately owned and if a planning application were to be submitted for the site it is hard to imagine that it could be refused, especially with the current "presumption in favour of development" written into the NPPF. I welcome the limit of 24 homes (there is space for many more) and the assurance that the rest of the land would stay as "green space", contain play areas and have ample off-road parking provision - but who would own the undeveloped land? I suggest that the policy be tightened to specify the type of housing we would require in more detail and to ensure, if possible, that most of the homes will remain small so the young people of the future will continue to be able to afford them - possibly terraced cottages with separate garage blocks to deter large extensions? Having a say in any development on this site could even be an opportunity to IMPROVE the traffic problems on Top Road. If we are able to influence the design, location and landscaping of the entrance it could help to calm, or even deter, through-traffic (the major cause of the problem) before it enters the villages. Without this policy in our Neighbourhood Plan the number, type and layout of any development of this site would not be influenced by OUR housing needs but according to the wishes of the developer. We would also miss out on funding for other traffic-calming measures because much more of the money raised by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would be used by Mid Sussex instead of being allocated to local projects within our parish.	Noted	Consider policy wording to specify layout, types of dwellings and access arrangements

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	We would support this provided that it did not have an unfavourable impact on those who live close by.		
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	Safe road access to Cookhams is crucial, considering the typical approach speed of traffic into the village (40 to 50 mph)	Noted	
WHP13	Site for New Homes	support	support	Housing developments must be "mixed" with all types of housing included.	Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	no opinion	no opinion	Each should be assessed on its own individual merit	Every planning application will be assessed on its own merits	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	no opinion	no opinion	See my comment on WHP11	Every planning application will be assessed on its own merits	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	mostly support	oppose	Any development in the centre of West Hoathly village can only add to the already desperate traffic and parking problem.	This is the intention of WHP6	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	strongly oppose	oppose	There is a nature protection zone which applies to new housing developments within 7km from Ashdown Forest so how can 24 houses be built within this distance? We have only one small green space left in Sharpthorne so to build 24 houses would have detrimental effect on the environment. We would propose reinstating this green space back to its former glory so that the generation of children we have in the village can enjoy playing in this area like their parents have done before them.	There is a misunderstanding here. A Conservation Area is a designated area of usually heritage/historic buildings as exists in part of West Hoathly and the centre of Highbrook.	Consider some clarification on CAs
WHP14	Conservation Areas	strongly oppose	oppose	Increasing housing density will increase traffic and bring further parking problems. It will not solve housing shortages.	This is the intention of WHP6	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	mostly support	support	Conservation areas need extending...	Not sure where is meant. The West Hoathly CA was reviewed, consulted upon and adjusted in 2009(?) by MSDC so is pretty much up to date.	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	no opinion	support	With careful planning	Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	support	support		Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	support	support		Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	support	support	Comment 1. I'm not clear on the criteria that determine a development is "infill". Comment 2. Will infill development be subject to both WHP11 and WHP14, or just WHP14.	Comment 1 - Infill refers to new developments of usually 1 or more dwellings within the existing built-up area as defined in map C. Comment - Both WHP11 and WHP14	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP14	Conservation Areas	support	support		Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	support	support		Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	support	support		Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	support	support		Noted	
WHP14	Conservation Areas	support	support		Noted	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	mostly support	no opinion		Noted	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	mostly support	no opinion	Please explain what exception sites are.	Exception sites are sites that are usually on the edge of the existing developed area but that wouldn't normally be considered allowable for development. In this case they become viable as exclusively affordable housing sites. Since at least 2009 WHPC has been seeking such a site in response to the Parish Futures Study but none has so far been found which would be viable.	Clarify wording
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	no opinion	no opinion	Each should be assessed on its own individual merit	Every planning application will be assessed on its own merits	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	no opinion	no opinion	See my comment on WHP11	Every planning application will be assessed on its own merits	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	no opinion	Not clear what 'exception sites' are and am concerned how many such sites could be found in the parish and be developed. There has been a massive amount of house-building in Crawley Down and I wouldn't like the same thing to happen in our parish We need to retain the balance of built area and natural rural sites	Exception sites are sites that are usually on the edge of the existing developed area but that wouldn't normally be considered allowable for development. In this case they become viable as exclusively affordable housing sites. Since at least 2009 WHPC has been seeking such a site in response to the Parish Futures Study but none has so far been found which would be viable.	Clarify wording
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	no opinion	Dont know what Exception sites are	Exception sites are sites that are usually on the edge of the existing developed area but that wouldn't normally be considered allowable for development. In this case they become viable as exclusively affordable housing sites. Since at least 2009 WHPC has been seeking such a site in response to the Parish Futures Study but none has so far been found which would be viable.	Clarify wording
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	no opinion	This reads like jargon speak -cold this be translated?	Exception sites are sites that are usually on the edge of the existing developed area but that wouldn't normally be considered allowable for development. In this case they become viable as exclusively affordable housing sites. Since at least 2009 WHPC has been seeking such a site in response to the Parish Futures Study but none has so far been found which would be viable.	Clarify wording
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	no opinion		Noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	mostly support	oppose	We have plenty of "brown fill" sites	We haven't found any!	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	mostly support	oppose	The traffic issues on Top Road and on surrounding roads need to be addressed and implemented before more housing should be considered.	WHPC is actively engaged on this with WSCC Highways	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	mostly support	oppose	Against infill site in our stableyard next to Vicarage. We were outraged when 4 houses planned without our knowledge. SHOW SOME RESPECT!!!	In fact no houses were "planned" there was solely an enquiry made as to whether this site might be possible.	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	strongly oppose	oppose	Strongly object to any deliberate new development within our village.	Unfortunately without some policies re "deliberate" development we are likely to get "accidental" and unsuitable ones	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	oppose	I feel affordable housing should be built on brown sites around towns not villages and only once all derelict buildings have been either restored for living in or raised to the ground and re-built.	Villages need affordable houses just as much as towns to ensure vitality of the community	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	oppose		Noted	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	mostly support	support	If the WH Plan does not take precedence over the MS plan then it is not much use.	The WH Plan if adopted would have equal weight when used by MSDC to assess planning proposals in this parish.	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	no opinion	support	With careful planning	Noted	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	support		Noted	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	support		Noted	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	support		Noted	
WHP15	Affordable Exception Sites	support	support	We do need more affordable housing	Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	mostly support	no opinion		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	no opinion	no opinion	We are fortunate enough to already have recreational facilities	Yes, but the intention here was to allow the improvement of "SANGS" within the parish rather than this money going elsewhere	Clarify SANGS meaning
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	no opinion	no opinion	Don't understand. Is this North Lane Rec? Finches Field? Sharpthorne?	It would more likely to not be - ie would be a more informal open space	Clarify SANGS meaning
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	strongly oppose	no opinion	I don't really understand what you are getting at here?	See the MSDC information on SANGS	Clarify SANGS meaning
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	support	no opinion		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	support	no opinion		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	mostly support	oppose	We would wish to see the North Lane Recreation ground added to the list of 'protected' recreational use areas.....the proposal to establish a shop there would not be supported, due to the potential for increased traffic flow along North Lane/further potential parking problems. In addition, any development, other than that already identified at Hoathly Hill and next to The Cookhams is not supported. Therefore, WHP11 is largely opposed	It is already identified on Map B. Comment re WHP11 noted	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	support	oppose	The current green spaces are well positioned around the parish and are accessible to most without the use of a car. If any planned development is proposed which diminishes our current green spaces, I should be very strongly opposed.	This isn't really the point re SANGS	Clarify SANGS meaning
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	mostly support	support	Let's hope that the promise of support by a developer for a SANGS does not influence the planning department's decision.	SANGS funding will be integrated into the CIL payments - it won't be optional!	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	support	support		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	support	support		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	support	support		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	support	support		Noted	
WHP16	Alternative Green Space	support	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	no opinion	no opinion	Each should be assessed on its own individual merit	Every planning application will be assessed on its own merits	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	no opinion	no opinion	In principle yes, but same response as WHP11-15	Every planning application will be assessed on its own merits	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	strongly oppose	no opinion	HH is a highly visible point in our village and protection should be given not only to the views FROM HH but also the views OVERLOOKING HH.	Noted	Consider wording of policy
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	support	no opinion		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	strongly oppose	oppose	Hoathly Hill is over developed already	Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	mostly support	support	The Hoathly Hill settlement is already chaotic, over developed and hardly picturesque. The views from there are probably quite nice. It is the view of Hoathly Hill from the vicinity of the church which needs serious consideration in future.	Noted	Consider wording of policy
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	mostly support	support	I think this paragraph needs to be beefed up. No further development should be allowed on the site unless a specific need can be shown by the Hoathly Hill Community. No further encroachment into the Conservation Area should be permitted. I also think the paragraph should include 'loss of views from Hoathly Hill and viewpoints in Map B.	The defined Hoathly Hill site does not contact nor overlap with the defined Conservation Area of West Hoathly	Consider wording re views into
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	support	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	support	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	support	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	support	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	support	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	support	support		Noted	
WHP17	Hoathly Hill	support	support	Too much development has been permitted at Hoathly Hill and there needs to be a block on further expansion.	Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	mostly support	no opinion	There is no mention of planning applications for new sites for employment. What if applications for "fracking" sites are received, for example? Or applications for new (or extended) sites which promote tourism?	Minerals planning is specifically excluded from the possible scope of Neighbourhood Plans. Other employment sites would be assessed against MSDC's Plan policies	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	no opinion	no opinion	I thought that this was the established case	Yes in District but additional emphasis was sought	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	strongly oppose	no opinion	I would cite the Intrepid Fox - which the owner built in order to develop. He cynically ran the business down and managed to get some planning permissions although not all those he wanted. A change of ownership has had a dramatic impact and having been taking for a ride once, I would urge the planners not to let this happen again.	That is the intention of this policy!	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	no opinion		Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	mostly support	oppose	For instance if a farm is no longer viable does this mean they would be encouraged to build houses and factories instead. Surely not.	The District Plan has provisions for redundant agricultural Buildings See MSDC DP11.	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	mostly support	oppose	Ref. is made to Community Shop on North Lane Recreation Ground taking up valuable space of green playing area	The Community shop does not form part of this Plan	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	mostly support	oppose	We need employment in the village, as well as the business i.e. do not convert a pub into housing.	That is the intention of this policy!	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	mostly support	oppose	Totally oppose the development of the shop on West Hoathly recreation ground	The Community shop does not form part of this Plan	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	mostly support	support	Shame this wasn't around in 2012 when Hilltop Stores was sold (with respect to the current owner).	The Hilltop Stores site still has the same approved use as it did and remains an employment site	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	mostly support	support	This policy should allow for more flexibility for redevelopment other than only when the 'use of the site solely for employment can no longer be sustained.' It should allow for redevelopment when employment in any economic mode is no longer viable. Long-term this might apply to the brickworks and to WH Garage.	The intention here is to retain the limited employment within the parish.	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	mostly support	support	In light of the unemployment figures nationally and the wish to keep as many of our young people in the locality together with a desire to generally reduce everyone's footprint on the planet I think we should be much more proactive in trying to attract employers to site their business within the parish.	Whilst it is thought that more "rural" businesses would be acceptable to most residents, encouraging any sort of employers probably would not	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	no opinion	support	I thought this already the case?	Yes in District but additional emphasis was sought	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	strongly oppose	support	We need some employment	That is the intention of this policy!	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	support	<p>After careful study of the whole document I strongly support all policies proposed, but in the months since publication the PC has given scope for meetings with those who oppose the proposal for a community village shop in WH. I strongly support such a shop, but with the reservation below.</p> <p>Four years ago Hilltop Stores closed, only because of the criminal activity and imprisonment of the shopkeeper / postmistress...Always before that WH and Sharpthorne had at least one general store each. The community shop committee have worked long and hard to RESTORE a shop to the residents of the EIGHT residential streets of WH - which is what they deserve, a shop within walking distance of home. This is especially important for the elderly and those without a car. The opposition have a point when they emphasize the shop plan as published creates a new hazard - a traffic crossroads at the top of Hilltop Road. This would be a dangerous point for children, some unaccompanied by adults, when going to and from school through the wide gateway. I ask the PC to ask the shop committee to re-think the car parking situation for shop customers, perhaps as follows: Widen North Lane to allow perhaps a dozen cars to park parallel to the new kerb instead of on the rec itself. Replace the hedge with a thinner hedge, in which is a walkers-only gateway for pedestrian customers of the shop. Debliveries by vehicles to the shop to be the only vehicles to have access by the wide existing gateway. Thank you.</p>	The Community shop does not form part of this Plan. Suggestions welcome and will be passed to WHPC	Pass onto WHPC
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	support		Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	support	Thank you for your letter dated 16th November 2013 inviting Ibstock to comment on the draft West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2030. Our "West Hoathly" brickworks is located within Sharpethorne and continues to provide an important part of Ibstock's portfolio. We are aware that the brickworks are a major employer in the area as the factory currently employs circa 40 employees. It is our intention that the operations continue for the foreseeable future and we support the employment policy which states that the priorities of the Plan are to conserve the limited employment opportunities in the Parish.	Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	support		Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	support	Consideration should be given to encouraging better agricultural use of the land and the maintenance of farm buildings for this purpose.	Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	support	We need to try and have employment in the parish	Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	support		Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	support		Noted	
WHP18	Existing Employment Sites	support	support		Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	no opinion	no opinion	Yes, but on their individual merits	Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	no opinion	no opinion	Each on their own merits	Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	support	no opinion	I presume that any such developments will be processed through the normal planning procedures?	Yes when they need planning consent - ie are not covered by "Permitted Development Rights"	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
WHP19	Home Working	mostly support	oppose	I strongly oppose any development of any kind on the Rec ground in West Hoathly.	None is proposed in thsi Plan	
WHP19	Home Working	mostly support	oppose	Totally oppose the development of the shop on West Hoathly recreation ground	The community shop does not form part of this Plan	
WHP19	Home Working	mostly support	oppose		Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	mostly support	support	This is open to misuse unless there is a limit on the number of residents in a dwelling who can each have such a unit.	Noted	Consider policy wording
WHP19	Home Working	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	mostly support	support	HOMEWORKING MUST BE SUPPORTED - but need Superfast Fibre Broadband asap! Less commuters = less cars on the road!! WHERE IS THE GENERAL COMMENTS BOX FOR THIS PLAN??????	That is the intention of this policy! Superfast Broadband should be covered by the current WSCC /Broadband UK initiative Sharpthorne and Ardingly exchanges should both be included in the planned roll-out	
WHP19	Home Working	mostly support	support		Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	no opinion	support		Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	support	support	This will become more and more - the norm. It needs the very best internet comms available to be enabled within our parish.	Noted - Superfast Broadband should be on its way within 2 years or so	
WHP19	Home Working	support	support		Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	support	support		Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	support	support	Agree but would also allow if there was a small employment for non occupants as that may help with local employment for youth or others.	Noted	Consider policy wording
WHP19	Home Working	support	support		Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	support	support		Noted	
WHP19	Home Working	support	support	This is a very interesting concept. The effect of the AONB has been to prevent building where it does not provide accommodation for those working on the land. This seems to be a regrettable limitation. This proposal allows the new building to become both a work and living space - will that trump the current limitation?	This policy and other AONB "protection" policies of MSDC will both be applied and a balanced assessment will be made by MSDC Planning Control	
WHP19	Home Working	support	support		Noted	
	General Comment	mildly oppose	no opinion	The letter attached to this form is available to view at the Parish Office and will be considered along with the other comments.	Noted	
	General Comment	mostly support	no opinion	A good plan in general. But I note from the MSDC plan, that the WH plan is intended to last for 20 years and should be kept up to date - but I didn't see how & how often this would be done. Also I din't see any mechanism for ensuring that the WH Plan does not clash with the plans from neighbouring parishes and vice versa. As the life of the plan is intended to be 20 years, I think it is important that it at least tries to predict the needs and priorities of the parish (eg affordable housing, schooling provision, tourism, etc) over that period so that it doesn't get stuck in a time warp. Also the Plan seems to concentrate on the central areas of West Hoathly & Sharpthorne, and largely ignores the preservation of the more rural areas of the parish.	The NP should be reviewed at approximately 5 year intervals. Nearby Parishes typically consult each other on their plans as we have done. Don't forget that the MSDC plan is already quite comprehensive re countryside areas and would be used alongside the NP	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
	General Comment	mostly support	no opinion	I feel disappointed that the Neighbourhood plan has not really supported the desire and need for a village shop in West Hoathly. I understand that this may not be something that the whole Parish thinks is important but I feel it is very important to West Hoathly. An easy to access shop that is within easy walking distance would greatly help the community. This need is not fulfilled by the Sharpthorne shop as it is too far to carry any significant shopping and requires a car so it is easier to call in to other shops on your usual journeys such as Crawley Down and East Grinstead rather than making a special journey to Sharpthorne in the car.	Noted. The community shop as an already active project before this plan was written was not included.	
	General Comment	mostly support	no opinion	Thank you for all the hard work that must have gone into this document and for making it reader friendly.	Pleased that was how you found it.	
	General Comment	mostly support	no opinion	I think this is a nice place to live in, a good view from my bedroom window. It is nice and quiet up in West Hoathly, but a bit more traffic here in Sharpthorne	That is what most people seem to think in this parish	
	General Comment	mostly support	no opinion	I found it (general comments option) by the way - please ignore my very last comment on previous submission! A great deal of work has clearly gone into this, but I fear that once again, like with surveys, a small % response will be received due to the large amount of reading one has to do. Could it not have been done in smaller sections, or two halves? Difficult to please all I know. To do this properly, one should read both the draft plan and related District Council plans, but I don't personally have time for that. I expect many feel the same. Neighbourhood outdoor workshops - engaging with the community a little more - door-to-door discussions. Worth trying next time? YouTube - could we have not put something on there? Non-internet confident folk - I'd like to see some support for those in the Parish who might benefit from a little one-to-one teaching from anyone who considers themselves internet-confident. I'd like to see an internet forum for open discussions - non-edited. Wording of policies can be misinterpreted. I would like to elaborate, but it's late, and I need my bed.	Six weeks were allowed for this consultation (it was not a survey) which is quite a long time to look into it. Many public workshops were held to which everyone had the opportunity to come. Re Internet skills the "Hub Club" an every Saturday morning for several months in Autumn 2011 but very little take up was seen - so this need is not clear. Unedited internet fora when sponsored by a public body carry various risks but there is nothing to stop a member of the public establishing such a thing.	
	General Comment	mostly support	no opinion	Please could the pavement be continued all the way up Station Road (South side)?	This is among the topics the PC continues to pursue with WSCC and which WHP9 may enable	
	General Comment	mostly support	no opinion	I know a lot of work, and input from any parts of our parish community, has gone into this. The most important thing for me are:- Making provision for affordable housing so that we can keep a younger element in the villages Making provision so that people, as they get older, can stay in this community; this means, again, some provision of smaller housing so folk can downsize. Also convenient services and facilities. Generally I support the Plan but think the policy wording can be improved in 4 cases.	Noted - these are key aims of the Plan	
	General Comment	strongly oppose	no opinion	We don't need a shop or coffee shop to be built on the rec., + I'm sure the proposed car park is not warranted. Customers do not need to drive there. I am not in favour of allowing anyone to become a part owner of a building on our rec., or to have access to park there.	The community shop does not form part of this plan	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
	General Comment	strongly oppose	no opinion	<p>16. Homes: I strongly oppose the need to build more homes in this village and would urge the parish council to join with other local parish councils against the need for more housing in the south east of England. The neighbourhood plan seems to me to be a totally undemocratic (bullying?) way of getting these homes through planning even tho' nobody wants them. I would argue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rightmove shows there are currently 6 houses available under the average house-price within three miles of the centre of West Hoathly, and six pages of houses available within the same radius. Some have been available for a while; some have come back onto the market having not sold previously. - 'there is minimal landowner interest in developments': so why should the one person who is interested - and has cynically kept his land for development purposes! - be able to develop this. I would read this comment as saying that despite the serious financial rewards which are available, most of the landowners in this village would prefer not to spoil the local landscape with further development. - The rate of development suggested by the plan , 30 additional dwellings over the next 5 years, by FAR exceeds the rate of growth which the village has sustained organically over the last five years. <p>Dwellings: 2012: 800 (grown by 3% since 2001) therefore, going backwards 2001: 777. So going forwards 2018: 824 dwellings required for a natural organic growth of 3%. ie an increase of 24 houses not 30. This natural organic growth will continue (there are currently planning requests within the village to turn garages into housing and this will continue thus we will get the increase in from new development plus the natural organic growth: surely we don't need both???)</p>	<p>The Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan project are obliged to work within the legislation that exists in the real world. The vast majority of Parish Councils in the MSDC area have wholeheartedly embraced the NP opportunity and the potential benefits it brings - as WHPC have done. The conclusions reached re the need and desirability for some additional homes are based on the surveys conducted in 2012 and the workshops and meetings that have taken place on the NP. The 3% growth of the population since 2001 to 2011 was not the numbers of homes. Also the population 2001-2011 has aged on average by 3 years which is indicative of the population trend imbalance here. Most "organic" new homes which are built tend to be large, expensive detached homes which do and would do nothing for the local need.</p>	
	General Comment	strongly oppose	no opinion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I don't believe there has been any development in the village to fulfil the needs of families caring for elderly relations or extended family? Is there a NEED for housing or a DESIRE for it? - There are young families who live in the village who move when their children reach school age. Why? I teach local antenatal classes which often have couples from our villages expecting their first child. All have moved by the time the children reach school age. * look to the schools (I believe the village school is much much better now but needs some serious marketing) * we want children from other villages to come to our schools, not our children going to other schools (both private and state). I have spoken to many parents recently who talked about scraping together school fees because they feel let down by the village school, or who have gone to primary schools in other villages. * increasing the volume of traffic and making it harder to walk to school will decrease the numbers in the village school. <p>17. Local Employment: There is significant, and happily disproportionate, employment given to adults with learning difficulties via the communities at Pericles and Duckyls - for example. The importance and impact of this should not be overlooked. (NB this is social housing and new houses have been developed recently on the Duckyls site.)</p>	<p>This need for carers was not something that specifically has come up in the NP research. The WH School is to be congratulated on its recent OfStEd "Good" rating which should help. WHP9 is geared to addressing the traffic issue.</p>	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
	General Comment	strongly oppose	no opinion	<p>The village already sustains 2 pubs, 1 cafe, 1 British Legion, 2 churches, 2 garages, 1 general store/Post office, 4 schools (HH, Pre, Primary, Philpots), 9 halls, a centre for creative arts, tennis courts, cricket ground, 2 playgrounds, a host of small businesses and cultural organisations. We do not need to increase the population to create a thriving community: We have a thriving community and further development is likely to lessen this rather than increase it.</p> <p>18. Community Wellbeing: I would fundamentally oppose the development of a medical centre given the new centres which have recently been built at Crawley Down and Forest Row: this would show phenomenal lack of joined up thinking.</p> <p>In summary, I am not convinced by the requirement for additional housing within our villages. I think the concept of a neighbourhood plan has been dreamed up by the planners to avoid the government having to make policy changes and develop the UK northwards. The South East of England is FAR TOO CROWDED and we should be shouting this from the rooftops and NOT just trying to work out how to cower to the bullying tactics of those in power. I would urge the parish council to stand up to them using every channel they have available.</p> <p>Additionally, having opened up a period for consultation I have found the comments posted by the Parish Council on the hub very worrying. The Parish Council have had their say and must now listen very carefully to the feedback which comes back and only after very careful consideration should any further comments be posted or you are in danger of restricting this crucial debate.</p>	<p>We are trying to look ahead to avoid issues as well as to address the very real concerns many residents have today about the parish. No proposals have been made re a medical centre - Section 18 merely refers to the situation as it exists today. The only comment responses posted during the consultation were simply to clarify the meaning of aspects of the plan - particularly when some residents actually asked questions. Some residents seem to find this very helpful and were then able to comment on the plan more meaningfully.</p>	
	General Comment	strongly oppose	no opinion	<p>How can you say it is a priority when you leave OAPs in the village unable to use the buses. We hear you want to close Philpots quarry, is that retaining local businesses & employment? We do not need business facilities: ie shop etc on our recreation ground</p>	<p>Assumed to refer to the reroute of the bus away from West Hoathly centre - this was due to repeated blockages and disrupted timetable. WHPC at least have no desire to close Philpots Quarry and this plan supports local employment sites. This plan makes no proposals for any shop on NLR.</p>	
	General Comment	strongly oppose	no opinion	<p>NO oppose: Sharpthorne is also an area of outstanding beauty, the field you propose to build on has magnificent views over the countryside. To hear the sound of the birdsong in the mornings & evenings, plus the Hoot of the owls from that field will completely disappear. The increased traffic from this housing would add to a more impossible task to access this country road. Traffic oppose: no to speed cameras no more 30 mile limits drivers take no notice please no speed bumps no street lights we do live in a village Start to address the volume of traffic, it starts at four am and stops at 8pm. How about having a toll charging to come through our villages just like the French do</p>	<p>These views need not be lost to the community. This parish's area is mostly undeveloped open AONB countryside. Unfortunately to do something about the traffic volumes and speeds some actions will need to be taken! I haven't seen tolls in French villages - only on their motorways.</p>	<p>Consider wording of WHP13 re views</p>
	General Comment	strongly oppose	no opinion	<p>I have lived in Sharpthorne for some 26 years at my address after living in London. The 24 houses next to my home will not improve our village. It will take away my view of the rural landscape. This is a rural village. How will these new houses improve the traffic problems that already exist in the village. The road is a rat run to Gatwick The new houses if built will add to light pollution if street lights were put up. I am opposed to this and any new housing in our village. This is a rural village not a town.</p>	<p>These views need not be lost to the community. This parish's area is mostly undeveloped open AONB countryside. WHP9 of this plan and the work with WSCC Highways by the PC is intended to address the traffic problems. No one wishes to turn our villages into towns.</p>	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	<p>A well thought out, comprehensive Plan. WELL DONE to all involved! Alan and Carmel Stewart. Cairnhill, Top Road.</p>	<p>Noted - Thank you!</p>	

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
	General Comment	support	no opinion	Interested that no mention of the proposed village shop. Having looked at the marked out footprint on the rec I am horrified to think that anyone thinks this is a good idea. Can see this turning into development by stealth - i.e. the shop runs out of volunteers, is forced to close, becomes a house etc. If there are sufficient volunteers then maybe instead of working in the shop maybe they could organise a milk run to Costcutters for those that can't make it and then we wouldn't need to vandalise the rec with buildings. Might be worth noting that for residents of Sharpthorne we have to make the journey to get to the school, church, pubs, doctors and other facilities - we're not trying to recreate our own versions of these at the expense of public recreation facilities.	This plan makes no proposals re a community shop.	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	Having had sight of other neighbourhood plans as well as visited a number of public presentations, I am of the opinion that the plan, as presented, has been well prepared, recognises the values attributable to the three communities and addresses the future needs of the community as whole. It is for these reasons I am happy to endorse the proposals and congratulate the Parish Council for preparing, and presenting, a well balanced plan to take us, as a community, forward into the future.	Noted	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	I would support an enhanced bus service to Crawley/East Grinstead (including one or two later in the evening; the 5pm bus from EG to Sharpthorne is too early for commuters and one during the day to Haywards Heath	This is a matter for Metrobus and subsidies from WSCC	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	I certainly have concerns about the proposed village shop. We are very lucky to have a well supplied local convenience store and it would be a shame to compromise its viability. Do Mid Sussex control the use of barn conversions? If not could the PC control the use to residential and not business use? Who controls tpos.? Should the PC conduct a survey of trees worth identifying for future notification of a tpo	This plan makes no proposals re a community shop. Barn conversions are covered by the District plan. MSDC control TPOs but the PC can request them	TPO point passed to WHPC
	General Comment	support	no opinion	A well thought out excellent plan, in time this should benefit the whole parish, that is if MSDC pass it!! A huge thanks for the effort put in to pull this together.	Noted and Thank you	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	I would like some further explanation. If this plan is approved by a referendum and implemented without any changes I assume the WHP items (highlighted in green) will eventually form the legal planning rules for future planning applications. I would like to know what happens to all the other information in the report. For example, will it be used as additional explanation of the intention of a particular WHP item, or will it have no weight in planning rules, or something else entirely. Revised comment 21/5/13 to replace a previous comment. General. Page 7, vision "achieve on-going continued reductions in non-sustainable energy and water use". Disagree with this vision. Including this as part of the vision could give a presumption of planning approval for any developments or alterations claiming to be sustainable. Each application should be determined on its merits. I'm concerned about schemes not yet devised which may be scientifically unsound and completely intrusive. Or water-harvesting schemes with an excessively large tank right against a boundary line - if the tank is above ground it ruins the neighbour's quiet enjoyment of their property, if the tank is below ground it means there is no room for roots from the neighbour's trees. Also, "achieve on-going continued reductions" could be used to force changes against the wishes of householders, in the same way as the current compulsory water metering scheme.	The surrounding text and the policies of the finalised version of the plan would be used by MSDC Planning if it is approved at a referendum. The NP policies will have equal weight with District-wide policies. 21/5/13 comments - Noted but none of these policies are applied in isolation. MSDC Planning apply them all where relevant to a particular application and then assess the overall balance of a case when reaching a decision.	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	Fully support all policies.	Noted	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	Community use: Active consideration should be give to the comments in Section 18 to developing a multi use facility. In particular this should consider the medical and social needs of the community both for the aging population and the young. A community shop within the Parish should only be considered where it is not viable for a commercial business (such as costcutters) to exist. If it were necessary, the lease of an existing commercial premises should be taken. No new building should be constructed for this purpose - particularly not on WH Recreation ground. The Hook Lane cricket pavillion does not appear to be readily accessible. A review of this would be appropriate.	Noted	Comment re MSDC owned pavillion passed to MSDC

West Hoathly Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Comments and Responses - June/July 2013

Policy Ref	Policy	Overall Opinion	Policy opinion	Comments	Response	Action
	General Comment	support	no opinion	I think the plan is good	Noted	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	Care homes for people with special needs at Horncastle House and willow and Maple Lodges and at Duckyls and also special school at Philpots could perhaps be mentioned in a separate paragraph. Note only No opinion tab could be assigned to this comment Map C. This could be out of date as I think there have been changes to reflect the planning permission for developments in the old station area. Also this would be a good place to show the strategic gap. I think the box top right shows Highbrook CA but it is difficult to read it (maybe all village subtitles could be added?. Note only No opinion tab could be assigned to this comment.	Noted.	Consider adding to introductory text. Consider Map C updates as suggested
	General Comment	support	no opinion	In addition to my specific comments on individual policies, I'd like to add the following general comments: 1. The Conservation Area is an enormous asset to our Community and is of high quality. It is full of beautiful buildings and glorious views of buildings, materials, trees and plants that blend well together. It should be protected with little, if any, leeway for "special pleading". This should be clearly stated in the Plan. We need the strongest possible arguments against the sort of plan put forward a few years ago for The Cat. 2. I suspect there is a strong chance planning consent for housing could be got on the Cookhams site on appeal. Therefore it is far more important to focus on what is built there (numbers, mix, design, layout, soft landscaping, materials, impact on vistas) than on whether anything is built. Large builders would always aim to build "standard product", which would not accord with our local traditions. It may be far better to exert maximum pressure in these areas than on whether any housing is built there 3. Top Road is getting a steadily more serious issue, and will get worse as traffic volumes (and lorry sizes) increase. It may be "difficult", but there must be a vision of what could be done and it would be better if that were in the Plan, especially as funding should be available if the Cookhams development goes ahead. It is not good enough to put it in the "too difficult" box!	All noted. Re 3. Work is currently underway with WSCC Highways on specific implementation options for traffic calming on the C319	Consider WHP13 wording as in 2.
	General Comment	support	no opinion	Having read the report from cover-to-cover and also having attended the Highbrook meeting, I must say that we are very impressed with the plan. It demonstrates an excellent understanding of the needs of the community and the locality. We are concerned however, that there appear to be a number of people in the community who perceive a 'A Yes Vote' for the plan as being 'A Yes Vote' for the Recreation Ground Shop. Consequently, we feel that this could result in 'No' votes when the referendum takes place, unless it is made very clear that this is not the case. We also feel that a significant number of people in the community see any and all changes in a negative light and would prefer to keep our parish frozen in time. Whilst we would hate to lose the character of the area (we are locals), letting it stagnate is unhealthy. This is particularly worrying when considering the proposals for infill housing. Many people don't seem to fully appreciate that failure to take charge of our own planning, doesn't mean "no building" but will simply lead to future decisions be taken out of our hands and placed in those the local authorities' Not a desirable outcome for any of us, I would think! Personally, we would welcome small scale builds of well designed, economy, 2-3 bedroom houses, as this should provide younger families with the opportunity to move into the parish and by default increase the numbers attending our primary school.	The community shop is no a proposal of this plan. All other comments noted.	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	Great plan. Full support on all issues.	Noted	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	We are very impressed with this plan.	Noted	
	General Comment	support	no opinion	The letter attached to this form regarding proposed new facilities for St. Margaret's Church is available to view at the Parish Office and will be considered along with the other comments.	Noted	
		mostly support		Overall opinion only entered	Noted	
		mostly support		Overall opinion only entered	Noted	
		mostly support		Overall opinion only entered	Noted	
		mostly support		Overall opinion only entered	Noted	
		support		Overall opinion only entered	Noted	

