

West Hoathly Neighbourhood Plan – draft Plan consultation comments summary for 22/6/2013 Workshop

Topic / Policy	Support	No Opinion	Oppose	Comment Themes	Comment / Potential Plan Changes (DRAFT)	Possible Changes to be Recommended (DRAFT)
Overall Opinion of Plan (125 Responses Received)	61 Support 36 Mostly Support	7	2 Mildly Oppose 19 Strongly Oppose			
WHP1 - Landscape	25	1	1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive comments Private land identified objected to Some missing viewpoints / areas Strategic gap WH / Sharpthorne Community shop issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No Change Adjust areas Add areas Consider explicit mention Not applicable in this plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No action 3 Accept changes Take advice from MSDC No action
WHP2 – Historic Lanes	19	3	2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Some misunderstandings re the purpose of this policy – ie re traffic – no, re allowing development – no Some inaccuracies – eg Chilling Street Do we need some TPO's in key sections re lane “tunnels” 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify intent in policy background Check Chilling Street and rest for completeness / accuracy Independent of NP 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Accept changes Take offline / discuss at PC
WHP3 – Recreational Spaces	22	2	6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Community Shop Issues Private land identified objected to Gravetye Woods / Selsfield Common missed out Should clearly permit the community shop development on the NLR and enlargement/improvement of the pavilion. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Not proposed in this plan – no change Consider adjustment based on comments Add Consider adjustment to permit development initiated/approved by PC on PC-owned land 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No action 3,4 Accept changes
WHP4 - Footpaths	17	1	1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Should refer to Public Rights of Way rather than Footpath 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Change wording 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Accept changes
WHP5 - Visualisations	18	0	0	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Caution re misleading representations Ideally show overall impact of multiple applications 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Leave as is Discuss MSDC Planning Control 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No action Take MSDC advice

West Hoathly Neighbourhood Plan – draft Plan consultation comments summary for 22/6/2013 Workshop

Topic / Policy	Support	No Opinion	Oppose	Comment Themes	Comment / Potential Plan Changes (DRAFT)	Possible Changes to be Recommended (DRAFT)
WHP6 – New Homes Parking	20	1	4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No of spaces linked to bedrooms / house type 2 spaces excessive for some homes Yellow lines for parking hotspots Homes shouldn't be specified by intended occupant 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consider more sophisticated formula Part of 1. Clarify difference between policy and implementation Consider rephrasing policy 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Accept changes Take offline - PC discussion Accept changes
WHP7 – Protection of Parking	15	3	0	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Wording seems confusing / ambiguous 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Tighten up wording 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Accept changes
WHP8 – Goods Vehicle Traffic	26	2	7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen to stop any additional HGV Recognition of employment use of HGV Transport assessment too weak 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1,2,3 Consider rephrasing policy 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1,2,3 Accept changes
WHP9 – Road Improvements	25	3	6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to needing development to get funds Development aggravates the problem Use CIL for recreational facilities as well Why not average speed zone throughout villages 20mph zone? Many other implementation suggestions and queries why implementation not specified Also an issue on the lanes 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Otherwise only by increasing precept to unacceptable level or long wait for WSCC. Not necessarily - could improve. No evidence to justify - see concerns matrix 5,6 Clarify difference between policy and implementation No supporting evidence to justify 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1,2,3, No action 4,5,6 Take offline – WHPC H & T committee No action

West Hoathly Neighbourhood Plan – draft Plan consultation comments summary for 22/6/2013 Workshop

Topic / Policy	Support	No Opinion	Oppose	Comment Themes	Comment / Potential Plan Changes (DRAFT)	Possible Changes to be Recommended (DRAFT)
WHP10 – Bluebell Railway	21	2	9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns re additional traffic and parking congestions Questions over what benefit Some want more than a halt 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Include restrictions on station use and parking availability to ensure not a main terminus – ie benefit to local residents and foot visitors only Clarify intent in policy background BRPS very unlikely to do so 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Accept changes 3 No action
WHP11 – Infill Housing	14	2	6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed up with policy 13 New Homes Limits on numbers? Should be smaller / lower cost homes Replace "house types" with "dwelling types". 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No action 3 Consider tightening policy 4 Consider rephrasing policy 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No action 3 Accept changes 4 Accept changes
WHP12 – Dwelling Extensions	14	3	2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Should also apply to demolish and rebuild proposals Concern with two houses into one projects Impact on neighbouring properties should also be considered. Is policy needed with MSDC Plan provisions? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2,3 Consider rephrasing policy 4 Review MSDC Plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2,3, 4 Accept changes

West Hoathly Neighbourhood Plan – draft Plan consultation comments summary for 22/6/2013 Workshop

Topic / Policy	Support	No Opinion	Oppose	Comment Themes	Comment / Potential Plan Changes (DRAFT)	Possible Changes to be Recommended (DRAFT)
WHP13 – Site for new homes	20	3	28	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should be spread around parish – unfair in Sharpthorne 2. Make it for elderly only 3. Traffic and access issues (top issue) 4. Last green space in village 5. Unnecessary – no need for more houses 6. Effect on AONB / ridge – views from PRoW + other issues 7. 200+ signature petition 8. Overcrowded site – too many houses + other planning issues 9. Construction traffic problems 10. NB Policy has some strong supporters though 11. Restrictions on houses being extended needed 12. No detailed plans provided 13. Design needs to be in keeping 14. Brownfield should be used first 15. Ignoring Futures Study 2009 16. Impact on neighbours and property values 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Only feasible site where owner wants to develop 2 No evidence of this type of requirement 3 Consider tightening policy 4 Opinions vary and would not all be built upon 5 Refuted by Housing Needs Survey & issues matrix 6 Clarify layout of site 7 Doesn't add new issues – main commented topic is traffic & access 8 Depends on Layout 9 Temporary & address in planning conds 10 No action 11 Consider tightening policy 12 Confusion between policy and implementation - no plans available yet 13 Not really a policy topic and with what? 14 Best assessed site 15 More up to date info & affordable need identified then 16 Questionable 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1,2 No action 3 Accept changes 4,5 No action 6 Accept changes 7,8,9,10 No action 11 Accept changes 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 No action
WHP14 – Conservation Areas	12	2	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Several misunderstandings about this policy need to be explained 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve surrounding text in plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Accept changes

West Hoathly Neighbourhood Plan – draft Plan consultation comments summary for 22/6/2013 Workshop

Topic / Policy	Support	No Opinion	Oppose	Comment Themes	Comment / Potential Plan Changes (DRAFT)	Possible Changes to be Recommended (DRAFT)
WHP15 – Affordable Exception Sites	6	8	6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Several people did not know what this was about Concerns that brownfield should be used first 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Improve surrounding text in plan This needs better explanation 	1,2 Accept changes
WHP16 – Alternative Green Space	9	6	2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Several misunderstandings about this policy to be explained 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Improve surrounding text in plan 	1 Accept changes
WHP17 – Hoathly Hill	13	4	1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns HH already overdeveloped Should include views into HH as well as from Boundary needs to be checked / adjusted 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence Not identified as "valued assets" – consider wording change Refine map 	1,2 No action 3 Accept changes
WHP18 – Existing Employment Sites	16	4	4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No clear themes 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No action 	1 No action
WHP19 – Home Working	13	3	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Need better Internet connections Limit on number of home offices per dwelling Small employment for non occupants to help provide local employment for youth / apprentice 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Not relevant to NP – already included in WSCC programme 3 Consider rephrasing policy 	1 No action 2,3 Accept changes
General Comments				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of appreciative comments re the Plan Several references against the Community Shop on NLR Several references against WHP13 Plan ignores rural areas Plan too difficult too complex Map C out of date 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No action Not relevant to NP Covered in WHP13 Covered by MSDC Plan Needs to suit planning world and residents – consider some clarifications Make adjustments 	1,2,3, 4, No action 5 Several policies need some re-wording 6 Accept
No Comments input	14 Support 4 Mostly Support	0	0			