

Post-It Note Comments on:- **Policy 10 – Bluebell Railway Halt**

Proposals by the Bluebell Railway to establish a halt at the previous West Hoathly Station Site will be supported.

Please place Post-It comments below.....

- Good new wording! Foot and bike stop only (like Kingscote)
- Can we see the full details of what the Bluebell plans are, parking etc.
- Do feel it would be an advantage and bring people, money and jobs to all villages as there is such a lot to see here.
- We do not want a halt or station. The road can't take it now let alone with a halt.
- Also possible transport route to shops (get a cheap deal on the train with residents local shopper tickets)
- I like the change suggested i.e. not a main terminus; foot + cycle + reduce car use + parking

Post-It Note Comments on:- **Policies Other than 10 & 13**

This sheet is for comments about policies other than WHP10 – Bluebell Railway and WHP13 – New Homes Site

Please place Post-It comments below with WHP Policy number included.....

- WHP11: no references to age – age isn't relevant – diversity of size & cost – smaller cheaper to counteract high prosperity prices locally.
- DP27 – West Hoathly has been identified as being effected by new runway at Gatwick. Direct route over village – huge increase in noise. What being addressed.
- First time I was aware of so many alternative sites that should be considered
- Inadequate time to consider high volume of new information
- Really need the public transport or parents driving kids even when late teens & early twenties – cost of getting them a car to college & jobs.
- Transport – need transport to secondary schools and public buses. Reduced service & possibly to be reduced again – new development will require cars if don't keep up public transport.

Post-It Note Comments on:- Policy 13 – New Homes Site

Development of the site adjacent to Cookhams, south of Top Road (as shown on the Map C) will be permitted for no more than 24 dwellings. Any development will need to have an appropriate mix of housing, provide green infrastructure, recreational and play facilities, provide satisfactory access and have consideration of the impact on views in the setting of the AONB.

Please place Post-It comments below.....

- For Cookhams Housing specify mainly smaller houses for young people/older people.
- Development site 477. Traffic speed surveys have been carried out by conspicuously attired speed gun operatives thus giving a false impression of the 85 percentile. It may be very much higher. A “covert” survey is required to truly ascertain design criteria for junction proposals.
- As a member of the Sharpthorne Community Action Group the group needs time to consider all the information we are asked to respond to.
- No guarantees as to who will live in these houses. Therefore no guarantee that they will use village school, shops, pubs etc to contribute to community.

If we are to proceed

1. Covenant that there will be no expansion of the agreed area AND this should not be full area
 2. What really is the minimum houses/timeframe we can “get away with” 24 in 5 years or 16 in 10 years
- Do we need the additional recreational facilities or will they simply stop people using the existing
 - If this is to happen only affordable please to encourage young families.

- If so far the only developable site it needs to be developed as indeed we need more houses in the parish. Needs handled with care to meet needs of village.
- Safety Traffic numbers & Speed – some form of speed enforcement is required other than the police who do not enforce speed codes as far as I can tell (in this area). Effective traffic calming by entrance features, signs, horizontal and vertical deflection and lane narrowing would be required. How these would fit into an AONB and the current village scene I cannot imagine.