

WEST CHILTINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Draft recommendations for handling the non-development issues in response to the pre-submission consultation

The comments on the *NP Report of Issues (Final)* paper have been collated and the following table shows the draft recommendations arranged into blocks of comments coloured on the RAG principle to show a recommendation for acceptance (green), rejection (red) and requiring further discussion (orange).

These issues were reviewed by the Steering Group at its meeting on 20 January 2016 and its agreed proposals/actions are shown below.

Para	Issue and Comment	Final recommendation	PC Recommended Comment	Steering Group Comment
16		No impact on plan	No action	
17		No impact on plan	No action	
18	(The Environment Agency) acknowledges that the plan directs development to areas of lowest risk but advises consultation with West Sussex County Council and Horsham District Council if any sites proposed have been affected by surface water or groundwater flooding.	<p>Surface water flooding is an issue in West Chilmington and the avoidance of making matters worse is a feature of planning permissions. Further consideration might be given to this before a final decision is made.</p> <p>The comments and background on surface water flooding need more consideration along with those of the Environment Agency (paras 17-19).</p>	<p>Need action plan and text. Needs to refer to issue 5</p>	<p>Issue 9 – Flooding ACTIONS: WCPC has an action list for WSCC which includes flooding.</p> <p>May need to lessen the action identified in the N Plan (MM)</p>
DW LB	<i>This is a planning issue and is also covered by the action plan Completely agree – flooding appears to be getting worse</i>	<p>Propose – a specific discussion on surface water flooding in the</p>		

MM	<p><i>Do we have clear/identified locations where surface water an issue? the locations can be categorized as easy medium, hard to resolve</i></p> <p><i>This should be a criteria for site suitability</i></p>	<p>SG to review whether any policy change is needed and to update the Action Plan</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Whilst there is an objective there is no policy in the plan so much of this issue is directed to work for the Action.Plan. NK and MM will discuss how this might be taken forward</p>		
51	<p>It is suggested that additional wording is added to the fourth paragraph of Issue 9 Flooding as underlined here 'Previous government policies and current national economic constraints have resulted in a lack of this essential maintenance. Also many landowners are unaware of their riparian duties to keep the ditches and watercourses on their land clear so that water flows freely.'</p>			
51 DW	<p><i>Landowners should read landowners (including householders) so that there is not the assumption that it is just farmers etc</i></p>			
19		No impact on plan	No action	
20	<p>It (EA) also recommends "that environmental infrastructure, including habitat enhancements, water storage areas, and green space is taken into account when looking to fund local infrastructure."</p>	<p>To the extent that any of these issues would become relevant to any site they will be taken into consideration. There are no plans for funding local infrastructure so this proposal has no impact on the plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>	No action	

		Recommendation		
20 MM	<i>These are significant matters for sustainability</i>	<p>Whilst there is no disagreement over the effect on sustainability the representation is about the funding of local infrastructure and not about green issues generally so this has no impact on the plan subject to the following.</p> <p>If the s106/CIL proposals, when firmed up, relate to this area then this assessment might need amending. See separate consideration of s106 issues below</p>		
21		No impact on plan	No action	
22	Historic England makes a number of proposals relating to heritage assets	<p>There is a specific policy on heritage assets and it will require specific consideration (see below)</p> <p>The problem here is that the Village Design Statement is very out of date and there are no plans to revive it. Propose that further discussion take place on this issue. (see also para 123)</p>		
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				

<p>28</p>	<p>Historic England also recommends making an addition to Policy D1 that creates a clear requirement for developers to consult the Village Design Statement (or any successor document) and to demonstrate within their applications that they have followed its guidance and protected the special features it identifies. It recommends using text similar to the following “In order to sustain and enhance the character of the parish, planning applications will set out how the development proposals conform with the guidance of the West Chiltington Village Design Statement, including the protection of the special features of the area’s character identified. Proposals that have clearly conformed with the guidance of this document, including the use of locally distinctive materials, scale, form and massing of buildings, layout and contribution to public space will be supported.”</p>	<p>Proposal –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Can we agree that the VDS will definitely not be updated? ii) Design issue can be dealt with together with Policy D1 below. <p>The VDS is no longer a relevant document and is not planned to be updated. It proved impossible in the preparation of the NP to get a viable statement of design principles. Consider if this should be revisited or if there is another way of reflecting the suggestion to create a map of the characteristic lanes or other features and adjust Policy D1 if necessary</p> <p>Proposal –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) Can we agree that the VDS will definitely not be updated? iv) Design issue can be dealt with together with Policy D1 below. v) As regards a map it does show readers not familiar with the area where these features are which road names by themselves might not. Discuss in SG. <p>Subject to the above consideration (para 29) propose that this amendment is not made as it refers to an out of date document.</p> <p>Proposal – A decision under para</p>	<p>Need to “bulk up” policies to make sure they reflect the VDS policies.</p> <p>*Ask HDC if we pursue abandoning the VDS will it mean that the supplementary planning document is replaced by the N Plan*</p> <p>*Do HDC expect a new VDS?*</p> <p>Ask AiRS can they do an assessment to include a map/list. Will it help to protect the character?</p> <p>RT: The VDS may be considered defunct, but presumably the suggested wording from H.E. would have chimed with the VDS when it was accepted, firstly by the community, and then as a SPD? If yes, then that means you have your evidence for this wording to be included in the NP (in addition to any other evidence which consultations and surveys produced) Point v) regarding a map is correct, - not sure if ParishOnline can assist, but if not, we can offer C21 which is an online mapping tool, which can be plotted with Heritage</p>	<p>ACTIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Steering Group to Review VDS to identify important sections. 2. RG to speak to Denis Wright re access to Parish Online 3. SD Circulated notes on 21/6/16 (saved in 2016 06 21 Meeting Papers) 4. ALL Steering Group members to review SD document before next meeting
-----------	---	--	---	--

28 MM	<i>WCPC Further discussion on how incorporate Village Design Statement</i>	Proposal A decision under para 29 will dispose of this issue too.		
28 SD	<i>further discussion needed to incorporate some of the Village Design Statement into the NP</i> <i>Further discussion with SG</i>	Recommendation It is accepted that HDC retains the VDS as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPDs). Subject to checking whether the adoption of the HDPF replaces all SPDs it was agreed that it would probably be necessary to advise Horsham that the VDS was no longer relevant. Before that further consideration will be given to all issues relating to heritage assets, Policy D1 and design issues that might be incorporated in the plan with NK taking the lead.		
29	“With respect to the positive features identified in the plan and Village Design Statement, it would be helpful if the plan included a clear map of the narrow or sunken lanes described as important features and included instructions to guide development on protecting their character, including the creation of points of access to new developments. Managing the requirement to provide an appropriate view splay, whilst maintaining the sense of enclosure provided by the steep banks of a sunken lane may require a specific approach within the proposals. Again, this could be provided as an addition to Policy D1 to provide clarity on how the wider requirements of the NPPF and Local Plan to protect heritage assets and local character should be implemented in the local context.”			
29 DW	<i>Does this really need a map or just a list as its largely Broadford Bridge Road, The Hollow, Southlands Lane and East Street to Pickety Corner</i>			
29 MM	<i>See 28 and 30</i>			

<p>29 SD</p>	<p><i>I was told that it is still relevant supplementary planning policy (by HDC), what would be needed to add further elements to the NP to conserve the heritage and character of the village other than the policies already outlined</i></p> <p><i>Further discussion with SG Where does the comment it is out of date come from?</i></p>
<p>30</p>	<p>It recommends using text similar to the following: “In order to sustain and enhance the character of the parish, planning applications will set out how the development proposals conform with the guidance of the West Chiltington Village Design Statement, including the protection of the special features of the area’s character identified. Proposals that have clearly conformed with the guidance of this document, including the use of locally distinctive materials, scale, form and massing of buildings, layout and contribution to public space will be supported.”</p>
<p>30 DW</p>	<p><i>The VDS is dead and many of these points are dealt with as part of the planning process</i></p>

30 MM	<i>This seems to be a recurring issue of consultation referring to village Design Statement which is out of date. Are VDS's something of the past and all NPs will be receiving the same sort of comment/issue. If so maybe worth finding out how other NP's have overcome/justified their position.</i>			
30 SD	<i>'locally distinctive materials, scale, form and massing of buildings, layout' these are important issues that need to be outlined to retain the character of the village</i> <i>Further discussion with SG</i>			
31		Proposal – this requires some action which can be addressed in due course Recommendation Accept representation and address the action with the heritage etc issues above		
31 DW	<i>Agree see comment in 27</i>			
32		No impact on plan	No action	
34		No impact on plan	No action	

35	<p>Sport England (S9) asks that we to ensure that we have reflected paras 73 and 74 of the NPPF in the plan and suggests that we consult its guides:</p> <p>'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England – Planning Policy Statement'. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/, and http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/.</p>	<p>See S9-1 in NP Evidence File and consider any issues before making a decision.</p> <p>Proposal – Take no action unless unless there is anything in the s106/CIL policy that is relevant.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Accept the proposal</p>	Accept	
36		No impact on plan	No action	
37		No impact on plan subject to any s106/CIL issues	No action	
38	No relevant comment		No action	

<p>39</p>	<p>Pulborough Parish Council (S6) asks us to expand on Policy T11 because of overlapping interests.</p>	<p>Consider if any further clarification is to be given to Pulborough.</p> <p>Proposal – review in conjunction with Policy T1</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Whilst it was not clear what more could be said this will be addressed in conjunction with the review of Policies T11-3</p>	<p>Refer to AiRS to review the policies</p> <p>RT: “POLICY TI 1: Integrate the policies of Storrington, Pulborough and West Chiltington to avoid the Parish roads becoming a bypass route.”</p> <p>Need to have a dialogue with Pulborough and SSW NP groups. Pulborough about to submit to Independent Examiner, SSW recently Examined and not to be put to referendum yet. So this conversation needs to happen quickly if policies are to be integrated as stated above. The language may need to be modified, perhaps in line with T1-3 along the line of:</p> <p>‘Engage in discussion with Pulborough and Storrington parish councils to ensure that West Chiltington parish roads do not become an informal bypass route, (as a result of policies in P and S Neighbourhood Plans).’</p>	<p>ACTIONS:</p> <p>MM to contact Pulborough & Storrington PC’s to progress this</p>
<p>39 DW</p>	<p><i>Not sure what more they expect as this is largely WSCC</i></p>			
<p>40</p>		<p>Accept representation</p>	<p>No action</p>	

41		No impact on plan	No action	
42		Recommendation	No action	
42 MM	<i>WCPC should also protect night skies</i>	As the original representation relates to the SDNP specifically and we are not proposing any developments in the Park it is irrelevant and the original no impact on plan marking should stand.		
44		Accept representation	No action	
45		Recommendation	No action	
45 MM	<i>This is important to Development Strategy and it was discussed and agreed at full WCPC to show the separation zone. It is a policy of WC to protect separation zone. therefore why not reinforce this with statement in WCNP and demonstrate compliance and support with HDC strategic plan and aligns with Storrington</i> <i>Reinforce this with statement in WCNP along with the map on page 26 as part of Development Strategy. Demonstrate compliance, support and alignment with HDC strategic plan</i>	Whilst there is no disagreement in principle here the West Chilt / Storrington separation zone is already protected by the HDPF and as no significant part of it is in West Chilt neighbourhood area and we have no plans to develop there to include it in the plan risks its being thrown out by the examiner as repeating existing HDC policy. NK will check whether any policy exists in the Storrington NP relating to this before a final decision is made.		
45 SD	<i>I agree this is supported through the HDPF policies but in light of another potential development on the Fryern Rd for 160 houses would not a belt and braces approach help protect WC from this type of development that could add to impact on our infrastructure, roads etc?</i>			
46		No impact on plan	No action	
47	This is a planning issue	Incorporated into the development issue handling paper	No action	

<p>47 MM</p>	<p><i>There is a need to have more clarity on policies H1 and H2</i></p> <p><i>Further discussion by WCPC when considering</i></p>	<p>issues naming paper</p>		
<p>48</p>	<p>Thakeham Parish Council (S11) is especially supportive of the WCNP which it considers to be an excellent document. It questions whether more designations should be made for green spaces to conform to the NPPF.</p>	<p>Consider when dealing with policy E1 (see para 121)</p>	<p>Review Policy E1 and expand (AiRS)</p> <p>RT: Monkmead Woods has some SSSI protection but not all? So Green Space inclusion would be a good move. See 121 for this as well.</p> <p>POLICY E1: To conserve the natural environment and district character by ensuring that Monkmead Woods with its habitats, footpaths and sites of scientific and nature interest is protected from development and maintained as amenity woodland along with the preservation as open spaces of the recreation ground and the open green space between the Common and the Village with its network of public rights of way.</p>	<p>ACTIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. JF has reviewed the HDC/HDPF Green Infrastructure Strategy and allocations (notes saved in Steering Group 2016 06 21 Meeting Papers) 2. Jess Price from Sussex Wildlife Trust has offered some assistance to SD. 3. Page 30 incorporate additional sites. 4. Rewrite Policy E1 to reflect JF work

<p>49 note</p>		<p>No impact on plan</p> <p>There is a reference to considering school places policy in the representation that we ought at some point just cover off in discussion.</p> <p>Recommendation is subject to Parish Clerk checking whether any school issues might affect the plan. They might in any event be a county matter which is excluded from inclusion in NP</p>	<p>SS to check policy with West Chiltington Community School Head Teacher</p>	<p>School Places Policy is a WSCC county wide policy which can be referred to so has no impact on the plan</p>
<p>50</p>	<p>In relation to Issue 6 Public Rights of Way it (WSCC) asks that consideration be given to proposing the upgrading of footpaths in the area from the built up settlements up to Broadford Bridge in conformity with its West Sussex Rights of Way Improvement Plan which might also be referenced in the Action Plan.</p>	<p>Consider how far it is wished to go and whether it has an impact on Policy TI2. (see para 136).</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Consider as part of TI2 review.</p>	<p>No action</p>	
<p>50 MM</p>	<p><i>Caution on this item WSCC would like to devolve responsibility for footpaths</i></p>			
<p>51</p>	<p>Flooding</p>	<p>Included with 18 above</p>	<p>Include with 18</p>	<p>See 18 above</p>
<p>51 LD</p>	<p><i>Strongly agree, many ditches are not maintained and cause problems</i></p> <p><i>What mechanisms are in place to enforce this?</i></p>			

<p>52</p>	<p>WSCC supports the approach in Policies T13 Public Transport Improvement and T14 Road Infrastructure.</p>	<p>This raises the question of how this support can be utilized and whether it merits further detail in the policies or is an issue for the Action Plan.</p> <p>Proposal – review with Action Plan when policies all settled</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Accept proposal</p>	<p>Ask AiRS to review Action Plan to ensure it is broad enough</p> <p>To fulfil T13</p> <p>RT: “2.5 Improve bus service to Pulborough station and trains from there.”</p> <p>Needs interpretation, background is evident in the NP, but:</p> <p>What does ‘Improve’ and ‘Service’ mean:</p> <p>punctuality, times of bus/ trains, timetable information, accessibility onto the vehicles</p> <p>Clearly this is a lobbying action, but if the suggestion in column 148 is taken up, this could be a good Action for the Implementation and Monitoring working group to get to grips with. Also Actions 5.7; 5.8 and 5.10 to be part of this exercise, some lobbying, some partnership working. (e.g. 5.8 Seating could be done quickly by the parish council, and funding easily secured, if pc is happy to commit to maintenance).</p> <p>To Fulfil T14:Action Points 5.1 – 5.6 should all be taken on by the working group.</p>	<p>ACTION: The original intention was to try to influence the bus companies so buses linked with trains in Pulborough</p> <p>SS/JF to look at policy wording to reflect intention</p>
-----------	---	---	---	---

52 DW	<i>Issue for the Action Plan</i>			
52	This paragraph also has a reference to Policy MIN1 which is marked for acceptance	Accept representation		
53	<p>It recognizes that the Action Plan is more focused on projects than policies, and makes specific suggestions.</p> <p>Action Plan 5.2 - only improvements to the Trunk Roads in the county would be funded by Highways England (A27 as referred to in the action plan). There are no major improvements programmed to the A283.</p> <p>Action Plan 6.1 and 6.2 – encourage the Parish Council to liaise with WSCC Public Rights of Way (PROW) on future intentions to maintain paths and improve accessibility. WSCC PROW retains an interest as highway authority can also provide advice.</p> <p>Action Plan 9.2 – additional wording requested to be inserted into the ‘How’ column of 9.2 as underlined here ‘Map problem sites, discuss options with landowners and highway authorities. Encourage regular landowner maintenance of ditches and watercourses.’</p>	Consider updates to Action Plan when all other policies have been settled.		ACTION: consider updates to Action Plan when all other policies have been settled.
53 DW	<i>Wary of WSCC motives as they own many of the footpath and are looking to offload maintenance onto Parishes. Also only WSCC have the legal powers to enforce action by landowners</i>			
54		No impact on plan	No action	

55	<p>It (WSCC) notes CP1 - Community Infrastructure Levy - and draws attention to the absence of an agreed mechanism for prioritizing infrastructure projects and asks for the parish council's support as part of its approach to the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>	<p>This is a matter for the Parish Council to consider as part its review of s106 and CIL. (see below)</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Defer to s106/CIL review</p>	<p>SS to send CIL list to councillors</p>	<p>SS has circulated CIL to Steering Group</p>
----	---	---	---	--

<p>59 note</p>	<p>Accept recommendation</p> <p>Proposal - The principle is accepted and that will suffice initially. The actual wording and layout will need to be considered in due course</p> <p>Recommendation Whilst merging two objectives is acceptable the real issue is the wording and this will be addressed at the redrafting stage. There is no need to put any issue to the Parish Council at this point.</p>	<p>Ask AiRS to look at Objective 1/3 to look at similarity and order and suggest any redrafting RT: Objective 1 refers specifically to Social rented and shared equity, Objective 3 does not make this specification, just that priority will be given to affordable homes which meet a local need. Could Obj 3 be to assist people to get onto the purchase housing ladder? If so, perhaps the language needs to be altered to make that distinction. My colleague Tom Warder, who is rural housing enabler, suggests some wording, which helps with definition: 1 - AH including social rented housing and various forms of intermediate market housing such as SO and SE. The Plan particularly supports models of AH which are able to provide genuinely affordable housing, based on what is affordable to local people. This could include community led development such as CLTs.</p>	<p>ACTIONS: Objectives 1&3 MM to take Obj 1 and add words Objective 3 – MM to look at wording and amend accordingly.</p>
--------------------	---	--	--

59 DW	<i>I can't where see this sentence is planned to go is Issue 3 or is it the title?</i>			
59 MM	<i>This does have an impact on the plan and the allocation of affordable homes has been a main item and objective in the Development Strategy. Care must be given so that this is not diluted</i> <i>Further discussion and agreement at the full PC is required. Put to next full council meeting February agenda item</i>			
60	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper	Development issue or incorporate in VDS review. Action Plan 4 needs rewording to better reflect Objective 4. Get advice to check it is in line with HDPF	See 28 above VDS review
61		Accept recommendation	No action	
62		Accept recommendation	No action	
63		Accept recommendation	No action	

<p>64</p>	<p>Objectives 10, 11 and 12 – conservation, sports facilities and health and wellbeing are seen as worded more like a planning policy. It is suggested that they could be reworded along the lines of “To secure through development, the conservation and enhancement of the local environment including biodiversity, rural character and habitat maintenance.” Specific requirements to contribute to habitat corridors, Monkmead woods could be requirements of the policies themselves.</p>	<p>This needs a bit of work to get them right.</p> <p>Proposal - The principle is accepted and that will suffice initially. The actual wording and layout will need to be considered in due course</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Accept the representation in principle and deal with the precise wording and content at redrafting stage</p>	<p>Agree – ask AiRS to redraft RT:</p> <p>Objective 10 The word ‘Especially’ is used here. If that is because consultations have shown that these issues, or specific areas are indeed of utmost importance, then to do a reword on the suggested lines would dilute that. One possibility might be to turn Objective 10 into a policy, - would need to talk to planning consultant and HDC about that.</p> <p>OR: reword as suggested, removing all mention of specific areas (bullets 4 and 5). However, you would then need to be assured that those two areas have sufficient protection in the policies or elsewhere in the Plan.</p> <p><u>Objective 11: This looks all right to me, as an Objective, rather than a policy, perhaps HDC suggestion to preface with ‘to secure, through development...’ is to ensure that the leisure facilities are included in the CIL wishlist?</u></p> <p><u>Objective 12: Same as Obj 11 above. These are</u></p>	<p>ACTIONS: SD to review and reword alongside Greenspace Policy. Remove 4/5. SD to engage with SWT for advice</p> <p>Include in list for Planning Consultant to review into a policy (E2 new policy)</p>
-----------	--	--	--	---

65		Consider in relation to MIN1 below	No action	
66-73	These are development issues	Included in the development handling paper	Include in Development issues	
68 SD	Treat as development issue	Included in the development handling paper		
71-72 MM	Comments on brown field sites and down sizing passed to development handling paper	Included in the development handling paper		
72 SD	Treat as a development issue	Included in the development handling paper		
74	Policy E1 – natural environment is supported and it is suggested that some more specific features such as biodiversity and landscape should be included in the policy as an enhancement. It is also suggested that the leisure department should be consulted with a view to designating Monkmead Woods as green space in accordance with NPPF para 76 and 77.	<p>This needs more detailed work before a proposal can be made.</p> <p>In the original design of this policy it proved difficult to get much input from the local “experts”. Proposal – this needs to be given much greater consideration in the SG</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Consider as part of the wider discussion on green space.</p>	<p>As above – E1 refer to AiRS</p> <p>RT: See paras 48 and 121 for comment.</p>	<p>Actions: link to 48 & 121 above SD/JF dealing with this.</p>
75	This is a heritage assets issue	This is dealt with as part of Policy D1 (see below)	No action	
75 SD	<i>Also to include hedgerows, native trees</i>			
76	This is a Policy CP1 issue	This is dealt with as part of Policy CP1 (see below)	No action	

<p>77</p>	<p>Horsham recognizes that the Non Statutory Policies which are not strictly land use related are deliberately addressed in a separate section of this plan. It warns that whilst some Examiners have suggested this as an approach it is not universally approved of by all Examiners. Some suggestions are made elsewhere that might change their nature to land use policies.</p>	<p>Propose that this representation has no impact on the plan at this stage.</p> <p>Proposal - Given the warning there might be a case for making a clearer up front statement about this issue either in the plan itself or by ensuring it is addressed in any covering document sent to the examiner. Deal with drafting stage later.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The representation will have no impact on the plan but at drafting stage consideration will be given to making sure that the distinction between statutory and non-statutory policies is absolutely clear.</p>	<p>Ask AiRS to review RT: Agree proposal in light of HDC warning. When selecting Examiner, WCPC can review his/her previous examinations to see whether the covering note approach would be welcome.</p>	<p>ACTIONS: Extract policies and put on a note to Maggie Williams to see if any can be pulled into Statutory Policies.</p>
<p>78</p>	<p>It is recognised that Transport and Infrastructure policies are important and there is a proposal to revise Policies TI1 and TI2 on the lines of “Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they will retain the existing character of the rural road network of the Parish. Proposals will also be supported where they provide opportunities for walking and cycling, particularly where they provide contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of footpaths and bridleways.” Other aspects of these policies ie TI3 and TI4 could remain non statutory or be incorporated into the supporting text of such a land use policy where it would have greater weight in terms of how it may influence development.</p>	<p><i>It is proposed to adopt Horsham’s suggestion and amend the policy wording to, “Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they will retain the existing character of the rural road network of the Parish. Proposals will also be supported where they provide opportunities for walking and cycling, particularly where they provide contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of footpaths and bridleways.”</i></p>	<p>Agree green wording</p>	<p>Give to PT for amendment</p>

78 SD	<i>Would this suggested wording stop potential road improvements or widening</i>	Recommendation Accept the representation. It was thought that necessary infrastructure improvements such the widening of Juggs Lane by way of example would not compromise the existing character.		
79	This is a Policy TI5 issue	This is dealt with as part of Policy TI5 (see below)	No action	
80	This is a Policy SRC1 issue	This is dealt with as part of Policy SRC1 (see below)	No action	
81 DW	The SA/SEA is said to be a considered and proportionate document with exemplary features of evaluation of different alternative proposals. It is suggested that consideration be given to additional work, perhaps cross-referenced in the SA/SEA on other site assessments treating them individually rather than as groups.	<i>This does not make sense as the site assessment report did deal with each site individually. A conversation with Horsham to clarify would be helpful to get this issue clear.</i> Proposal – await Horsham’s response to a question on this issue	Development Issue	
81 SD	<i>The site assessments were flawed and incorrect in some cases and need to be redone using objective criteria and further investigation of new potential sites in line with planning frameworks, more understanding of sustainability is needed in order to promote robust site selection and ranking of sites</i> <i>Further discussion with SG and PC needed</i>	Recommendation Accept the proposal.		

86	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper Recommendation Although it is a development issue it should be treated as not having any impact on the plan as it just plain wrong.	Include with development issues	
87		Accept the representation		
88	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper		
89		Accept the representation		
90	There was a comment from a resident (74) relating to page 2 and the need to have conformity with the local plan but complains of a lack of references to the local plan in the WCNP.	It has not been recognised that the “local plan” is the HDPF to which there are ample references and it is proposed that this representation has no impact on the plan. Proposal – include both terms in the glossary	Agreed approach	
90 DW	<i>This is a common misunderstanding – should we have both terms in the Glossary?</i>	Recommendation The representation has no impact on the plan but an amendment to the glossary will be made.		
91		The original proposal not to accept the representation was based on the fact that the actual SWOT analysis had limited responses. The recommendation now is that provided the changes are not too significant some redrafting should take place.		
91 MM	<i>As this is a review and opportunity to revise Np why not include other strengths that have now come forward from consultation process</i> <i>Example: Village Hall/Village Nursery key facilities in the village bringing othere to our village etc</i>		Need to improve SWOT, SD volunteered to draft for review by Steering Group	ACTION: SD to work on SWOT

92		Accept the representation		
93	A resident (74) questions the wording of the vision statement and suggests rewording it to 'To protect and enhance the special and valued characteristics of the Village and Parish area, notably their intrinsic rural character, historic buildings, low density housing, tranquillity, community areas, gardens and wildlife, and to support proposals for sustainable development, provided they do not have an overall negative impact on the Parish, as defined by this plan'.	<p>As this is the only comment about the vision statement other than from Horsham that thought it was "clear" it is proposed that this representation has no impact on the plan.</p> <p>The words used are a consultees proposals for the vision statement and are proposed to be rejected</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The problem of sweeping generalisations was recognised and it was agreed that the representation has no impact on the plan.</p>	Agreed to reject	
93 RT	<i>one must be careful about using sweeping statements or generalizations such as: 'provided they do not have an overall negative impact on the Parish' as this may be hard to defend.</i>			
95	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper		
95 MM	<i>A matter for Development Strategy</i> <i>Further discussion at SG and agreement at PC</i>		Development Issue	
96	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper	Development issue	
96 SD	This is a development issue			

97	This is a heritage assets issue	This is dealt with as part of Policy D1 (see below)	Include in Heritage review for AiRS	ACTION: Need a local list. Suggested that Bruce Fryer, Dan Weaver, Rosemary, Mike Hobbs or Reg Slater may be able to assist JF tpo coordinate other than Dan Weaver who MM will contact. Buildings list was done by NK – MM/SD to look at this
98		Accept the representation	Accept	
100	Objective 6 – public rights of way – West Sussex County Council (para 50) asks that consideration be given to proposing the upgrading of footpaths in the area from the built up settlements up to Broadford Bridge in conformity with its West Sussex Rights of Way Improvement Plan which might also be referenced in the Action Plan. (see also para 136).	<p>Consider how far it is wished to go and whether it has an impact on Policy T12. (see para 136).</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Take into account as part of a general review of T12 and Action Plan</p>	<p>Refer to AiRS for comment</p> <p>RT: The W Sx R o W Improvement Plan Schedule of maintenance has West Chiltington scheduled for Feb 2016 for routine inspection and maintenance. Suggest including this document as a reference for T12.</p> <p>Objective 6: This could be for the Implementation and Monitoring Working Party (see para 148) to take on, and the action under Obj could include working with Schedule of Maintenance above, but also working with volunteers, and conservation organisations to achieve Obj 6 aims. Signage, clearance, and walks leaflets/apps.</p>	ACTION: MM to ask Fran Davis/ Simon Booth/ Ian Walters to task

JUNE 2016 - POST STEERING GROUP

100 DW	<i>Comments on 51, 52 & 53 apply</i>			
100 MM	<i>Need to consider in light of WCPC are not responsible for footpaths it is land owners</i> <i>Caution how far does WCPC want to go on this</i>			
101		Accept the representation on the basis that there is no intention to lose any key issue	Accept	
101 MM	<i>Reducing the number of Objectives I can support providing we do not lose key issues we previously identified and wanted to address</i>			
102	No comments		No action	
103	Already addressed above		No action	
104		Accept the representation	Accept	
105		Accept the representation	Accept	
106	Already addressed above	This will be part of discussions on Objective 10 and any CIL issues		
106 MM	<i>As per comment in 101</i>			
107		No impact on plan	No action	
107 DW	<i>Agree with resident 6 but not worth losing sleep over.</i>			

108	Objectives 14-17 – mineral extraction – there were no comments on the objectives although the Policy was questioned in part by West Sussex County Council (para 52) over the final para of the policy and Horsham (see para 65) indicates that there might still be objections to including this when the examiner sees it even though it is clearly non-statutory.	Propose that Objective 17 be removed. Some additional text might ensure that the underlying point is still made. Recommendation The underlying representation should be accepted and Horsham’s point is proposed to have no impact on the plan	Remove Objective 17	
108 MM	<i>more reflection on what this means</i>			
109	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper	Development Issue	
109 MM	Phasing is dealt with in development handling paper			
110	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper	Development Issue	
111 note		Recommendation	Development Issue	
111 MM	Traffic in development handling	The representation itself has no impact on the plan but the general issue of traffic is dealt with in the development handling paper		
112 note		A linked comment about the split of development between the Village and the Common is addressed in the development handling paper	Development Issue	
112 SD	This is a development issue			

112 MM	<i>It is clear they are referred to as 2 settlements by HDC and we should maintain this position, in particular the WCNP is very positive on this matter and strongly advocates the settlement zone between the settlements is preserved as part of the development strategy</i>	Recommendation The representation itself has no impact on the plan but the general issue of the split between the Village and Common is dealt with in the development handling paper		
113		This really a development issue but the question raised is one that is being addressed in the development handling paper	Development Issue	
113 DW	<i>As Policy 4 was declared ambiguous in the recent appeal – need input from Horsham before we discuss this locally</i>			
113 MM	<i>This is much more complicated and the policies should be taken in the round and in relation to the whole of HDPlan</i>	Recommendation Remove original red marking which has become out of date and include in development handling paper.		
113 SD	<i>Agree, but no policy can be viewed in isolation either, the HDPF must be looked at as a whole and the supporting text also referred to</i>			
114	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper	Development Issue	
114 SD	This is a development issue			
115	This is a development issue	The existence of the development handling paper reflects this proposal.		
115 DW	<i>Agree that this is 'the' major area for review, but depending on size should be part of the plan as people only seem to look at that and not supporting documents.</i>			
115 MM	<i>Chapter 5 and policies H1,H2 are key to Development strategy</i>			
115 SD	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper		

116	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper	Development Issue	
117	This is a development issue	Included in the development handling paper	Development Issue	
118		No impact on plan	No action	
Policy E1				
119		No impact on plan	No action	
120	One resident (39) seeks to amend the wording to include “ and the open green space Settlement Separation Zone between the Common and the Village with its network of public rights of way”. Another (49) argues for specific protection for the space between Smock Alley and The Village and seeks to ban all development on green field sites.	The addition of the words “Settlement Separation Zone” introduces a technical term that covers part of existing policy but seeks to imbue the whole space with that designation which is not necessarily something that the local planning authority would agree with. Recommendation Defer to consider with the development strategy in due course.	Development Issue	
120 MM	<i>Defer to the discussions on Development Plan</i>	The second comment about banning all development on green field sites is imprecise although its intention is probably clear and goes well beyond national and local policy as “all green fields” cannot be protected so it is proposed that this representation has no impact on the plan.		
120 SD	<i>I was told that HDC positively support it, and will back it up. Green fields between the two parts of the village are part of the open rural countryside feeling in this area and must be protected to stop the ‘urban sprawl’ effect that developers would like to inflict on us. That is why there are policies 25, 26 and 27 to stop this.</i>		No action	

<p>121</p>	<p>Horsham District Council (para 74) supports the policy and suggests that some more specific features such as biodiversity and landscape should be included as an enhancement. It is also suggests that the leisure department should be consulted with a view to designating Monkmead Woods as green space in accordance with NPPF para 76 and 77. Thakeham Parish Council (para 48) also makes the point about designating green space.</p>	<p>This needs more detailed work before a proposal can be made.</p> <p>Proposal – discuss in SG</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Consider as part of a general review of Policy E1</p>	<p>Reflect HDC policies ask AiRS to review</p> <p>RT: Interesting suggestion to consult the 'Leisure Department' if this is taken forward, I would also suggest consulting with Public Health which now sits within WSCC and has a current remit to identify Open Spaces for Physical Activity. Regarding the specific features on biodiversity and landscape – Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre can help.</p> <p>www.sxbrc.org.uk or tel: 01273 497553.</p> <p>POLICY E1: To conserve the natural environment and district character by ensuring that Monkmead Woods with its habitats, footpaths and sites of scientific and nature interest is protected from development and maintained as amenity woodland along with the preservation as open spaces of the recreation ground and the open green space between the Common and the Village with its network of public rights of way.</p>	<p>ACTION: Covered under 48/74 above</p>
<p>121 MM</p>	<p><i>Further discussion at SG</i></p>			

122		Accept the representation	Accept		
123	This is addressed as part of heritage assets	Dealt with below under D1 and TI2	Include with heritage review	Include with heritage review	
Policy D1 – Heritage assets					
124-129	All addressed in the following entries	<p>Proposal - See below discuss in SG as to what work can be done</p> <p>See NP Evidence File S4-1. There are proposals later (see paras 22 and 23) that may require some research before a final decision is made</p> <p>HER has to be obtained via a specific enquiry of WSCC Record Office. Consider how this is to be done if non-designated heritage assets are to be identified although the Heritage Gateway (see above) does have a list of 66 records</p> <p>These are acceptable in principle but more work needs to be done on how the policy E1 or more probably TI2 (para 136) might specifically be amended. (see also para 123).</p>	Include with heritage review	Include with heritage review	
126 RT	<i>is something I have previously suggested. An interested party will need to take ownership, compile the data/evidence/list, etc.</i>				
22	Historic England (S4) recommends reviewing their guidance in relation to neighbourhood plans at https://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/			Include with heritage review	Include with heritage review
DW	<i>Should this read para 23 and 24?</i>				
23	It also recommends that a brief review is prepared of the records of previous archaeological finds from the area recorded in the West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER) as part of the evidence base to the plan in order to identify the potential for Non-designated Heritage Assets including archaeological remains. A summary of the information held can be accessed online at http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/gateway/ .			Include with heritage review	Include with heritage review
23 LB	<i>Heritage analysis would seem to be relevant before final decision on the plan</i>	Proposal - consider further in SG as part of Policy D1 and TI2			

25	<p>In relation to specific policies it is noted that “Policies E1, CP1 and TI2 and Action 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 relate to the improvement of the footpath network and would recommend that either Policy E1 or TI2 could include a requirement for development to contribute to development of a Historic West Chiltington walking route for the enjoyment of both residents and visitors. An appropriate policy would require development proposals to include appropriate additions to potential routes identified within the plan (which might also serve to improve footpath and cycle access within the parish) including interpretation of local themes of historic interest through information boards, landscaping or public art.”</p>	<p>discussion</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Deal with together with other work on heritage assets etc referred to above</p>		
25 DW	<p><i>If we accept the principle here does there need to be another action in the action plan as 6.1,2 and 3 don't cover it</i></p>			
LB	<p><i>Improvements to “off road” facilities for walkers and riders (?cyclists) would be beneficial</i></p>			

26	<p>It (HDC) also notes that “the pre-submission version of the plan includes Policy D1 to guide the protection and re-use of heritage assets and we support the provision of positive policy within the plan to guide development to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets. It would help to provide clarity to the policy to refer to paragraphs 128-131, 135, 137, 139 and 140 of the NPPF (possibly as a footnote) to clarify what the requisite level of protection would be with regard to non-designated heritage assets (we also recommend using this term consistently to avoid confusion).”</p>	<p>No development is proposed within or nearby heritage assets so propose no impact on plan generally.</p> <p>Conformity Reference on p31 already refers to NPPF Section 12. Propose adding “paragraphs 128-131, 135, 137, 139 and 140.” Propose amending “undesigned heritage assets” in the Policy text to “non-designated heritage assets”. (see also para 125)</p> <p>Proposal - This will ultimately come down to drafting and that can be considered later</p>	No action	
26 DW	<p><i>Agree with consistency of terms – not convinced that we should go down to paragraph level</i></p>	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Accept that generally this has no impact on plan but adopt the proposed amendments to the wording and finalise at drafting stage</p>		
27	<p>The Parish Council “may wish to identify the potential for non-designated heritage assets to be present as a part of this justification either within the supporting text or as an appendix to the plan” in addition to the conservation area and heritage assets referred to in Policy D1, e.g. “The Parish Council have identified a number of buildings of Local Historic Interest. Development proposals that provide a viable future use that sustain the significance of these buildings will be supported”.</p>	<p>Non-designated heritage assets are dealt with in para 23 (paper shows 26). The reasoned justification refers to a list of heritage assets being included in the Appendix but the list is not there.</p> <p>Propose adding a list and map.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Address as part of heritage discussions referred to above</p>	<p>Include with heritage review</p>	<p>Include with heritage review</p>

27 DW	<i>Agreed - and a map which would help plan a walking route</i>			
LB	<i>Agree – list useful for completeness</i>			
75	HDC - Policy D1 – heritage conservation - the Council is supportive of the desire to conserve and enhance the historic character of the parish. It is suggested that consideration be given to providing further clarity of any specific features that are locally distinctive (eg building materials). The policy might also be strengthened if an indication is given of the undesignated heritage assets that might be particularly important to protect – this could perhaps be set out in an appendix. This policy might also be cover the issue of character of residential gardens to provide mechanism to protect this feature which has been recognised as being of particular importance to the Parish.	<p>This is similar to the proposals by Historic England (para 23) and more work needs to be done to get this right</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Address as part of heritage discussions referred to above</p>	<p>Include with heritage review</p>	<p>Include with heritage review</p>
75 SD	<i>Also to include hedgerows, native trees</i>			

97	<p>He also requests that the Reginald Fairfax Wells estates covering Grove, Spinney , Sunset, Heather, and Westward Lanes be recognised in the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan as an 'Area of Historical Local Interest' as recommended by the respected local historian Ann Salmon. This links in with a suggestion by Historic England that the potential for undesignated heritage assets to be included in a protection policy be considered (para 26). See also para 126).</p>	<p>It is proposed that this be dealt with along with the comments of Historic England on non-designated heritage assets (para 26)</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Address as part of heritage discussions referred to above</p>	<p>Include with heritage review</p>	<p>Include with heritage review</p>
130		No impact on plan	No action	
Policy CP1				
20	<p>(The EA) also recommends “that environmental infrastructure, including habitat enhancements, water storage areas, and green space is taken into account when looking to fund local infrastructure.”</p> <p>To the extent that any of these issues would become relevant to any site they will be taken into consideration. There are no plans for funding local infrastructure so this proposal has no impact on the plan.</p>	<p>If the s106/CIL proposals, when firmed up, relate to this area then this assessment might need amending.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Address as part of S106/CIL discussion to review whether any policy change is needed</p>	<p>Include in actions on S106/CIL</p>	
55	<p>It (WSCC) notes CP1 - Community Infrastructure Levy - and draws attention to the absence of an agreed mechanism for prioritizing infrastructure projects and asks for the parish council's support as part of its approach to the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>			

76	<p>HDC - Whilst Policy CP1 – infrastructure provision – is supported and a clear steer is given on the type of infrastructure included it is suggested that more detail, perhaps in a separate document or appendix, would be helpful. It might also be sensible to include specific examples from the objectives such as rerouting the bus to the Pulborough surgery.</p>	<p>Address as part of S106/CIL discussion to review whether any policy change is needed</p>	<p>Include in actions on S106/CIL</p>	
76 DW	<p><i>Not keen on having a separate document</i></p>			
131	<p>Policy CP1 – Community Infrastructure Levy – only 2 representations were received (2 and 95), and both are supportive of the policy. West Sussex County Council (para 55) seeks support for an agreed mechanism for prioritizing infrastructure. Horsham District Council (para 76) suggests that more detail, perhaps in a separate document or appendix, would be helpful. It might also be sensible to include specific examples from the objectives such as rerouting the bus to the Pulborough surgery.</p>		<p>Include in actions on S106/CIL</p>	
132	<p>Sport England (para 37) refers to its guidelines on developing new sports facilities.</p> <p>If any such facilities are included in s106 or CIL bids then this may need to be considered.</p>		<p>Include in actions on S106/CIL</p>	

Policy T11			
133	<p>Policy T11 – protecting parish roads – is generally supported. Three residents (11, 33, 40) commented specifically and two of them drew attention to the need to control speed limits and restrict access to heavy commercial vehicles. A resident (4) made a number of points about how to control traffic issues. Another resident (38) makes a similar point to the policy about the B2133 Harbolets Road and as well as speed enforcement a proper east-west bypass for Billingshurst is suggested. Pulborough Parish Council (para 39) asks for further clarification of the policy. Horsham District Council (para 78) suggested amending the wording on the lines of “Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they will retain the existing character of the rural road network of the Parish. Proposals will also be supported where they provide opportunities for walking and cycling, particularly where they provide contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of footpaths and bridleways.” Such a change could transform the T11 into a land use policy.</p>	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Adopt Horsham’s suggestion and amend the policy wording to, “Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they will retain the existing character of the rural road network of the Parish. Proposals will also be supported where they provide opportunities for walking and cycling, particularly where they provide contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of footpaths and bridleways.”</p> <p>The majority of comments are supportive and/or contain specific proposals for achieving the policy. They are rightly placed in the action plan and as such it is proposed that these representations have no impact on the plan.</p> <p>Consider what impact the proposal to merge issues on this subject has on the policy text</p> <p>Consider if any further clarification is to be given to Pulborough</p>	Agreed amendment
Policy T12			
134		No impact on plan	No action

135	The maintenance theme occurs in most of the other representations. A resident (22) proposes improvements to footpaths between The Common and The Village to allow, for cycles, pushchairs and mobility scooters to use them. Others comment similarly together with a plea (39) to include equestrians in the description with the policy being reworded to “Encourage walking, cycling and horse riding by maintaining footpaths and bridleways”	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Propose accepting amendment in principle but consider how best this fits in with another proposed change in para 136.</p>	Agreed	
136	Historic England (para 25) makes proposals for an historic walking route and Horsham District Council (para 70) suggests considering proposals that will provide opportunities for walking and cycling, particularly where they provide contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of footpaths and bridleways. West Sussex County Council (para 50) specifically suggests considering upgrading footpaths from The Village to Broadford Bridge as bridleways.	<p>Propose - Discuss the issue in SG</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>These are acceptable in principle but more work needs to be done on how the policy or E1 (see para 123) might specifically be amended. Include in E1 and D1 discussions</p>	<p>Ask AiRS to review RT: A recently approved NP, Southbourne, had a policy to incorporate a ‘Green Ring’ which developers would have to respect and contribute to. This included a variety of green infrastructure assets, and I believe the same or similar wording could be used here. I will send the clerk a briefing sheet with the policy wording and justification text from that parish.</p>	<p>ACTION: SS to check Southbourne policy. To be circulated with meeting papers 21/7/16</p>
Policy TI3				
137		No impact on plan	No action	

138	West Sussex County Council supports (para 52) and asks how this support can be utilized and whether it merits further detail in the policies or is an issue for the Action Plan whilst Horsham District Council (78) wonders if there is a way of incorporating this in T11 and T12 to give it a land use quality.	This needs further consideration. Recommendation It is proposed to adopt Horsham's suggestion and amend the policy wording to, "Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they will retain the existing character of the rural road network of the Parish. Proposals will also be supported where they provide opportunities for walking and cycling, particularly where they provide contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of footpaths and bridleways." Reconsider overall structure and wording of T11-3	Agreed amendment as previous	
78	HDC - It is recognised that Transport and Infrastructure policies are important and there is a proposal to revise Policies T11 and T12 on the lines of "Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they will retain the existing character of the rural road network of the Parish. Proposals will also be supported where they provide opportunities for walking and cycling, particularly where they provide contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of footpaths and bridleways." Other aspects of these policies ie T13 and T14 could remain non statutory or be incorporated into the supporting text of such a land use policy where it would have greater weight in terms of how it may influence development.			
138 139 MM	<i>Further discussion required</i>			
Policy T14				
139		No impact on plan	No action	

Policy T15				
140		No impact on plan	No action	
141	Horsham District Council (para 77) asks for consideration of the approach taken by Thakeham that might mean this can be incorporated as a land use policy.	<p>Here is Thakeham's policy:</p> <p>"Proposals to improve the speed and quality of existing mobile communications and broadband services to the Parish will be supported, provided the location and design of any above-ground network installations reflect the character of the local area."</p>	<p>Ask Ains to draft in line with Thakeham's policy wording</p> <p>RT: The wording in Thakeham's NP is acceptable, but does WC have evidence for this policy inclusion?</p>	<p>ACTIONS:</p> <p>Include Thakeham Policy in Final Draft</p>
141 LB	<i>Mobile and broadband services in some areas are inadequate. This does need to be fully considered. (we need to use a satellite service which is expensive and slow. Mobile coverage in the house is virtually non-existent)</i>	<p>Consider how this might be adapted to be included in the plan in SG discussion</p> <p>Consider how Thakeham's approach might be adapted to be included in the plan.</p>		
141 MM	<i>Consider how HDC comment could be adapted into NP</i>			
79	HDC - Policy T15 - broadband – as currently worded is correctly in the non-statutory section but it might be that an approach similar to that employed by Thakeham and commented on in that parish's health check could justify its inclusion as a land use policy.	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>There are two issues here both of which are acceptable. Consider at drafting stage how best to deal with them</p>		
142		This was incorrectly marked in the working document but the recommendation following the general pattern is no impact on plan	No action	
Policy SRC1				

143		This was incorrectly marked in the working document but the recommendation following the general pattern is no impact on plan	No action	
144	Horsham (para 80) suggests there might be benefit in adding an additional layer to the justification in Policy CP1 by including more specific projects and cross referencing the two policies.	Consider further the merits of this suggestions Recommendation Include in the discussion on s106/ CIL issues and to identify more specific examples to include in text	Include in actions on S106/ CIL	
80	HDC - On Policy SRC1 – Sport Recreation and Communities – it suggested that whilst the infrastructure issues are addressed in Policy CP1 there might be benefit in adding an additional layer to the justification in that Policy by including more specific projects and cross referencing the two policies.	Consider further – see para 144	Include in actions on S106/ CIL	
80 DW	<i>Projects are likely to be transient and would therefore require regular plan updates. Should be part of action plan</i>			
Policy SRC2				
145		No impact on plan	No action	
Policy HW1				
146		No impact on plan	No action	

Policy MIN1				
147		No impact on plan	No action	
148		No impact on plan	No action	
148		Accept representation		
Action Plan and Monitoring				
148	<p>Action Plan and Monitoring – one resident (30) thought the plan rather good and suggested that some skills were potentially available from amongst parishioners which might ease pressure on parish councillors. West Sussex County Council makes some specific proposals for amendments to individual actions (para 53).</p>	<p>The resident's representation is helpful and it is proposed that the "Management" paragraph on page 45 is amended by adding at the end "...or additionally enlist expertise from amongst parishioners which might ease the pressure on parish councillors.</p> <p>Consider the impact that changes to the plan and implementation suggestions in the representations might affect the Action Plan.</p> <p>Proposal - Defer all reconsideration until the issues and policies have been settled at which point it can be updated to take account of the changes</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Accept the proposal</p>	<p>Ask AiRS to review and advise</p> <p>RT: As WC does not have a current Community Led Plan, and the VDS is considered to be defunct, this suggestion is timely. However, the management paragraph amended wording should be more robust with a definite action to follow up:</p> <p>"to bring in skills and expertise from the wider community, and ease the pressure on parish councillors, an Action Plan Implementation and Monitoring Working Party will be set up, with clear guidelines as to remit and reporting lines." Or similar wording – the current favoured terms is 'Task and Finish Group' if preferred.</p>	<p>ACTIONS: Agree RT wording be included.</p>
149		No impact on plan	No action	

SA/SEA				
150	The SA/SEA is said by Horsham (para 81) to be a considered and proportionate document with exemplary features of evaluation of different alternative proposals. It is suggested that consideration be given to additional work, perhaps cross referenced in the SA/SEA on other site assessments treating them individually rather than as groups.	<p>This does not make sense as the site assessment report did deal with each site individually. A conversation with Horsham to clarify would be helpful to get this issue clear.</p> <p>Proposal – wait for response from Horsham</p> <p>Recommendation</p>	Development issue	
150 MM	<p><i>It may be that Horsham DC are suggesting it would be better to have individual detailed site assessments rather than the output shown as a group/table. It seems a matter of communication/interpretation of what available.</i></p> <p><i>Further discussion and a matter of how we approach the site evaluations/ assessment process and documentation. This should be revisited as part of this representation of consultation and amend the process and documentation to support the revised NP</i></p>	Accept the proposal to wait for Horsham		
151 note		No impact on plan but record in Basic Conditions Statement In due course	No action	

No consideration

Accept

Reject

Deal with in Development Issues

ACTIONS REQUIRED

REWRITE