

WPC: Pre-Submission Plan Schedule of Comments Received – Individual Representations: Annex B1

April 2016

Ref	Rep	Important Aspects identified	Overall support	Policy No	Agree or Disagree	Representation	Steering Group Comment
1	Resident		Yes			Would like speed limit on A281 changed to 30mph.	The Steering Group welcomes the support. Traffic calming is already covered in the NP. See item 6.5.
2	Resident		Yes			A well planned policy but could be improved with a picture of Blackstone conservation area.	The Steering Group welcomes the support. This is agreed, and a picture will be added.
3	Resident		Yes			Supports the NP and has no objections to the proposed Green Links which run adjacent to his property.	The Steering Group welcomes the support.
4	Resident		Yes			Fully support NP.	The Steering Group welcomes the support.
5	Resident		No			<p>Firstly I would like to commend all those who have contributed to the Plan. For the most part I find it well presented and clearly written. However, some parts of Section 5 lack clarity and must be improved before the plan goes any further. I fully recognise the difficulties associated with producing this kind of document, and I would not expect it to be entirely right first time, so I have tried to be constructive in my criticism.</p> <p>Comments follow.</p> <p>Objectives 5:2 This is arguably the most important section of the entire document to get right. It is absolutely vital that the objectives are expressed clearly and</p>	<p>The Steering Group welcomes the comments.</p> <p>Policy 2: Based on these comments and responses from Horsham District Council, the Steering Group has amended this Policy to provide clarity.</p> <p>Policy 4: Based on these comments and responses from Horsham District Council, the Steering Group has amended this Policy to provide clarity.</p> <p>Item 5.26: This has been discussed at various open meetings, and there is evidence to</p>

					<p>unambiguously. They need to be both specific and measurable, especially in light of the fact that “The objectives will form the core of the monitoring activity” by HDC and WPC. However, there is a lack of clarity (e.g. no explanation of what exactly is meant by “windfall housing”) and some phrases are so vague as to be almost meaningless (e.g. “sustain the significance of the conservation area...” and “secure the future of existing employment areas”) It would be helpful if the objectives were numbered.</p> <p>Policy 2: Housing Windfall Sites The precise meaning of “windfall” needs to be explained. 5:17 “The policy defines....” – does this refer to this policy, or some other policy? If it is this policy, I suggest the wording “Small scale is defined as” 5:18 In the phrase “proposals for greater than that number of new homes”, it is not clear what number is being referred to. 5:20 This section is written entirely in planning language and needs to be translated into plain English. It also seems to be self-contradictory. It appears to make “on-site” delivery (whatever that means) a requirement, then sets out the conditions for “off-site contributions”.</p> <p>Policy 4: Community Facilities In marked contrast to the vagueness of the Objectives, Policy 4 gets very specific about the Parish Hall and Blackstone Rise Garages. It also contains a number of statements and observations which need both clarification and justification if they are to be retained. Also it is questionable whether such specific plans belong in a policy document.</p>	<p>support this.</p> <p>Policy 6: The Steering Group agrees with the comments and has amended this Policy to provide clarity.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>5:24 “remaining viable will require investment in updating and/or increasing the size of the facility to support new uses” The first part of this statement is self-evident, no justification is provided for the second part.</p> <p>5:25 “a range of buildings and associated land, all of which may be capable of being extended or redeveloped in ways that are suitable to a rural location” Does this mean that extension and redevelopment is a specific policy aim? If not, the statement should be removed. If so, justification must be provided. The phrase “may be capable” is meaningless and should be removed.</p> <p>5:26 “It is widely agreed with parishioners that the Parish Hall site would benefit from future development in order to finance the redevelopment of the hall and safeguard its future” What is the justification for the claim that this is “widely agreed with parishioners”? What exactly is meant by “future development” and “redevelopment”? Again, is this a policy aim?</p> <p>5:27 Blackstone Rise Garage Site – “the Steering Group believe some controlled development with additional community parking would be of benefit to the Parish” What does “controlled development” mean Why state what the Steering Group believe? This of itself is not a policy and has no place in this document.</p> <p>5:28 Claims compliance with HDPF Policies 11 and 43. Given that the proposals so far put forward for the “redevelopment” of the Blackstone Rise Garage Site would result in the loss of the garages and/or some of the parking spaces, this would be in direct</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>contravention of HDPF Policy 43. Policy 11 is irrelevant to this issue Therefore I suggest that 5.27 should be deleted from this plan. It also needs to be shown how the Parish hall proposals comply with the HDPF Policies.</p> <p>Policy 6: Green Links 5:31 It is not clear what is proposed here. The document describes “a series of 4 interlinking footpaths” but does not say whether these are existing or new footpaths. Inset Map 1 appears to show more than 4 footpaths, again without any indication of whether they are existing or new.</p> <p>As it stands, the objectives are not clear enough and the plan contains insufficient justification for some of its proposals.</p>	
6	Resident		No		<p>Policy 4: Community Facilities Proposals to improve the viability of an established community use of the following buildings and facilities</p> <p>‘5.25....policy requires that proposals avoid increasing the use of community facilities to the extent that they may harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties, for example through traffic movements, on-street parking and noise or light pollution.’</p> <p>5.27 Also brought to our attention by Horsham District Council, is the redevelopment of the Blackstone Rise Garage Site in Blackstone. This has raised much concern from parishioners, but the Steering Group believe some controlled development with additional community parking would be of</p>	<p>The Steering Group welcomes the comments.</p> <p>Policy 4: Based on these comments and responses from Horsham District Council, the Steering Group has amended this Policy to provide clarity.</p>

					<p>benefit to the Parish.</p> <p>One policy would appear to contradict the other. 5.25 states that proposals should avoid several things, one of which is on street parking. By the time you read 5.27 vague undefined phrases like 'controlled development' and 'additional community parking' appear. Clearly the concern from the parishioners (i.e. the people who live there,) is nullified by the Steering group trotting out something not elaborated on, but they feel would be better for us.</p> <p>5.28 'enhancing and promoting local cultural facilities on a scale appropriate to its location' . As the Blackstone garages are (apart from the post box) the sole local facility, cultural or not, by all means enhance the site with say, better landscaping and a coat of paint...but other than that it already does what it says on the tin. It is local. It is a facility. It operates on a scale in keeping with its location. If it aint broke.....</p>	
7	Resident		No		<p>Quote: 5.24 This policy supports development proposals intended to secure the long term benefit of the Woodmancote Parish Hall (0.44ha) and the Blackstone Rise Garages (0.10ha). These are facilities that are important to the local community and remaining viable will require investment in updating and/or increasing the size of the facility to support new uses.</p> <p>5.27.....the redevelopment of the Blackstone Rise Garage Site in Blackstone. This has raised much concern from parishioners, but the Steering Group believe some controlled development with additional</p>	<p>The Steering Group welcomes the comments.</p> <p>Policy 4: Based on these comments and responses from Horsham District Council, the Steering Group has amended this Policy.</p>

					<p>community parking would be of benefit to the Parish.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>1. In admitting that Blackstone Rise Garages are important to the local community how can the Steering Group conclude that controlled development will benefit the community?</p> <p>2. HDC's proposal is to form 8 parking spaces using both sides of the highway. It is not clear at this stage if their plans will include further parking within the curtilage of the present garage site but this seems unlikely. Eight spaces falls woefully short of the necessary parking provision.</p> <p>3. The creation of a parking bay on the west side of Blackstone Lane immediately to the south of the current entrance to the garages will result in the farmer being unable to turn left out of his field with a tractor and trailer. This is a regular occurrence and would cause considerable inconvenience. In fact short of doing a huge detour there seems no solution.</p> <p>Quote:</p> <p>5.28 This policy is in line with HDPF Policy 43 Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation, and Policy 11 Tourism and Cultural Facilities in enhancing and promoting local cultural facilities on a scale appropriate to its location.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>How can the removal of the garages and parking facilities enhance and promote local cultural facilities?</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>WPC Housing Report</p> <p>Quote: Horsham District Council has not mandated any residential development for Woodmancote Parish, so there was no urgency in identifying potential sites. However, having decided to proceed with the Neighbourhood Plan in order to influence possible future development, the Steering Group and Focus Group identified a shortage of certain types of housing.</p> <p>Comment: If HDC have not mandated any residential development for Woodmancote why do they propose developing the garage site?</p> <p>Quote: The surveys, open meetings, questionnaires and consultations identified a small need for downsize houses, and property suitable for first-time buyers within the Parish. The average house price in Woodmancote is well above the national average, making entry into ownership difficult for younger residents who would rather stay local than move away The sites chosen will supply the identified needs and the higher end of four/five bedroom houses coming through windfall. Traditionally, there has been one windfall per year and over the twenty year period of the Neighbourhood Plan, those future sites will expand the housing stock.</p> <p>Comment: As the sites chosen will supply the identified needs</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>why has the Steering Group concluded that the controlled development of the Blackstone Rise Garage site would be of benefit to the Parish? The Steering Group are well aware of the concerns of the residents of Blackstone who are directly affected by this proposal and, despite confirming that the Parishes housing needs will be met by the call for sites proposals, they conclude that HDC's development proposals for the garage site are a good idea.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>HORSHAM DISTRICT PLANNING FRAMEWORK</p> <p>Quote: Policy 39 This policy is fundamental to the delivery of sustainable development in the District. Developers working in conjunction with the Council and service providers should demonstrate that there is adequate capacity.....to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users.</p> <p>Comment: The parking problems that the development would create have been made perfectly clear to both HDC and WPC by the residents of Blackstone who would be affected by the development.</p> <p>Quote: Policy 41</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Parking</p> <p>4. Development which involves the loss of existing parking spaces will only be allowed if suitable alternative provision has been secured elsewhere or the need for development overrides the loss of parking and where necessary measures are in place to mitigate against the impact.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>1) HDC's proposal to create 8 parking spaces on the highway is not a suitable alternative:</p> <p>2) Eight spaces is insufficient to accommodate the needs</p> <p>3) The spaces on the highway do not provide the security afforded by the garages and gated parking area</p> <p>4) There is no need for the development as WPC's Neighbourhood Plan clearly demonstrates that the call for sites proposals will adequately cater for the parishes housing needs.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>WPC's decision making process appears to arrive at a decision that will lead to a worsening situation for those affected and is not supported by the results of its own surveys. Furthermore, HDC's proposed development does not conform to the guidelines it has formulated in its Planning Framework.</p>	
8	Resident		No		<p>Policy 4:</p> <p>I cannot support the WPNP because of the</p>	The Steering Group welcomes the comments.

					<p>statements made in 5.27. The statement reads as though it is a foregone conclusion that the site will definitely be redeveloped. It is NOT. It is only a prospective redevelopment.</p> <p>Any such redevelopment would need to comply with a number of policies contained in the Horsham District Planning Framework Policy Document, not least, policies 39, 40, 41 and 43.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the statement “the Steering Group believe some controlled development with additional community parking would be of benefit to the Parish.” It is not up to the Steering Group to decide if a development is of benefit or not, it is up to the local residents in conjunction with the PC. No one can possibly know if a development is a benefit until details of any proposed redevelopment are known. By all means say that the site has been mentioned by HDC as a possible redevelopment site but do not commit to it at this stage.</p> <p>It is interesting to note that Inset Map 1 clearly shows the garage site as a “community facility”. I am pleased that the PC recognises it as such! However I am disappointed to note that the major parking problems that Blackstone has is not addressed in the WPNP.</p> <p>Suggested modifications: Change the wording of Policy 4: 5.27 so that it reads:-</p> <p>“During the preparation of the WPNP, Horsham District Council suggested a possible redevelopment of the Blackstone Rise Garage site in Blackstone. Any such scheme would be considered in the usual</p>	<p>Policy 4: Based on these comments and responses from Horsham District Council, the Steering Group has amended this Policy.</p> <p>The parking problem has only been brought to the Steering Group’s attention through the potential development of the Blackstone Rise garage site, which will now be addressed in policy 2.</p> <p>Item 6.5: An additional point will be added to read ‘Improvements to off street parking within the Parish’.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>manner of a windfall site and with reference to the WPNP once a plan has been submitted.”</p> <p>6. Implementation : add an additional point 6 as follows:</p> <p>6.5 point 6 – Providing additional parking areas in Blackstone</p>	<p>Change community facility map to remove garages.</p> <p>The parking problem has only been brought to our attention through the potential development of the garage site, which has now been dealt with in policy 2.</p>
9	Resident		Yes		<p>An interesting and informative document, with a clear vision for the future of the Parish.</p>	<p>The Steering Group welcomes the support.</p>
10	Resident		Yes		<p>Parking is an increasing problem in/around The Street with young families owning 2 cars each and the garages. We need the school bus back as children become of school age.</p> <p>Suggested modification: Extra parking could be provided at the north end of Blackstone and the Blackstone welcome sign where there is ample room to tarmac on the verge. Not happy with any 'piping in' of ditches as there is enough surface water already.</p>	<p>The Steering Group welcomes the comments and agrees that parking in Blackstone is an increasing problem.</p>

11	Resident		TBC			<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Comments</u></p> <p><u>Comments- typographical</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All pages would be better with (February, 2016) not just (February) 2. Page 15 clause 4.3 – an apostrophe is missing from Council's 3. Page 24 clause 5.22 – text needs aligning 4. All photographs require titles – not just some <p><u>Comments – queries</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. No definition given for "WNP" 6. No definition given for "rCOH" 7. Page 25 clause 5.26 – what does "(Church Trust)" convey? <p><u>Comments – general</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Page 27 Green Links – the photograph of a stream makes the network of footpaths look as if they are underwater 9. Page 9 The Neighbourhood Area – the photograph again makes the emphasis on a wet area 10. Three photographs of tractors in the Plan – would be good for Farmers' Weekly but not this document <p><u>Comments to content</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Page 17 clause 4.11 – "Provision of new facilities" – this would appear to be meaningless unless the facilities are described 12. Page 3 – reference to Policy 4 – it would be beneficial to the reader to have this explained – perhaps it could be added as an "Appendix – Policy 4 Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion" 13. Page 3 – call for sites – surely the submitted sites should be listed with some appropriate comment as to their suitability or otherwise 	<p>The Steering Group welcomes the comments.</p> <p>1 – 4: This is agreed.</p> <p>5: Definition is given at item 1.3.</p> <p>6: This is a company name and so does not require definition.</p> <p>7: This item will be amended for clarity.</p> <p>8 – 9: The Steering Group does not agree.</p> <p>10: The Steering Group feels that the tractors highlight the rural nature of Woodmancote, but will add more pictures to the NP to give more balance.</p> <p>11: The Steering Group agrees and will describe the facilities found to be missing or inadequate in the questionnaire results.</p> <p>12: A link to this can be found in the evidence base (found at this link http://www.woodmancoteparishcouncil.co.uk/Core/Woodmancote-PC/Pages/Neighbourhood_Plan_documents_1.aspx)</p> <p>13: This can be found in the evidence base in the Housing Report.</p>
----	----------	--	-----	--	--	--	--

12	Resident		Yes			Satisfied that the draft Plan broadly meets its remit. Appreciates that it is a draft only but it needs proof reading. Regrets that certain (very few) residents have waited until now to air their concerns given the ample opportunities given in the preparatory stages.	The Steering Group welcomes the support and has now corrected the typographical and grammatical errors in the NP.
13	Resident		No			<p>Comment: Policy 4: Community Facilities Section 5.27 implies that development of the garages is a foregone conclusion, I would take issue with this section for three reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. both the Parish Hall and the Garages are prospective developments only, 2. the comment that the 'Steering Group believe some controlled development with additional community parking would be of benefit to the Parish.' Bearing in mind that it is up to the residents and local PC and not the Steering Group to decide if any development of the site would be of benefit, this can not be explored until details of any proposed development are released. 3. Policy 4 declares that the Garages are considered a community asset, and that the Policy is in line with HDPF Policy 43 and Policy 11. <p>Suggested modification: Policy 4 – Section 5.27 – I would suggest that this needs changing to: 'During the development of the WPNP, Horsham District Council suggested a possible redevelopment of the Blackstone Rise Garage site in Blackstone. Any such scheme would be considered in the usual manner of a windfall site and with reference to the WPNP once a plan has been submitted.'</p> <p>I believe that although Policy 4 complies with HDPF Policies 43 and 11, it does not comply with</p>	<p>The Steering Group welcomes the comments.</p> <p>Policy 4: Based on these comments and responses from Horsham District Council, the Steering Group has amended this Policy.</p>

					<p>HDPF Polices 39, 40, 41 and 42.</p> <p>As Horsham District Council have acknowledged, there is a shortage of parking spaces in Blackstone, it would therefore be amiss if this matter was not addressed in the WPNP, being included in Section 6 – Page 29 of the document in the section relating to Infrastructure.</p> <p>It is difficult to vote for a plan which includes elements which would be a detriment to the residents, instead of a benefit or improvement to the Parish.</p>	
14	Resident		Not stated		<p>Ironically the garages were the result of good local planning in the 1960s when they were built. As a result of the ‘more than one car per house’ development of recent years, plus the greatly enlarged size of cars nowadays, space for parking throughout Blackstone is inadequate, resulting in parking which is inconvenient for other road users and sometimes restricting access and even hazardous. I do not know whether the Parish Council is addressing these issues, if it accepts them, in the Neighbourhood Plan. Certainly Horsham District Council has covered the matter very comprehensively in the policies referred to in Mary Batchelor’s paper.</p> <p>We have to be concerned about any plan which results in restricting freedom to develop on a long term basis.</p>	The Steering Group welcomes the comments.