

<b>WOODMANCOTE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 16 SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Nature of representation</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>
Sarah Nelson	South Downs National Park Authority	Support withComments	The time table for the SDLP has been revised, the first sentence of paragraph 3.18 should be removed, support the strengthening of Policies 1 and 2.
Charlotte Mayall	Southern Water	Support with inclusion of additional policy	Without the inclusion of an additional policy to support the provision of new infrastructure, the plan fails the basic conditions test on the grounds it fails to comply with the NPPF.
Ian and Sheila Murphy 6, Blackstone Rise	resident	comment	As far as we are aware there is no requirement for a community facility to serve the wider community. If it provides a significant benefit to a significant number of people as well as reducing risk to all road users and pedestrians then surely it must constitute a community facility. The fact that the residents of Woodmancote have no need of the facility does not remove the fact that all the residents of Blackstone benefit from the garages be it for parking or safe and easy passage through the village.
Alison Giacomelli	Natural England	Support	Supports the plan as it does not allocate any development sites and the policy for Green Links is supported.
Marguerite Oxley	Environment Agency	Support	No objections to the plan because it does not propose to allocate sites for development.
Kevin Wright	Henfield Parish Council	Support	The Plan is well written, paragraphs 5.30-5.31 should refer to both the HDPF and Core Strategy policies as these are ones currently used by the SDNP Authority. Query re the purpose of the * in para 5.33.
Caroline West	WSCC	Support	Amendments to Policy 3 are welcomed following previous comments, concerns regarding the latter two projects listed in para 5.34 are maintenance projects, suggest inclusion of support for cycling facilities in the parish. If this is the case the supporting text in paras 5.30 and 5.34 would need to be amended. Typos in paragraphs 5.32 and 5.34 required, ref in para 6.5 changed from 5.35 to 5.34. * in para 5.33 should be deleted. General comment in response to references to CIL and planning obligations in the implementation section of the plan.
Various	HDC	comments	DM - 5.15 refers to 'infill' sites as those being appropriately contained – this could be a bit vague.  5.19 refers to the provision of affordable homes on-site rather than through contributions. Notwithstanding the bigger argument over whether affordable homes can be sought on schemes of 10 and under following the written Ministerial Statement, if developments in the Parish are to be limited to 5 or less, we would only be seeking affordable homes on those of 5 dwellings (as per Policy 16) so I would presume that most developers would opt for a 4 unit scheme instead. Also, if 1 affordable unit is to be provided on site (20% of 5) then it's unlikely that any RP would be interested in taking this on.