

Stakeholders - General			SPC DECISION The recommendations have been approved by SPCNHP and the Parish Council. The Submission Plan is subject to the agreement of the Parish Council at the next convenient meeting TBC
Ref No.	Comment	Recommendation	
10	I've seen so many new house builds in Handcross in such a short space of time. Traffic has doubled and trying to get on the Horsham Road is scary. Concerns for young families with children trying to get them to school.	Comments noted.	
		No changes required.	
		In response to the Regulation 14 Pre-submission consultation WSCC have confirmed, the size and location of proposed site allocations have been taken into account when considering if further transport evidence is required. WSCC confirmed the overall development proposed in the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan is in accordance with the forecast estimate of background traffic growth assumed in the Strategic Transport Assessment. WSCC confirm no overriding concerns about the transport impact of the Plan. Slaugham Parish Council are therefore satisfied the proposed development is acceptable in highways terms.	
		The Neighbourhood Plan includes transport related aims to support development proposals which seek to provide traffic management, improvements to the pedestrian environment as well as parking improvements.	
11	Disgusted that we are being "sold out" by our Parish Council. Far too much development going on in Handcross, we are a village, and should remain as such. Concerns village is unable to provide suitable infrastructure for another development of this scale. Concerns re road safety, increased traffic and parking.	Comments noted.	
		No changes required.	
		The Neighbourhood Plan includes transport related aims to support development proposals which seek to provide traffic management, improvements to the pedestrian environment as well as parking improvements.	
		In response to the Regulation 14 Pre-submission consultation WSCC have confirmed, the size and location of proposed site allocations have been taken into account when considering if further transport evidence is required. WSCC confirmed the overall development proposed in the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan is in accordance with the forecast estimate of background traffic growth assumed in the Strategic Transport Assessment. WSCC confirm no overriding concerns about the transport impact of the Plan. Slaugham Parish Council are therefore satisfied the proposed development is acceptable in highways terms.	
12	Concern over extra traffic caused by the recent application for 600 dwellings, a school and retail space. Recommends traffic lights on all junctions of the roundabout.	Comments noted.	
		No changes required.	
		The Neighbourhood Plan includes transport related aims to support development proposals which seek to provide traffic management, improvements to the pedestrian environment as well as parking improvements.	

16	Concerns regarding transport/community infrastructure/facilities to support the strategic allocation at Pease Pottage.	Comments noted.  No changes required.
20	Aim 7 traffic management - Concerns regarding increase in traffic.	Comments noted.  No changes required.  Aim 7 seeks to support proposals which seeks to improve and/or introduce traffic management measurements within the Parish.
21	Huge concern with regard to impact on traffic from already agreed development and future developments.	Comments noted.  No changes required.  The Neighbourhood Plan includes transport related aims to support development proposals which seek to provide traffic management, improvements to the pedestrian environment as well as parking improvements.
30	Concerns re the contents of the draft NP and the traffic grid lock that is already evident through Pease Pottage. Entrance into and from the Moto Services should be directly on and off the motorway not via Brighton Road Pease Pottage (B2114).  Moto Services should not be compared to the services and facilities provided by local shops. A chemist and bakers would be particularly useful.  Throughout the NHP there is mention of "could be" drainage improvement but this should read 'should be' drainage improvement.  The infrastructure of Pease Pottage (electrics, water, drainage, schools, doctors) does not support the proposed increases in developments.	Comments noted.  No changes required.  The Neighbourhood Plan includes transport related aims to support development proposals which seek to provide traffic management, improvements to the pedestrian environment as well as parking improvements.  With respect to impact on services, it is considered the Parish offers reasonable access to services and facilities. No statutory providers have raised any concerns regarding impact on infrastructure.
32	Queries the extent of land off Finches Field which is being referred to as a potential development site. Request further clarification on the location and size of developer near the Composting station.	Comments noted.  No changes required.
36	Representation sets out there is a need for more parking in the village and no parking areas have been identified in the plan. Better public transport could possibly help with the situation. The service to Handcross is poor especially at work times. The culture change from car use to public transport would be an uneasy transition anyway so even if this was improved the parking and traffic problems would persist.	Comments noted.  No changes required.  The Parish Council is aware of parking problems in the village. Aim 8: Parking, seeks to support proposals to provide parking in line with WSCC.

39	<p>What Handcross desperately needs is greater car parking facilities to take the burden off the busy high street. This would also help the local shops to thrive.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>No changes required.</p> <p>The Parish Council is aware of parking problems in the village. Aim 8: Parking, seeks to support proposals to provide parking in line with WSCC.</p>	
41	<p>The current draft SNP does not mention lack of a built-up area boundary for Slaugham. Recommend a specific mention of Slaugham's lack of a built-up boundary, and it's implications, be included.</p> <p>In para 4.17 the assets listed seem oddly chosen. Why is the Handcross Recreation Ground not mentioned? Similarly, if Nymans Gardens are mentioned, should High Beeches also? Slaugham Pond is mentioned, but I don't know if this is intended to mean the Mill Pond or the Furnace Pond?</p> <p>Policy 7 in paragraph 4.23 The policy wording seems almost to encourage development in conservation areas. I am surprised that The Street (Park Road) Slaugham is not included in this list.</p> <p>Para 2.15 and 5.6 the reference should be to village halls, not hall, as the hall in Warninglid (and future one in Pease Pottage) are also valued as well as the one in Handcross.</p> <p>Para 5.25, Aim 3, could horse-riders be included with pedestrians and cyclists (as they are in Aim 5), as there are a lot of horse-riders on the roads of the Parish.</p> <p>In the previous SNP, a footpath between Warninglid village and the primary school was proposed; could this be included as an Aim of the current SNP?</p> <p>There does not seem to be any specific mention in the SNP of the future of the Parish Hall in Handcross.</p> <p>Would it be possible for the SNP to encourage local groups to produce such local historic lists and plans in the future. Could this be an Aim of the SNP?</p> <p>I don't think the SSSI is actually within the Parish as objective 2 (para 4.3) suggests.</p>	<p>Para 4.17 to be updated to include Handcross Recreation Ground, High Beeches Gardens, Mill Pond and Furnace Pond.</p> <p>Policy 7 include reference to the Street (Park Road), Slaugham.</p> <p>Update para 2.15 and 5.6 to read: halls.</p> <p>Update Aim 3 to include horse riders.</p> <p>Update Aim 5 to include reference to the footpath between Warninglid Village and the primary school.</p> <p>Supporting text of Policy 9: Community Facilities to be updated to highlight support for Handcross Village hall improvement and/or replacement.</p>	