



Summary of Representations made on the Regulation 16 version of the West Chiltington Neighbourhood Development Plan (WCNDP)

1. The Regulation 16 consultation of the WCNDP was held between 18 October to 6 December 2024. The Council received 47 representations.
2. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised in the representations.

Ref Number	Full Name	Policy	Support/Objection /Comment	Summary of Comments
WCH1	Nikki Wilcock		Support	Plan is well researched and constructed. Understand that additional housing is necessary, and whilst not wishing to see more housing in West Chiltington, agree with selected sites. Ratify without amendment.
WCH2	Historic England		Comments	General advice and guidance to assist with the development of the Plan with regard to the historic environment and the area's heritage assets.
WCH3	Elaine Hunt		Support	Support in its entirety. The Plan is forward-looking but also respects and protects the unique feel of the village.
WCH4	Surrey County Council		Comments	No comments to raise.
WCH5	Patricia Jeffs		Support	Plan is well thought out and the sites identified for development have been given a great deal of consideration. Smock Alley has wood adjoining the site kept for wildlife and community. Village shop is also within walking distance of site (which may mean a walk along a narrow lane, but this is normal for a village).
WCH6	Frances Davis		Support	Document well thought out and addresses issues that affect the residents. It has taken too long already and needs to progress.

WCH7	Michael Webster		Support/Comments	These two para's are key to maintaining the separation zone which should be protected at all costs: Appendix 9, para 3 Appendix 9, para 4.5 (2 nd sentence)
WCH8	Environment Agency	Policy EH2a, H2a & H2b	Support with modifications Support	EH2a suggest point of clarification to final sentence of criterion 1 "The need for a sequential test does not apply to changes of use or residential extensions." Suggested change to the last sentence of paragraph 1: <i>"The need for a sequential test does not apply to residential extensions or changes of use (except for changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site or to a mobile home or park home site)."</i> Policy H2a & H2b – Pleased that the two proposed sites are located in areas at the lowest probability of fluvial flooding & that the previous recommendation regarding consideration of groundwater protection has been incorporated into the policy (H2b) given the presence of Source Protection Zones 1 & 2.
WCH9	Southern Water	Policy EH2, EH2b, EH11, H1 & H2, H3, LC5, EH1, EH10, H2a, H2b,	Comments	Welcome inclusion of Policy EH2, however, recommend amending wording of supportive text and policy criterion to include para 5.43 and SP10 criterion h) of HDLP. Also suggest additional criterion wording to ensure the operation of any existing natural surface water drainage provisions is not impaired by new development. EH2b - support inclusion of criterion 3. H2a - additional wording proposed as detailed in representation, to address close proximity to Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1). H2b – additional wording proposed, as detailed in representation, to address close proximity to SPZ1 and sites proximity to groundwater abstraction point (borehole).

				<p>EH11 – support.</p> <p>LC5 - additional policy criterion recommended, as detailed within representation, to ensure that essential utility infrastructure is not inadvertently precluded.</p> <p>H2 – add new criterion in relation to SuDs: <u>14. Incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to attenuate surface water on site and help manage flood risk.</u></p> <p>H3 – add new criterion to ensure location of utility infrastructure considered early in the design process: <u>Layout is planned to ensure future access to any existing utilities infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</u></p> <p>EH1 - support.</p> <p>EH10 - support.</p>
WCH10	South Downs National Park		Comments	<p>References to a ‘secondary’ local planning authority are incorrect. Both SDNP and HDC, and the respective Local Plan’s, have equal relevance.</p> <p>Important to highlight that the BUAB of West Chiltington Common is in the setting of the National Park.</p> <p>The designated Neighbourhood Plan Area includes a small area in the south-west which is located within the SDNP.</p> <p>A number of corrections, observations and clarifications have been submitted, please refer to the table entitled SDNPA response to the West Chiltington (Regulation 16) Submission Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for full details (ref:WCH10).</p>

WCH11	Vivienne Gibson		Support	Full support for the Neighbourhood Plan.
WCH12	Andrew Gibson		Support	Support.
WCH13	West Sussex County Council (as service provider)		Comments	<p>No overriding concerns about transport impacts of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Strategic Transport Assessment indicates no severe impacts on transport network that cannot be mitigated to satisfactory level.</p> <p>Amend heading of para 2.12 to include both the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Partial Review March 2021) (JMLP) and West Sussex Waste Local Plan (WLP).</p> <p>Amend supportive text of Policy H2 to make reference to Policy M9 of JMLP: <u><i>Proposals for development within a Minerals Safeguarding Area will need to accord with Policy M9 (Safeguarding Minerals) of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan. A Mineral Resource Assessment may be required prior to any development being consented, which addresses the relevant requirements set out in the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan.</i></u></p> <p>H2a – criterion 3 – recommend review of wording to clarify whether all criteria should be met for development to be supported.</p> <p>H2a – criterion 3(f) – provided that the western boundary of site is Broadford Bridge Road, trees or hedgerows may need to be cut back to maintain suitable visibility splays if access is to be from this road. Recommend revised wording to clarify such need.</p> <p>H2b – criterion 3 – recommend review of wording to clarify whether all criteria should be met for development to be supported.</p>

				<p>H2b – criterion 3(e) – depending on where vehicle access to site is proposed, trees or hedgerows may need to be cut back to maintain appropriate visibility splays. Recommend revised wording to take into account such need.</p> <p>H3 – make reference to the standards for storage and collection of waste specified in para 6.8.9 of Manual for Street (2007) in supportive text.</p> <p>H4 – criterion 1(e) – review wording to take into account any reasonable and justifiable exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>H4 – criterion 1(g) – WSCC emphasis that the appropriateness of requesting developer contributions would be assessed on a case-by-case basis, provided that the small-scale development of 5 or fewer dwellings might not create a traffic impact that is sufficiently significant to warrant developer contribution.</p> <p>Objective 7(e) – reconsider wording to cover different aspects of mineral extraction.</p> <p>GA1 – review wording to take into account any reasonable and justifiable exceptional circumstances. Sites assessed on a case by case basis.</p> <p>GA3 – WSCC are concerned that the requirements set out in the policy are not fully justified. Also concerned with the requirements on reprovision of off-street parking. Encourage making reference to the WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 20) in the supporting text.</p> <p>Appendix 7 – para 4.2 – recommend re-consider wording. Concerned that the current remarks could be interpreted as discouraging cycling</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				which would not be in alignment with the Active Travel Strategy set out in Ch6 West Sussex Transport Plan 2022-2036.
WCH14	David John Stoner	H2b	Support with modifications	Object to Land at Smock Alley (H2b). Proposal not included in original Neighbourhood Plan or any public consultation. Site is located in separation zone/local gap and previous applications have been refused as deemed unsustainable. Disruption to wildlife, lack of public transport, increased traffic with no streetlights/pavements, lack of public amenities, out of character. The Smock Alley Policy should be removed.
WCH15	Rex Riddington		Support with modifications	Object to Land at Smock Alley (H2b), must be removed from the plan. Object due to location, lack of public transport, isolation from rural services, settlement separation, harm to protected wildlife. Comment also made on consultation process.
WCH16	Terence John Clare	6.Housing H1 a, b, c, d, e & H1.2, 1.3	Comments	Object to Smock Alley (H2b). Site is an area of wildlife, of which key organisations have spoken against the development, also refused by Planning Inspector and planning committee. Site located in separation zone, outside of BUAB, no pavements, poor drainage, potential traffic would create hazardous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. A borehole has been drilled which has potential conflict with Southern Water. Treatment plant, pump station and maintenance facility will be noisy and intrusive. Concerns over balancing pond, and increased risk of flooding on surrounding area. Comments also made on consultation process.
WCH17	David John Stoner	H2b	Support with modifications	Object to Land at Smock Alley (H2b). Proposal not included in original Neighbourhood Plan or any public consultation. Site is located in separation zone/local gap and previous applications have been refused as deemed unsustainable. Disruption to wildlife, lack of public transport, increased traffic with no streetlights/pavements, lack of public amenities, out of character.
WCH18	Ian Harvey-Samuel		Comments	Concerns over designated Conservation Area resulting in Wells Houses being preserved in a degraded/neglected state, with poor quality

				environment. Tree and hedge cutting with overgrown vegetation removal is required to return area to its original state.
WCH19	Michele Clare	H1 (para 6) (Page 24)	Support with modifications	Object to Land at Smock Alley (H2b) – previous Local Plans excluded / protected site. The site is in conflict with policies within HDPF, Local Plan Review and Neighbourhood Plan. Site will not be integrated with adjoining settlement boundary, will harm character of the area and not sustainable. Lack of public transport, increase in traffic will impact of road safety and damage to local ecology. Site has previously been rejected 3 times. Neighbourhood Plan should reflect wishes of residents.
WCH20	Louise Constable	Policy H2, H1.2, H2.b & Paragraphs 1.11, H1.2, H2.b	Oppose with comments	Object to Smock Alley (H2b). Site will be located within the separation zone and has been refused 3 times with 2 at appeal. Current application (4 th) decimates hedgerow. Plan appears rushed, and neither H2a or H2b were in previous versions of the Plan. Detailed comments in relation to consultation process. Also questions validity of evidence base.
WCH21	Derrick E Frost		Support	There has been public consultation and the sites chosen are suitable for development. Plan should be implemented as soon as possible.
WCH22	Fiona Murphy	P28 – Policy H2a	Oppose	Object to Hatches Est (H2a). Proposed site shows access via residential driveway, which has not been permitted by landowner (copy of solicitor letter attached). Site would lead to loss of privacy, increased risk of accidents on surrounding road, inclusion of 7 Tree Preservation Order's, site is subject to flooding, and may be subject to pesticide run off from vineyard. Farm access has already damaged bottom of driveway.
WCH23	Richard & Susie Pike	Policy H2b Land at Smock Alley	Oppose	Object to Smock Alley (H2b). Refused 5 times to date. Developer led, not sustainable development led by the community. Limited access to sustainable modes of transport with reliance on motor vehicles. Located within separation zone, distance from local services, out of character, harm to protected wildlife, increased danger from potential traffic and further damage to property frontages.

WCH24	Carys Pickett	Policy H2B	Support with mods	Object to Smock Alley (H2b). Rejected twice by Council and twice by Planning Inspectorate. Site not sustainable, outside BUAB, encroachment into separation zone, eco and habitat concerns. Question how Plan can be considered well-made if proposal has been previously judged as undeliverable. Keep development within BUAB and prioritise windfall sites.
WCH25	Gary Constable	H2b Land at Smock Alley – H2 Land for Housing	Oppose	Object to Smock Alley (H2b). Site subject to 3 previous applications, all rejected by HDC, two rejected by Planning Inspectorate. Detailed comments in relation to consultation process and questions in relation to supporting evidence base (site assessment process).
WCH26	Joanna Rae	PARA 2 3.41 – Policy H2b	Oppose with comments	Objection to Smock Alley (H2b). Site does not have suitable roads for access and no public support. Comments in relation to consultation process. Plan has no policies addressing the roads or transport. School coaches are not suitable for the road system, causing damages to hedgerows and road surface due to size, unsafe and causes congestion. Needs to be formal restrictions on road infrastructure, such as categorising and signage i.e not suitable for HGV. Parking restrictions such as no parking zones and double yellow lines at junctions and down The Hollows Lane. Introduce a limit to the number of times an application can be made for development.
WCH27	Susan Rooke	Policy H2b	Oppose with Comments	Object to Smock Alley (H2b). 14 houses is too many for an area with no shops or local amenities by foot, negative impact on area and residents, and increase in traffic will make road access busier. Understand need for more new build but this should be in more sustainable areas. Proposal should be halved or in area with amenities and schools accessible by foot.

WCH28	Petina Frost	Para 6 – Policy H2a	Support with Comments	<p>H2a – site is associated with groundwater accumulation and run-off affecting East Street and Broadford Bridge Road. Building on site has potential to have harmful impact on local hydrological profile.</p> <p>GA2.1 – proposal will in turn support other objectives such as accessibility and connectivity, economic and community resilience, tourism, healthy neighbourhood and reduce traffic.</p> <p>LC4 – potentially include The Queens Head PH to the list.</p>
WCH29	Peter Manfield	Appendix 9 EH10	Support with modifications	<p>EH10 – this is the most important part of the Plan. Take another look at wording of policy and make clear that no development will be permitted within Separation Zone. Since drafted application DC/21/2429 had total disregard to the Zone.</p> <p>Object to Smock Alley (H2b). DC/24/1619 land is unsuitable for development and should deserve the protection of the separation zone.</p>
WCH30	Bruce Rea-Palmer	1.6-1.12-2.4-3.8-4-6(H1)-6(H2b) – 6(GA1) 5NP Policies – H1, H2B, GA1	Oppose with comments	<p>Comments in relation to consultation process undertaken.</p> <p>Object to Hatches Lane (H2a) and Smock Alley (H2b), both of which do not meet requirement of H1 (criteria a and b).</p> <p>H2b conflicts with the core objectives of the Plan and principles of sustainable development as set out in NPPF.</p> <p>GA1 – with regards to the proposed developments this policy is undeliverable, therefore sites are unsustainable. Policy should be re-drafted or sites outside requirements of policy removed.</p> <p>The Plan should merely recognise requirement to accept allocation of 25 homes without according the development proposals separate policy status. This would enable parish councillors to reflect how best to meet the allocation within the other policy constraints.</p>

WCH31	Sharon Davis		Oppose	<p>Detailed comments in relation to evidence base validity, supporting documentation, and the consultation process.</p> <p>The Plan conflicts with principles of sustainable development as detailed within the NPPF. Policies within the Plan contradict each other. Legislative requirements have not been met.</p> <p>Objects to Smock Alley (H2b). Allocation is inconsistent with the Plan's objectives and evidence base. It has a historic context of refusal and overwhelming community opposition. Concerns in relation to accessibility, sustainability, impact on environment, flood risk and effect on character of the area.</p> <p>Remove H2b, evidence base should be updated, consultation process should be revisited, prioritise brownfield sites, reconsider sites within the BUAB, adopt a phased development approach, promote transparency and public engagement in site selection.</p>
WCH32	Terence Allen			<p>Plan would have benefitted from professional oversight. Fundamental flaws previously put forward were dismissed.</p> <p>Changes to landscape, due to development of vineyard's, and the impact this has had on the parish and environment has not been assessed.</p> <p>Object to Hatches Lane (H2a) – development would reduce pollinators and impact on public health.</p> <p>Ranking of site assessment is inconsistent. For the residents to make an informed decision all sites should have had their plans available for scrutiny.</p>
WCH33	Lawrence Hudson		Oppose with comments	<p>Detailed comments in relation to validity of evidence base and consultation process.</p>

				<p>Lack of pre-Regulation 14 engagement directly violates the community-led principle of Neighbourhood Planning, as set out in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and Government Guidance.</p> <p>Previously advised information incorrect in relation to site, as detailed in AECOM report, which has not been updated.</p> <p>Plan should be reconsidered with up-to-date information and new consultations in accordance with guidance and legislation.</p>
WCH34	Sean Davis	Policy H1 and H2b and consultation statement	Oppose	<p>Object to Smock Alley (H2b) – Impact to local character, compromises environmental quality and biodiversity, does not reflect actual contemporary housing need, and fails to provide the social and economic benefits required of sustainable development. The plan does not consider developments delivered in previous years.</p> <p>Site opposed for over 10 years, goes against the will of the local community. The draft Plan mentions Harwoods as a major local employer planning relocation in the Parish, expected to bring new employment opportunities. This is incorrect as they have moved out of the area.</p> <p>Site (Smock Alley) is contrary to the Plans vision and core objectives and is in conflict with the principles of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF (social, economic and environmental). Policy H1 is too dense, is not in keeping with the settlement pattern, located outside the existing BUAB and will have a detrimental impact on the character/heritage of the village.</p> <p>Considers the whole Plan is unfit for purpose.</p>
WCH35	Natural England	Policy EH11		<p>EH11: Water Neutrality - support wording of policy.</p> <p>No further comments to make on other policies.</p>

WCH36	Ken Williams	ALL		<p>The West Chiltonington Neighbourhood Plan is out of date. Greater transparency is required for the process. The neighbourhood plan process is flawed.</p>
WCH37	Julia & Thomas Brooks	H2a and H2b	<p>Oppose Hatches Estate development</p> <p>Support Smock Alley development</p>	<p>Objection to Hatches Estate. The development would present a safety issue for pedestrian users with no formal footway along Broadford Bridge Road.</p> <p>Broadford Bridge Road should be identified as a sunken lane under Policy EH7.</p> <p>The increase in traffic volumes from additional development (Hatches) would be unsustainable for the village narrow road network with potential increased levels of pollution, congestion and noise.</p> <p>Development of Hatches Field would be contrary to Policy EH1, development in this location would be negative for wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>Justification for the need for affordable housing in West Chiltonington. No regular public transport service for the village making it difficult for people without a car to travel. Some roads have no formal pavement making it dangerous for pedestrians especially for children.</p> <p>Existing Flooding issues would be exacerbated around Broadford Bridge Road and East Street.</p> <p>Proposed development outside the BUAB. Local residents not consulted properly. New street lighting would cause excessive light pollution.</p> <p>Lack of publicity surrounding the plan from the parish. Engagement with the local community was inadequate.</p> <p>Support is given to Smock Alley as an allocation.</p>

WCH38	Campaign to Protect Rural England Sussex Branch	H2b – land at Smock Alley	Oppose	<p>Objection to Smock Alley allocation. Previous applications and appeals attributed to the site have been rejected for development. Smock Alley does not comply with Policy 4 of the HDPF and the development would not be contained within a defensible boundary. The allocation of Smock Alley would be contrary to the Separation Zone policy as advocated by WCNDP. The allocation of Smock Alley would be a harmful to the character and appearance of the village.</p> <p>The allocation of Smock Alley would be contrary to the Habitat Regulations with the presence of Barbastelle bats and a number of other species reported onsite.</p>
WCH39	Philip Tapsfield	H2b Smock Alley		<p>General support given to the neighbourhood plan. Objection to the inclusion of Smock Alley as an allocation because of the planning history associated with the site. Smock Alley as an allocation would impact negatively on biodiversity, poor accessibility for parents with push prams and little access to suitable footways. The loss of biodiversity at Smock Alley is not supported. Smock Alley is also located in the separation zone. The allocation would contribute to the erosion of the gap between the two settlements.</p>
WCH40	Judith Mays	H2a	Oppose with comments	<p>Hatches Estate is considered to be an important habitat for biodiversity with protected TPOs within the curtilage of the site. The proposed allocation of this site would be contrary to principles underpinning the Nature Recovery Network. It is outside the existing BUAB and would impact negatively on the character and heritage of the village. The proposed quantum of development would be considered to overdevelopment of the site. Hatches Estate</p> <p>Rural roads in the village are inadequate for increased road traffic with road safety considered to be regarding speeding traffic on narrow rural lands which would be in conflict with pedestrian users on Broadford Road.</p> <p>Hatches Estate should be determined as Local Green Space.</p>

				Hatches Estate site is subject to localised surface water flooding, has poor access, near the conservation area, the site is considered to be a wildlife corridor for important species.
WCH41	Linda Belcher	Various	Oppose	<p>Objection to Smock Alley should not come forward following previous application and appeals.</p> <p>The volume of through traffic through West Chilts Conservation Areas will have a detrimental impact to the integrity of the conservation area.</p> <p>The legibility of the document/plan and maps need to improve.</p>
WCH42	Colin Strange	Various	Oppose	Lack of public consultation and failure to supply correct prepared, checked, documents. The duty to consult the public has not been fulfilled. Documents have errors, maps and diagrams are unreadable at 'printed size' repetitions of unquantifiable statements, 'waffle' and not fit for purpose so not fit for public consultation. With all previous refusals/rejections of Smock Alley proposals, the site should not be allocated in the WCNP. Inadequate road infrastructure to provide appropriate vehicular and pedestrian access to and from the site because there is a lack of footpaths and a lack of street lights. No consideration to the integrity of conservation area impacted from increased traffic.
WCH43	Mark and Carri Price	H2b, EH6, EH10	Oppose with comments	Strongly oppose the inclusion of Land at Smock Alley under H2b. Site has been subject to 4 planning applications and 3 appeals in 11 years. Proposal in unsustainable location and coalescence between west Chiltington and west Chiltington common, and detrimental impact on wildlife. Any development here contravenes EH10 settlement separation. No material difference between previous applications and the latest one and there are no mitigations or attempts to address previous refusal issues. Lack of public consultation. Errors in the scoring of the selected sites in sustainability, site encroaches on settlement zone between the common and the village. Outside the BUAB and lack of sustainable transport connections. The impact on biodiversity and to

				protected species locally would be negative. More suitable sites should have been included East of Hatches House, Southmill House, The Winery. Question over removal of Map 21 and Appendix 1 from the plan. Remove proposed development of smock alley from the plan – recommend re-engagement with the community in fully transparent consultation process.
WCH44	Mark Russell	Various	Oppose	Much to commend in Neighbourhood Plan – accurately deals with strengths of and challenges facing West Chilton. Cycling and walking around the village is not appropriate where it is in reality hazardous with cyclists and pedestrians come into conflict with the motorist. Importance of separation zone between old village and the common, should be retained. Allocations such as Smock Alley are located within the separation zone. Planning Inspectorate stated this in reason for refusal of proposed development at appeal. HDC is imposing sites on the neighbourhood plan.
WCH45	Susan Goddard	Para 4.1 of appendix 2	Comments	AONBs are now known as National Landscapes. The sentence about the National Park should read 'It is also on the boundary of the South Downs National Park which includes a section of the River Chilt and part of Monkmead Wood' as the National Park was designated over 14 years ago.
WCH46	Nigel Smith	All	Oppose	Insufficient consultation, invalid regulation 14 survey as parishioners not given the opportunity to make observations known on early stage of site selection. Most parishioners not aware of 6 December as deadline for Regulation 16 as there was no leaflet drop, or email, so no contact about the consultation period. Neighbourhood plan out of date and area has a higher percentage of older people, the younger ones not getting a chance to have input. Smock Alley site is considered unsuitable, as confirmed by refusals of applications and appeals. Site is Greenfield site, located in the separation zone, with limited access to sustainable transport, increased traffic around the village is unsustainable and is unsafe conflicting with pedestrian, increase pollution derived from the additional traffic, visual amenity would be affected by the development of Smock Alley. Development will destroy wildlife, create additional

				<p>flooding, and not meet the 3 criteria of economic, social, and environmental objectives of the NPPF. The impact on local biodiversity from the development of Smock Alley would be negative on local wildlife. The site is not considered to be water neutral. Reference is made to additional evidence as presented by Sharon Davis in her representation. The addition of any significant numbers of new properties cannot be accommodated because of the narrow lanes and the alternatives should be reviewed.</p>
WCH47	Jean Smith	All	Objection	<p>Lack of engagement with the community and insufficient publicity regarding the Reg 14 and Reg 16 consultation. Objection to the Smock Alley allocation as previous applications and appeals attributed to the site have been rejected for development.</p> <p>Most parishioners not aware of 6 December as deadline for Regulation 16 as there was no leaflet drop, or email, so no contact about the consultation period. Neighbourhood plan out of date and area has a higher percentage of older people, the younger ones not getting a chance to have input. Smock Alley site is considered unsuitable, as confirmed by refusals of applications and appeals. Site is Greenfield site, located in the separation zone, with limited access to sustainable transport, increased traffic around the village is unsustainable and is unsafe conflicting with pedestrian with narrow lanes, increase pollution derived from the additional traffic, visual amenity would be affected by the development of Smock Alley. Development will destroy wildlife, create additional flooding, and not meet the 3 criteria of economic, social, and environmental objectives of the NPPF. The impact on local biodiversity from the development of Smock Alley would be negative on local wildlife. The site is not considered to be water neutral. Reference is made to additional evidence as presented by Sharon Davis in her representation. The addition of any significant numbers of new properties cannot be accommodated because of the narrow lanes and the alternatives should be reviewed including the South Mill site.</p>

WCH48	HDC	All	Comment	<p>Acknowledges of the hard work by the parish undertaken to reach this point in the process. Suggested recommendation on points of clarifications on several policies to improve outcomes.</p> <p>Greater resolution of policy maps and designations to make things clearer so accurate decisions can be made by stakeholders.</p>
-------	-----	-----	---------	---