

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE

12 March 2015

DRAFT WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT
MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION
RESPONSES

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Jenny Nell Tel: (01962) 848278 jnell@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES

CAB2656 Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, update following consultation 9 February 2015

CAB2615 Draft Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Site Allocations, publication and consultation - 22 September 2014

[CAB2530\(LDF\)](#) Local Plan Part 2 Update Report – Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee 27 Nov 2013

[CAB2429\(LDF\)](#) Local Plan Part 2 Launch and Next Steps – Cabinet (LDF) Committee 17 December 2012

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Draft Local Plan Part 2 was subject of a six week consultation period during October to 5 December 2014. As a result over 1,100 individuals and organisations submitted comments to the draft Plan. Many of these made multiple comments on different policies, raising over 2000 representations. This Committee received a report on 9 February (CAB2656 refers), setting out initial feedback from the consultation, which highlighted the need for a series of meetings to examine the comments in detail and to consider any necessary changes to the draft Plan before it is submitted for examination later in the year.

This is the first more detailed report which examines the responses received to the settlements of Colden Common, Kings Worthy, Swanmore, Waltham Chase, Wickham and South Hampshire Urban Areas, which are appended in schedule format to this report. The bulk of representations either raise matters of detail on policy wording or support/object to the sites being allocated for development, either on a point of principle or promoting an alternative site for consideration.

The schedules provide a comprehensive summary of the comments received with common issues being grouped together. All responses are available to view in full on the Council's website. There are a number of representations that raise issues

relating to site selection and promoting alternative sites for consideration. It will be necessary to undertake further work to ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2. Consequently, this report often recommends that there are matters which require further investigation and the results of this will be reported to a future meeting of this Committee.

It will also be necessary to liaise with the respective Parish Councils/Town Forum and undertake the required assessments to ensure that the sites that are allocated in the pre-submission version of LPP2 are the most sustainable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 That Members note the responses received to the draft plan and agree the 'recommended responses' proposed.

CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE12 MARCH 2015DRAFT WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION RESPONSESDETAIL1. Introduction

- 1.1 Members received an update report and initial feedback on matters raised during the consultation on the draft Local Plan Part 2 at a meeting of this Committee on 9 February 2015 (CAB2656(LP)) refers.
- 1.2 CAB2656(LP) acknowledged the need for further reports given the number and range of representations received. Consequently, this report is the first in a series which will examine the responses in more detail and suggest changes to the Plan, if necessary, prior to the Pre-Submission version and its submission for examination later in the year.
- 1.3 All representations have now been processed and can be viewed on the planning policy pages of the Council's website:
<http://documents.winchester.gov.uk/LPP2/Default.aspx> From here, comments can be inspected by general topic/settlement and by alphabetical lists of respondents' names. The following table indicates the total number and distribution of representations received:-

	Number of Respondents	Number of Comments
Total for whole plan	1128	2082
Split by chapter/topic		
Chapter 1 & 2	18	43
Winchester Town	108	227
Bishops Waltham	62	112
Colden Common	180	242
Kings Worthy	62	88
New Alresford	569	861
Swanmore	43	59
Waltham Chase	37	52
Wickham	69	136
Denmead	6	6
Small Rural Villages	14	20
South Hampshire Urban Areas	7	10
Development Management and Implementation and Monitoring	64	188
Appendices	3	4
General	23	24
SA/SEA/HRA	9	10

1.4 Appended to this report are schedules for the following settlements. Each schedule lists the representations received which have been sorted according to the paragraph/policy referred to, and by whether it is an objection, support or comment. All representations have been summarised and those making common points have been grouped together. The final column includes a recommended officer response to the issue being raised, if it is appropriate to do so at this stage, and if relevant includes a recommended change to the draft Plan.

Appendix 1 Colden Common

Appendix 2 Kings Worthy

Appendix 3 Swanmore

Appendix 4 Waltham Chase

Appendix 5 Wickham

Appendix 6 South Hampshire Urban Areas

- 1.5 Also appended is an index which lists all representations by respondent number with the name of the individual or organisation making the representation (Appendix 7). Representations can be searched alphabetically by respondent name from the web site:
<http://documents.winchester.gov.uk/LPP2/Default.aspx>
- 1.6 Many representations relate to site allocations, suggest alternative sites for development/changes to settlement boundaries, or raise issues with the proposed allocations or policy wording. These comments typically refer to various matters and will require further work and checking of information before a recommendation can be brought back. There will also be a need for sustainability appraisal. It will therefore be necessary to assess the matters raised in detail and seek further advice as necessary, hence the 'recommended responses' in relation to site allocations are normally to undertake further work and report back to a future meeting (planned for late May/early June 2015). Recommended responses are made in relation to various other matters raised and it is recommended that these be agreed as a basis for developing the next version of the Plan (subject to any changes arising from the further work mentioned above and meetings suggested below).
- 1.7 Given the participative nature of the preparation of LPP2 it is important to involve Town/Parish Councils in this process and it is proposed to hold further discussions with Parish Councils and the Winchester Town Forum prior to making recommendations about site allocations. Each site that is proposed for development will also have to undergo a sustainability appraisal and assessment with regard to the Habitats Regulations and strategic environmental assessment, prior to final allocation.

1.8 The 30 March meeting of this Committee will take a similar approach to the remaining settlements, development management policies and maps/appendices. Recommendations arising from the proposed further work would be reported to a meeting or meetings in late May/Early June.

2. Background

2.1 LPP2 is required to be in compliance with both the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (adopted March 2013). Its purpose is to set out detailed development management policies and to allocate non-strategic development sites for a range of uses. LPP2 will cover that part of the District outside the South Downs National Park, where the National Park Authority is producing its own Local Plan. LPP2 covers Denmead, although the Denmead Neighbourhood Plan will set out site allocations and some other policies (subject to the outcome of the referendum held on 5 March 2015).

2.2 The preparation of LPP2 must comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. NPPF (paragraph 155) however, also advises that *“early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area...”*.

2.3 Report CAB2530(LDF) to Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 27 November 2013 set out the details of the extensive work that had been undertaken with local communities, particularly in relation to identifying sites to meet the development requirements for the larger villages. Extensive discussion and debate took place with the Town/Parish Councils and/or their steering groups on potential sites. The draft Local Plan was produced taking account of housing requirements and technical assessments on open space, landscape sensitivity, transport accessibility and other background reports and assessments, as well as the results of local community consultation on site preferences.

2.4 Report CAB2615 (22 September 2014) sought approval for the draft LPP2 – Development Management and Allocations to be published for a 6-week public consultation. The consultation held during October to December 2014 falls under the requirements of Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which represents the first statutory stage in preparing a local plan.

2.5 The remainder of this report examines representations to the proposals in LPP2 for the settlements listed in para 1.4 above, and detailed schedules for each settlement are appended.

3 Summary of key matters raised

- 3.1 **Colden Common**- representations focus on the two sites allocated in LPP2, or promote alternative sites for consideration. The bulk of representations relate to the proposal under Policy CC2 for a gypsy and traveller site on Main Road. Since publication of this draft plan, it has been brought to officers' attention that the site has been sold and is no longer available for permanent travellers' pitches and should, consequently, be removed from the Plan as an allocation. This however, does not negate the need to identify sites for permanent pitches for Travellers within the Winchester District, as identified in the Travellers Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire (2013). This will be dealt with when the ongoing site assessment study currently being undertaken is completed, the outcome of which will be reported to a future meeting of this Committee.
- 3.2 **Kings Worthy** – representations cover a range of matters, including significant support for the only site allocation (policy KW1). A number of comments challenge the need to allocate a site for 50 dwellings when the residual housing requirement is only 22. Alternative sites are suggested for development instead of that proposed under Policy KW1. The consultation process is also challenged in that the details of Policy KW1 changed with an increase in the number of dwellings to be provided, although this has enabled a significant proportion of open space and green infrastructure to be brought forward for public use, securing the future of the settlement gap with Abbots Worthy.
- 3.3 **Swanmore** – representations raise matters relating to the development strategy for Swanmore, stating that 250 units is too large for the village given its location adjacent to the South Downs National Park and the settlement gap with Waltham Chase, but also the lack of facilities and services to support such a level of growth. Encroachment into the gap and impact on the adjacent countryside were included in the issues raised, in addition to more site specific comments relating to transport and drainage.
- 3.4 **Waltham Chase** – like Swanmore, some representations challenge the development strategy for the village and raise objections to all proposed allocations in relation to traffic impact; capacity of the school; lack of local employment opportunities; impact on character and amenity of the area including the gap.
- 3.5 **Wickham** – many comments raise objection to the two housing sites proposed, with alternatives suggested. There are also many representations concerning transport, drainage and flooding issues, including the cumulative impact of the Welborne development. Hampshire County Council is currently undertaking a flooding and drainage investigation which will help to inform any changes to the Plan.
- 3.6 **South Hampshire Urban Areas** – this section of the Plan attracted fewer representations given the strategic allocations already in LPP1. Key issues covered the need for employment land to be protected and/or more to be

allocated, in addition to specific comments in relation to Policies SHUA1 and 2.

4 Next Steps

- 4.1 A further meeting of this Committee is scheduled for 30 March 2015 to cover Bishops Waltham; New Alresford, Winchester Town, Denmead and small rural settlements; development management and general responses, maps, appendices, etc. This meeting has been scheduled as a possible all-day meeting and, if so, a programme will be prepared to allow interested parties to attend specific sessions.
- 4.2 Further meetings will be held in late May/early June, to recommend and agree final changes to the draft Plan, which will include the confirmation of sites to be allocated for development.
- 4.3 The Local Development Scheme refers to pre-submission version of LPP2 being published in June 2015. This is unlikely to be achieved given the need for additional meetings. It may, however, still be feasible to take a revised plan to Cabinet in June and Council in July, prior to publication over the summer. Therefore, a revised Local Development Scheme will need to be produced.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5. COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND PORTFOLIO PLANS (RELEVANCE TO)

- 5.1 The Local Plan is a key corporate priority and will contribute to achieving the Community Strategy and implementing several aspects of Portfolio Plans.

6. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The key resources for undertaking work on LPP2 have been approved as part of the budget process, consisting primarily of an annual sum of £36,700 and an earmarked reserve which stood at £172,759 at 1 April 2014. This budget and earmarked reserve are used for ongoing consultancy requirements, ensuring resources are available to deal with major expenditure at key stages, e.g. examination. This funding is expected to be adequate for the foreseeable future, subject to progress with LPP2, any changes in government requirements and the need to review plans.

7. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 7.1 None.

8. APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 Colden Common
 Appendix 2 Kings Worthy
 Appendix 3 Swanmore
 Appendix 4 Waltham Chase

Appendix 5 Wickham

Appendix 6 South Hampshire Urban Areas

Appendix 7 Index of respondents by number/name

Appendix 1

Colden Common - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
	4.3.1 – 4.3.14		Introductory Paragraphs	
51369	4.3.2	Comment	Development Needs Housing Template includes some errors regarding affordable housing needs. Data does not include the 'unique to Colden Common', highly significant 220 'affordable' mobile home pitches within the parish. These mobile homes are currently used by all categories of UK residents who wish to reside in Colden Common, including static travellers, which shows an oversupply of mobile home/caravan pitches in the parish.	The mobile home accommodation referred to lower cost market housing, rather than being provided as 'affordable housing' in planning terms. There is not, therefore, an error in the report's failure to highlight this accommodation, although the high proportion of mobile homes in Colden Common is acknowledged. However, this is not such a significant characteristic as to warrant a change to the Plan. Recommended Response: No change required.
51500	4.3.3	Object	Residents were not asked how many dwellings they thought would be reasonable for Colden Common.	The Local Plan Part 2 is required to meet these needs, which have already been determined by Local Plan Part 1, at Colden Common. Twyford does not have a specific housing target within LPP1 and lies within the SDNP. Therefore, it will be dealt with by the SDNPA in its Local Plan. Recommended Response: No change required.
51663			Colden Common is being overdeveloped with up to 250 more houses identified in the Local Plan, being forced on the village. Why not Twyford which has had limited development over the years?	
50282	4.3.5	Object	The total requirement of LPP1 to provide 250 dwellings should be met as follows: 1. Existing Commitments – 30 dwellings 2. Identified small sites – 55 dwellings 3. Sandyfields – 75 dwellings 4. Main Road – 31 dwellings 5. Lower Moors – 45 dwellings 6. ANO small site – 14 dwellings	The Net Housing Requirement table under paragraph 4.3.5 will be updated in the next version of the Plan, although this is not expected to significantly change the remaining land to be allocated. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: Update the Net Housing Requirement table as necessary (paragraph 4.3.5). To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50282	4.3.6	Object	Concern about the deliverability of SHLAA sites within the existing settlement boundary. Opportunities should be taken to exceed the requirements set out in LPP1 and/or identify additional reserve sites which are capable of coming forward following a review of the overall up to date requirement. Colden Common is clearly suitable to accommodate growth above the minimum requirements of the LPP1 without breaching established planning or environmental thresholds.	SHLAA sites within the settlement boundary have been included if confirmed by owners as deliverable within the Plan period. LPP1 requires provision of “about” 250 dwellings. This is not precise or a ceiling and gives some leeway, however there is no need at this stage in the Plan period to aim to exceed this amount or to identify reserve sites. Recommended Response: No change required.
51369, 51874	4.3.6	Support	New development should be accommodated within existing settlement boundaries in the first instance. The inclusion of the sites 888 and 889 (Clayfield Park Homes and Avondale Park) is supported but these must be linked and include tree planting along Main Road to protect the street scene in this part of Colden Common. These sites are confirmed as developable and deliverable and were favoured in the community consultation.	Support welcomed and comments noted.
51369	4.3.7	Support	The boundary change to include SHLAA site 2499 (back garden that adjoins the Jardini dwelling) should be subject to addition of 1 new home to the proposed windfall allocation.	Paragraph 48 of the NPPF states that, “Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply.” The Council’s study did not find such compelling evidence to include any “windfall allowance” in the Net Housing Requirement table for Colden Common. However it is intended to update the table to take account of any planning permissions or completions that have come forward. Recommended Response: Update the Net Housing Requirement table as necessary (paragraph 4.3.5).
51369		Comment	Windfalls should be allowed for (about 10 dwellings); one dwelling has been built in Chestnut Avenue and 2-5 are planned on land at 44 Spring Lane.	
51558		Object	This paragraph should be deleted and an alternative source of ‘flexibility’ sought. Stating that where windfall sites are approved will ‘provide flexibility in maintaining the supply of housing in the village’ is in direct conflict with paragraph 48 of the NPPF and the Council’s own study on windfall in the settlement.	

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51443	4.3.10	Object	Object to the decision making process described, that refers to exclusive discussions with the prospective developers of sites 275/2495 and the assumption that an increased capacity with higher density is acceptable. The proposal to allocate 165 houses to Site 275 should be reconsidered on the basis that a lower density site will have less impact on the National Park and will cause fewer problems on Main Road.	Paragraph 4.3.10 describes events that took place. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51558	4.3.10	Object	No reference is included to site 2389 despite the obvious preference shown by residents for this site, that the site was one of two that were 'most favoured' by residents but was removed due to its status as a SINC. No information was provided by the Council to explain to residents that there are circumstances where parts of a SINC may be suitable for development or that the SINC status offers no statutory protection to the ecological features of the site and that, through a suitable planning application, an ecological management plan could be secured and that this could improve the ecological value of the site as well as offer a greater degree of protection.	Greater detail regarding the outcome of the previous stages of community consultation is given in the Regulation 18 Consultation Statement (Part 1). A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50282, 51443	4.3.10 – 4.3.11	Object	The proposed Development Strategy endorsed by Colden Common Parish Council in October 2013 was based on technical evidence and extensive consultation with the public, landowners and developers. The proposed strategy identified three preferred sites around the village including site 2494 (land off Main Road) as a preferred option. However the development strategy including the Sandyfields Nurseries/Main Road site put forward on the premise that it is the "community's preference" is not supported by the evidence of numbers responding to the consultations and is contrary to the clearly expressed views of the majority of the local community that development should be accommodated	Paragraphs 4.3.10 and 4.3.11 describe events that took place. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			on multiple sites dispersed around the village.	
51443	4.3.12	Object	<p>Disagree with the following statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “No major constraints” – versus the National Park, Ancient Woodland, PAWS, TPOs, a major water main and a difficult site access. ▪ “Well related to existing services and facilities” – the County’s report refers to a distance of 1200m from the school and Co-op and concludes that this is “adequate”. In the Manual for Streets the focus for plan making is the more usual 800m standard for walkability. ▪ “No significant adverse impact on biodiversity, landscape or heritage” – debatable given the nearby SINC and adjoining National Park. ▪ “It has community support” – this is not compelling. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50967	4.3.13	Comment	Support further extension of Colden Common school, but mindful of Winchester’s County Councillors wish to keep all primary schools in the district at two form entry. This must be reviewed if necessary.	<p>Comment noted. The nature of improvements to the school is not a matter for the Local Plan.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50030 (Owslebury PC)	4.3.13 - 4.3.14	Object	Owslebury PC understands the need for housing development in Colden Common but concerned to ensure that such development is accompanied by substantive improvements to the main roads particularly between Fair Oak and Winchester. At present there is a daily bottle-neck in the Colden Common/Twyford area, often causing traffic to use Owslebury as a short cut. Further housing development without improvements to the road network will simply add to the problem.	<p>Strategic-level transport assessment was undertaken in relation to Local Plan Part 1 and was taken into account in setting the development strategy and settlement housing targets. The Local Plan sets out requirements for transport measures to accommodate the development and future planning applications will need to undertake more detailed assessments, including of the cumulative impacts of traffic generated by development, and implement detailed measures to address this.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50038 (Twyford PC)	4.3.13 – 4.3.14	Object	Twyford PC considers that any development in Colden Common would have an adverse effect on Twyford from increased traffic along the corridor to Winchester and the M3. Specific funding for improvements of the infrastructure through Twyford including cyclepath provision should be included in the plans and allocated from the CIL; adjacent parishes should receive	<p>Strategic-level transport assessment was undertaken in relation to Local Plan Part 1 and was taken into account in setting the development strategy and settlement housing targets. The Local Plan sets out requirements for transport measures to accommodate the development and future planning applications will need to undertake more</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			appropriate contributions where specific infrastructure needs arise from nearby developments.	detailed assessments, including of the cumulative impacts of traffic generated by development, and implement detailed measures to address this. The comments on priorities for CIL spending are noted, but these are not determined through the Local Plan. Recommended Response: No change required.
50967	4.3.14	Comment	Concern has been raised over the impact of traffic passing along Main Road past the Main Road entrance when this new development has taken place. What mitigation will take place to allow traffic to exit safely from the Park Homes site?	Policy CC1 under the paragraph relating to access to the allocated site includes, "... along with any wider access traffic management measures necessary;" The detail of such measures, which may include traffic management measures to allow traffic to exit safely from the neighbouring Glen Park Mobile Home Park, would be a matter for a planning application. Recommended Response: No change required.
	CC1		Allocation of land at Sandyfields Nurseries, Main Road	
50105 (South Downs NPA), 50967, 50977, 51003, 51005, 51010, 51019, 51040, 51107, 51140, 51172, 51277, 51281, 51292, 51360, 51365, 51369, 51423, 51429, 51451, 51495, 51587, 51588, 51777, 51879, 51889	CC1	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support proposal – no specific comments. [Comment by 5 respondents] Other respondents made specific comments as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reflects outcome of extensive village consultation; was endorsed by the Parish Council. [Comment by 12 respondents] ▪ Largely a brown field site and preserves other greenfield sites. [Comment by 5 respondents] ▪ This is the best option. [Comment by 4 respondents] ▪ It will not have a significant visual impact: the front part of the site is narrow, previously developed land which shields the rest of the site from public views along Main Road. [Comment by 3 respondents] ▪ Would facilitate good traffic management scheme for traffic on to and off the Main Road and mean less traffic through village. [Comment by 2 respondents] ▪ Easy access to village centre, school and community centre. [Comment by 2 respondents] 	Support welcomed.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The woodland will benefit the village. [Comment by 2 respondents] ▪ SDNPA welcomes and offer of Stratton's Copse for community use. ▪ Water runoff should not be a problem, or pollution of the River Itchen. ▪ Development will rebalance the village. ▪ Good footpath links to Boyes Lane Park. ▪ Site is developable, available for development within the plan period and capable of providing 165 homes. It is in a sustainable location and there are no over-riding constraints that would prevent its development. ▪ Substantial landscaping along the boundary with Glen Park can protect the privacy of residents at the mobile home site. ▪ The closure of the caravan storage facility at Sandyfields is a business decision for the owners to make; it is not a planning reason for refusing residential development on the site. 	
51451, 51495	CC1	Support	<p>Support CC1, however the new development must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be subject to the protection of existing mature boundary trees and also the addition of significant new tree screening along the Main Road, B3354 boundary; ii. be fully sustainable so as not to impact on the already fragile water table of the area and the overloaded local infrastructure of the parish, including traffic; and iii. include the provision of a safe vehicle and pedestrian crossing on the B3354. [Comment by 2 respondents] 	Support welcomed, see also the recommended response to objections to policy CC1 below.
50281, 50282, 50995, 51046, 51048, 51059, 51084, 51142, 51143, 51144, 51145, 51146,	CC1	Object	<p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <p>Site should be deleted as is not a suitable and sustainability location for housing development because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ adverse impact on the landscape character of the SNDP and its setting; [Comment by 15 respondents] 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51147, 51352, 51378, 51390, 51391, 51443, 51551, 51753, 51873, 51875, 51877			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ severance of Main Road from facilities and difficulty / safety crossing; [Comment by 10 respondents] ▪ scale of development proposed is too large; [Comment by 7 respondents] ▪ only adequate access to shops, facilities and schools; [Comment by 3 respondents] ▪ detrimental impact on the setting of Grade II listed buildings directly to the north of the proposed access; [Comment by 2 respondents] ▪ loss of caravan storage and jobs; [2 respondents] ▪ fails to respect the character and setting of the existing settlement; ▪ not a brownfield site. <p><u>Traffic Impact</u> Increase in traffic in village generally and on Main Road which is at capacity. Locating 165 dwellings along Main Road via a single access point would result in a significant concentration of traffic generation, exacerbating the amount of heavy traffic and congestion at peak periods. [Comments by 14 respondents]</p> <p><u>Stratton's Copse & Green Infrastructure</u> Development will threaten Stratton's Copse. Using this to meet the site's public open space requirements would have a detrimental effect on ecology and biodiversity. Development proposals do not reflect the Standing Advice for Ancient Woodland issued by Natural England. [Comment by 9 respondents]</p> <p><u>Development Strategy</u> Development should not be concentrated on a single large site but dispersed between a number of smaller sites to reduce impact on the highways during peak periods and reduce risks to delivery and environmental effects. [Comment by 7 respondents]</p>	most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p><u>Alternative Site Preferred</u> Site should be replaced in whole or part by land east of Highbridge Road as the preferred housing allocation because this is the most appropriate strategy for growth at Colden Common.</p> <p>The site adjacent to the school/near to Brambridge Park is more favourable for reasons including nearer to the school, the shop (Co-op), the bus route and the road network; further from the Traveller's site; more integrated with rest of the village and not hidden away. [Comment by 3 respondents]</p> <p><u>Constraints</u> Constraints significantly reduce the developable area of the site and the total number of dwellings which could be delivered. Site should be reduced in capacity with the number of dwellings reduced to 100 to lower the density and allow for buffer, on-site play area and pipeline easement. [Comment by 2 respondents]</p> <p><u>Impact on facilities and services</u> There is already significant pressure on the local facilities, including the school which is struggling to meet the demand of its local catchment before any further development. No satisfactory plan has been given to remedy this, or the potential secondary school issues that will become apparent down the line.</p> <p>The surgery is stretched to capacity. [Comments by 2 respondents]</p> <p><u>Travellers Pitches</u> Sandyfields site should not be used for permanent travellers pitches. Development to create homes is inevitable and necessary with so many young people and families who need a place to live in dire straits. Better proposals should be put forward for this site.</p>	
50085 (Natural England)	CC1	Object	The policy should be far more specific in what is required by way of green infrastructure and biodiversity	A number of representations make comments on

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			management. The woodland (Stratton's Copse) is referred to as wet woodland and therefore has less recreational value.	the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50090 (Southern Water)	CC1	Object	<u>Water Infrastructure</u> Southern Water's assessment reveals that additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development, involving making a connection to the local sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity at costs to the developers. Propose insert the following under 'infrastructure': "provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider." There is sewerage infrastructure crossing the site that needs to be taken into account when designing the proposed layout (easement width of 6 metres or diversion required).	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	CC1	Object	<u>Archaeological Impact</u> Site has archaeological potential for previously unrecognised remains and features associated with prehistoric occupation of this area. Policy CC1 should include a new heading 'heritage' or 'archaeology' and a development criterion to read "preparation of a comprehensive archaeological assessment to define the extent and significance of any archaeological remains and provide for their preservation or recording as appropriate".	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50105 (South Downs NP Authority)	4.3.16 – 4.3.18	Support	SDNPA supports the requirement for sympathetic boundary treatment with the NP, the detail in para. 4.3.17 regarding future management of Stratton's Copse and	Support welcomed.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			endorses the statement to work jointly to bring the site forward.	
51443	4.3.16 – 4.3.17	Object	Question the accuracy of statements made in these paragraphs.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50085 (Natural England)	4.3.17	Object	<u>Park Copse</u> 1 st 2 bullet points should relate to the whole of Park Copse SINC, rather than Stratton's Copse. Suggest that such permissive access should link to the existing public right of way in the north east of the wood.	The proposals relating to Stratton's Copse are within the same ownership and specifically linked to the development of the Sandyfields site so are referred to even though the copse is within the SDNP and not within the jurisdiction of this LPP2. The rest of Park Copse is also within the SDNP and falls to be considered in the Local Plan for the SDNP. Recommended Response: No change required.
50281, 51443	CC1 / Consultation	Object	<u>Consultation process.</u> Object to the way in which WCC has used the results of the community engagement exercise undertaken by Commonview in decision making.	Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that, "Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area." This advice has been taken into account in developing the Local Plan. Sites promoted in the draft Plan are not promoted solely on the basis of community engagement and were selected for sound planning reasons. Recommended Response: No change required.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
	CC2		Travellers' Site at Ashbrook Stables, Main Road	
50083 (Environment Agency)	CC2	Comment	Pleased to see the development criteria relating to infrastructure. It is essential that there is no pollution to the water environment.	Noted, see response below. Recommended Response: No change required.
50990, 50994, 51006, 51012, 51014, 51016, 51017, 51028, 51029, 51030, 51031, 51034, 51037, 51038, 51045, 51047, 51048, 51054, 51056, 51057, 51059, 51062, 51063, 51064, 51065, 51068, 51069, 51070, 51073, 51074, 51075, 51076, 51077, 51078, 51080, 51081, 51082, 51084, 51085, 51087, 51090, 51098, 51101, 51102, 51105, 51112, 51142, 51143, 51144, 51146, 51147, 51243, 51273, 51277, 51323, 51328, 51352, 51353, 51356, 51357, 51358, 51369, 51370, 51371, 51381, 51382, 51390, 51391, 51423, 51429, 51432, 51433, 51434, 51453, 51500, 51502, 51504, 51512, 51517, 51524,	CC2	Object	<p>A travellers' site in this location will have a negative impact on the area for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would constitute an over-concentration of travellers in and around Colden Common; large site already at Nobs Crook. ▪ Would be disproportionate to the size of the village where already numerous mobile homes; other areas should absorb some provision. ▪ Alternative site(s) elsewhere. ▪ No need in Colden Common. ▪ Change character and appearance of entrance to village - at the gateway of an established community, on prime, highly visible land and would have a detrimental effect on the rural setting, and the SDNP ▪ Greenfield site; assessed as highly sensitive in the landscape assessment. ▪ Outside the proposed settlement boundary; greenbelt land. ▪ Close proximity to existing homes - would cause nuisance to local residents. ▪ Close proximity to businesses and will deter new ones from establishing. ▪ Detrimental effect on heritage - close to a grade 2 listed building (Holy Trinity Church). ▪ Detrimental effect on transport – access to the site is directly off of the B3354, an already overburdened public highway, heavy commuter route, an emergency route for any unavoidable M27 closures; caravans entering and leaving site would cause road safety issues. ▪ Would put pressure on local services, education, health 	<p>Due to a change in ownership this site is no longer available for travellers' pitches. Therefore the allocation would not be deliverable, and would therefore not meet the requirements for 'soundness', and should be removed from the Plan. However the need permanent pitches for Travellers, as identified in the Travellers Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire (2013), remains within Winchester District. This will be dealt with when the ongoing site assessment study is completed, the outcome of which will be reported to a future meeting.</p> <p>Recommended Response: A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Normally, further work would need to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, with the results of this reported back to a future meeting. However, in view of the change to the availability of the site, it is recommended that policy CC2, its supporting text and allocation on Map 2, be deleted.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51529, 51530, 51533, 51537, 51538, 51540, 51542, 51544, 51545 51546, 51548, 51549, 51550, 51551, 51552, 51553, 51554, 51556, 51559, 51560, 51562, 51565, 51577, 51578, 51587, 51588, 51593, 51603, 51605, 51610, 51613, 51615, 51619, 51620, 51621; 51659, 51663, 51674, 51683, 51699, 51700, 51704, 51752, 51798, 51811, 51865, 51866, 51867, 51868, 51869, 51871, 51872, 51875, 51876, 51877, 51880, 51881			<p>and community services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risk of flooding – drainage problems on site. ▪ Loss of hedgerow and damage to trees. ▪ Lack of infrastructure - waste management; sewage and waste water treatment; lighting; public transport. ▪ Cause pollution – waste; noise and light. ▪ Site assessed not suitable for permanent housing – should also apply to traveller’s accommodation. Or allocate for permanent housing. ▪ Reflect negatively on house prices; increase cost of home insurance. ▪ Increase crime; anti-social behaviour; put pressure on police services. ▪ Unclear how site and occupants will contribute to taxes for the local services. ▪ Unlikely to integrate into village. Include in CC1 to promote inclusion not isolation. ▪ Possible expansion of site/increase in number of pitches on site. ▪ Previous breach of planning on this site – problems caused; no reason to permit now. ▪ Contradicts sustainability objectives of the Plan. ▪ Danger to nearby horses and riders. ▪ Insufficient space on site for a LEAP. ▪ Question whether conversion of adjoining stables to domestic use has planning permission. 	
51548	4.3.20	Object	<p>This section states that the site is "immediately adjacent to one that is currently owned and occupied by members of the travelling community". That is not really true as the two sites are separated by an area of woodland that also borders a number of residential properties. The LPP2 states that there is a requirement to "retain and reinforce existing boundaries around the site" but makes no mention of how these will be enforced.</p>	<p>See above - policy CC2 and its supporting text is recommended for deletion.</p> <p>Recommended Response: That policy CC2, its supporting text and allocation on Map 2, be deleted.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50305, 50967, 51059, 51070, 51500, 51533, 51542, 51548, 51577, 51619, 51704, 51753, 51811, 51878,	CC2 / Consultation	Comment / Object	<p>There has been insufficient consultation and lack of publicity re proposal. A specific site has been identified at Colden Common prior to a full and proper assessment of all potential sites for travellers within the District. WCC has not consulted with the local community or the parish council on this matter prior to the publication of the draft Local Plan. Previous consultation by 'Commonview' referred to the suitability of this site for housing and did not mention travellers.</p> <p>Nearby residents along Main Road and Hensting Lane were not directly informed of the proposal by mail, leaflet or site notice which is the norm for a planning application so people given insufficient time to comment.</p>	<p>The draft LPP2 was published for a 6 week period of consultation which is normal for planning documents, consistent with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and statutory requirements. The Plan was in the public domain some weeks prior to that when published for the Cabinet's consideration. There was wide publicity of the Plan in various formats including leaflets to households. Specific mailing, as with neighbour notifications for planning applications, is not required by either the SCI or statute. To have highlighted the proposed traveller site over other development proposals would have implied some discrimination, especially as the proposal is very small in scale compared to the Sandyfields site allocation for 165 dwellings.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
51621	General	Comment	We have an illegal concrete base in Nob's Crook, Colden Common. Why was this allowed?	<p>This is not an issue for the Local Plan but if it constitutes a potential breach of planning control it may be investigated by Planning Enforcement.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
	Omission		Colden Common Site / Policy Omissions	
51874	Omission	Object	The site comprising Clayfield Park Homes Ltd and land at Avondale Park - including further land (additional land to the north giving a combined site area of approximately 2.33ha) as indicated on the submitted plan - should be subject to a formal site allocation in a policy to ensure that the site is safeguarded for future development.	<p>The site lies within the existing settlement boundary where development is already permitted by policies MTRA2 (LPP1) and DM1 (LPP2); therefore there is no need to make an allocation in LPP2. The site is already referenced as a SHLAA site in paragraph 4.3.6. Any additional dwelling capacity resulting from the extension of the site will be taken into account when the table under paragraph 4.3.5 is updated in the next version of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Update the Net Housing Requirement table as necessary (paragraph 4.3.5).</p>
50281	Omission	Object	Land east of Highbridge Road, Colden Common (SHLAA site 1874) should be included in a revised policy CC1	A number of representations make comments on

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>with up to 70 dwellings allocated on the northern part of the site and informal recreation on the southern field. This site is the most appropriate strategy to accommodate housing growth at Colden Common, to replace or supplement the Sandyfields site, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is contained by the triangle formed by Main Road, Highbridge Road and Church Lane; is physically and visually separated from the open countryside and the settlement form of Colden Common would be respected. ▪ The future residents would not be physically severed from the settlement by a busy road. ▪ The site is located adjacent to the shops and primary school which are the main facilities within Colden Common and would be readily accessible to the future residents. ▪ The site can provide the opportunity to deliver the type of informal open space required to meet a demonstrable need within Colden Common. 	<p>the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50282	Omission	Object	<p>The Main Road site (SHLAA site 2494) should be preferred to the Sandyfields site to meet part of the housing requirement (31 dwellings) at Colden Common based on assessment of the evidence base.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transport Assessment: Main Road and the wider road network can accommodate the amount of traffic that the development would generate without giving rise to highway capacity or safety concerns. ▪ Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment: development of this site would be entirely consistent with the surrounding urban fringe land uses and not have a significant impact on the wider landscape setting of the village and the SDNP. ▪ Ecological assessment and surveys identified potential for protected species: mitigation measures are proposed to protect these, hedgerows and trees. ▪ Development can be set back into the site behind new landscaping along the site's frontage to minimise impact on the setting of the listed buildings across the road. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
50282	Omission	Object	<p>Developing the site (SHLAA site 1870) on the northern edge of the village with frontage onto Lower Moors Road for 45 dwellings should be a preferred option to contribute towards meeting Colden Common's housing requirements. It will not give rise to any unacceptable adverse impact because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Transport Statement demonstrates that Highbridge Road and the wider road network can accommodate the amount of traffic expected to be generated from the development without giving rise to highway capacity or safety concerns. ▪ A management plan for the non-developed areas (hedgerows, woodland buffer areas, areas of tree planting) is proposed and has the potential to deliver biodiversity enhancement. ▪ A mitigation strategy is identified to ensure there is no net loss to the reptile habitat. ▪ A buffer of open space and additional landscaping is proposed to protect the setting of the 3 listed buildings to the east of the site. ▪ The site represents a logical rounding off and completion of the settlement pattern without visually encroaching into the landscape setting of the village. ▪ It is available and deliverable. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51443	Omission	Object	<p>Policy CC1 should be recast to include about 45 dwellings at Church Lane, Colden Common (SHLAA sites 1871 & 2561). A reduced scale 'Garden Village' concept will be more sustainable than the Sandyfields Site because it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is unaffected by the National Park; ▪ Seeks to address the limited public open space in the south of the village through the provision of a community orchard, allotments and a major new 'country park' (forming a soft southern boundary); and ▪ Is a short (800m) walk to the schools and services with the only main road to cross being Church Lane. ▪ We will provide a safe pedestrian crossing point and possibly some related traffic calming measures which 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>would also slow traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visibility splays are good. ▪ The existing footpath and cycleway network to the south would be used to join and better connect with the centre of the village, allowing easier access to the open countryside and services (including two pubs and employment) on the southern outskirts of Colden Common. ▪ The land is generally free from environmental and ecological constraints. ▪ Very few properties will be affected directly. 	
51558	Omission	Object	<p>A second allocation policy should be included in the plan for a smaller allocation at the Glenpark site (SHLAA site 2389) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More than one site should be allocated to accommodate the housing requirement for Colden Common to provide flexibility with a greater spread of sites contributing to the overall requirement. ▪ The Plan provides no buffer should any deliverability come into question. ▪ Our ecological surveys suggest that although the site is a designated SINC parts would be suitable for development and could accommodate around 15-20 dwellings. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51605	Omission	Comment	<p>A petrol station is needed on the old Sandyfields Nursery site at Colden Common.</p>	<p>No comments or evidence of need for a filling station at Colden Common have been provided by fuel retailers.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
	Map 2		Colden Common Policies Map	
51369	Map 2	Support	<p>The proposal to amend the current settlement boundary to include SHLAA site 2499 and those back gardens that also adjoin the Jardini dwelling.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
51874	Map 2	Object	<p>The site comprising Clayfield Park Homes Ltd and land at Avondale Park - including further land (additional land to the north giving a combined site area of approximately 2.33ha) as indicated on the submitted plan - should be</p>	<p>As there is no need to make an allocation for sites within the existing settlement boundary - see response to omission objection 51874 above – there is no need to show this site on the policies</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			shown on the policies map to ensure that the site is safeguarded for future development.	map. Recommended Response: No change required.
51369, 51500	Map 2	Object	The settlement boundary should not be changed to include SHLAA site 2497, the rear gardens to properties along the east side of Main Road in the NE corner of the village. This rural area is currently important mature back garden space backing onto a designated SINC area. Change to the settlement boundary here is totally unnecessary and could lead to backland development – ‘garden-grabbing’ by the back door - which would change the rural outlook to the gateway to the village at this point.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51558	Map 2 (and Settlement Boundary Review)	Object	The settlement boundary for Colden Common should be further amended to incorporate the land adjacent to Glen Park (Site 2389). This would represent a logical extension to the settlement and provide the Authority with flexibility to facilitate the housing requirements for the settlement.	See also the response to omission objection ref. no. 51558 above. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations / settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Appendix 2

Kings Worthy - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
	4.4.1 – 4.4.15		Introductory Paragraphs	
51618	4.4	Comment	Object to building of houses on Top Field, Hook Pitt Farm Lane, Kings Worthy due to: traffic impact; flooding, loss of land used by wildlife and for informal recreation.	<p>The Council is in the process of exploring the opportunity to bring this site into public ownership, securing its future. A public consultation event was held on 23 February and the responses are currently being assessed. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations / settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51449	4.4.6	Object	The exception site at Hookpit Farm should be included in the housing requirement, as this would remove the need to allocate another site. Kings Worthy is in danger of becoming an over developed suburb of Winchester and losing its semi-rural character.	<p>25 Dwellings have been granted planning permission at Hookpit Farm, under policy CP4 (Affordable Housing on Exception Sites to Meet Local Needs). Policy CP4 states that such developments are 'in addition to general housing provision in Policy CP1', hence they are not included when calculating housing supply.</p> <p>Para 4.4.5 specifically refers to the need to ensure that all development should be appropriate in scale and design so as to conserve the settlement's identity, countryside setting and local features. The settlement gap between Kings Worthy and Winchester is protected under Policy CP18. Para 4.4.2 also acknowledges that there are large number of trees in Kings Worthy which contribute to its very</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				'green' semi-rural/suburban appearance. Recommended Response: No change required.
50967 51186	4.4.7	Comment	Consider land behind Tesco Express and the HCC site at The Grove for redevelopment for housing purposes.	Neither of these sites are identified in the SHLAA. However, given their location within the settlement boundary, any proposals for redevelopment would be considered under Policy DM1. Recommended Response: No change required.
50770, 51186, 51599	4.4.7/4.4.8	Object	<p>If existing SHLAA sites at Cornerways (site 2509) and Tudor Way (site 329) are developed they are of significant size and could bring forward all necessary housing as windfall without the need to develop outside the current envelope. Road access onto Tudor Way/Springvale Road is sub-standard with no pavement and poor street lighting. Mature trees in this area form an important visual break and closure of the gap between Abbots Worthy and Kings Worthy should be avoided.</p> <p>The Plan should include a specific statement that makes it clear that small infill sites will make a contribution to the housing target for Kings Worthy.</p>	<p>Para 4.4.7 of the Plan makes it clear that given the presumption in favour of development within the built up area (Policy DM1) these sites do not need to be formally allocated in this plan and an allowance has been included within the housing requirement for Kings Worthy that assumes they will be developed. With regard to the site specific comments made, these matters will be taken into consideration when detailed proposals are presented for consideration on these sites.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.8 specifically refers to unidentified 'windfall' sites and the last sentence states that "<i>Any such proposals will continue to be considered on their individual merits against current policies and, where approved, will provide flexibility in maintaining the supply of housing in the village</i>". This clarifies that, where windfall sites come forward, they will contribute to the housing supply of Kings Worthy.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
KW1		Lovedon Lane Housing and Open Space Allocation		
50022 (Kings Worthy PC), 50773, 50790, 50811, 50824, 50835, 50840, 50845, 50846, 50855, 50862, 51043, 51044, 51058, 51093,	KW1	Support	<p>Support the development of the Lovedon Lane site.</p> <p>This site represents the wishes of the majority of residents, the scale and location is proportionate and offers the Parish considerable benefits.</p> <p>The site will provide well designed high quality, eco-</p>	Support welcomed. The developers promoting the site were invited to exhibit options for the site alongside the Local Plan exhibition. Comments on the options were to be sent to the site promoters, so most responses on the Local Plan have not specified which option they are commenting on, but refer in general to support for development in this location.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51127, 51387, 51581, 51599 51838 51678 50815 50863			friendly housing; more open space and pitches and links with Eversley Park; better transport access both locally and to major roads and avoids adding extra vehicular movements into the centre of Kings Worthy and is within walking distance of a bus route. This site has less impact on wildlife and performs highly when assessed against the site selection criteria. The site is well related to existing facilities. Given the flooding in the village last year, this site is the only one that should be considered for development. Support development of this site particularly option 2a Support development of this site particularly option 2b. Support option 2.	
50967	KW1	Comment	Offsite improvements such as lighting and reprofiling the Lovedon Lane junction would be necessary to ensure the safety of users. It would also be an opportunity to improve the cycle link from here to join the 'footway' alongside the A33 which is used as a cycle path regularly.	Policy KW1 and para 4.4.18 recognise the need for highway improvements and for the provision of safe vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access and links with the village centre. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50105 (South Downs National Park)	KW1	Comment	The open space at Lovedon Road adjoins the national park and this should be recognised in the text and a specific development requirement to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on the landscape on the national park.	Paragraph 4.4.12 refers specifically to the development of this site minimising its impact on the landscape and Gap. Given that the South Downs National Park runs along the A33 at the southern edge of the site and southern Kings Worthy it is considered appropriate that the policy and accompanying text is amended to reflect this (assuming this policy is retained). A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: Policy KW1 and paragraph 4.4.12 (if retained), amend to include

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				reference to the need to avoid detrimental impacts on the South Downs National Park (detailed wording will be reported back to a future meeting).
50175	KW1	Comment	This proposal results in the loss of a playing field, it is necessary to ensure that this facility is relocated as close to the existing playing field and pitches.	<p>Policy KW1 specifically refers to the need to provide green infrastructure and open space which includes replacement sports pitches. Para 4.4.16 also refers to the provision of replacement recreation provision. The consultation on options for the area indicated a strong preference for locating development so as to avoid the loss of existing pitches. Therefore, policy KW1 (if retained) is likely to require some revision, but any loss of recreational facilities will be more than adequately replaced by a substantial proportion of the site being laid out for various types of open space, both formal and informal.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50820 ,51503, 51839, 51840,	KW1	Object	There should be the opportunity to establish a purpose built community facility for use by a number of community groups within Kings Worthy. Particularly, with the number of young people in Kings Worthy growing there is a need to provide facilities which benefit the development of the younger community. Discussions are being held with the Parish Council about replacing the existing scout hall which is old and too small. The policy as drafted prevents any community building being brought forward as part of the development proposals. Development of this site provides an ideal opportunity to bring together community facilities and the provision of a purpose built facility, to provide long term stability to a range of organisations which exist in Kings Worthy.	Policy KW1 does not include a specific requirement for additional community facilities as part of this development, although there is reference to 'other facilities' under the first element of the policy covering 'nature and phasing of development'. Similarly, para 4.4.14 refers to improvements of other facilities or financial contributions will be secured through planning obligations where this is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The 2014 Built Facilities Assessment concluded that there was no key sports facility in Kings Worthy and that the scout hut was in poor condition, although it did acknowledge that given proximity to Winchester there was limited need to provide additional facilities locally. A number of representations make comments

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				<p>on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50084 (English Heritage)	KW1	Object	<p>This site lies within an area of high archaeological potential relating to iron age/roman settlement. New criteria should be added to the policy under the heading of 'heritage' or 'archaeology' to read " preparation of a comprehensive archaeological assessment to define the extent and significance of any archaeological remains and provide for their preservation or recording as appropriate".</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50090 (Southern Water)	KW1	Object	<p>SW have undertaken an assessment of infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposed development. That assessment reveals that :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is currently sufficient capacity in the sewerage network to accommodate the proposed development; • underground sewerage infrastructure needs to be taken into account when designing the development and an easement width of 6 metres would be required; • the site is within a groundwater Source Protection Zone, the area requires a high level of protection to safeguard public water supplies. <p>Request that the policy is amended under infrastructure bullet to include <i>“provide future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</i> <i>- must ensure that groundwater sources are protected to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency.”</i></p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50808, 50866 51000, 51091	KW1	Object	<p>Kings Worthy has had its fair share of development. There is no requirement for 50 dwellings on a greenfield</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Kings Worthy has a high level of existing permissions and SHLAA sites compared to</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
51186, 51199 51265, 51268 51299, 51446 51449			site, the balance required is 22. Brownfield sites are available in the village.	<p>most other villages and is the only MTRA2 settlement where the windfall assessment concludes that a windfall allowance should be made. These sites will typically be 'brownfield'. Whilst the housing requirement table (para 4.4.6) suggests Kings Worthy needs to find land for an additional 22 dwellings to meet its 250 requirement, it has been necessary for this to be increased so as to secure substantial open space provision and the long term protection of the gap, and this will provide flexibility to avoid full reliance on windfall sites.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50784, 50808 50976, 50985 51018, 51066, 51089, 51091 51095, 51186 51199, 51265 51268, 51299 51380, 51446 51449	KW1	Object	<p>The earlier consultation was flawed as that was for 20 houses not the 50 now proposed. Benefits of additional land and a community building have been exaggerated. The proposed allocation for 50 dwellings does not reflect the views of local people and makes a mockery of the consultation process. Only a small proportion of the village participated and the allocation of the site should not have been through a simple voting process. Immediate neighbours to the site should have been specifically notified of the changes in numbers.</p> <p>Given the changes in the proposals this must be subject to further consultation. The hundreds of pages of documents act as a disincentive for anyone to spend the time to investigate what is actually being proposed</p>	<p>Since early 2013 WCC has been engaged with local communities to identify suitable sites for the allocation in LPP2. This proactive engagement has increased understanding of the need and benefit to allocating sufficient land for development to provide certainty over the plan period. The need to propose the allocation of greenfield sites of varying scales in each of the MTRA2 settlements has inevitably led to some local controversy, either from the promoters of unsuccessful competitor sites, local residents, or both. Proposals can change in response to new evidence and the draft Local Plan has now been subject to further consultation. The allocation of sites in LPP2 has followed a robust process which takes account of both technical evidence and community participation. Para 4.4.14 refers to the extensive evidence base developed through the preparation of the Plan, which in the case of Kings Worthy has identified the need for open space provision for all types, apart from sports pitches. The allocation of land at Lovedon Lane provides this need to be realised given its location adjacent to existing recreation provision. The level of housing has been increased since the early consultation so as to achieve this recreation provision and the long term protection of the gap, by ensuring that substantial</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				<p>land within the Kings Worthy / Abbots Worthy settlement gap will be provided as open space. The allocation of this site has received support from the Parish Council and others, but a number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
<p>50808, 50809, 50770, 50784, 50881,50967, 51000, 51018, 51066, 51089, 51091, 51095, 51186, 51199, 51265, 51268, 51299,51380, 51446, 51449, 51503, 51678, 51703 51789, 51839, 51840</p>	<p>KW1</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Object to the proposed development for the following reasons :-</p> <p><u>Traffic/access</u> – (comments made by 16 respondents) - which is via one of the main approach roads to the village and development will create a negative visual impact on the area; impact on A33 junction; increased congestion, noise and pollution; Lovedon Lane is too narrow to accommodate more traffic; reduce speed limit; distance to nearest bus stop/an additional bus stop will be required; will require additional parking for Eversley Park; consideration should be given to an additional access to the site from Loader Close to alleviate traffic flows and parking issues; access to the allotments should not be via Hinton House Drive; lack of parking for allotment users and users of the sports facilities</p> <p><u>Impact on the ‘gap’</u> – (comments made by 12 respondents) the site is in a prominent location in the strategic gap; the existing gap should be retained; should not build on Eversley Park; what guarantees are there that the revised gap will not be handed over for development in the future;</p> <p><u>Character of village</u> – (comments made by 8</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations / settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>respondents) too many houses proposed; too high density; should be no public areas adjoining existing housing; destruction of hedgerows and trees; will urbanise this part of the village; visual impact; should not build on this open space; its location as a rural fringe development and proximity to the national park should dictate the site layout and appearance</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u> – (comments made by 6 respondents) impact on school places; site is too far from services; run off from the site will cause flood risk; lack of range of shops.</p>	
51461	KW1	Object	There is over reliance on one site so another should be allocated. Promote SHLAA site (500) land at Woodlands Farm	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51465	KW1	Object	Land at Lovedon Lane (SHLAA site 365) is not the most sustainable location for residential development. It scored less well than site 2508 in terms of proximity to local facilities, and when considered in terms of other SA objectives. The Council has given more weight to the community consultation than to its own evidence base with a risk that other factors have been put above the SA objectives in coming to the conclusion that this site is the most appropriate location for development.	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51703	KW1	Object	Preference for Top Field (Site 2506) or the brownfield site by the demolished house (Site 2508).	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				<p>addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51715	KW1	Comment	<p>Object to alternative sites.</p> <p>SHLAA Site 500: access from Tudor Way will result in traffic at junction with Springvale Road which has very restricted visibility and add traffic to other difficult junctions in the locality.</p> <p>SHLAA Site 364: less problematic but junction of Lovedon Lane with A33 will need major improvement. Both need improvement to sewerage and electricity supply.</p>	<p>This representation refers to alternative sites that are not being promoted through the Local Plan. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
Map 6		Kings Worthy Policies Map		
51387	Map 6	Object	<p>Support the allocation in Policy KW1, but request that Draft Policies Map 6 be amended, to reflect the outcome of consultation on two housing options for the envelope of the site. The strong community preference was for Option 2 which avoids any development of the park with a housing area that wraps around the current boundary.</p>	<p>Comment noted – it will be necessary to determine the extent of built development required under Policy KW1 (if retained), to revise the policy, and to ensure that the policies map correctly reflects any subsequent allocation. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51503	Map 6	Object	<p>The delineation of the settlement boundary (Policy DM1) on Map 6 constrains the area that could be considered for new built development in an unduly restrictive</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			manner. This fails to consider positively the opportunity for the village to secure the most appropriate location, layout and mix of uses within the wider KW1 allocation. The delineation of the boundary with the Local Gap boundary must be reconsidered in the context of the ongoing masterplanning work for the site.	alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
OMISSION		Kings Worthy Site / Policy Omissions		
50770	OMISSION	Object	SHLAA Site 500 - mention should be added of it being an important open space.	Site 500 is a SHLAA site and not suggested for development in the draft Plan. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50807	OMISSION	Object	Promote land at Top Field for residential development - an area of some 8 Ha with access off Hookpit Farm Lane, Kings Worthy, adj to recent development of 25 affordable dwellings. That development lies to the north of Top Field and would provide access to any further residential development. This site should be allocated as there is an over reliance on one site being delivered; over estimate of windfall; unreliable supply. The consultation in relation to KW1 is unsound as it was misleading and confusing for the public. WCC are proceeding on a fundamentally flawed basis in respect of Kings Worthy for the following reasons: First, the KW1 allocation of 50 dwellings and the accompanying settlement boundary will result in a severe constraint on	Whilst this site is not being promoted for development in the local plan, the Council is in the process of exploring the opportunity to bring this site into public ownership, securing its future. A public consultation event was held on 23 February and the responses are currently being assessed. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			market and affordable housing in one of WCC's most sustainable settlements. The Authorities approach does not accord with the NPPF paragraph 47. The draft LPP2 documents do not provide a housing trajectory that meets the requirement of the fourth bullet point of paragraph 47 of the NPPF. WCC approach to addressing the under delivery of housing does not accord with the second bullet point of NPPF paragraph 47. The NPPF does not offer the option favoured by WCC of making up the under delivery over the plan period. The chosen allocation at KW1 has multiple flaws at a technical and practical planning level.	to a future meeting.
51373	OMISSION	Object	Abbots Worthy should be included within the settlement of Kings Worthy as it is part of the built development. This would give the opportunity to make a case for an extra care development of 63 dwellings as part of the allocation of the 250 dwelling allocated for Kings Worthy. It should not be considered separately just because it's in the SDNP and separated by the A33.	Kings Worthy falls under Policy MTRA2 of LPP1 due to a combination of its size and level of facilities. This is not the case for Abbots Worthy which falls under Policy MTRA 3 and within the South Downs National Park. Development in Abbots Worthy is not precluded by Policy MTRA3 but needs to be in accordance with the requirements of the policy. As the area falls within the South Downs National Park it will in due course be covered by the policies of the National Park Local Plan, currently in preparation. Recommended Response: No change required.
51449, 51465	OMISSION	Object	Consideration should be given to the Kings Worthy House site (2508) which is behind the Cart and Horses public house - at least part of that site is brownfield. A contained development of this site would have far less impact on the rural boundaries and outlook from Kings Worthy, could preserve the settlement gap as currently exists, would put the scrubland to better use and improve amenity by landscaping the settlement gap. The site is well related to existing community facilities. A new access road, following the old drive, could be provided as part of the changes need to re-layout the	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations / settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			Cart and Horses junction.	to a future meeting.
51461	OMISSION	Object	Allocate land at Woodlands Farm for residential development to include: Up to 100 dwellings; significant POS; setting and interpretation gains for the SAM; opportunities to strengthen local pedestrian links; integration with the existing pattern of development; convenient location in terms of facilities. The area proposed for development is well related to the form of the settlement and extends no further westwards than the existing housing at Springvale Avenue and Bentley Close. The site occupies the lower slopes of the valley and has the benefit of a frontage on to Springvale Road.	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Appendix 3

Swanmore - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
	4.5.1 – 4.6.14		Introductory Paragraphs	
50932	4.6	Object	Development should be directed to larger areas that have the infrastructure to support it, rather than Swanmore	The Local Plan Part 1 sets the housing target of 250 dwellings for Waltham Chase, taking account of infrastructure provision, and this has been statutorily adopted following consultation and examination. Recommended Response: No change required.
50921, 51337	4.6.3	Object	Object to the amount of housing being planned, particularly when combined with development at neighbouring villages. Object to increase in traffic that will result on inadequate roads. Infrastructure, facilities and services are already stretched and cannot cope with the proposed level of development.	The adopted strategy as set out in DS1 of Local Plan Part 1 outlines the distribution of the required amount of housing across the District up to 2031. Policy MTRA 2 further specifies a target of about 250 dwellings in Swanmore and Waltham Chase and 500 in Bishops Waltham throughout the Plan period. The strategy was developed following consideration of the relative sustainability and suitability of settlements for future development. The Local Plan Inspector considered the soundness of this strategy and Local Plan Part 1 has now been statutorily adopted following consultation and examination. Development of the sites identified will require improvements to infrastructure where this is considered necessary and deliverable, as specified in the specific site allocations and delivered as part of the resulting planning applications. In relation to the Settlement Gap, analysis of potential sites for development within Swanmore (including SHLAA sites and the potential for windfall) revealed that it would not be possible to accommodate all the required development within

				<p>the existing settlement boundary. Swanmore is surrounded by Settlement Gaps to the south and west and the South Downs National Park to the east and north, so new greenfield development will be likely to intrude onto one of these areas. Technical analysis and extensive consultation of possible greenfield sites was undertaken to arrive at the preferred development sites.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
50907	4.6.5	Object	<p>Given the area of Swanmore Parish that lies within Winchester District as opposed to that within the SDNP it is unreasonable for the entire housing requirement to be met in this LPP2. This has prevented the Settlement Boundary being expanded into Site 2458 (land south of Dodds Lane) which was clearly highlighted by the extensive Village Survey as being the area which local people see as most appropriate for development, and where the "gap" is under least pressure from surrounding parishes.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
SW1-SW3		All Swanmore Policies		
50105 (South Downs National Park)	SW1-SW3	Comment	<p>These sites lie away from the NP boundary and are therefore unlikely to have an adverse impact on the landscape value of the NP.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
51828	SW1-SW3	Object	<p>The amount of housing proposed would put unacceptable pressure on the local road network and be a safety risk, especially when combined with other housing at Waltham Chase and Bishops Waltham. It is not clear that existing facilities and services can cope with the amount of housing proposed.</p>	<p>See response to introductory paragraphs above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
SW1		Swanmore College Housing/Open Space Allocations		
50175 (Sport England)	SW1	Comment	<p>Any master plan must ensure that the replacement sports facility is better than the pitch that is lost.</p>	<p>SW1 requires recreation facilities to improve and replace those being developed for housing. Planning permission has now been granted for this proposal and it is being implemented.</p>

				Recommended Response: No change is required.
50090 (Southern Water)	SW1	Object	Southern Water's assessment of Swanmore's infrastructure reveals that additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development. Proposed amendment add: - 'provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider', to infrastructure part of policy.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51555	SW1	Object	The allocation of significant additional housing to identified sites in Swanmore and Waltham Chase is unsustainable given the lack of local facilities / services / employment opportunities in those settlements. This will lead to significant additional car journeys.	See response to introductory paragraphs and policies SW1-SW3 above. Recommended Response: No change required.
SW2		The Lakes Housing Allocation		
50997	SW2	Support	Support, but concerned that improvements to The Lakes may make it a short cut for traffic to avoid the village centre when travelling between Waltham Chase and Droxford.	Support welcomed. The references to improving The Lakes in policy SW2 relate to pedestrian and cycle improvements, not vehicular access.
51088, 51464	SW2	Support	Best option for development as opposed to other sites (2515, 2443 in Swanmore & 1894 and 2568 in Waltham Chase) for maintaining the gap between Swanmore and surrounding villages. Development here will help maintain the pleasing approach to the village. The plan needs to take account of any effects of the development of SW2 on the travelling community.	Support welcomed. The comment about the effect on the travelling community is noted.
50313	SW2	Support	Support the inclusion of site 340 within the housing allocation for approximately 90 dwellings, open space and other facilities including affordable housing. Specific aspects of the policy that are supported are the access from Hillpound, which minimises the loss of trees and hedgerows, and the landscaping requirements. The developer is willing to make a financial contribution towards the expansion of Swanmore College of Technology and other infrastructure to make the development acceptable in planning terms.	Support welcomed.

50036 (Swanmore Parish Council)	SW2	Comment	Seek assurance that will be no requirement for further development outside of the proposed settlement boundary OR that flexibility is provided by the boundary of site 2505 and Belmont Farm remaining unchanged (outside of the development boundary) provided the SDNPA agrees to relinquish the boundary at site 2458 thereby including it within the settlement boundary.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50083 (Environment Agency)	SW2	Comment	The southern part of the site lies within flood zone 3 and this is reflected in the development criteria, the most vulnerable uses on a site should be steered to the lowest risk area.	Comment noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
51643	SW2	Comment	Existing local roads already suffer from severe congestion. If access to SW2 is at the New Road end it would cause congestion and danger for Swanmore College pupils. There should be no access at New Road, with access from the Droxford Road end only and pedestrian and cycle links to New Road and to the north.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	SW2	Object	The site may contain previously unrecognised archaeological remains. The policy should include additional development criteria under 'heritage' or 'archaeology' to read "preparation of a comprehensive archaeological assessment to define the extent and significance of any archaeological remains and provide for their preservation or recording as appropriate".	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50085 (Natural England)	SW2	Object	This allocation site adjoins two local wildlife sites. Development here is likely to result in one or more of the following effects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct impacts due greater public access 	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2,

			<p>(permitted or otherwise), lighting, noise, etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in management may impact on the features the site is noted for, or priority species that are present. • Severance from the wider countryside, prejudicing any future restoration of stronger ecological linkages in the future. <p>Whilst the policy requires the development to “retain, improve and manage the Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) as Natural Green Space”, it is not clear whether this can be done whilst at the same time providing a net gain for biodiversity. It is not clear whether the SINCs will become Public Open Space, and if so how this can and will be reconciled with the likely best management requirement for the SINC, namely involving grazing. Advise the following wording is added to the policy: “- ensure no net detriment to biodiversity (including habitat isolation and fragmentation) through onsite and, if necessary, offsite measures”.</p>	<p>further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50090 (Southern Water)	SW2	Object	<p>Additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development. Existing sewerage and surface water infrastructure needs to be taken into account when designing the proposed development and an easement would be required. Provide future access to the existing sewerage and surface water infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. Proposed amendment add to policy: “provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider”.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50313	SW2	Object	<p>Support allocation but the policy has unacceptable aspects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is not possible to provide an overall masterplan for the whole housing allocation - not all the land within the allocation would be likely to come forward for development at the same time. • Alternatively each element of the development 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will</p>

			<p>should demonstrate how it does not prejudice the development of the wider allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may not be possible to provide footpath/cycleway links through the site due to the 2 SINC's. • Alternatively a financial contribution could be provided towards the upgrading of The Lakes public footpath • The developer should not be required to retain, improve or manage either of the two SINC's - they should remain the responsibility of the landowners. • If deemed necessary and appropriate a financial contribution could be sought towards their management. 	be reported back to a future meeting.
51555	SW2	Object	The allocation of significant additional housing to identified sites in Swanmore and Waltham Chase is unsustainable given the lack of local facilities / services / employment opportunities in those settlements. This will lead to significant additional car journeys.	See response to introductory paragraphs and policies SW1-SW3 above. Recommended Response: No change required.
50900, 50921, 51293, 51340, 51343, 51416, 51819, 51521, 51526, 51597, 51626, 51648, 51680	SW2	Object	<p>Object to policy SW2 for the following reasons:</p> <p><u>Flooding and Drainage</u> - The Lakes has a high water table and is waterlogged/prone to flooding. Not suitable for development, development will increase flooding in the area and surrounding. Existing drainage/sewage systems cannot cope (comment by 12 respondents);</p> <p><u>Traffic</u> – Object to increase in traffic. Roads in area are already busy (Hill Pound and New Road referred to). Hillpound is a narrow road and is already over used by HGV vehicles. Area would become more polluted and creating a bottle neck (comment by 9 respondents);</p> <p><u>Road safety concerns</u> - Concern that existing Road (Hill Pound/Gravel Hill) is unsafe, Mislingford Forest Road, Gravel Hill and Cott Street junctions specifically mentioned, difficult to access properties on Hill Pound. These problems will increase with the development</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

proposed. Problems of obtaining safe access into the site from Hill Pound and general pedestrian safety concerns due to development (comment by 7 respondents);

Concerns that parking will overflow onto Hillpound, which is too narrow to allow road side parking (comment by 2 respondents);

Amenity impact on properties opposite the access on Hill Pound due to lights and noise from traffic (comment by 2 respondents);

Access Issues - The Lakes should be used for access, but not made a through road. Martin Close could only be used as access for a small amount of traffic. The Lakes should be tarmacked and made up with pavement and street lighting. A roundabout on New Road, near village hall on proposed green area to ease congestion on New Road (comment by 9 respondents);

Settlement Gap – Development should not intrude on the Gap between Swanmore and Waltham Chase. Other areas to the north east and on the other side of Lower Chase Road could have been chosen in preference (comment by 5 respondents);

Biodiversity – Concern over effects on the stream on the site that feeds into River Hamble that could adversely impact the wetland flora and fauna of The Moors and the Hamble. Development would have an impact on wildlife in the area – otters (River Hamble), deer, snowy and other owls. Wildlife-rich hedgerow on both sides of the Lakes and along perimeter of the field at Hill Pound should be retained. TPOs should be placed on large mature trees in the area (comment by 5 respondents);

Character – Effect of development on rural character of the approach to the village. Development would be out of character with existing development in the vicinity. Housing should be in keeping with housing opposite on Hill Pound; family-sized housing, low height buildings set back from the road (comment by 4 respondents);

			<p><u>Infrastructure/Facilities/Services</u> – Swanmore does not have adequate public transport, education, health, broadband services, local sewage and drainage systems (comment by 4 respondents);</p> <p><u>Suitable Housing</u> – high cost of dealing with drainage issues will reduce viability and there is a concern that lower quality, higher density housing will be a result, with little affordable housing provided (comment by 3 respondents);</p> <p><u>Landscape</u> - Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal shows the site is a highly sensitive location. Impact on visual amenity from the PRow (comment by 2 respondents);</p> <p><u>Other</u> - The site is also under a power line and pylons, which could cause health risks (comment by 1 respondent).</p>	
50943	SW2	Object	<p>Effect of development on neighbouring paddock - security issues, noise, disruption and possible trespass issues. Propose use of land for housing, as will no longer be suitable as a paddock. (No site plan or further details provided).</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50907	SW2	Object	<p>As the development of SW1 for 70 houses is almost halfway to the 2031 building target, development of The Lakes should be delayed to see if the dense development of SW1, actually works in practice in this rural area. If it proves acceptable, then the Lakes will provide the space required to meet the quota, without further destroying the character of the village. Otherwise discussions with the SDNP will be required to bring forward site 2458 in order to respect the gap between</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

			Swanmore and Waltham Chase.	
51416	SW2	Object	Object to one big soul-less housing estate with many houses and no room. lots of smaller developments of family properties dotted around the village would be better.	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51519	SW2	Object	Swanmore is a rural village, on the periphery of the national park, the housing has just been put anywhere, without constructive examination of the actual impact, and consideration of more suitable sites	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51521	SW2	Object	Object to the development of the sites making up SW2. This number of houses is large, question the need for them and the interpretation of the results of consultation on the various 'quadrants'. Not all of the site was included in the quadrant which had the most positive responses.	<p>The representation refers to the consultation exercise undertaken by Swanmore Parish Council, The sites proposed in Draft Local Plan Part 2 arose following considerable technical assessment of the planning merits of the various sites as well as consideration of the results of the Parish Council's consultation. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will</p>

				be reported back to a future meeting.
51597	SW2	Object	<p>Illegally established travellers site on the southern boundary of The Lakes, a high tension power line an pylons and an often fast flowing open stream. These points all add to the unsuitability of areas 340 and 2464 for housing for young families.</p> <p>The development plans for Areas 340 and 2464 would have a serious detrimental impact on the amenity and value of our home with no benefit or compensation, financial or otherwise.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51680	SW2	Object	Development will result in a loss of rural view from property	<p>The preservation individual views cannot be considered under planning policy</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
SW3		Lower Chase Road Open Space Allocation		
50036 (Swanmore Parish Council)	SW3	Support	Support if a legal agreement is arranged between HCC, WCC, SPC and the landowner to deliver an accessible area for the overall benefit to Swanmore residents.	Support is welcomed. Policy SW3 requires the provision of public open space.
51731	SW3	Comment	Support SW3 in principle. The site is available and achievable. The site is within the defined Gap, but not designated for landscape or ecological value and is well related to the settlement. The detail of the policy is over-prescriptive; it should not specify the location or extent of the housing area. Policy should not specify amount of units, but refer to 'limited' housing, on the assumption this would be up to 10 units. Policy should allow for uses such as a care home. The 'landscape' and 'infrastructure' requirements are not necessary as they are covered by other policies (revised wording for SW3 suggested).	<p>Support is welcomed. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50897, 50907, 50933, 50934, 51088, 51207, 50412, 51555	SW3	Object	<p>Object to policy SW3 for the following reasons:</p> <p><u>Character</u> – Proposal would overdevelop the village by fringe development. Proposal is out of character with the surrounding area, which has individual chalet style properties, bounding fields. Density would be out of character, should be for one dwelling only (comment by 3</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the</p>

			<p>respondents).</p> <p><u>Gap</u> - Object to development within the Settlement Gap (comment by 2 respondents).</p> <p><u>Open Space</u> – Object to open space for recreation - too small, bound on three sides by residential - safety concerns for users and security concerns for residents. Sufficient open space nearby. Shortage of allotments in area. Support idea of use of site as allotments (comment by 2 respondents).</p> <p><u>Footpath access</u> - Dangerous access point – road narrow and without street lights (comment by 1 respondent);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old site of Singleton Farm suffers from very poor drainage, and contains a well (comment by 1 respondent); • The proposed housing could prove difficult to sell because of the noise and proximity to the new sports provision on SW1 (comment by 1 respondent); • Sufficient housing could be allocated within the SW2 sites (comment by 1 respondent); • Support no development of SHLAA site 2449. This is tranquil farmland and part of wildlife corridor and settlement gap to Bishops Waltham (comment by 1 respondent). 	<p>most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51555	SW3	Object	<p>The allocation of significant additional housing to identified sites in Swanmore and Waltham Chase is unsustainable given the lack of local facilities / services / employment opportunities in those settlements. This will lead to significant additional car journeys.</p>	<p>See response to introductory paragraphs and policies SW1-SW3 above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
Map 18		Swanmore Policies Map		
50313	Map18	Support	<p>Support for the inclusion of the land under option to Barratt David Wilson Homes (site 340) within the housing allocation covered by Policy SW2.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
51207	Map18	Comment	<p>SDNP boundary should be reviewed with the aim of assessing the suitability of the area south of Dodds Lane for housing allocation. A small amendment to the boundary would provide space for a significant number of</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an</p>

			properties with little impact on the character of the rest of the village. This area has near access, along footpath recently created from Cobbet's Close, to the centre of the village, is in walking distance to the primary school and church.	alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51124	Map 18	Object	From the Parish consultation exercise, why have areas E & F been allocated, despite being liable to flooding and large numbers of respondents preferring the more central areas of L & K? Why does SDNP extend into part of area L & K which is surrounded by housing?	The representation refers to the consultation exercise undertaken by Swanmore Parish Council, The sites proposed in Draft Local Plan Part 2 arose following considerable technical assessment of the planning merits of the various sites as well as consideration of the results of the Parish Council's consultation. The boundary of the SDNP cannot be altered by LPP2. Recommended Response: No change required.
51800	Map 18	Object	Object to settlement boundary change, bringing in SHLAA sites 2001 & 2447. Threeways, Chapel Rd, would be surrounded by development on two sides. A new access onto Chapel Rd would be too dangerous.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50036 Swanmore Parish Council)	Map18	Object	The settlement boundary with respect to SHLAA sites 2001 and 2447 should match the existing settlement boundary and the SDNP boundary changed to bring in line with that boundary.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the

				most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51104	Map18	Object	Object to settlement boundary review between Chapel Road and Droxford Road. (Settlement Boundary Review Background Paper map ref 4). Paragraph 20 of the background paper states that it is unnecessary to release small sites outside the settlement boundary. Alignment with SDNP boundary appears to be contrary to guidance in paragraph 21, which states that adjustments should not be made just for neatness. May lead to undesirable small backland development here and elsewhere in the village, when large sites have already been set aside for development more in accord with local views. Access to site would be needed from Chapel Road, which is a dangerous junction location. Implications for pedestrian and vehicle safety.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51444	Map18	Object	Settlement boundary should be amended to include land to the rear of Greenfields Lodge (part SHLAA site 2514 as shown on map supplied) as a logical rounding off. The land is available, was rated as excellent access in the transport assessment and can be accessed without demolition of Greenfields Lodge. It meets the criteria in paragraph 2.33 of LPP2.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51832	Map 18 / Gap	Object	Object to the lack of a detailed review of settlement gaps, which have only been amended where sites have been allocated for development. A 'Gap Analysis' report has been produced (details provided) which shows that development of land at Lower Chase Road, Swanmore would not visually damage the Gap or cause	The principle of a Gap between Swanmore, Bishops Waltham, etc is established in Local Plan Part 1 (policy CP18). In defining the detailed boundaries of Gaps, the approach adopted consistently across the District is to define all the land between the

			coalescence and recommends the gap should be redrawn.	<p>respective built-up areas. This approach is continued in the draft LPP2, even if it may be possible to argue that not every parcel of land within the defined area contributes to the Gap. The land referred to in this objection is outside the built-up area of Swanmore and has not been allocated following an assessment of development needs and potential sites. There is, therefore no reason to review the Gap in this location or to depart from the consistent approach to defining Gaps, namely of making them contiguous with the built-up areas they separate.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
OMISSION		Swanmore Site / Policy Omissions		
50291	OMISSION	Object	<p>Land adjacent to Cobbett Close comprises 1.34ha within the SDNP area adjacent to the settlement boundary, and relates well to the built up area. Access for up to 30 dwellings is achievable via Cobbett Close. The exclusion from a comprehensive site assessment and consultation process because of the location in the SDNP is flawed and unjustified, the site can and should be identified in LPP2 even if its allocation is through a SDNP Local Plan. The site is more sustainable, and was preferred by the public through consultation. The site is sequentially preferable on flood risk grounds and more accessible to the school and village centre. Winchester's landscape appraisal rated the site as less sensitive than the proposed allocation site. Landscape consultants have assessed its impact and indicate that development can be assimilated into a landscape framework which conserves the landscape of the National Park.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

51832	OMISSION	Object	Object to the exclusion of land adjacent to Alexandra Cottage, Lower Chase Road from the Swanmore site allocations and its inclusion in the Settlement Gap (CP18). Consider the site to be infilling. A planning application has been submitted and shows evidence of deliverability. The allocation of site SW3 shows that Lower Chase Road is a suitable location for development. Land adjacent to Alexandra Cottage has not been subject to landscape appraisal. If it had, it is likely to have the same landscape impact as SW3.	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51444	OMISSION	Object	SHLAA site 2514 was dismissed by the Settlement Boundary Review as not available but it is made up of two parcels of land to the rear of Greenfields Lodge, Church Road, Swanmore. Whilst the rear portion of site 2514 (accessed off Bucketts Farm Close) is not available, the remainder of the site (as outlined on the plan supplied) is available, can be accessed without demolition of Greenfields Lodge, is rated excellent for accessibility in the transport assessment and least sensitive in the landscape appraisal. The settlement boundary should be amended to include land to the rear of Greenfields Lodge as a logical rounding off.	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
Consultation		Swanmore Consultation Process		
51343, 51340	Consultation	Object	Object to the process. Questionnaire about areas for development should have been more widely distributed. Only made aware of the initial exhibition after the event. The 'mop up' for the people who missed the event was only during working hours. Interpretation of questionnaire results - how were the responses of the small number of residents who live in quadrant D taken into account when compared to the larger number of respondents in other quadrants? For some areas where the responses for agreement to development were high, but are areas where local councillors/MP live, consideration has been given to these votes being bias by the residents and this	<p>The representation refers to the consultation exercise undertaken by Swanmore Parish Council, WCC considered the merits of various sites available for development, which may not fall strictly within the 'quadrants' which formed part of the Parish Council's consultation. The sites proposed in Draft Local Plan Part 2 are proposed following considerable technical assessment of the planning merits of the various sites as well as consideration of the results of the Parish Council's consultation and as such are considered sound by WCC.</p>

		<p>has been taken into account. I don't even know where my local councillors live and feel if any 'allowances' have been made for this there could be an unfair bias being applied here. Interpretation of quadrant grid - There was a positive result for development in quadrant E, but only a very small positive result in quadrant D. This has not been taken into account as the proposal is to build on land right up to the road side of Hill Pound, which is in quadrant D not quadrant E. The village was broken up into quadrants and votes were taken on those quadrants. Those boundaries should be adhered to if a democratic representation is to used to form local development framework planning</p>	<p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
--	--	--	---

Appendix 4

Waltham Chase - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
WC1- WC4		All Waltham Chase Policies		
51518	WC1-WC4	Object	<p>The scale of the plans for Waltham Chase is massive overdevelopment. The traffic is already extremely heavy at times, with narrow or non-existent pavements, and is unsafe for pedestrians. Traffic uses Curdridge Lane as a rat run, this will only exacerbate with another 300 homes. Winchester Council has failed to stop HGV lorries using Curdridge Lane as a shortcut through the village, despite new signage. The Primary school is full and the catchment area has been reduced so that half the village no longer falls within it. The nearest GP surgery is in Bishops Waltham, waiting times are on average two weeks. If all these areas are built on, then rain water cannot drain away and will result in flooding of the village. Waltham Chase will lose its rural identity and village atmosphere by such a massive development.</p>	<p>The Local Plan Part 1 sets the housing target of 250 dwellings for Waltham Chase and this has been statutorily adopted following consultation and examination. Strategic-level transport assessment was undertaken, along with work on the capacity of local facilities and services, and was taken into account in setting the respective housing targets. The Plan sets out requirements for infrastructure provision/improvement to accommodate the developments and future planning applications for which will need to undertake more detailed assessments, including of the cumulative impacts of traffic generated by development, and implement detailed measures to address this.</p> <p>Recommended Response; No change required.</p>
51072	WC1-WC4	Object	<p>Object to WC1, WC2, WC3, and WC4 and promote an alternative site - Van Diemen's Field - for the following reasons; the site is a suitable, having few constraints and does not compromise the purpose of the strategic gap. Pennyfarthing Homes is a local developer with a track record of delivering high quality schemes; there is a willing landowner so delivery will be rapid; Winchester City Council's consultation with the Parish Council was flawed; as was the Parish Council's consultation on its chosen site. The site assessment prepared by Savills should be considered further by the Council; the site was submitted as a standalone SHLAA site earlier but was misrepresented during the consultation. Question whether the site was properly assessed during the site selection process The Council's summary of constraints in respect of the various sites has errors and omissions. The objector's revised supporting document should be</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			re-considered; the site should be assessed as a standalone site; the Council should revisit its own assessment of sites; the Council should acknowledge the attributes benefits of the proposed alternative site; the Council should consider re-running its consultation in Waltham Chase which used confusing and/or inaccurate information.	
51021, 51801	SHLAA sites 2288 and 2491	Comment	These sites should not be considered for development for the following reasons; road safety impact, loss of amenities for local residents; intrusion into the gap; not in keeping with the rural location; development in the area has previously been resisted by the Council and that approach should be continued	Noted. All available sites were considered, but these sites are not proposals in the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2. However, they are proposed for inclusion in the settlement boundary as a result of the allocation of land north of Clewers Lane (WC2), for which consent has recently been granted. Recommended Response: No change required.
WC1		Morgan's Yard Mixed Use Allocation		
51886, 51092	WC1	Support	In combination with WC2 and WC3, WC1 is the best solution for the village – it will not exceed the capacity of local services and infrastructure, other alternatives are less attractive, and the proposal retains rural character Good access to Winchester Road Convenient for the school Most appropriate site according to the Village Appraisal	Support welcomed.
50085 (Natural England)	WC1	Comment	The site is adjacent to Waltham Chase Meadows SSSI, the policy states “ensure an effective buffer between the development and the adjoining Waltham Chase Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);” As a predominantly brownfield site, this policy appears sufficient to be consistent with the NPPF.	Noted. Recommended Response: No change required
50090 (Southern Water)	WC1	Object	Southern Water has undertaken an assessment of its infrastructure and that assessment reveals that additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development, involving making a connection to the local sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity. SW is not fully funded to provide local sewerage infrastructure as Ofwat	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			expects the company to recover new development and growth costs from developers. Proposed amendment: "Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider" to the infrastructure part of policy.	sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51673, 50331, 51555, 51543	WC1	Object	<p>Object to the policy for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the development will cause traffic congestion of local roads (comment by 2 respondents); lack of local facilities/services/employment opportunities to support the new housing (comment by 2 respondents); housing should be allocated instead to areas with employment opportunities (comment by 2 respondents); the development will cause parking problems in the local area (comment by 1 respondent); the school should not be expanded onto land at Morgan's Yard as it already has a negative impact on the area (comment by 1 respondent); loss of employment land (Comment by 1 respondent). 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50313	WC1	Object	<p>Policy WC1 confirms the mixed use allocation of the site, including about 60 dwellings. The residential element of the allocation is supported in principle, however the reduced capacity, extensive on-site and off-site requirements, and the remedial costs of contamination, prejudices viability. The requirement to provide an on-site extension of the school playing field of between 0.5 and 0.64 hectares and to replicate the existing employment floorspace has a direct impact on the land available for development and viability. It is unclear what other options have been explored to extend the school site. The requirement to re-provide the employment floorspace on the site is because it is one of the 'few significant employment sites in the village', but a proportion of the</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>site is currently vacant, and the remaining uses offer only limited employment. The policy requires the provision of a buffer to the SSSI to the north, the maintenance of existing landscaped boundaries around the site, and provision on site open space that limits the land available for development. Reference is made to contamination, but no evidence is presented to justify this. Notwithstanding this, 40% affordable housing is still expected. In combination, these requirements will make the scheme unviable and should be reduced, with an increase in the residential capacity.</p>	
WC2		Clewers Lane Housing Allocation		
51092	WC2	Support	<p>In combination with WC1 and WC3, WC2 is the best solution for the village – it will not exceed the capacity of local services and infrastructure, other alternatives are less attractive, and the proposal retains rural character</p>	Support welcomed.
51021, 51022, 51113, 51555, 51812, 51886	WC2	Object	<p>Object to WC2 for the following reasons;</p> <p><u>Access/traffic</u> - impact on road safety in Clewers Lane and other local roads including shared-surfaces between pedestrians and vehicles; impact on existing infrastructure including roads; local roads/pavements would need to be improved to facilitate the development of the site; lack of corresponding employment opportunities leading to additional car journeys; employment opportunities are in larger settlements so that is where additional housing should go (comment by 12 respondents);</p> <p><u>Character /loss of amenities</u> - loss of amenity for local residents; overdevelopment of the site; development not in-keeping with the rural location; lack of open space in the scheme; undesirable intrusion into the countryside(comment by 5 respondents);</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response; To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p><u>Local facilities/infrastructure</u> - too much pressure on local schools; in combination with other policies, the proposed 250 dwellings proposed for Waltham Chase is excessive; building more schools will “import” pupils from other areas; development will cause problems with drainage (comment by 5 respondents);</p> <p><u>Nature Conservation</u> - adverse effect on nature conservation/ecology (comment by 2 respondents);</p> <p><u>Impact on the gap</u> - intrusion into the gap in this location (comment by 3 respondents);</p> <p><u>Other</u> - development has previously been resisted by the Council and the circumstances have not changed; the proposed settlement boundary is illogical and inconsistent; feedback from consultation with local people did not demonstrate clear support; the previous local opposition to development should be taken into account; vacant houses across the UK should be occupied before building new housing (comment by 8 respondents).</p>	
51801	WC2	Object	<p>Object to WC2 for the following reasons; the settlement boundary should not be amended to accommodate development; drainage is poor; there is noise from nearby commercial development; Clewers Lane is too narrow to accommodate additional traffic; screening the site will not be sufficient; hedgerows and trees will be lost which will impact wildlife; the development is incompatible with the use of Clewers Lane by horse-riders and cyclists; the Council has resisted development proposals on this site and the circumstances have not changed.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response; To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
WC3		Sandy Lane Housing Allocation		
51092	WC3	Support	<p>In combination with WC1 and WC2, WC3 is the best solution for the village – it will not exceed the capacity of local services and infrastructure, other alternatives are</p>	<p>Support welcomed</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			less attractive, and the proposal retains rural character	
50090 (Southern Water)	WC3	Object	Southern Water has undertaken an assessment of its infrastructure and that assessment reveals that additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development, involving making a connection to the local sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity. SW is not fully funded to provide local sewerage infrastructure as Ofwat expects the company to recover new development and growth costs from developers. Proposed amendment: "provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider" to the infrastructure part of policy.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50285	WC3	Object	Support in principle for the policy but it is unduly prescriptive and greater flexibility should be introduced. Policy WC3 is for about 60 dwellings, this would achieve a gross density of less than 20 dwellings per hectare. Potential site layouts indicate that higher densities could be achieved without harm to the character and appearance of the area, the wider countryside, the sustainability or appearance of the proposed housing or the amenity of residential neighbours. The policy should be amended to provide for about 70 dwellings.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response; To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50349,51205, 51374, 51454 51455, 51518 51555, 51812 51830, 51831 51886,	WC3	Object	Object to Policy WC3 for the following reasons; <u>Access/traffic</u> - local roads and existing road junctions will be overloaded with traffic; existing roads need pavements to be added to make them safe; occupiers of the new housing will have to use cars as there is inadequate public transport; there is no local employment which will result in more car journeys and congestion; rat-runs will be created; increased traffic would cause danger to pedestrians Bull Lane (comment by 13 respondents);	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response; To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p><u>Local facilities/infrastructure</u> - the development will cause drainage/flooding problems; it will damage the operation of the only farm in the village; local services will need to be improved, including doctor's surgeries and dentists; surface drainage is a problem and development will make this worse; if development does take place, additional play areas should not be provided as existing ones are underused; developing on green land increases the risk of flash-floods (comment by 7 respondents);</p> <p><u>Character/loss of amenity</u> - the site is the highest point in the village and development will damage visual amenity; the proposed development site are too close together; the rural character of the village will be lost; development would impact badly on existing properties on Clubhouse Lane; additional road and pedestrian lighting would add to light pollution; traffic noise and other pollution would also spoil the quality of life; the proposed buffer will not prevent the loss of sunlight and privacy into back gardens (comment by 6 respondents);</p> <p><u>Impact on the gap/countryside</u> - to alter the settlement boundary in this location would be contrary to advice in the NPPF in respect of altering the boundaries of established green belts (comment by 3 respondents);</p> <p><u>Nature conservation</u> - Pipistrelle bats live the barns on this site; it is the habitat of bats, badgers, foxes, owls, Red Kite and two species of woodpecker (comment by 2 respondents);</p> <p><u>Other</u> - property prices will be depressed due to the provision of affordable housing in the housing development; housing development has previously been resisted and circumstances have not changed (comment by 5 respondents);</p>	
WC4		Forest Road (North and South) Housing Allocations		
51820, 51793, 51106	WC4	Support	Bargate Homes have promoted both these sites for a number of years. The two sites have been selected as preferred locations for development within the draft	Support welcomed.

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>Local Plan Part 2 as a direct result of discussion with the parish and City councils, and public consultation. The development requirements for both sites will be adhered to where possible when bringing the site forward for development. The sites will also deliver on-site affordable housing at 40%.</p> <p>General support for distributing housing around the village</p> <p>The site reduces the scope for less coordinated, piecemeal development; Forest Road provides a good link road (for example to the A32); existing pavements on Forest Road can be used, improving road safety; good vehicular access to the sites can be achieved from Forest Road; the site to the south of Forest Road is of low quality agricultural value and has poor drainage; development on these sites increases the prospect of providing affordable housing in any development.</p>	
51515	SHLAA site	Comment	The threat of development should also be removed from the site to the south-east of Forest Road (SHLAA site 2432).	<p>Noted. All available sites were considered, but these sites are not proposals in the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
51009, 51515, 51516, 51555, 51695, 51771, 51829, 51793, 51886	WC4	Object	<p>Objection to WC4 for the following reasons;</p> <p><u>Access/traffic</u> (10) - there are no employment opportunities in the area to support the proposed housing, leading to additional car journeys; employment opportunities are in the larger settlements and therefore development should be located in those settlements; there is limited public transport increasing the need for car journeys; some local roads will become rat-runs; the increase in traffic on local roads would be unacceptable; development on Forest Road should include road safety improvements; traffic congestion, particularly at school pick-up time; development will make flooding worse as sites are in EA flood zones 2 & 3; issues with sewage</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response; To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>outflow (comment by 10 respondents);</p> <p><u>Local facilities/infrastructure</u> - the local shops are limited; if affordable housing is developed, the occupiers will be faced with a lack of healthcare, oversubscribed schools, poor public transport, and inadequate local roads; lack of facilities and services in the village to serve new residents (comment by 9 respondents);</p> <p><u>Impact on the gap/countryside</u> - the sites are in the strategic gap separating Waltham Chase and Swanmore, at its narrowest and most sensitive point (comment by 5 respondents);</p> <p><u>Character/loss of amenity</u> - the northern apex of the northern site should be kept free from development and used as green infrastructure or open space (comment by 2 respondents);</p> <p><u>Nature conservation</u> - loss of wildlife habitats; the sites have been designated as sensitive (comment by 2 respondents);</p> <p><u>Other</u> - alternative sites in Waltham Chase, Shirrell Heath, and Shedfield are more suitable for development (comment by 1 respondent).</p>	
50083 (Environment Agency)	WC4	Object	<p>A section of the Lower Chase Stream, designated as main river, runs along the western edge of the site. Would have expected to see criteria in this policy that requires a suitable buffer zone to be left to this channel to allow for maintenance access. Ideally the development layout should be designed so that no gardens back on to this stream to reduce the risk of unauthorised alterations and dumping of waste. We would also expect to see enhancements where possible.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response; To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50085 (Natural England)	WC4	Object	<p>The site is adjacent to Waltham Chase Meadows SSSI which is not mentioned in the policy. Development here is likely to cause harm to that area and this has not been recognised. Suggests additional wording for the policy.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response; To ensure that the</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50090 (Southern Water)	WC4	Object	Southern Water has undertaken an assessment of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposed development. That assessment reveals that additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development, involving making a connection to the local sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity. SW is not fully funded to provide local sewerage infrastructure, as Ofwat, expects the company to recover new development and growth costs from developers. Our assessment also reveals that there are existing foul water sewers and a surface water sewer that need to be taken into account when designing the proposed development. An easement width of 6 metres would be required, which may affect the site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. Proposed amendment - add to infrastructure part of policy – “provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider. Provide future access to the existing foul water and surface water infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response; To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
OMISSION		Waltham Chase Site / Policy Omissions		
50331	OMISSION	Object	The rectangular piece of land that lies to the north of Lower Chase Road and east of Winchester Road, is ideally placed to play a positive part in the delivery of employment opportunities, to balance the incoming residential development. There are employment uses to the west and the northern and eastern boundaries are clearly defined by trees and mature hedges. Vehicular	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2,

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			access is achieved via Winchester Road, and is conveniently located for 4 bus routes. This site is an accessible, sustainable location, and the settlement boundary should be amended to allow employment uses on this site.	further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50963	OMISSION	Object	Land south of Solomon's Lane should be preferred to provide houses, as this area is more sustainably located due its proximity to the school and other village facilities	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51490	OMISSION	Object	Object to the omission of land at Ludwells Farm Waltham Chase for a care facility aimed principally at the elderly. A Care Needs Assessment undertaken by the respondents identifies a current need for 546 extra care beds within Winchester of which 283 beds are within a 5 mile catchment of the site. When assessed against supply there is a shortfall of 290 beds in Winchester and 211 beds within a 5 mile catchment of the site. There is also a need for 1,416 registered care beds within Winchester, of which 593 are within 5 miles of the site. The predicted population growth for 65 and over is expected to increase by 70% between 2010 and 2033 with a 175% increase in those aged 85+. The site provides an opportunity to deliver specialist housing for the elderly. The suitability of the land has already been established through a planning consent for a care facility in July 1990. It is in a	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			sustainable and accessible location and would constitute a natural extension to the north-eastern boundary of Waltham Chase. The NPPF requires local authorities to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends.	
51072	OMISSION	Object	Objecting to the process by which land at Van Diemens Field was considered during the consultation process as part of a larger landholding (1984) rather than as a standalone site as requested by the landowner/agent. This irregularity in the consultation process has prejudiced the landowner. The consultation should be re-run.	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51698	OMISSION	Object	The new housing should be located to the south of the village near to the school, post office, recreation ground and pub.	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Appendix 5

WICKHAM - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
	4.8.1 – 4.8.16		Introductory Paragraphs	
51834	4.8.4	Object	Object to any major development in Wickham – small scale brownfield sites, together with Welborne, are more than enough to meet Wickham’s housing needs.	The Local Plan Part 1 sets the housing target of 250 dwellings for Wickham and this has been statutorily adopted following consultation and examination. Account has been taken of completions, consents, SHLAA sites and windfall potential, but brownfield sites will not provide for the required level of housing and greenfield site allocations are needed. Recommended Response: No change required.
51833	4.8.4	Object	It is misleading to say that the process of selecting appropriate sites represents the views, needs and aspirations of the community. The Plan reflects a Government-imposed house-building quota and there should be a sizeable reduction in the allocation of new homes for Wickham.	The housing target derives from the Local Plan Part 1 (see above), which itself involved considerable community consultation. However, this target is now set. Recommended Response: No change required.
51494, 51835	4.8.5	Comment	There is insufficient local employment in Wickham to meet the requirement that "development should result in a more sustainable community by improving the balance between housing, employment and services." Many new residents will have to travel to work and will inevitably add to congestion.	The ‘Wickham Needs Assessment for LPP2’ set out local views on development needs and considered the need for additional employment land. It did not consider land allocations were necessary, in common with other smaller ‘MTRA2’ settlements. The housing target is, however, a requirement of LPP1 (see above). Recommended Response: No change required.
51535	4.8.9	Support	Support the provision of additional affordable housing as part of new developments in the village.	Support welcomed.
51833	4.8.9	Object	The two sites allocated are not ‘several sites’ so the strategy does not meet the aim of accommodating development over several sites rather than one large site. Other sites should be considered (three or more sites) and phased over a number of years to allow	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the

			infrastructure improvements before the subsequent phase of building work commences.	most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51472	4.8.11	Object	Response to the consultation was minimal, largely because the small leaflet circulated gave the impression that the die was cast together with a paragraph indicating that if the two sites did not go ahead the village could have to accept more homes. The leaflet made no reference to what residents were being asked to contribute or whether they could voice options on the number of sites that should be considered. There was no provision for the participation of the elderly, some of whom have mobility problems and/or do not have access to electronic media.	This representation relates to the consultation on the proposed strategy undertaken in early 2014. The leaflet gave a summary of the proposals and directed people to where they could find further information, including an exhibition. The exhibition was very well attended, including by many elderly people, and was staffed by representatives from the Strategic Planning Team and Parish Council. It is not accepted that the consultation, or the total of 66 written responses received, was minimal. Recommended Response: No change required.
51833	4.8.14	Comment	Wickham Surgery is extremely busy and residents have to wait for an appointment with a named GP. WCC should increase GP provision to cater for the 4,000+ new patients Wickham can expect as a result of the proposed Wickham sites combined with the Welborne development.	The City Council is not responsible for GP provision, but a new surgery has recently been developed in Wickham and the work undertaken on local needs did not identify a need for its expansion or improvement. Recommended Response: No change required.
51833	4.8.16	Object	The Plan takes practically no account of the impact on Wickham of the Welborne development. A full and realistic assessment of the impact of Welborne traffic should be undertaken before building work commences in Wickham and must feature all the developments being proposed by FBC and its neighbours.	The Welborne development forms part of the Partnership for South Hampshire's (PUSH) strategy for South Hampshire, to which the City Council is a signatory. Welborne is a proposal of the statutory Fareham Borough Plan and its development has been taken into account in developing the Local Plan Part 1, which sets the housing target for Wickham. Strategic-level transport assessment was undertaken in relation to both plans and have been taken into account in setting the respective housing targets. The Plans set out requirements for transport measures to accommodate the developments and planning applications for Welborne and Wickham will need to undertake more detailed assessments, including of the cumulative impacts of traffic

				generated by development, and implement detailed measures to address this. Recommended Response: No change required.
WK1 – WK3		All Wickham Policies		
50423, 51794	WK1 - WK3	Support	General support for the proposals for Wickham.	Support welcomed.
50042 (Wickham PC), 51491	WK1 - WK3	Comment	Support for the proposals for Wickham, but concerned about surface water drainage problems and additional traffic / these should be resolved before development takes place.	Support welcomed, see below in relation to drainage and transport issues. Recommended Response: No change required.
50426, 51532, 51710	WK1-WK3	Comment	The additional development being proposed will put too much traffic on the A32 and will separate people from local amenities. The road is already dangerous and development at Welborne will make the position worse. Development should not be permitted until existing drainage and flooding problems have been resolved. Parking in the square is difficult and new development will make it worse.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51354	WK1-WK3	Comment	Road safety, traffic flow and parking problems are not dealt with adequately in the planning process. Cycling should be made safer and more people would cycle.	Transport issues are dealt with in the planning process, including measures to encourage cycling and walking. Measures are included in the relevant site allocations, but detailed transport measures are matters for planning applications. Recommended Response: No change required.
51509	WK1-WK3	Comment	The area is waterlogged and additional development will make the situation worse. The road system/parking facilities already struggle to cope and additional housing will make the situation worse. These issues need to be resolved before any development takes place.	Account is taken of flooding, drainage and transport issues in assessing site allocations and policy requirements are included in relation to drainage (policy WK1) and transport (relevant site allocations). Detailed drainage and transport measures are matters for planning applications. Recommended Response: No change required.
51541	WK1-WK3	Comment	No thought has been given to drainage, roads, shops and parking in the village, nor has the impact of Welborne which will result in additional traffic.	See responses above. Recommended Response: No change required.
50426	WK1 - WK3	Comment	The preferred option of allocating sites north and south of the village was based on historic information and a comprehensive development of one large site would be a better solution. Access to facilities is better from the	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.

			north of the village. Development at the Glebe would be distant from shops and facilities in the village and development at Mill Lane would offer a range of advantages.	Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51023	WK1 - WK3	Comment	Object to the development at Welborne which will make existing traffic, flooding and sewage disposal problems in Wickham worse and will destroy its identity. Say no to Welborne.	See responses above, Welborne is a proposal of the Fareham Local Plan. Recommended Response: No change required.
50394	WK1-WK3	Comment	Development should not be split across 2 sites. The Mill Lane proposal should replace The Glebe development and be combined with the Winchester Road site (1909) which would have many advantages. Traffic is a problem and will get worse with the development proposed.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51322	WK1-WK3	Comment	If development takes place conditions attached to planning permissions related to flood prevention / drainage must be enforced in order that the measures are put in place.	It is agreed that appropriate conditions should be applied to future planning consents and that these should be adequately enforced. The Local Plan enables this. Drainage matters are also subject to the Building Regulations. Recommended Response: No change required.
51488	WK1 - WK3	Comment	Support the Wickham Society response to the consultation and wish the response to be considered as our own response.	Noted. Recommended Response: No change required.
50385	WK1 - WK3	Object	Object to WK1-WK3 because of existing flooding problems which development will make worse.	See responses to policies WK1 – WK3 below. Recommended Response: No change required.
51815	WK1 - WK3	Object	Object to additional housing in Wickham as it will involve the loss of good quality agricultural land and inadequate drainage means that flooding will get worse. No	New site allocations are needed to accommodate the level of housing required by the Local Plan Part 1. Most of the sites that have been promoted

			development should take place unless these problems have been resolved.	for development are agricultural land, but land quality is one of the factors taken into account in the site selection process. For drainage issues, see responses to policy WK1 below. Recommended Response: No change required.
51472	WK1 - WK3	Object	Development on just two sites, which will be completed over an unspecified period, does not conform to residents wishes for development on several sites which would be phased over a period of years. The scale of development and its location on greenfield sites will erode Wickham's identity. The impact on Wickham of the Welborne development has not been properly considered and the increased traffic movements will inflict massive parking pressure on Wickham.	The community's preference for development of several smaller sites was taken into account in the site selection process, but the sites available are generally large sites. The desire for smaller sites had to be balanced with the nature of the sites available and other planning considerations. These include the impact of the proposed sites on the landscape, accessibility, historic environment, etc. Recommended Response: No change required.
51508	WK1 - WK3	Object	Object to additional housing in Wickham as the A32 roundabout is very busy and will get worse even without traffic from Welborne. Development should be concentrated on a single site (the Bloor site) not two separate sites as proposed.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50105 (South Downs National Park)	WK1-WK3	Object	There are two open space and one housing allocation in Wickham that are close to the boundary of the National Park. Specific development requirements are required for these policies to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on the landscape of the National Park. The open space allocation at Winchester Road should incorporate encouraging sensitive access to the Meon Valley Trail.	One of the proposed open spaces adjoins the National Park (Mill Lane) and the other is close to it (The Glebe), although both housing sites are clearly separated from the Park. In terms of a reference to development requirements, Policy CP19 of Local Plan Part 1 refers to the need to ensure that development within and adjoining the SDNP is not harmful, so adequately covers this matter. In the case of the proposed Mill Lane sports site, from which direct access to the Meon Valley Trail (within the National Park) would be beneficial, it is recommended that a suitable reference should be added to policy WK2 (assuming this policy is retained).

				Recommended Response: Policy WK2 (if retained), amend 2 nd bullet point under ‘Access’ to read “provide safe vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access to the sports site in Mill Lane, including parking provision commensurate with the proposed use, <i>and ensuring any access to the adjoining Meon Valley Trail is sensitive to its location in the National Park</i> ”.
WK1		Wickham Drainage Infrastructure		
50083 (Environment Agency)	WK1	Support	Support the inclusion of this policy and pleased to see the positive approach that is being taken to enable development to be delivered whilst taking account of existing drainage issues.	Support welcomed.
50376, 50377, 51494	WK1	Support	Generally support WK1 and the intention to investigate and improve drainage problems. This should be done before any development, with developers required to ensure no greater runoff. This is a major problem in Wickham which should be given high priority for CIL spending.	Support welcomed. See below in relation to development requirements. The comments on priorities for CIL spending are noted, but these are not determined through the Local Plan.
50396, 50399, 51361, 51722	WK1	Comment	The local sewerage system is inadequate and additional development will make the problem worse. Support for the policy but the developer should be required to resolve existing flooding/drainage issues, not just avoid adding to them. Drainage infrastructure must be technically proven to minimise flood risk. CIL should be used to fund drainage works.	Noted, see below. Recommended Response: No change required.
50374, 50380, 50402, 51477, 51606, 51833, 51834, 51835, 51836	WK1	Object	Several areas of Wickham suffer drainage and flooding problems, despite remedial works, and no development should be allowed until the existing problems regarding drainage have been rectified. Developers should be required to ensure that there is no increase in run-off from a developed site. The costs should be met by WCC and/or CIL.	Hampshire County Council has commissioned an investigation of drainage and flooding issues in Wickham and the results are expected shortly. This will provide information and consider possible actions, and will be taken into account in considering the issues raised in relation to policy WK1 and whether any changes are needed to the policy. Recommended Response: Flooding and drainage issues are the subject of further investigation, the results of which will be reported back to a future meeting.

51835	WK1	Object	Drainage is a community problem as HCC does not have financial responsibility for measures which will resolve the present problems (riparian landowners are responsible for their properties). Any necessary remedial work should be added to the CIL 123 list, and the Plan should make it clear when the current drainage problems will be rectified and whose responsibility this is.	Noted, see above. Recommended Response: No change required.
51282	WK1	Object	WK1 is not stringent enough and merely requires: (i) that incidents, capacity and mitigation measures are "properly assessed and taken into account in testing the impact of proposals"; (ii) refers to "nearest point" and vague "adequate capacity"; and (iii) the requirement should be that the risk of flooding is decreased rather than "not increased". The policy should require that existing issues be resolved, not "opportunities..... taken wherever possible".	Hampshire County Council has commissioned an investigation of drainage and flooding issues in Wickham and the results are expected shortly. This will provide information which will be taken into account in considering the issues raised in relation to policy WK1 and whether any changes are needed to the policy. Recommended Response: Flooding and drainage issues are the subject of further investigation, the results of which will be reported back to a future meeting.
50374, 50402	WK1	Object	The policy should also include traffic modelling and management, or a new policy should be included to cover these issues. The cumulative impacts of this and other developments should be taken into account.	Detailed traffic modelling or management matters are not required at the Local Plan stage, nor appropriate for inclusion in the Plan. The Local Plan Part 1 was subject to transport assessment at the strategic level. The Local Plan Part 2 contains specific access requirements in the relevant site allocation policies and other policies set out general requirements that will need to be satisfied at the planning application stage (e.g. policies CP10 and DM18). Recommended Response: No change required.
50314, 51325	WK1	Object	Object to the requirement to prevent development until the foul drainage issues have been resolved. The existing sewer surcharge issue in Bridge Street is the responsibility of WCC, Hampshire County Council and Southern Water, not the developer and the problem of floodwater being contaminated with sewage is the responsibility of Southern Water. The developer's contribution to existing drainage problems is in the form of the CIL contributions levied against the developments, with the allocation of these monies the responsibility of	Hampshire County Council has commissioned an investigation of drainage and flooding issues in Wickham and the results are expected shortly. This will provide information which will be taken into account in considering the issues raised in relation to policy WK1 and whether any changes are needed to the policy. Recommended Response: Flooding and drainage issues are the subject of further investigation, the results of which will be reported

			the LPA. The Plan should separate and define the means of resolution, including funding of existing drainage problems, and the drainage considerations and implications of new development.	back to a future meeting.
51466, 51472	WK1	Object	<p>WK1 is misleading in where the responsibility lies for addressing existing problems. It should be amended to ensure that the drainage issue is properly expressed and clarify what is and isn't the developer's responsibility, no matter which development site is preferred (technical note on drainage issues provided).</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity as to which authority is responsible for maintenance and/or remedial work in respect of the current drainage system.</p>	<p>Noted, see above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Flooding and drainage issues are the subject of further investigation, the results of which will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51472	4.8.17	Object	<p>There are also surface water problems at Garnier Park and The Spur / Circle area, with no gullies at The Spur for surface water to drain into. The proposed site (WK2) slopes steeply and water runs from the land flooding footpaths, gardens and causing the brook (that runs behind the houses in The Spur backing onto the school) to flood.</p>	<p>Noted, see above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Flooding and drainage issues are the subject of further investigation, the results of which will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51325	4.8.17 - 4.8.21	Object	<p>The existing sewer surcharge issue in Bridge Street is the responsibility of WCC, Hampshire County Council and Southern Water, not a developer. The developer's contribution to existing drainage problems is in the form of the CIL contributions levied against the developments, with the allocation of these monies the responsibility of the LPA. The existing drainage issue is poorly explained and public expectations are likely to be at considerable variance to the reality. The Plan should separate and define the means of resolution, including funding of existing drainage problems, and the drainage considerations and implications of new development.</p>	<p>Noted, see above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Flooding and drainage issues are the subject of further investigation, the results of which will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50377, 51835, 51836	4.8.18	Support	<p>Support paragraph 4.8.18 which suggests that the costs of improving drainage should be met by Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. The comments on priorities for CIL spending are noted, but these are not determined through the Local Plan.</p>
51472	4.8.19	Object	<p>The study that HCC is commissioning must be made public (for comment) before any final decision is made, and should provide clarity as to which authority or agency would be responsible in the event of failure of any part of</p>	<p>Noted, see above.</p> <p>Recommended Response: Flooding and drainage issues are the subject of further</p>

the system.

investigation, the results of which will be reported back to a future meeting.

WK2 – WK3

All Wickham Housing Allocations

50404	WK2-WK3	Support	Support the site allocations for Wickham. The public have supported development of The Glebe over several consultations, development could enhance the approach to Wickham from the B2177, The Glebe site does not contribute to flooding of Riverside Mews, which housing to the north of the village would, and waterlogging of the site can be addressed. The traffic impact of Welborne is underestimated and may require a bypass to be considered, but putting all housing to the north of the village would reduce the options for providing this. Objections to The Glebe should not override good planning considerations.	Support welcomed.
51650	WK2 - WK3	Comment	If development takes place, there should be improvements to local roads to accommodate the additional traffic.	Noted, see responses to comments on policies WK2 and WK3 below. Recommended Response: No change required.
50412, 50416, 51437, 51483, 51807, 51810	WK2 - WK3	Object	Object to additional housing in Wickham for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• drainage is a serious problem and the present flooding problems must be assessed / rectified before any more building takes place (comment by 5 respondents);• traffic and parking is already a problem in the village and additional development (including Welborne) will make it worse (comment by 4 respondents);• development should be spread over 2 or more sites (comment by 3 respondents);• the combined traffic impact of proposals in Wickham, Welborne, etc should be assessed / development should not take place until Welborne is complete as the impact of increased traffic on Wickham will not be known (comment by 3 respondents);• the number of houses at Wickham and/or	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

			<p>Welborne should be reduced (comment by 2 respondents);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed development is too dense (comment by 1 respondent). 	
50376, 50377, 51471, 51477	WK2 -WK3	Object	<p>The Mill Lane site (1909) should be developed instead of The Glebe. It would allow better pedestrian and cycle access from the Winchester Road site without needing to use main roads. WK3 compares less favourably with alternative sites in terms of drainage, landscape, access and traffic issues.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50416	WK2 - WK3	Object	<p>Development should be spread over more than the 2 sites proposed; the development proposed is too dense; no account has been taken of the potential impact of development at Welborne, Eastleigh, Winchester, and Havant on Wickham, particularly in terms of traffic; the existing drainage and road infrastructure in Wickham is not sufficient; there is no evidence that the additional homes proposed for the area will maintain or improve employment opportunities; development will erode Wickham's identity as a village; the proposals do not meet the aspirations or preferences of the community but the needs of WCC to meet its housing quota; the statement that the majority of the responses to the previous consultation supported the proposals is misleading; parking in the square is already at full capacity; the sites identified in the plan are not feasible because the access is inadequate due to weight of traffic which will get worse when Welborne is implemented; the requirement that development does not add to existing flooding "wherever possible" creates scepticism; any study into flooding must be made public and clear as to which body would be responsible in the event of any failure of the system.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50396	WK2-WK3	Object	<p>Object to WK2 as 125 dwellings is a high density and the density proposed here and at The Glebe will have an</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for</p>

			adverse effect on the character of Wickham. Would prefer housing on several smaller sites (Winchester Road, The Glebe, Knowle). 250 houses will put pressure on The Square and if there is a single large site it should include a convenience store. Development at Wickham should be put on hold until there is a final decision on Welborne.	development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50314	WK2 - WK3	Object	Policies WK2 and WK3 refer back to policy WK1, which is a Wickham-wide policy that is applicable to all sites. It does not need to be repeated in a site-specific policy as there are no site-specific departures from WK1.	Given the importance of flooding and drainage issues in Wickham, as highlighted by the comments received on the Plan, it is considered important to emphasise in policies WK2 and WK3 (if retained) the need to undertake necessary improvement measures. Recommended Response: No change required.
WK2		Winchester Road Housing Allocation		
50314	WK2	Support	Support the housing allocation on land off Winchester Road, the site is sustainable, well-related to local facilities, well-connected for pedestrians and largely concealed from distant views.	Support welcomed.
51808	WK2	Support	Prefer additional housing to be built on the Winchester Road/Mill Lane site, subject to existing flooding problems being addressed. Flats should be included in the development.	Support welcomed, see below regarding flooding issues.
50399	WK2	Comment	Support this site but the density proposed is too high and not appropriate in scale and design. Account should be taken of existing densities (Houghton Gardens is 25dph). If the Mill Lane site were developed it would allow good pedestrian and cycle access to facilities and the proposed open space without needing to use main roads.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50380, 51282, 51361	WK2	Comment	Support for WK2 but neighbouring site 1908 should also be developed, which would improve access to the proposed sports pitches and reduce vehicles and cycles using the main roads. There would be potential for improvements to surface and foul-water drainage which the developer of 1908 has indicated that they would	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through

			contribute to.	LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51721	WK2	Comment	The proposed development will make flooding worse (particularly Mill Lane) and cause traffic congestion. Housing should be spread around the village. If the plans incorporate greenspace bordering Mill Lane that is a good idea.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50397, 50416, 50421, 51139, 51472, 51494, 51723, 51833, 51834, 51835, 51836, 51837	WK2	Object	<p>Object to the proposed allocation for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the density is too high / 125 houses is over-development / it will not be in keeping with Wickham's rural character (comment by 7 respondents); • traffic and transport issues, impact of new junction, traffic generation/congestion (comment by 6 respondents); • the drainage system is inadequate / development will worsen existing drainage/flooding problems (comment by 4 respondents); • site 1908 (Mill Lane) should also be developed to enable more direct/safe pedestrian/cycle access to the village centre, or to alleviate drainage problems (comment by 4 respondents); • pedestrian access into the village is difficult, needs improvement, or more pedestrians will have a harmful impact on properties in The Spur (comment by 3 respondents); • development will be harmful to / overlook properties in The Circle and Spur (comment by 2 	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.

			<p>respondents), need for increased landscaping;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development will impact on protected trees (comment by 1 respondent); • loss of wildlife (comment by 1 respondent); • housing should be spread over 3-4 smaller sites (comment by 1 respondent). 	
50085 (Natural England)	WK2	Object	<p>The site adjoins Gravelpit Copse SINC, development here is likely to result in one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impacts due greater public access (permitted or otherwise), lighting, noise, etc; • severance from the wider countryside, making it harder for priority species on the site to act as part of a larger population; • prejudicing any future restoration of stronger ecological linkages in the future. <p>The likely impact has not been recognised and measures to address such impacts need to be highlighted to ensure both policy CP16 and WK2 can be delivered, and for consistency with NPPF para 117. Advise additional wording: “- ensure no net detriment to biodiversity (including habitat isolation and fragmentation) through on-site and, if necessary, off-site measures”. A public right of way crosses the site and the Plan should require no net degradation to the public right of way through on-site landscape measures or off-site measures nearby, so as to be consistent with policy CP15 and NPPF paragraph 75.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50090 (Southern Water)	WK2	Object	<p>Southern Water has undertaken an assessment of its infrastructure and ability to meet forecast demand for the proposed development. Additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development, involving making a connection to the local sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity. SW is not fully funded to provide local sewerage infrastructure, as Ofwat expects the company to recover new development and growth costs from developers. In line with the supporting text in paragraph 4.8.19, SW seek to ensure that surface water is drained</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

			<p>separately from the sewerage system and managed so that the risk of flooding is not increased within the vicinity of the site or downstream from it. Propose an amendment to add:</p> <p>“- provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.</p> <p>- surface water management measures will be required to ensure that the risk of flooding both on-site and downstream of the site is not increased.”</p>	
50314	WK2	Object	<p>Object to the requirement to provide allotments as on-site open space. It is unrealistic to accommodate allotments in addition to 125 dwellings, roads, footpaths, landscaping and open space, as allotments require extensive areas of land.</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51325	WK2	Object	<p>Policy WK2 refers back to policy WK1, which is a Wickham-wide policy that is applicable to all sites. It does not need to be repeated in a site-specific policy as there are no site-specific departures from WK1.</p>	<p>Given the importance of flooding and drainage issues in Wickham, as highlighted by the comments received on the Plan, it is considered important to emphasise in policy WK2 (if retained) the need to undertake necessary improvement measures.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
WK3		The Glebe Housing Allocation		
51325	WK3	Support	<p>Support WK3. Comments on the benefits of the scheme under the headings Nature and Phasing of Development; Access; Landscape; Green Infrastructure and Open Space; Infrastructure; and Archaeology.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
50374, 50375, 50380, 50391, 50399, 50416, 50421, 51139, 51282, 51354, 51361, 51450, 51459, 51494, 51510, 51645, 51809, 51833, 51834, 51835,	WK3	Object	<p>Object to development at The Glebe (policy WK3) for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transport issues, traffic generation, impact on local roads and junctions, combined impact with Welborne (comment by 14 respondents); • development should be on one site or more sites, other sites would be more suitable and better related to community facilities, the Mill Lane site 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the</p>

51836, 51837			<p>(1908) is preferable/more sustainable (comment by 13 respondents);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site is separated from the village by the A32, is distant from village facilities, has poor pedestrian/cycle links into the village, would encourage people to access the village by car (comment by 12 respondents); • the proposed access / junction / crossing points would cause problems, danger, or increase congestion (comment by 8 respondents); • the site is subject to flooding/drainage problems, development would make flooding worse (comment by 6 respondents); • the site is sensitive in terms of archaeology, protected trees, the settlement Gap, and/or proximity to the South Downs National Park (comment by 4 respondents); • development of the Glebe does not have community support, is opposed by many local residents, the selection process was not open (comment by 4 respondents); • impact on the village's identity and rural features, the density is unacceptably high compared to the adjoining housing (comment by 2 respondents). 	various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50084 (English Heritage)	WK3	Object	<p>Further assessment and site investigations are required to examine the extent of previous Roman settlement and related activity. Not aware that this has been done, so request that policy WK3 is deleted or includes a caveat that states "Planning permission will only be granted provided that it is has been clearly demonstrated through a comprehensive archaeological assessment (including site investigations) that any archaeological remains do not form an overriding constraint and detailed proposals accord with" If retained the policy should include reference to heritage or archaeology to state "provide for the preservation or recording of archaeological remains, as appropriate."</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50090 (Southern	WK3	Object	Southern Water has undertaken an assessment of its infrastructure and ability to meet forecast demand for the	A number of representations make comments on

Water)			<p>proposed development. Additional local sewerage infrastructure would be required to accommodate the proposed development, involving making a connection to the local sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity. SW is not fully funded to provide local sewerage infrastructure, as Ofwat expects the company to recover new development and growth costs from developers. In line with the supporting text in paragraph 4.8.19, SW seek to ensure that surface water is drained separately from the sewerage system and managed so that the risk of flooding is not increased within the vicinity of the site or downstream from it. Propose an amendment to add:</p> <p>“- provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.</p> <p>- surface water management measures will be required to ensure that the risk of flooding both on-site and downstream of the site is not increased.”</p>	<p>the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
51325	WK3	Object	<p>Policy WK3 refers back to policy WK1, which is a Wickham-wide policy that is applicable to all sites. It does not need to be repeated in a site-specific policy as there are no site-specific departures from WK1.</p>	<p>Given the importance of flooding and drainage issues in Wickham, as highlighted by the comments received on the Plan, it is considered important to emphasise in policy WK3 (if retained) the need to undertake necessary improvement measures.</p> <p>Recommended Response: No change required.</p>
51466	WK3	Object	<p>Do not agree the evidence shows that allocation of land at The Glebe is preferable to land at Mill Lane (Site 1908). With the development of Houghton Gardens the doctor’s surgery, community centre and school forms a strong community cluster, the site relates well to the existing village envelope and better maintains the compact nature of the village. The Glebe is separated from the village and its facilities by the A32. A single sustainable village extension, rather than several smaller dispersed sites, can maximise new community infrastructure and the viability of affordable housing and phasing can be more closely controlled. Location to the north of the village could significantly assist in delivering local pedestrian and cycle access to the new recreation</p>	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

area at Mill Lane and would reduce the cumulative impact of traffic of the new major development of Welbourne. The site is “least sensitive” compared with The Glebe which is “moderately sensitive” in WCC's landscape assessment and "particularly sensitive" in the SA. The site is available and can deliver up to 90 homes, with access from Mill Lane (which could be a secondary access with the principal vehicle access from Winchester Road, if developed concurrently with WK2) and informal open space and play areas. The site is not in a high-risk flood zone however there are local flooding issues affecting The Glebe which currently acts as a natural attenuation area. There are no designations applying to the site whereas in WCC’s heritage assessment The Glebe is categorised as ‘red’ on both heritage and archaeological impact.

**DM1
Wickham**

Wickham Settlement Boundary

51466	DM1 Wickham	Object	With the development of the affordable homes at Houghton Gardens, together with the doctor’s surgery, community centre and school, forming a strong community cluster, all of which is presently outside the policy boundary, there is a compelling case for a redrawing of the boundary (DM1), in this part of the village.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50138, 50314	DM1 Wickham	Object	Object to the exclusion of the affordable housing at Gwynne Way and Houghton Way, and the community centre, doctors surgery and school buildings. These are areas of substantial built form. The proposed settlement boundary only includes the proposed housing allocations, it is illogical and misleading to exclude land which is already developed. It is incomprehensible to leave development in the defined countryside because it is affordable housing or community buildings.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundaries or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results

				of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
	Omission		Wickham Site / Policy Omissions	
50377, 50399	Omission	Comment	There should be a policy on transport, access and movement for Wickham, along the lines of that proposed for drainage (WK1), in view of the development proposed nearby. The traffic modelling does not take account of all proposed developments.	Detailed traffic modelling or management matters are not required at the Local Plan stage, nor appropriate for inclusion in the Plan. The Local Plan Part 1 was subject to transport assessment at the strategic level. The Local Plan Part 2 contains specific access requirements in the relevant site allocation policies and other policies set out general requirements that will need to be satisfied at the planning application stage (e.g. policies CP10 and DM18). Recommended Response: No change required.
50380, 51361 51477, 51835 51836	Omission	Object	There should be a policy in the Wickham section of the plan, similar to WK1, referring to the traffic and parking implications of development, including the cumulative impact of Welborne and other developments in the wider area. No development should be allowed until a clear and accurate understanding of the traffic implications has been developed.	Noted, see response above. Recommended Response: No change required.
50314	Omission	Object	Land immediately to the north of the WK2 housing allocation should be included within the allocation so that a larger site is created. The number of houses would not increase but would enable the provision of a wider range of houses, a greater number of large houses and more generous landscaping provision. Most, if not all the development in the village should be provided in this location.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51837	Omission	Object	Object to the omission of the Mill Lane site (1908) which will contribute to the rectification of the drainage problems, is away from major routes and will have less traffic impact on key local roads, and is also closer to the surgery and school.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through

				LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50421	Omission	Object	Sites 1908 and 2020 were not included as they do not adjoin the settlement boundary, but both sites have boundaries bordering the settlement. An additional site adjoining Knowle has been proposed but not included in LPP2 although the site is within the Wickham Parish boundary.	Noted, see response above. The Local Plan Part 1 requirement is for an additional 250 dwellings at Wickham. While Knowle is within Wickham Parish, it is a separate settlement and subject to separate Local Plan policies (MTRA3). Recommended Response: No change required.
51511	Omission	Object	Support for the inclusion of the Mill Lane site (1908) in preference to The Glebe as the latter floods, is of historical significance and is on open land which separates Wickham and Welborne.	Noted, see response above. Recommended Response: No change required.
Consultation		Wickham Consultation Process		
50380	Consultation	Object	Have not been kept informed at all stages of site selection on the options or reasons why some sites have been selected and others ruled out. The decision-making processes used within NPSG, WPC and WCC, are not transparent, unsound and need revisiting.	There has been extensive involvement of the local community, both work with the Wickham Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group and Parish Council, and through consultation exercises at key stages. The Steering Group reported back through the Parish Council and a major consultation on the proposed development strategy took place in early 2014. This involved distribution of leaflets in the village and an exhibition. The exhibition was very well attended and the consultation resulted in a total of 66 written responses. A report was published on the outcome of the consultation, which showed that the majority of those responding supported the proposed strategy. This work formed part of the 'front-loading' process prior to the more formal consultation on a draft Plan. It is not accepted that the process was not transparent or sound. There has since been consultation on the draft Local Plan and there will be future formal consultation on subsequent versions of the Plan.

				Recommended Response: No change required.
51466	Consultation	Object	Do not agree that the strategy has the clear support of the community. On behalf of Bloor, an independent community consultation was undertaken earlier in 2014, which identified there was considerable objection to The Glebe. In the absence of a neighbourhood plan and referendum, support for the draft strategy can only be indicative and, if promoted on the basis of indicative community preference over and above sustainability issues, it is unlikely to accord with national policy.	Noted, see response above. The draft Plan is not promoted solely on the basis of community preference. Sites were selected for sound planning reasons and these will continue to be important in undertaking further work on the various points raised by representations. Recommended Response: No change required.

Appendix 6

South Hampshire Urban Areas - Responses to Draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
5.1 – 5.12		Introductory Paragraphs		
50077 (Havant BC)	5.7	Comment	The Havant Borough Site Allocations Plan allocates part of the ASDA car park as a mixed use development (Policy WA2). Seek reassurance that Winchester's Local Plan will allow for this land to be brought forward or that WCC considers allocating the part of this land in its District.	Winchester's Local Plan Part 2 does not refer to this very small area of land, but Local Plan Part 1 allocates the West of Waterlooville development area. As an existing commercial site within the built-up area of Havant there is no reason for Winchester to resist the Havant proposals, especially given the Duty to Cooperate. However, it is not considered necessary to change LPP2, given its very general reference to West of Waterlooville. Recommended Response: No change required.
50172 (Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust)	5.11	Objection	The Wildlife Trust has raised concerns over the use of Dash Wood being promoted as a SANG in Fareham Borough Council's Local Plan Part 3 Welborne Plan: it should not be. It is the eighth best ancient woodland in Hampshire with 60 ancient woodland indicator species. The ecological sensitivities of this site may be compromised by opening it up to public access. This site should therefore be excluded from the Winchester LPP2 as an area to be used as a SANG or for public open space. Opening this site up for public access would be against LPP2 draft Policy DM24 – Special Trees, Important Hedgerows and Ancient Woodlands.	This was matter debated at the Welborne Plan Examination at which Winchester City Council was not in agreement with the Wildlife Trust's position. The outcome of the Welborne Plan Examination is awaited and the relevant section of the Local Plan Part 2 may need to be updated accordingly. Recommended Response: Review paragraphs 5.10 – 5.12 on receipt of the Welborne Plan Examination Inspector's Report and update the paragraphs as necessary.
SHUA1		Whiteley Green Housing Allocation		
50041 (Whiteley TC)	SHUA1	Comment	Whiteley Green Housing Allocation mentions vehicle access from Lady Betty's Drive. This is a very narrow lane, this should be revised to allow vehicle access via Bader Way, with footpath/cycle access only onto LBD as shown in the outline planning application for 75 houses	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
				sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
50090 (Southern Water)	SHUA1	Object	<p>The Southern Water infrastructure assessment reveals that foul water and surface water sewers need to be taken into account. An easement of 6 metres would be required, clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. In addition, the development is located within a groundwater Source Protection Zone. Development should therefore only be permitted if adequate mitigation measures can be implemented, to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency. Proposed amendment to the policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -provide access to the existing foul and surface water infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. - ensure that groundwater sources are protected, to the satisfaction of the EA. 	<p>A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
50041 (Whiteley TC)	5.16.	Comment	<p>This states the SINC at Solent 2 precludes further development. The SINC was in place before development started and HCC has said it would need to be reviewed. The future use of this site should be confirmed</p>	<p>HCC has been contacted regarding the status of the SINC, and the outcome of this discussion might require amendments to the LPP2. A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs to be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>
SHUA2		Little Park Farm Employment Allocation		
50260	SHUA2	Support	<p>Support the continued allocation of land at Little Park Farm, Whiteley for employment use. The land is both developable and available for employment use.</p>	Support welcomed.
Map 21		Whiteley Policies Map		
51463	Map 21	Object	<p>Object to the extent of the Meon Gap between Whiteley and Fareham. Skylark Meadows should be excluded from the Gap and as a consequence also exclude land</p>	<p>The principle of a Gap between Whiteley and Fareham/Western Wards is established in Local Plan Part 1 (policy CP18). In defining the detailed</p>

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			adjoining Lodge Green from the Gap. Landscape report submitted in support of the objection.	boundaries of Gaps, the approach adopted consistently across the District is to define all the land between the respective built-up areas. This approach is continued in the draft LPP2, even if it may be possible to argue that not every parcel of land within the defined area contributes to the Gap. The land referred to in this objection is outside the built-up area of Whiteley and no site allocations are necessary in this area. There is, therefore no reason to review the Gap in this location or to depart from the consistent approach to defining Gaps, namely of making them contiguous with the built-up areas they separate. Recommended Response: No change required.
OMISSION		Whiteley Site / Policy Omissions		
50041 (Whiteley TC)	OMISSION	Comment	Solent Business Park is a strategic employment area its boundary should be defined to protect it from residential applications. There are undeveloped sites in the business park with permissions that have lapsed, their future development potential should be protected.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51585	OMISSION	Object	Failure to respond to the Joint Core Strategy Inspector's recommendations on employment allocations. There is no evidence that the Council has taken into account the need to look at the Hillsons Road area. The Council should be assessing whether further employment land needs to be allocated in Local Plan 2 to meet the employment needs of the wider area, including the market towns and larger villages in the southern part of the District. Propose a larger employment development on the eastern edge of Botley, centred on Steeple Court, Pinkmead Farm and Botley railway station.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition. Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.
51585	OMISSION	Object	Failure to take account of the 2014 Solent Local Economic Partnership (LEP) Strategic Economic Plan.	A number of representations make comments on the proposed site allocations/settlement boundary or

Respondent Number	Paragraph / Policy	Response	Summarised Comment	Officer Comment / Recommended Response
			<p>The employment proposals made in Local Plan 2 do very little to support this Strategy. The proposals in the Plan should be reviewed in the light of the priorities for the sub-region and new employment opportunities included. Proposed change requested: allocate land to the eastern side of Botley, centred on Steeple Court, Pinkmead Farm and Botley railway station for employment development.</p>	<p>suggest sites for development, either as an alternative to those allocated in the draft plan or in addition.</p> <p>Recommended Response: To ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated through LPP2, further work needs be undertaken on the various points raised in the representations, including sustainability appraisal, and the results of this will be reported back to a future meeting.</p>

Appendix 7

Respondents to draft Local Plan Part 2 Consultation listed by Respondent number

Number	Respondent
50003	Bishops Sutton Parish Council
50004	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
50009	Compton and Shawford Parish Council
50013	Denmead Parish Council
50015	Durley Parish Council
50018	Hursley Parish Council
50022	Kingsworthy Parish Council
50024	Micheldever Parish Council
50025	New Alresford Town Council
50028	Olivers Battery Parish Council
50029	Otterbourne Parish Council
50030	Owslebury Parish Council
50033	South Wonston Parish Council
50036	Swanmore Parish Council
50038	Twyford Parish Council
50039	Upham Parish Council
50041	Whiteley Town Council
50042	Wickham Parish Council
50075	Eastleigh Borough Council
50077	Havant Borough Council
50082	Highways Agency
50083	Environment Agency
50084	English Heritage
50085	Natural England
50090	Southern Water
50098	Mobile Operators Association
50105	South Downs National Park Authority
50114	Thames Water
50130	Marine Management Organisation
50132	Alresford Society
50138	Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
50143	Mapledean Developments Ltd Southern Planning Practice
50144	Persimmon Homes

Number	Respondent
	Southern Planning Practice
50146	Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments Adams Hendry
50147	Heron Land Developments Adams Hendry
50148	Winchester College Adams Hendry
50153	Weatherstone Properties Ltd Metropolis
50161	Bishops Waltham Residents Association
50162	Winchester Friends of the Earth
50168	City of Winchester Trust
50169	Winchester Area Community Action (WACA)
50170	The Theatres Trust
50172	Hampshire and Isle of White Wildlife Trust
50174	Winchester Action On Climate Change
50175	Sport England (South East Region)
50185	St Giles Hill Residents Association
50194	The National Trust
50217	RSPB
50225	South Downs Society
50227	Orchard Homes
50228	Ms. C Forbes Southern Planning Practice
50229	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
50230	Winchester Fit for the Future Campaign
50232	Southcott Homes Neame Sutton Limited
50243	Summerbrook Ltd Rapleys
50258	Mark Gregory

Number	Respondent
	Southern Planning Practice
50260	Frobisher Ltd PRO Vision
50263	Seaward Properties and Langtons Farm Luken Beck
50269	Nick Russell Clarke Willmott LLP
50280	Huxley (UK) Ltd City Planning Ltd
50281	Welbeck Land LLP Star Planning and Development
50282	Bargate Homes Pro Vision
50284	Crest Strategic Projects Ltd G L Hearn
50285	Linden Homes Ian Baseley Associates
50291	Portico Property Edgars Limited
50305	Ian King WYG Planning
50313	Barratt David Wilson Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
50314	Bewley Homes Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
50331	Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd
50342	John Hayter Bishops Waltham
50349	Martin J Clarke Waltham Chase
50359	Ms Judith Martin Winchester
50367	David Rees Winchester
50374	Mr Brian Oswald
50375	Mrs L D Carter
50376	Mr Michael Carter
50377	Mr Chris Hoare
50380	David Michael Smith
50385	Mrs Angela Robinson
50391	Mr Iain Laws

Number	Respondent
50394	Mr John McGhee
50396	Katie Chamberlain
50397	Mr Laurence Turnbull
50399	Margarita Smith
50402	Mr Michael Wilkes
50404	Mr & Mrs Holladay
50412	Mr R Lae Wickham
50416	Anton & Suzi Hanney
50421	Ms Jane Turner Wickham
50423	Mrs Eleanor Watts Wickham
50426	Mrs Cooper Wickham
50432	Mr Adam Welch Shawford
50436	Ashlynn Hanning-Lee Winchester
50445	Mrs Caroline Dennis
50446	Mr Nicholas Dennis Winchester
50457	Ms Imogen Dawson Winchester
50469	Ms Josie Dixon Winchester
50489	Mr M Culhane (c/o Pro Vision)
50502	Sylke Kramer Winchester
50503	CALA (c/o G L Hearn)
50505	Mr and Mrs W Vandersteen Olivers Battery, Winchester
50507	Dr Jonathan Rial Winchester
50509	Linda Mackie Winchester
50510	Bargate Homes
50523	Mr Gagg Winchester
50554	Mr Bill Hoade Winchester
50556	Mr Adam Charlesworh

Number	Respondent
50557	A Gamblin
50558	Barry Aked New Alresford
50559	A Veitch
50560	A Greenwood Alresford
50561	A Wheeler
50562	A Peters
50565	A Black Alresford
50567	A Gilbertson
50572	B Rodwell Alresford
50573	C Bazlinton Alresford
50575	G M Wood Alresford
50576	B Durham Alresford
50577	B Tippett Alresford
50579	C Ratcliffe
50582	C & A White Alresford
50584	Iain Reid
50590	D Carr Alresford
50593	P Dix Tichborne Down
50595	N Barton Tichborne Down
50596	E Hutton
50597	E Hesse Alresford
50599	F Barker Alresford
50600	P Walker Alresford
50603	I E Fry Alresford
50607	G Lumb
50609	J Gregory

Number	Respondent
50614	Peter Tudor Alresford
50615	H Hamilton Alresford
50617	F C Podger Alresford
50620	I E Cross Alresford
50622	I E Dix Bishops Sutton
50623	J Chatwin Alresford
50625	J Bernie Tichborne Down
50626	H Bernie Tichborne Down
50629	J Mitchell Bishops Sutton
50630	J Morley New Alresford
50631	J Barker Alresford
50633	Alresford Professional Group
50634	J Deeley Alresford
50635	J Clayton
50637	Mrs Joan Briggs New Alresford
50639	A M Miller Bishops Sutton
50640	J Miller Bishops Sutton
50641	J Cranfield Alresford
50642	J I Wight Alresford
50646	J Dicker Alresford
50647	K Barrett Alresford
50648	K Masters Alresford
50650	K Turner

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
50651	J Laming Alresford
50653	R Lawes Alresford
50654	L Flynn Alresford
50657	L Hall Tichborne Down
50659	J Garrett Alresford
50661	M Durham Alresford
50662	M & J Lester Alresford
50668	Stephen Mitchell Alresford
50669	M Chesters
50670	M J White Alresford
50673	B Munday Alresford
50675	N Kelly-Wren Alresford
50676	N Moyes Alresford
50679	N Kerr-Smiley Alresford
50682	P W King Alresford
50683	P W Kennedy Alresford
50684	M Bazlinton Alresford
50691	R Pointer
50692	Mr Richard Chatwin Alresford
50693	R Read
50694	R K Pugh Alresford
50696	R Oates R Alresford
50700	S Dalling

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
50701	S Kerr-Smiley The Nursery Road Residents Group Alresford
50703	S Curtis Alresford
50705	M25 Group (c/o Solent Planning)
50708	S McKenzie Alresford
50709	Cllr S Cook Alresford
50711	S Richardson
50713	Sarah Mitchell
50718	S Hurrel Alresford
50719	S Morley Alresford
50725	T Dicker Alresford
50729	P Burn Alresford
50730	Mr Victor Prior Alresford
50733	T Wield Southampton
50734	W & T Smith Alresford
50737	P Andrews Tichborne Down
50742	B Piper Alresford
50743	Mr Harry Fairbairn Alresford
50744	R Kendall Alresford
50745	J R Digby Alresford
50749	Mrs S Mason Bishops Sutton
50750	Mr & Mrs Wade

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
50762	M Blaxland Kings Worthy
50770	D A Fry Kings Worthy
50773	D Renshaw Kings Worthy
50784	Ella Kendrick Kings Worthy
50790	M Evans Kings Worthy
50807	Drew Smith Limited Quayside Architects
50808	M Prince Kings Worthy
50809	M Gill Kings Worthy
50811	M Renshaw Kings Worthy
50815	M H Edwards Kings Worthy
50820	N Freemantle Kings Worthy
50824	N McCleery Kings Worthy
50835	P & M Evans Kings Worthy
50840	R M Clarke Kings Worthy
50845	S Evans Kings Worthy
50846	R Evans Kings Worthy
50855	T E Brown (MBE) Kings Worthy
50862	L Webber Kings Worthy
50863	N Curwen Kings Worthy
50866	J Prince Kings Worthy
50881	The Upper Itchen Valley Society

Number	Respondent
	Kings Worthy
50890	Mr Colin Andrews Swanmore
50897	Graham and Vivien Gardner Swanmore
50900	Ms Helen West Swanmore
50907	Mr Jeremy Harrison Swanmore
50919	Mr and Mrs M W Letts Swanmore
50921	Ms Nicole Bassett Swanmore
50932	Rita Andrews Swanmore
50933	Mr James Coltman Swanmore
50934	Mrs Sandra Coltman Swanmore
50943	Trudy Willcocks Fareham
50963	Mr T Gannaway Waltham Chase
50967	Cllr Jackie Porter HCC
50971	Cllr Martin Tod Winchester
50973	Mr and Mrs Bullen
50974	Mr Ian Mackintosh
50975	Mr Nicholas Denbow Alresford
50976	Mr Harold Mobley Kings Worthy
50977	Mr David Pickett Colden Common
50978	Mrs Patricia Bacon Brighton
50979	Ms Jane Hutchence Alresford
50980	Lindsay Dobner
50981	Mr Mark Dobner
50982	Mr & Mrs Paul and Wendy

Number	Respondent
	Draper Winchester
50983	Mr Robert Sanders Alresford
50984	Mr Richard Hallett Denmead
50985	Mrs Lynsey Marks Kings Worthy
50986	Mr Malcolm Fleming Alresford
50987	Mrs Philippa Fleming Alresford
50988	Miss Abbey Bevan Alresford
50989	Mrs Alison Bevan Alresford
50990	Mr Barry Ansell Colden Common
50991	Mr Andrew Boarder Bishops Waltham
50992	Mr George Hand Alresford
50993	Mrs Judith Hand Alresford
50994	Mrs Angela Carter Colden Common
50995	Miss Pamela Walley Colden Common
50996	Mrs Clare Hedgecock Bishops Waltham
50997	Mr Michael Westwell Swanmore
50998	Mr Christopher Blissard-Barnes Winchester
50999	Petrina Irwin Bishops Waltham
51000	Mr Matt Neal
51002	Mr Sam Smith Bishops Waltham
51003	Mr Robert Pickett Brambridge
51005	Mrs Rosemary Pickett

Number	Respondent
	Brambridge
51006	Mr Neville Smith Colden Common
51007	Prof. Julian Davies Winchester
51008	Miss Margaret Glover Bishops Waltham
51009	Mr T Pascoe Waltcham Chase
51010	Foreman Homes Southern Planning Practice
51012	Mr Stephen Aubrey Colden Common
51013	Mr Cedrick Fawcett Alresford
51014	Miss Alexandra Clay Colden Common
51015	Mrs Julie Boarder Bishops Waltham
51016	Mr Andre Ansell Colden Common
51017	Mr Ashley Ansell Colden Common
51018	Ms Christine Wall
51019	Mr & Mrs Boyle Colden Common
51020	Mr Keith Divall Alresford
51021	Mrs Janet Larcombe Waltham Chase
51022	Mr Gordon Larcombe Waltham Chase
51023	Mr & Mrs M Chapman Wickham
51024	Mr Geoffrey Beetham Old Alresford
51025	Mr & Mrs Robin and Tricia Bashford Alresford
51026	Mrs Julie Errington Alresford
51027	Mr Kevin Ryan

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51028	Mrs Katherine Whale Colden Common
51029	Dr Hina Ricks Colden Common
51030	Mrs Lisa Hansen Colden Common
51031	Mr Kin Lee Colden Common
51032	Dr Michael Dickens Alresford
51033	Mrs J Bernard Perins School
51034	Miss Susan Tanner Colden Common
51035	Mr & Mrs Packer Alresford
51036	Ms Rowena Price Alresford
51037	Mrs A Badnell Colden Common
51038	Mr & Mrs Peter and Annie Hessewood Colden Common
51039	Ms Emma Barnett Abbots Barton
51040	Mr John Cawley Brambridge
51041	Mr Mark Brown Winchester
51042	Ms Camilla Seth-Smith
51043	Mr Simon Leigh Kings Worthy
51044	Dr Roland Williamson Winchester
51045	Mr Steve Brockway Colden Common
51046	Mr Brian Campbell Colden Common
51047	Mrs Janina Barnes Colden Common
51048	Mr Veerappan Zayren

Number	Respondent
	Colden Common
51049	Mr Richard Bacon Bighton
51050	Mrs Stephanie Nelson
51051	Mrs Jill Parker
51052	Ms Lesley Hobbs Bishops Waltham
51053	Ms Sylvia Conway-Jones Winchester
51054	Helen and Tim Bryant
51055	Ms Alison Clyne Waltham Chase
51056	Mr David Walton Colden Common
51057	Mrs Catherine Beckett Colden Common
51058	Mrs Tricia Parsons Kings Worthy
51059	Lizzie Mckenzie
51061	Mrs Lisa Griffiths Alresford
51062	Mr John Charlton Thatcham
51063	Mr Thiruselvan Moodley Colden Common
51064	Mrs Bridget Moore Colden Common
51065	Mr Garry Cook Colden Common
51066	Ms Catherine Saunders Kings Worthy
51068	Mr Jon Hayes Colden Common
51069	Dr Matthew Ricks Colden Common
51070	Mrs Nadia McCabe Colden Common
51071	Mr Paul Greisen Alresford
51072	Pennyfarthing Homes Savills
51073	Mr Anthony Worman

Number	Respondent
	Colden Common
51074	Mr Gavin Colley Colden Common
51075	Mr & Mrs Robert and Amanda Maiden Colden Common
51076	Mr Robert Stevens Fishers Pond
51077	Dr Matthew Cross Fishers Pond
51078	Dr Nigel Cox Colden Common
51079	Mr Jim Maynard Winchester
51080	Mr Brian Collins Colden Common
51081	Mr Stephen Cox Colden Common
51082	Mr Calvin Stanfield Colden Common
51083	Dr Annarita Roscino Colden Common
51084	Timothy Bryant
51085	Mr Derek Conway Fishers Pond
51086	Mr Melvyn Exton Alresford
51087	Mrs Vivien Stevens Fishers Pond
51088	Mr Gwynne Lewis Swanmore
51089	Mr Christopher Towle Kings Worthy
51090	Ms Rebecca Dillon Colden Common
51091	Ms Ingrid Clifford Kings Worthy
51092	Prof. James Coleman Shirrell Heath
51093	Mr Robert Parsons Kings Worthy
51094	Mr John Weston

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51095	Mr Wyn Pugh Kings Worthy
51096	Mr Stuart Jones Durley
51097	Mr J Harte Winchester
51098	Mr Alan Finch Fishers Pond
51099	Mr Adrian Sydenham Alresford
51100	Mrs Carol Smith Winchester
51101	Mrs Kathleen Begley-Finch Fishers Pond
51102	Mr David Blackburn Colden Common
51103	Mr Ian Howe Bishops Waltham
51104	Mr Ashley Bennett Swanmore
51105	Mr Stephen Moore Colden Common
51106	Mr Stephen White Swanmore
51107	Mr Andrew Hazzard Colden Common
51108	Mrs Jill Dickens Alresford
51109	Mr Robin Townsend Pitt, Winchester
51111	Mr and Mrs Colin and Fiona Scott-Morton Alresford
51112	Mr Nicholas Ryan Colden Common
51113	Mr Graeme King Waltham Chase
51114	Mr Jeff Rees Alresford
51115	Mrs Faith Rees Alresford
51116	Mrs Fiona Leggett

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51117	Mrs Cathy Hutton Bishops Sutton
51118	Mrs Lesley Wylde Alresford
51119	Dr Peter Stokes Alresford
51120	Mr Tim Walden Alresford
51121	Mr Roger Dewey Alresford
51122	Hon David Chidgey Winchester
51123	Mrs Laura Wheeler Alresford
51124	Mrs Elizabeth Fricker Rickmansworth
51125	Mrs Sarah Chedghey Alresford
51126	Mr Derek Davidson Pitt, Winchester
51127	Mrs Karen McCleary Kings Worthy
51128	Mr Paul Repper Bishops Waltham
51129	Mr Godfrey Andrews Alresford
51130	Mr Nicholas Molden Pitt, Winchester
51131	Mrs Susan Andrews Alresford
51132	Mr Sam Kerr-Smiley Alresford
51133	Ms Sue Dewhirst Bishops Waltham
51134	Mrs Irene Spencer Alresford
51135	Mrs Pauline Mousley Bishops Waltham
51136	Mr Martin Camp Four Marks
51137	Dr and Mrs Malcolm and Ena

Number	Respondent
	Phillips Alresford
51138	Miss Eleanor Kerr-Smiley Alresford
51139	Mr Richard Sharp Wickham
51140	Mr Anthony Sanders Brambridge
51141	Mr Alistair Beecher Alresford
51142	Mrs Judith Clay Colden Common
51143	Mr Trevor Clay Colden Common
51144	Mrs V Charlton Colden Common
51145	Mr M McKenzie Colden Common
51146	Miss Finlay McKenzie Colden Common
51147	Mr Gregor McKenzie Colden Common
51148	Mr Anthony Nowak Alresford
51149	Mrs Sarah Thorne Alresford
51150	Mr Andrew Thorne Alresford
51151	Mr Robert Leggett Alresford
51152	Mrs Christine Garrett Alresford
51153	Mrs Jane Richards Alresford
51154	Mrs Anabela Williams Tichborne Down
51155	Mrs Erica Cook Alresford
51156	Mr Jonathan McKenzie Alresford
51157	Mrs Fiona Camp Four Marks
51158	Mr Anthony Lester

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51159	Mr Colin Harris Alresford
51160	Mr Gareth Cowling Alresford
51161	Mr David Wright Alresford
51162	Mr John Watson Alresford
51163	Mr Mark Godley Alresford
51164	Mrs Sharon McPherson Alresford
51165	Mr Jeff Smith Alresford
51166	Mr Hans Wustefeld Bishops Sutton
51167	Lord David Chidgey Alresford
51168	Mr Bernard Simmons Alresford
51169	Mrs Alison Perry Bishops Waltham
51170	Mrs Marilyn Weston Alresford
51171	Mrs Catherine Harris Alresford
51172	Mrs Suzanne Smith Colden Common
51173	Mrs Julie Mountain Alresford
51174	Mrs Denise Buxton Alresford
51175	Mr Charles Bellamy Alresford
51176	Mrs Susan Dix Tichborne Down
51177	Mrs Delicia Brook Alresford
51178	Mr David Brook Alresford
51179	Mr Mike Croudson

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51180	Mr Robert Page Alresford
51181	Mr Ian Waring Green Alresford
51182	Mrs Elizabeth Eldred Alresford
51183	Mrs Elizabeth Pakenham Alresford
51184	Mr Kevin Keiran Alresford
51185	Mrs Brenda Flowerdew Alresford
51186	Mr Peter Kierans Kings Worthy
51187	Mr Simon Chapman Bishops Waltham
51188	Mr Timothy Constable Alresford
51189	Mrs Hilary Hawarden Alresford
51190	Mr Mike Roberts Alresford
51191	Mr Llewellyn Hawarden Alresford
51192	Mrs Linda Hide Alresford
51193	Mr Ross Andrews Alresford
51194	Mr David Garrard Alresford
51195	Mr Kenneth Blowes Alresford
51196	Mr Robin Kennedy Alresford
51197	Mr James Pugh Alresford
51198	Mr Russell Eldred Alresford
51199	Mrs Caroline Kierans Kings Worthy
51200	Miss Rachel Boyd

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51201	Mrs Jacqueline Frampton Alresford
51202	Mr Richard Stowe Alresford
51203	Mr Dudley Clayton Alresford
51204	Mr Owen Collison Enderby, Leicester
51205	Mrs Karen Cranstone Waltham Chase
51206	Mr Richard Chin Alresford
51207	Mr Simon Pelly Swanmore
51208	Mr Simon Adams Alresford
51210	Mrs Deborah Hands Alresford
51211	Mrs Karen Beecher Alresford
51212	Mr Kieron Matthews Swindon
51213	Dr Nigel Wood Marlborough
51214	Mr Mike Dowsett Alresford
51215	Mr Brian Timmons Southampton
51216	Mr Charles Bone Winchester
51217	Mr Terry Burns Cobham
51218	Ms Amanda Hughes Ashtead
51219	Mr Joe Martens Hinchley Wood, Esher
51220	Ms Antoinette Cuming Alresford
51221	Ms Carol White Alresford
51222	Mr Alexey Kavokin

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51223	Mr Peter Evans Alresford
51224	Ms Elizabeth Dow Alresford
51225	Mr Phillip Attenborough Alresford
51226	Mr Jeffrey Hamlin Alresford
51227	Mr Derek Rouart Alresford
51228	Mrs Mary Saunders Alresford
51229	Mr Stephen Coward Alresford
51230	Mr Steven Tan Alresford
51231	Dr Gary Carter Tichborne Down
51232	Mrs Rachel Gray Alresford
51234	Mrs Lisa Barley-Jones Alresford
51235	Mr Leon Jones Alresford
51236	Miss Kate Cox Alresford
51237	Mr Steven Kennedy Winchester
51238	Mrs Pamela Mitchell Bishops Sutton
51239	Mr Graham Hulford Alresford
51240	Mr Jonathan Whale Alresford
51241	Mrs Margaret Parker Alresford
51243	Mr and Mrs M Green Colden Common
51244	Miss Hettie Whale Alresford
51245	Mr Gordon Stratten

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51246	Mr Alistair Abbott Alresford
51247	Mr Steve Hathaway Bishops Sutton
51248	Mr Ian Mitchell Alresford
51249	Mr Roy Naismith Alresford
51250	Mr Mark Chedghey Alresford
51251	Mrs Gillian Scott Alresford
51252	Mr Paul Roberts Alresford
51253	Mrs Tamzin Greggs Elstea
51254	Mr Chris Humphries Alresford
51255	Mrs Susan Wustefeld Bishops Sutton
51256	Ms Debbie Cook Alresford
51257	Mr David Taylor Alresford
51258	Mr Jonathan Shirley Andover
51259	Julie Hepenstal Alresford
51260	Mr Simon Hunt Alresford
51261	Marion Jones Alresford
51262	Miss Celeste Richards Alresford
51263	Mr Matthew Hepenstal Alresford
51264	Mrs Helen Hunt Alresford
51265	Mr Paul Bristow Kings Worthy
51266	Mrs Jackie Sumner

Number	Respondent
	Bishops Sutton
51267	Mr Anthony Pargett Alresford
51268	Mrs Fran Williams Kings Worthy
51269	Kate Munce Tichborne Down
51270	Mr Stephen Clarkson Alresford
51271	Mr Benjamin Hunt Alresford
51272	Liz Brown Alresford
51273	Mr Robert Flett Colden Common
51274	Mr Christopher Hunt Alresford
51275	Heather Burke Alresford
51276	Mr Gordon Matthews Alresford
51277	Mr Ian Taylor Brambridge
51278	Eleanor Radcliffe Tichborne Down
51279	Mrs Pauline Garrard Alresford
51280	MrsHQ Lesley Skeet Alresford
51281	Mr Mark Holloway Brambridge
51282	Mr Neale Turner Wickham
51283	Mr Reg Wragg Alresford
51284	Mrs Jackie Connell Alresford
51285	Ms Jill Willder Winchester
51286	Mrs Margaret Slater Alresford
51288	Ms Maxine Baughan

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51289	Ms Tina Biehn Alresford
51290	Ms Lorraine Dewey Alresford
51291	Juli Davis Alresford
51292	Mrs Christine Taylor Brambridge
51293	Mrs Sally Hemy Swanmore
51294	Mr John Edmett Alresford
51295	Mr Christopher Glanfield Alresford
51296	Miss Amanda White Bishops Sutton
51297	Mr Malcolm Wallace Alresford
51298	Mr John Frampton Alresford
51299	Mrs S Bristow Kings Worthy
51300	Mrs Lucinda White Alresford
51301	Mrs Glanfield Alresford
51302	Mr Terence Hallas Alresford
51303	Mrs Beverley Minall Alresford
51304	Mr Robin Sharp Alresford
51305	Mrs Sue Croudson Alresford
51306	Miss Jane Flowerdew Alresford
51307	Mr Ian Tillett Alresford
51308	Mrs Maddie Attenborough Alresford
51309	Mr David Rees

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51310	Mr Ben Baxter Alresford
51311	Mr Anthony Mason Alresford
51312	Mrs Jemma Martindale Alresford
51313	Pat Matthew Alresford
51314	Mr Robert Matthews Alresford
51315	Miss Trudy Coutts Alresford
51316	Mr Ian McDonald Alresford
51317	Ms Susan Heller Bishops Sutton
51318	Mr Philip Harrison Denmead
51319	Mr Piers Armstrong Alresford
51320	Mr Keith Purchase Alresford
51321	Mr Nigel Edmond Quayside Architects
51322	Diann Dudley Wickham
51323	Ali Zubaidi
51324	Clare Whitfield
51325	Croudace Homes Cluttons LLP
51326	Winchester Town Forum
51327	Mr Brian Mitchener Winchester
51328	Rachel Tuxworth
51329	Mary Chesters Alresford
51330	Mr Toby Wood Alresford
51331	Mr Graham sumner Bishops Sutton
51332	Gillian Forbes

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51333	Mr Andrew Fowler Alresford
51334	Penny Murray Alresford
51335	Emma Torode Alresford
51336	Mr Steve Barrett Alresford
51337	Mrs Karlaine Gilbert Swanmore
51338	Pauline Barrett Alresford
51340	Mrs Vanessa Hayward Swanmore
51341	Mrs Josephine Morley Alresford
51342	Mr David Knight Alresford
51343	Mr Jonathan Hayward Swanmore
51344	Mr Chris Fox Oliver's Battery
51345	Hazel Page Alresford
51346	Mrs Susan Rees Alresford
51347	Mrs Nicola Hurrell Alresford
51348	Mrs Kate Barrett Alresford
51349	Mrs Sue Clarke Alresford
51350	Mr Nick Connell Alresford
51351	Mr Ben Gower Alresford
51352	Mr William Martin Colden Common
51353	Mrs Briony Mackown
51354	Mr Tony Page Wickham
51355	Cllr Dominic Hiscock

Number	Respondent
51356	Mr Martin Denly Fishers Pond
51357	Arif Faizi
51358	Mr Mark Stone Colden Common
51359	Alan and Jane Inder Bishops Waltham
51360	Joanne Nicholson Colden Common
51361	Anthea Burke Wickham
51362	Anne Ororke Alresford
51363	Sara Wood Alresford
51364	Mr Michael Wood Alresford
51365	Mrs Andrea Torode Colden Common
51366	Andrea Findlay
51367	Mrs Isla Sprott Alresford
51368	Mr Andrew Sprott Alresford
51369	Mrs Pamela Glasspool Colden Common
51370	Mr Roy Sansom
51371	Maureen Sansom
51372	Mr & Mrs Byrne Winchester
51373	Mr Mark Gardner Winchester
51374	Mrs Gwyneth West Waltham Chase
51375	Mr Ryan Bevan Alresford
51376	Mr Oliver Bevan Alresford
51377	Mr & Mrs Martin Venn Alresford
51378	Mr Paul Brook
51379	Mr Andrew Johnson

Number	Respondent
51380	Shona Birch
51381	Mr Mark Lusty Colden Common
51382	Mr Wayne Carter Colden Common
51383	Miss Amanda Mumford Bishops Waltham
51384	Mr Graham Smith Alresford
51385	Mrs Linda Smith Alresford
51386	Linden Limited Boyer Planning
51387	HAB Housing Planning Sphere
51388	Mr John Pearson Olivers Battery
51389	Ms Dorothy Hamilton Alresford
51390	Mr Howard Gray Colden Common
51391	Mrs Jennifer Gray Colden Common
51392	Julie Pendred
51393	Mr James Meade Pitt, Winchester
51394	Mr Paul Watters Alresford
51395	Mr Michael Stenning Bishops Waltham
51396	Mrs Nicky Gower Alresford
51397	Master Joshua Gower Alresford
51398	Master Oliver Gower Alresford
51399	Mr Timothy Banks Winchester
51400	Mrs Tracy Greenfield Bishops Waltham
51401	Mrs Judy Munday Alresford
51402	Mr Martin Bell

Number	Respondent
	Compton
51403	Compton Down Society
51404	Mr James Arrowsmith Alresford
51405	Mrs Alison Arrowsmith Alresford
51406	Mrs Suzanne Mitchell Alresford
51407	Miss Alison Wright Alresford
51408	Mr Peter Duff Winchester
51409	Mrs Linda Tiplady Alresford
51410	Miss Poppy Whale Alresford
51411	Mr Keith Page Alresford
51412	Mrs Sarah Dineen Swanmore
51413	Mr David Learmonth Alresford
51414	Mr Keith Barrett Alresford
51415	Janette Harley Alresford
51416	Ms Jane Miller Swanmore
51417	Mrs Louise Knight Alresford
51418	Mrs Rosemary Waring Green Alresford
51420	Mr Chris Greenfield Durley
51421	Mrs Bryony Osmond Bishops Waltham
51422	Mrs Rosemary Hallas Alresford
51423	Mr Adrian Wright Colden Common
51424	Mr Mike Caldwell Winchester
51425	Mr Toby Gilbertson

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51426	Mr Robert Walls Alresford
51427	Mr John McCowen Brighton
51428	Mr Henry McCowen Brighton
51429	Mrs Adelaide Morris Colden Common
51430	Mrs Felicity Dwyer Alresford
51431	Claire Morgan Winchester
51432	Mr Edward McKenzie Colden Common
51433	Mrs S Murray Colden Common
51434	Mrs Shelia Mckenzie Colden Common
51435	Constance Leach
51436	Mrs I Bond IBA Planning Ltd
51437	Mr Barry Marson Wickham
51438	Mr George Beckett Bryan Jezeph Consultancy Ltd
51439	Mr Greg Peck Tichborne Down
51440	Mr David Farmer Winchester
51441	Mr Clive Earthy
51442	Lainston Estate Southern Planning Practice
51443	Bloombridge Development Partners Vectos
51444	Mr John Vearncombe WYG
51445	Mr Graham Moyse WYG
51446	Wendy Aldridge
51447	Mr Richard Goodall

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51448	Mr Lon McCarthy Littleton
51449	Mr Robin Sharp Kings Worthy
51450	Yvonne Taylor
51451	Mr Colin Hazzard Southern Planning Practice
51452	Mr John Fleming Gladman Developments Ltd
51453	John and Jean Hart Fishers Pond
51454	David and Sarah Wyatt Waltham Chase
51455	Mr Barry West Waltham Chase
51456	Olivers Battery Community Centre Project Group
51457	Mr Karl Bevan
51458	Mr Brian Anderson
51459	Mr John Forbes
51460	Mrs Dolores Willis
51461	Taylor Wimpey DC Planning Ltd
51462	Highwood Group WYG
51463	Iberian Investments Ltd Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
51464	Mrs Tracy Lewis Swanmore
51465	Apache Capital Terence O'Rourke Ltd
51466	Bloor Homes Terence O'Rourke Ltd
51467	The Hospital of St Cross Pro Vision Planning and Design
51468	Mrs Karen Adcock Alresford
51469	Mr Chris Adcock Alresford
51470	Mrs Tessa Harding Alresford
51471	Mr Neil Cook

Number	Respondent
	Wickham
51472	Sally Goodman Wickham
51473	Mr & Mrs David Barnes Pitt, Winchester
51475	Mr Stephen Wallsi Alresford
51476	Lightwood Property Pegasus Planning Group
51477	Mr Mark Hilton
51478	Patricia Daas Bishops Waltham
51481	Mr Hampton Colden Common
51482	Mr Paul Bulkeley
51483	Mr Patrick Braybooke
51484	Mrs Jane Swan Alresford
51485	Mr Simon Miller Bishops Waltham
51486	Mr Steve Porcher Bishops Waltham
51487	Hilary Carr Alresford
51488	Brian and Sue Eyley Wickham
51489	Reedrent Ltd Solent Planning
51490	Martindale Homes Tetlow King Planning
51491	Mr Peter Wilson Wickham
51492	Mr Robert Fowler Sun Hill and Tichborne Residents Group Alresford
51493	Cllr Lucille Thompson
51494	Kate Conduct
51495	Mrs Wendy Williams Brambridge
51496	Karen Barratt Winchester
51497	Jaqueline Regan

Number	Respondent
	Hyde, Winchester
51498	Mrs Sophie Bartrum Bishops Waltham
51499	Mr Clive Burgess Bishops Waltham
51500	Mr Michael Blackstaff Colden Common
51501	Rosie Pitt Weeke
51502	Mrs Victoria Tilling Colden Common
51503	Mr Andy Blaxland Kings Worthy
51504	Mr Alexander Noble Colden Common
51505	Mr Chris Ward Brian Jezeph Consultancy
51506	Miss Lucy Cutler Alresford
51507	Mrs Christiana Carpenter Alresford
51508	Mr & Mrs Laing
51509	Miss Kerry Kenward Wickham
51510	Mr Brian Barrett Wickham
51511	Ann Sadler-Forster
51512	John and Anne Meddleton Colden Common
51513	Mrs Sarah Pearce Alresford
51514	Mr Michael Clarke
51515	Miss Janet Boakes Waltham Chase
51516	Mr James Watters Waltham Chase
51517	Ms Teresa Baraclough Colden Common
51518	Mr and Mrs Clark Waltham Chase
51519	Allison Hampshire Shirrell Heath
51520	Susan Peck

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51521	Mr Bill Cottingham Swanmore
51522	Mr Barry Cole Alresford
51523	Mr & Mrs Victor and Pauline Brown Alresford
51524	Mr Alan Smith
51525	Mr Thomas Proudfoot Alresford
51526	Mr Martin West Swanmore
51527	Mr Peter Johnson
51528	Abigail Griffiths-Torrance Alresford
51529	Mr Anthony Woodman
51530	Mr and Mrs W Chignell Fishers Pond
51532	Matt Whitfield
51533	Nicola Dagg
51534	Philip and Sheila Morgan
51535	Wickham Community Land Trust
51536	Anna Thompson
51537	Mr Mike Robinson
51538	Richard & Jo McFahn Colden Common Winchester
51540	James & Sara Davies
51541	The Coker Family
51542	Mrs Vivian Woodman Fishers Pond
51543	C Morgan & Sons Waltham Chase
51544	Penny Kimpton
51545	Mr Todd Pink
51546	Elaine & Mark Dennison
51547	Mr Steve Welfrod
51548	Mr Peter Hayward Colden Common
51549	Mr David Parker

Number	Respondent
	Colden Common
51550	Mr R Porter
51551	Master Monty McKenzie Colden Common
51552	Ms S L Murraray Colden Common
51553	Hayley Parker Colden Common
51554	Mr Neil Russell
51555	Rachel Odell
51556	David & Margaret Bowker Colden Common
51557	Christine Codd
51558	Marguerite & Nick Farthing Turley
51559	Mrs Samantha Newman-Carter Colden Common
51560	Mr Brian Newman Colden Common
51561	Mrs Jill Newman Colden Common
51562	Mr Michael Woodman Fishers Pond
51563	Mr R Thomas Alresford
51564	Mr M Wimbleton Alresford
51565	Mr Mike Roe Colden Common
51566	Dr Jim Thompson Alresford
51567	Mr Phil Pratt
51568	Peter & Alison Dudgeon
51569	Richard & Sally Nichols
51570	Jim & Helen Floor
51571	Mr T S Hart
51572	Ann and Roy Bright Pitt, Winchester
51573	Rachael Gardner Winchester
51574	Mrs Sarah Shawcross

Number	Respondent
	Winchester
51575	Louis Martinelli Winchester
51576	Mr Robert Loughridge Winchester
51577	Mr Brian Matthews Colden Common
51578	Ms Susan Rice Colden Common
51579	Hazeley Developments Ltd Savills
51580	Alfred Homes Savills
51581	Mr Gordon Webber Kings Worthy
51582	Mr Graham Mackenzie Olivers Battery
51583	Jo Cleasby Edward Terrace Residents
51584	Debbie & William Farren-Price and Lockett Winchester
51585	Trustees of Jenkyns Southern Planning Practice
51586	Mr Keith Rogers Alresford
51587	Mr Derek Brunger Colden Common
51588	Mrs Rosemary Brunger Colden Common
51589	Mrs Isabella Cliff Alresford
51590	Mrs Patricia Brownlow Alresford
51591	Mr Charles Perry Alresford
51592	Mrs Chris Aked Alresford
51593	Mrs Kathleen Moulds Colden Common
51594	Dr Kenneth Cliff Alresford
51595	Mr Raymond Crump

Number	Respondent
	Bishops Waltham
51597	Mrs Patricia Griffiths Swanmore
51598	Mr John Leask Alresford
51599	Mr Lionel Newman Kings Worthy
51600	Mrs Sandra Hooker Alresford
51601	Mr Raymond Salter Alresford
51602	Mrs Alicia Salter Alresford
51603	Mr Ross Edwards Colden Common
51604	Mrs Lesley Mills Alresford
51605	Ms Chris Janson Colden Common
51606	Mr Geoff Phillpotts Wickham
51607	Mr Andrew Field Alresford
51608	Mr J Thompson Alresford
51609	Mr David Hucknall Alresford
51610	Mr Michael Gaskell Colden Common
51611	Mr Paul Maxlow-Tomlinson Alresford
51612	Mrs Julia Maxlow-Tomlinson Alresford
51613	Mr Peter Soper Colden Common
51614	Mrs Gina Denbow Alresford
51615	Mr Harry Haigh Colden Common
51616	Mrs Susan Prior Alresford
51617	Mr Peter Daniels

Number	Respondent
	Bishops Waltham
51618	Mr Ray Elliott Kings Worthy
51619	Mr Ian Bidgood Colden Common
51620	Mr & Mrs A Simmonds Colden Common
51621	Mr Russ Hedley Colden Common
51622	Mr Bryce Fletcher Alresford
51623	Mr John Briggs Alresford
51624	Mr John Rabjohns Alresford
51625	Mrs Christine Rabjohns Alresford
51626	Mrs Linda Powell Swanmore
51627	Mrs Ann Wadman Bishops Sutton
51628	Mr & Mrs Peter and Moira Jackson Alresford
51629	Mr Steven Pratt Alresford
51630	Mrs Joyce Shearman Alresford
51631	Mrs Elizabeth Boreham Alresford
51632	Mrs Carolyn Bateman Alresford
51633	Mr Patrick Russell Alresford
51634	Mr Jonathan Marshall Alresford
51635	Mrs Rebecca Peet Alresford
51636	Mr Darren Boreham Alresford
51637	Mr Darren Smith Alresford
51638	Mrs Leah Canaway

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51639	Mrs Jacqueline Cheshire Alresford
51640	Mrs Kerrie Pratt Alresford
51641	Mrs Sarah Bridges Alresford
51642	Mr Ian Redway Alresford
51643	Mr Ian Winkfield Swanmore
51644	Mrs Patricia Fowler Alresford
51645	Mr Robert Randell Wickham
51646	Mr John Hall Alresford
51647	Mrs Hilary Gaskin Bishops Waltham
51648	Miss Wendy Palmer Swanmore
51649	Mrs Olga Grudskaya
51650	Mr & Mrs William and Helen Baldwin Wickham
51652	Mr Nikita Kavokin Alresford
51653	Mr Steven Gillespie Alresford
51654	Mrs Olive Gillespie Alresford
51655	Mrs Margaret Lumb Alresford
51656	Mrs Caroline Perry Alresford
51657	Mr Ernest Piper Alresford
51658	Mrs Lini Seward Alresford
51659	Mr Peter Douglas Colden Common
51660	Ms Jan Delgado

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51661	Mr David Finden Alresford
51662	Mr John Holliday Alresford
51663	Mr Trevor Piper Colden Common
51664	Mr Tim Rowden Alresford
51665	Mr Gordon Thoday Alresford
51666	Mrs Jane Fuest Alresford
51667	Mrs Sheila Johnson Alresford
51668	Mr Scott Bean Alresford
51669	Mrs Gillian Allen Winchester
51670	Mrs Veronica Gibbes Alresford
51671	Mr Michael Gibbes Alresford
51672	Mrs Melissa Newton Bishops Waltham
51673	Mr Raymond Tipping Waltham Chase
51674	Mr Kenneth Symes Colden Common
51675	Mrs Jane Adlam Alresford
51676	Mrs Hilary Trickle Alresford
51677	Miss Margaret Kerlogue Alresford
51678	Mrs Jennifer Turton Kingsworthy
51679	Mr David Bolton Alresford
51680	Mr Donald Griffiths Swanmore
51681	Mr Paul Granger

Number	Respondent
	Tichborne Down
51682	Naomi Jane Holden
51683	Mr Christopher Budden Colden Common
51684	Mr R Cook Alresford
51685	Mr Anthony Bukcle Alresford
51686	Miss Karen Hately Alresford
51687	Mrs Gill Middleton Alresford
51688	Mrs Jaqueline Snowdon Alresford
51689	Mrs Lorraine Lillywhite Alresford
51690	Mr Christopher Lillywhite Alresford
51691	Mr Graham Walker Alresford
51692	Miss Lili Anne Walker Alresford
51693	Mrs Pamela Prangle Abbotts Barton
51694	Mr Alan Pratt Alresford
51695	Mr Richard Jastrzebski Waltham Chase
51696	Mr Paul Sumbler Alresford
51697	Mr Michael Hooker Alresford
51698	Mr Peter Airey Waltham Chase
51699	Mr Carl Harvey Colden Common
51700	Mrs Julia Mockford Colden Common
51701	Mr Marcus Biggs Alresford
51702	Captain Hugh Peers Alresford
51703	Mrs Jane Mossman

Number	Respondent
	Kingsworthy
51704	Mrs Susan Collom Colden Common
51705	Mr Robin Breach Bishops Waltham
51706	Mrs Margaret Highton Alresford
51707	Mrs Dawn Harvey Alresford
51708	Mr Graham Harvey Alresford
51709	Mrs Susan Gatie Alresford
51710	Mr David Bailey Wickham
51711	Mr David Adam Alresford
51712	Major John Sturgis Alresford
51713	Mr Gareth Rees Alresford
51714	Mr Ian Ware Bishops Waltham
51715	Mrs Patricia Fry Kings Worthy
51716	Mrs Jennifer Ware Bishops Waltham
51717	Wendy Bailey
51718	Dr Marian Read Bishops Waltham
51719	Mr David Williamson Bishops Waltham
51720	Mrs Carole Peck Winchester
51721	Mr John Kemp Wickham
51722	Mrs Erica Kemp Wickham
51723	Miss Wendy House Wickham
51724	Mr Harold Young Alresford
51725	Mrs Tatiana Grudskaya

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51726	Mrs Rosalind Sheppard Alresford
51727	Mrs Vasanti Rogers Alresford
51728	Mrs Janet Chierchia Bishops Waltham
51729	Mrs Helen Fleming Alresford
51730	Mr John Morgan Alresford
51731	Mr S Gray Luke Beck MDP Ltd
51732	Mrs Mary Thompson Alresford
51733	Ms Siobhan Sweeney Alresford
51734	Mrs Carole Billingham Alresford
51735	Mrs Diana Cawston Alresford
51736	Mrs Jackie Moetteli Winchester
51737	Mr Cameron Mills Alresford
51738	Mr Sam Bridges Alresford
51739	Mr Nick Mills Alresford
51740	Miss Hannah Middleton Alresford
51741	Mrs Angela Eaton Alresford
51742	Mr Terence Young Stanmore, Winchester
51743	Mr Jonathan Snowdon Alresford
51744	Mrs Amanda Marshall Alresford
51745	Mrs Georgina Pretty Alresford
51746	Mr Tom Middleton

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51747	Mr Barry Pretty Alresford
51748	Mrs Daphne Sinclair Alresford
51749	Mr Paul Corbett Alresford
51750	Mrs Jacqui Redway Alresford
51751	Mrs Margery Harley Alresford
51752	Mrs Patricia Chaffey Alresford
51753	Mrs Susan Beck Colden Common
51754	Mrs Maureen Mayers Alresford
51755	Mr Gerald Falloon Alresford
51756	Miss Diana Williams Alresford
51757	Mrs Patricia Ferris Alresford
51758	Mrs Margaret Stroud Alresford
51759	Mr Kenneth Warner Alresford
51760	Mrs Ann Warner Alresford
51761	Mrs Josephine Williams Alresford
51762	Mrs Joan Perry Alresford
51763	Mrs June Fairbairn Alresford
51764	Mrs Angela Garrett Alresford
51765	Mrs christine Gillespie Alresford
51766	Mrs Olive Toleman Bishops Waltham
51767	Mr & Mrs Stephen and Clare

Number	Respondent
	Garner Bishops Waltham
51768	Mr Mervyn Wren Alresford
51769	Mr M McCullagh Winchester
51770	Mr & Mrs Anthony and Barbara Taylor Tichborne Down
51771	Mrs Janet Evans Waltham Chase
51773	Mr Abdi Dadgostar Alresford
51774	Mr Peter Hodge Tichborne Down
51775	Mr & Mrs William and June Butler Alresford
51776	Mrs Christine Markwick Alresford
51777	Mr Gerald Maggs Colden Common
51778	Mrs Margaret Stewart Alresford
51779	Mrs Maire Pearson Alresford
51780	Mrs Mary Dunn Alresford
51781	Mr Frederick Perry Alresford
51782	Mr George Clelland Alresford
51783	Mrs Gina Chamberlain Alrseford
51784	Mrs Carole Lenox Alresford
51785	Mr David Lenox Alresford
51786	Mrs Jennifer Terry Alresford
51787	Mr Simon Terry Alresford
51788	Mrs Rita Edwards

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51789	Mr P Vernon Hazel Kings Worthy
51790	Lt Cmdr Walter Mayers MBE Alresford
51791	Mr Stanley Giles Alresford
51792	Mr Henry Woodham Alresford
51793	Mr Maurice King Waltham Chase
51794	Mrs Elizabeth Hardinge Wickham
51795	Mrs Hefin Tudor Alresford
51796	Mrs Janet Whitfield Alresford
51797	Mrs Susan Hucknall Alresford
51798	Mrs Marguerite Walker Colden Common
51799	Mrs Margaret Ritchie Alresford
51800	Mr & Mrs E Crabb Swanmore
51801	Mrs Vivienne Young Waltham Chase
51802	Miss Emma Kerr-Smiley Alresford
51803	Mrs Glenys Tippett Alresford
51804	Mr John Frampton Bishops Waltham
51805	Ms Miranda Johnson Abbotts Barton, Winchester
51807	Mr & Mrs L Towlson Wickham
51808	Mrs J M Tuffill Wickham
51809	Mr Philip Clohosey Wickham
51810	Mr P Spence

Number	Respondent
	Wickham
51811	Mr & Mrs Ian and Mary Summers Fishers Pond
51812	Mr & Mrs Robert and Elizabeth Davidson
51813	Mr P H Dean Winchester
51814	Mr Andrew Rutter Winchester
51815	Mrs J Bass Wickham
51816	Nicky Wood Alresford
51817	Colin, Daniel, Miroslava & Jessica Tester Alresford
51818	Carolyn Walker Alresford
51819	Dr Afsaneh Dadgostar Alresford
51820	Bargate Homes WYG
51821	Mrs Claudia Fisher Bishops Waltham
51822	Dr Nishith Patel Bishops Waltham
51823	Mrs Sharon Sims Bishops Waltham
51824	Mrs Margaret Jones Durley
51825	The Wilkinson Family Pro Vision Planning and Design
51826	Mr Mark Easton Bishops Waltham
51827	Mr Miles Cheetham Bishops Waltham
51828	Mr Paul Davey
51829	Mr Max Parry Swanmore
51830	Mrs Karen Williams Waltham Chase
51831	Mr Roger Shepley

Number	Respondent
	Waltham Chase
51832	Southcott Homes (Fareham) Ltd Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
51833	Claudia Pattison
51834	Mr & Mrs Goodey
51835	Rosemary O'Leary
51836	Susan Hoare
51837	Mrs R Wiffen Wickham
51838	Mrs Mary Brown Kings Worthy
51839	3rd Winchester (The Worthys) Scout Group
51840	Worthy's Football Club, The Scouts, Worthy Runners, Girlguiding UK Kings Worthy
51841	Mrs Belinda Broadway Alresford
51842	Mr Bert Guy Alresford
51843	Mrs Elaine Guy Alresford
51844	Mr Brent Davis Alresford
51845	Mrs Christine Allison Alresford
51846	Mr Jeffrey Allison Alresford
51847	Mr Clive Hancock Alresford
51848	Mr Derek Holt Alresford
51849	Mr Ian Wight Alresford
51851	Mrs Joanna Anderson Alresford
51852	Mr Mark Rowe Alresford
51853	Melanie Locke Alresford
51854	Nicole Gregory

Number	Respondent
	Alresford
51855	Mrs Patricia Watters Alresford
51856	Mr Paul Martindale Alresford
51857	Mr Peter Jennings Alresford
51858	Mr Peter Sheppard Alresford
51859	Mr Roland Bugler Alresford
51860	Mr Scott Bridges Alresford
51861	Mr Sean Bolger Alresford
51862	Mrs Stephanie Jennings Alresford
51863	Mrs Susan Lawrence Alresford
51864	The Holmes Family Pro Vision Planning and Design
51865	Mrs Angela Blackburn Colden Common
51866	Mrs Annemarie Page Colden Common
51867	D J Clarke & C A Fleury Fishers Pond
51868	Mr David Reece Colden Common
51869	Mrs Elizabeth O'Connor Colden Common
51871	Mr John McCabe Colden Common
51872	Mrs Maureen Alderman Colden Common
51873	Mr & Mrs E McKenzie Colden Common
51874	Mr Neil Matthews G L Hearn Ltd
51875	Mr Paul Underwood Colden Common
51876	Mr Richard Wheeler

Number	Respondent
	Colden Common
51877	MR Roy Hickman Colden Common
51878	Mr Thomas Atkinson Colden Common
51879	Mr Thomas Hazzard Colden Common
51880	Mr Nick Male Colden Common
51881	Mr James Butterfield Colden Common
51882	The Carroll Centre Winchester
51883	Steve Harbourne

Number	Respondent
	Winchester
51884	Judy Harbourne Winchester
51885	Mr Nigel Freemantle Swanmore
51886	John and Sara Bostock Waltham Chase
51887	Paul and Karen Harding Alresford
51888	Stephen Johns
51889	Mrs Debbie Harding Colden Common