

## **Summary of responses to Local Plan Large Development Sites Consultation 2019**

### **Introduction**

- 3755 consultation responses received
- 3755 has been broken down into 10,900 individual comments in relation to the questions asked

Below summarises and identifies key points made in response to each consultation question. It does not;

- Note the amount of times the comment was made
- Repeat all comments made
- Identify who made the comments

Whilst this summary does not repeat comments or identify how many times comments were said, key recurring themes in the responses are;

- A desire for the climate change emergency to influence the decision making in the Local Plan and development sites – referencing the Council's decision to declare a climate change emergency
- Infrastructure concerns; particularly health, transport and education
- An exasperation with development, consultation and construction, particularly in some villages that have experienced many new homes in recent years
- Northbrook Park scored the most 'reds' in the site assessment and cannot be justified when there are reasonable alternatives

Many comments supporting Northbrook Park and Whitehill & Bordon were made by residents of other areas of the district, using duplicated text.

## **Whitehill & Bordon**

### **Consultation question WB1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- The proposed primary school is on a main trunk road that is not designed for a lot of traffic
- Traffic through Kingsley needs to be considered
- Will create a new community, in an ideal location for families
- Good proximity to major employment centres and dual carriageway/motorways
- Gypsies and Travellers have historic links to this area so good to include them
- A care home is a useful inclusion
- Welcome the objective of meeting the housing needs of everyone developing a balanced community. It is noted that there is reference to a C2 care home,
- The provision of Affordable Extra Care Housing for Older Persons should be a requirement of the site allocation policy. This should be around 80 homes. This would normally be expected to fall within Use Class C3. Recommend that affordable supported housing of a smaller scale (around 12 homes) should be provided to meet the specific needs of those with mental health, learning or physical disability.
- Support 3.1ha employment but question if it is realistic
- Not enough employment proposed to support the new residents
- Support one job one house
- Density in-keeping with surrounding area
- Higher densities bring more urban scale to Whitehill & Bordon
- Increase in social housing when there is already enough
- Sensible to provide significant proportion of affordable housing
- Support the new town centre, new schools roads and open spaces, leisure and sport
- Plans to deliver new schools are poorly defined
- Do not support more housing here
- Support use of brownfield land

### **SANG comments:**

- Support SANG generally but not in proposed locations
- SANG – more intensive management will change its character
- Proposed SANG doesn't go far enough to mitigate harm
- The Slab should not become a SANG and therefore object to The Croft
  - Impact on biodiversity
  - Adverse impact on Scheduled Ancient Monument
  - It is a registered Common
- Broxhead Common (South) SINC should not become a SANG
  - Need to separate the proposed SANG from the SPA of Broxhead Common (North)
  - Purpose of SANG is to attract visitors. It will not be possible to control visitors to Broxhead Common (south) SINC such that they do not have an adverse impact on Broxhead Common (North) SPA
- Broxhead SANG is wholly inappropriate given that it lies immediately adjacent to and bordering Broxhead and Kingsley Commons and has the potential to draw new residents to rather than away from the SPA. There are multiple routes, both PRoW and other tracks, that link the proposed Broxhead SANG to the SPA. The promotion of the proposed Broxhead SANG could have the perverse outcome of increasing visitation to Broxhead and Kingsley Commons, potentially exacerbating recreational disturbance rather than mitigating it. If such a SANG were to be included it would create confusion regarding the role of SANGs and undermine perception of the need for SPA mitigation

- The proposed Oxney SANG and Gibbs Lane SANG are 8.55ha net and 14.40ha net in size, respectively. Both are of narrow structure, and whilst no detailed walking routes have been provided, it seems extremely unlikely that they can accommodate a circular walk of 2.5km each
- Concerns that the new SANG opposite Bordon Inclosure would provide access straight onto the Broxhead Common SSSI, which is also common land (for which WTC has the monitoring obligations)
- SANG land is well distributed around the perimeter of the site thus providing easy access for residents in all areas of the development
- Wrong to make dual use of land that has already been designated for protection
- Response from Natural England
  - Broxhead Common - Due to its immediate proximity the Broxhead common proposal is therefore unsuitable for use as SANG.
  - Gibbs Lane - this proximity to a heathland means Natural England views this proposal as unsuitable for SANG
  - Slab Common: the proposal for SANG involves partitioning a section of Slab Common, a registered common totalling 135 ha. To enclose this part of the common for off-lead dogs would require consent from the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State; therefore there is currently no surety that this can actually be delivered. The site comprises a mosaic of habitat types associated with heathland; given the attributes of this site with regard to location, local connectivity, scale and diversity, Slab Common may be viewed as a site of significant current and potential value to the ecological network. Therefore Natural England currently has reservations around the proposed use of this site as SANG.
  - Oxney: on paper this proposal appears to be the most appropriate of those put forward as SANG
  - Hogmoor: already established as a strategic SANG, the current proposals include elements which may be detrimental to the accessibility and attractiveness of Hogmoor.

**Consultation question WB2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- Road and bus improvements are essential to facilitate use of Liphook rail station
- At peak times during school terms, traffic can be backed up from the mini roundabouts as far as the Sainsbury roundabout, for example. Controlled pedestrian crossings would improve traffic flows
- The school must be built as part of the infrastructure of the development, so that it is ready when the population is there, not the other way round
- The provision of a rail link would enhance the development of Bordon as well as reducing traffic – a large consideration to the ‘eco-town’ ethos and the current global issue to reduce carbon emissions
- Needs shops and public services
- Town Football and Rugby Pitches and training facilities
- Train Station - should be a priority before more building plans are approved
- Provision for Post 16 education when it is a legal requirement for full time education or apprenticeships up to 18
- The reconstruction of the rail line from Bentley to a new station in the heart of the development with the recently introduced Guildford to Farnham trains extended to serve Bordon, a possible future link to the Portsmouth line at Liss should be considered
- This could be a TRAM or a Fuel Cell Tram Bus using the old railway line to Bentley

- Greatham would welcome the provision of an improved public transport link if this development goes ahead. This could bring more custom to facilities and reduce traffic into Greatham
- Public open space should be public and publicly maintained, not funded by new residents
- Highway connectivity - the relief road
- Thames Water – Minor infrastructure upgrades maybe required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development

**Consultation question WB3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

- Destroy the woodland and common
- Destroys the habitat of lots of wildlife
- Will encroach further into the countryside
- Equestrian routes disrupted/ restricting access to countryside
- Reducing the amount of green spaces
- No facilities to accommodate the already existing population
- Expansion may lead to increased crime
- Detrimental to the historic sunken lanes
- Damage to the historic buildings in Selbourne Increased danger to Blackmoor primary school from traffic in Drift Road
- May impact on secondary schools in the Farnham and Haslemere areas
- Over use of local footpaths within the park
- No minor injuries provision
- Clinics have to be attended miles away
- Transport links haven't been addressed
- Increased issues with parking, traffic and road safety
- A325 North is already extremely congested at peak times
- Increase in lorries moving waste
- Reliance of private cars for all purposes
- Heavy traffic increase on junctions A3/A325 North Farnham Road
- Not attracting new sustainable jobs
- Unsupported by sound planning evidence
- The proposed SANGs will not provide enough mitigation
- Development within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Special Protection area Negative impact on small animal and bird populations
- Whitehill & Bordon is surrounded by SSSIs, SPA's and SACs Loss of privacy with properties potentially overlooked
- Destroys bat mitigation
- Will damage endangered species of wild flowers
- Whitehill & Bordon would require approx. 18 ha of new SANG to accommodate 1294 dwellings
- Whitehill only place in Britain to have all 12 UK breeding reptiles and amphibians
- Effect on air quality
- Remaining habitats exist on nutrient poor heathland which are affected by nitrogen
- Sewage work currently are not fit for purpose
- Rent in area too high
- Lack of housing need – many homes currently remain unsold

**Consultation question WB4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- A lot of work has already been done, so can build on that, and could be achieved within plan period
- Sufficient housing to satisfy need
- New / good infrastructure is already in place
- Makes sense to use infrastructure / new infrastructure in place
- Meeting needs of future generations rather than adding pressure to existing, inadequate services
- Make planned infrastructure more viable
- Good road network
- Good connections to station
- Commercially feasible to provide Bordon with a new train station
- Good access to A3
- Employment opportunities nearby
- Strong public transport network
- Plans for new schools / new secondary school to open
- Use of brownfield land / making use of redundant land
- New affordable housing
- Economic gains - create new jobs /growth
- One house one job
- Local jobs so reduce commuting
- Environmental gains and recreational enjoyment from new SANG
- SANG capacity
- Create new ecosystems
- Potential to deliver net gain to biodiversity
- Reduce carbon footprint / low or zero carbon homes
- New community facilities can be used by the whole community
- Facilities for young people
- New housing will match recent new housing
- Natural progression of what is already being built
- Support the new town centre
- Increase funding for local services, e.g. health care
- Able to plan for infrastructure and development at same time / extensive program of integrated infrastructure
- Regeneration / supports current regeneration programme within 'Green Town Vision'
- MOD can release more land when needed / potential for 2<sup>nd</sup> phase / logical next phase
- Enhance / support local facilities
- Designated Government housing zones
- An additional investment of around £195m into the local economy

**Consultation question WB5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Traffic congestion at Guildford during rush hours (A3 and A31)
- Significant additional traffic will impact on rural roads and villages in the SDNP
- Concern about impacts on A325/A31 not just from traffic travelling to the Farnham area, but also traffic using this important transport corridor to access Guildford, the Blackwater Valley and the M3/M25 beyond. The main road network around Farnham is already congested so it is essential that these cross-boundary impacts are carefully assessed and mitigation identified

- SPA/SAC sites likely to require mitigation for these proposals are located across more than one local planning authority
- Delivering SANG and net gain in partnership with the SDNPA

**Consultation question WB6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- Multiple owners
- It is totally dependent on the rate of building, governed by the rate at which developers believe units can be sold.

### **Land South East of Liphook**

**Consultation question LP1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- Level of development is excessive / density too high
- Disproportionate enlargement of the village
- Do not need another school
- Support provision of a satellite school
- Proposed school is less than half the size of the current Infant and Junior School and is completely inadequate to match needs
- A new school will fragment school facilities across Liphook
- Liphook football uses the club and pitches found at the rec. There is not demand for them to be relocated
- Relocation of football pitches would make them inaccessible to a large proportion of the village
- Relocating the Memorial Ground playing pitches would be very aggrevious to many residents as this land was gifted to the village as a Memorial to those who fell in the First World War
- Any potential relocation would be required to meet with Sport England's E4 exception under its playing fields policy, which requires that any replacement provision is at least equivalent or better in terms of quantity; quality and accessibility to that which has been lost
- Community hub will detract from existing provision
- Provision of community facilities would be an enhancement
- Need for further retail floorspace is unjustified as empty units locally
- Do not need more employment land – recent completions not occupied
- Not suitable for employment land due to distance from the A3
- Forced creation of employment land will not actually increase local employment
- Minimal employment land
- Proposed primary school not in a suitable location for the rest of the village / not required
- SANG too far from the development, with no pedestrian footpath
- SANG is not a new area, it is already well used and an accessible area
- SANG not attractive – crossed by electricity pylons and covered in trees
- SANG does not represent a suitable alternative to visiting the SPA
- The SANG land is designated as Priority Habitat which will require further scrutiny of the suitability of the SANG land
- Highly likely need to drive to SANG
- At the centre of the proposed development there is an access road on the opposite side of Highfield lane leading straight onto Stanley common which is Public access, it is also home to protected birds and snakes etc. This goes through Ancient woodland.

It would seem probable that many residents of the development will prefer to merely walk 10 metres to cross Highfield lane and will use the access road to gain recreational access to Stanley Common rather than walk a considerable distance to the SANG.

- RSPB has serious concerns about the quality of the proposed SANG – a circular route through the SANG would not be possible without requiring the use of urban areas outside of the SANG boundary, which is not appropriate
- Rural means fields not constructed parks – should not create organised green space
- The proposed car parking area at the top of North Lane is irrelevant – there is already car parking at Iron Hill, 200m to the east, which is rarely filled to capacity
- More detail needed on Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots
- Query the need/commitment for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople accommodation
- Access should not be via Berg estate
- Proposed allotments away from the road with access by foot only / minimal allotment space
- Proposed provision of new cycle tracks/walkways is impractical, the roads and pavements are too narrow

**Consultation question LP2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- Infrastructure to address the impact of additional surface water runoff from the development
- Improve the communication between "South and East of Liphook" and the centre of the Village
- Improve the parking facilities and amount of parking at the station
- Improve access to and past the Square which is presently a "bottleneck"
- Additional highway infrastructure
- Public buses could not access Highfield Lane from Midhurst Road unless significant widening of the existing junction is carried out. This will necessitate felling numbers of trees.
- The existing roads south of the railway line are not fit for this proposal and will need significant upgrade to handle the increased usage
- Highfield Lane is a narrow country lane serving four residential homes and Highfield and Brookham Schools. The existing soft verges would need to be incorporated to allow sufficient width
- Pavements and associated street lighting would have to be incorporated if it is envisaged that this becomes an access route suitable for pedestrians
- Attention needs to be given to how speed can be restricted coming into an expanded residential area from a rural route
- Road improvements are essential to ease peak hour traffic congestion, which is already significant. This requires a multiagency approach
- Controlled pedestrian crossings would improve traffic flows.
- A link road to the A3 / relief road
- A north -south link between Haslemere Road and the A3
- Link road between Petersfield Road (B2070) and Longmoor Road
- Bypass roads are needed to link Haslemere Road to London Road and Portsmouth Road to Longmoor Road to relieve traffic congestion in the Square
- A route from the far end over the railway via a new bridge linking to the A3 and roads into the existing housing estate closed off to all except cycles and walking
- A new form of road system in the village centre

- A new foot/cycle bridge over the railway line, from the south-western point of the development to link up with the existing foot/cycle way in Manor Fields and onto the village centre
- Highfield Lane would need to be significantly widened
- Improvements to the walkway over the railway
- New walking and cycling routes to the village and station
- New pavements for walking access to the village with the necessary streetlighting
- It is not practical to provide safe cycle routes into Liphook without constructing a new railway bridge or widening existing bridges
- Chiltley Lane should be blocked for all vehicles to prevent it being a cut through to Devils Lane
- The existing Chiltley and Devil's Lanes are designated to be not accessible from the proposed site. The only way to achieve this would be to build bridges for local traffic over these lanes or close the lanes to local traffic
- Enhanced traffic calming and speed control measures
- NHS dentist in the village
- Upgrade the train service
- A better bus service
- Public transport
- Secondary school places
- Pre school facilities
- Care home/care provision
- Medical facilities
- More amenities
- Youth facilities
- Improved pedestrian access
- Minor infrastructure upgrades may be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development (Thames Water)
- Significant improvements to sewerage infrastructure and electricity and water

**Consultation question LP3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

Transport and travel

- Significant increase in traffic
- Roads are already congested and too narrow
- The roads are narrow and already posing risks to pedestrians
- Already gridlock in the centre of Liphook during rush hour
- Key road over railway line cannot be widened without significant cost
- Midhurst Road railway bridge and road currently very dangerous Incorrect walking distance from station to site (1,200 not 800) metres
- Terrible access on and off A3
- All 3 proposed exits are hazardous/ dangerous – will not be fit for purpose
- Proposed dangerous access to Haslemere Road
- Little public parking
- Proposed bus route will never be used
- Access via Willow Gardens will cause immense increase in traffic, fumes and noise
- Inadequate parking at Liphook station
- Proposed site entrances would not be safe
- Development would be car led
- The railway line from Liphook to London is at capacity



- Insufficient station car park spaces- will add problems to surrounding streets
- Highfield Lane already busy and dangerous/ dangerous junction
- Devils Lane will not be able to take any more traffic (single lane road)
- Midhurst Road to narrow wouldn't allow lorries to pass
- Dangerous bike routes- children currently cannot cycle safely towards village over railway
- Site too far from village centre
- The distance to the infant and junior school is too far and unsafe to walk with small children
- No attempt to mitigate the added pollution

#### Other infrastructure

- No infrastructure that side of the railway line
- Existing sewage system already not fit for purpose – causing flooding issues and raw sewage in various locations
- Limited services
- Puts more stress on local amenities which are already stressed
- No extra infrastructure being considered e.g. doctors, town parking, road widening, traffic management
- Thames Water already expressed site flooding concerns when the previous development was refused
- No guaranteed funding for new schools or existing ones – don't want split locations
- Electricity capacity in Liphook already overstretched
- Utilities will be strained- where will the water be sourced from and disposed of?
- Dormitory town impact on infrastructure
- Already existing frequent power cuts, this will be made worse
- Access to healthcare is already extremely very limited
- Struggling bin collections already – garden waste service already full

#### Environment and landscape

- Negatively impact the Wey River and nearby environment
- Will impact views of SDNP
- No strategic Environment Assessment has been taken place for the Liphook site
- Lynchmere Common is an ancient heathland – would become overrun and damaged with extra families walking in it
- Destruction of Green space
- Adversely impact the environment and the natural beauty of the surrounding area
- Site would destroy the visual amenity of the area
- Increased noise generation disturbing wildlife
- Impacts on trees, ancient woodlands, heritage assets, nature and ecology
- Impacts protected ground nesting birds
- Site within 5km of SPA and metres from SINC
- Chiltley Lane and Highfield Lane home several protected specified which would have to be relocated
- Tree on site would affect the setting of Lynchgate and Goldenfields West Grade 2 listed buildings
- Sussex border path runs though South of site will be impacted by appearance of the proposal and the increase in traffic caused by it

- Flooded pavements close to site and site floods regularly

#### Other

- 600 houses far too dense/ out of character with Berg estate
- Gypsy site will take up agricultural land
- Destroys agricultural land
- Food production would be lost
- Site wrong side of Liphook (poor location)

#### **Consultation question LP4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- Adjacent SDNP – benefit wellbeing of residents
- Increase visitor numbers to the SDNP
- Close to station to London Waterloo / good rail links
- Can walk and cycle to railway station
- Well served by bus routes
- Deliver new and improved sustainable transport routes
- Minimise commuter miles
- Infrastructure already developed
- Additional housing will help consolidate the village centre (shops)
- Improves the social environment
- Increase amenity areas and public open spaces
- Increase jobs and employment opportunities
- Better schooling and increased number of school places
- Improved transport links
- New allotments and community gardens
- Provide affordable housing
- New football pitches
- New rural employment opportunities
- New workspace that is reflective of local need
- Regeneration

#### **Consultation question LP5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Landscape setting, setting of the park, views into and out of the SDNP
- Build housing up the boundary of the SDNP
- Heavy light pollution on SDNP / conflict with dark night skies policy / impact assessment needed
- Proposed SANG is within SDNP
- Flood attenuation lies within SDNP
- Highfield Lane is in West Sussex and not Hampshire, so roads cannot be developed by HCC
- Access to the site would include land in West Sussex and SDNP
- Requires further consultation between authorities
- SDNPA refuse to consider the most sensible development in the village – SDNPA should be encouraged to consider this land
- Due to boundaries, the housing is being squeezed into an area outside the SDNP
- Increase pressure on rural roads in SDNP

- Consider potential impacts arising from the cumulative impact of development proposals in Havant, Chichester and East Hants, and on the junction/access for Hazleton Farm onto the A3
- Adverse Impact on Haslemere station in Waverley Borough
- The views to the natural woodland in this location are longstanding and serve several cross county long distance walking routes and bridleways. The views up towards the natural asset that draws some visitors to the parish to walk towards Lynchmere on the Serpent Trail or down towards the Shipwrights Way will be irremediably affected, as well views from the higher land back towards the parish from SDNP land.

**Consultation question LP6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- The developer proposing this scheme currently doesn't have an interest in the entire site. The ownership is still fragmented and there is insufficient evidence to suggest that they could assemble the land necessary.
- There are multiple landowners of the site which makes delivery complex.
- The proposed green space is not owned by the developers
- The development of the included chicken farm site which has recently been rejected for development brings into question the feasibility of the site in general.
- The proposed SANG in Radford Park is not realistic due to the distance between the proposed development and the park.
- At the Consultation event in Bordon LPC was informed that all the land was registered and that it was not believed to be subject to any Covenants. However, we have since found reference to Covenants in the Highfield WEP (page 16). LPC requests that East Hants checks these Covenants and clarifies whether they show anything that could constrain or prevent a housing development going ahead on this part of the proposed site.
- The costs of providing the requisite facilities including major road improvements and access for pedestrians is likely to make the scheme uneconomic.
- If railway bridges need improvements, this will make delivery of housing very slow
- Slowing of housing market
- New school not deliverable as Bohunt School has no knowledge of any proposal or discussion
- Proposed bus route not deliverable given the existing off-peak service has recently been reduced due to lack of use

## **Extension to Land East of Horndean (Hazleton Farm)**

### **Consultation question HD1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- Inclusion of Traveller accommodation on a large development site is not appropriate
- Query the need for Traveller accommodation
- Support the inclusion of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation
- Should be less housing and more open space and good sized gardens
- No real provision of employment
- Minimal employment land
- Employment space should be larger to reduce off site commuting
- High density
- Need first time housing/retirement housing
- Provision of affordable extra care housing for older persons should be a requirement of the site allocation policy – this should be around 60 homes
- Affordable supported housing of a smaller scale (around 12 homes) should be provided to meet the specific needs of those with mental health, learning or physical disability
- Question the need for so much housing in this area
- No evidence of demand for another community use
- No centre or own facilities
- The local centre should be much larger with communal meeting space
- No provision for schools, play pitches or allotments
- No link to the LEOH site to the north and integration is essential

### **Consultation question HD2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- Solar panels, gardens and grey water recycling, renewable energy in homes
- Frequent and inter-connecting public transport system
- Mature, carbon absorbing trees
- Wildlife corridors
- New active travel routes connecting Havant, Rowlands Castle and Horndean to mitigate the impact on the road network, to encourage active travel (improve health)
- Access to dentists, nurses, doctors, medical centre, physios, mental health professionals, drug abuse and addiction clinics, as well as policing and emergency services
- QA hospital needs investment
- A dedicated 'Medical Centre' with Doctor triage minor injury is required for the Catherington - Horndean + Hazleton site and Clanfield
- Significant investment in the B2149 and improved traffic calming
- Improve local B roads and connections to it
- Additional bus service south and north bound
- Additional rail link
- Circular bus route within the site
- sufficient retail, leisure and entertainment provision
- Public transport
- Needs work done to improve the local B road and connections to it, additional bus services together with sustainable on-site retail opportunities
- An integrated design of all proposed access road junctions with the B2149 would be required.
- Additional primary school places must be provided.

- GP surgery facilities must be provided
- Improved access to and parking at the nearest railway station, which is in Rowlands Castle
- Increase the frequency of stopping services both to London and Portsmouth
- Examine the possibility of extending the length and scope of the reservoir feeder road from the B2149 (in the vicinity of Pyle Lane) to the B2149 (Petersfield Road) in the vicinity of Staunton Park / Leigh Park - and to add into this road access to and from the new developments
- Proposed cycling links south through Havant Thicket & the Reservoir site could help but need connecting to the Petersfield Road & Hermitage Stream cycle routes south entirely on sealed surface tracks to make them usable cycle commuting
- Bridleway 24/22 could enable more cycling from the two sites than all other opportunities combined. The route south has an A3(M) bridge in a good state of repair. The track surface is very old Tarmac that could easily be repaired. Havant BC have planned a cycle link from BW22 past Padnell Grange to the cycle route into Havant Town Centre, Dunsbury Park Business and Cowplain & Waterlooville Town Centres.
- The second site is a long walk from Horndean TC but is within easy cycling distance. No public transport is proposed. One of the proposed lights crossings of the north bound slip roads to the A3(M) at J2, has short sight lines and wouldn't be appropriate, or considered safe by most people, for children to cycle. An easier option from the site would be via the BW24 bridge and BW24a onto Dell Piece West with a single crossing of Dell Piece West with better visibility.
- About 700m of deep rutted clay surface on BW24a would need rebuilding with a sealed surface for a traffic free walking and cycling route.

**Consultation question HD3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

Environment and landscape

- Loss of greenfield, farm land, ancient woodland and trees in "The Thicket" (attached OS map of 1870)
- Impact of development on Havant Thicket, a quiet area – popular for walking, running and cycling and wildlife
- Impact on biodiversity (specifically Bechstein bats)
- Loss of open space for wildlife - corridors should be kept open
- Popular natural/wildlife area next to development site (Bere Wood) will be greatly disturbed
- How are wildlife corridors to be established with 2 of the 3 sides next to roads
- Air pollution from close by A3M. NOX and CO2 impacts.
- Rowlands Castle Road and Treadwheel road frequently flooded. The development will take the available land to soak up the excess rain, area known for sink holes. More water will run into built up areas.
- Rowlands Castle and Horndean already heavily developed, its vital to keep as much green barriers as possible.
- Budds Farm waste water processing – this area needs to achieve nutrient neutrality.
- Site on the Portsmouth Water catchment area of Blendworth Common, where surface water and subsurface streams start their journey down to Bedhampton Springs to feed water supply.
- Pollution to aquifers.
- Loss of UK BAP/S.41 Priority habitats on the development footprint, inadequate buffering of adjoining woodland.

- Compromising the delivery of a future Nature Recovery Network.
- Gypsy / traveller sites will be located 250m from Solent Special Protection Area 5.6km buffer zone, compliance with Policy S22 in Draft Local Plan would have to be considered. As well as being near Havant Thicket SINC and reservoir.
- Constraints arising from the proximity of the SDNP are the safeguarding of views, relative tranquillity, dark night skies, biodiversity and geodiversity and transport and accessibility. This site would result in a huge urban population adjacent to a National Park that has the highest level of protection.
- Portsmouth Water – Principal aquifer at risk - if site included in LP important for site investigation of risk before development is laid out.
- Southern Water – assessment of capacity of existing infrastructure local sewage infrastructure has limited capacity, not a constraint provided development ensures through policy /conditions align the delivery of wastewater infrastructure.
- Forestry Commission manage land between this site and the planning application to north – recreational pressure likely to be significant and nitrate implications require careful consideration.
- South Downs National Park – The setting of the National Park being landscape-led a landscape-evidenced approach would be required, appropriate scale and density for a rural transition between built up Horndean and rural area of SDNP. Trees and Hedgerows along B2149 should be retained.
- Assessment of the constraints on this site must be considered against the EHDC Landscape Capacity Study (Part 2).
- Very few areas if any connections can be created, e.g. Row of 8 Oak trees subject to TPO and route protection zone would have to be avoided, a large wooded area planned to be retained.
- Portsmouth Water - Risks to groundwater quality need to be appropriately assessed and mitigation of risks, throughout the design and development of site.

### Transport and travel

- Pressure on parking at Rowlands Castle railway station, current parking inadequate and no opportunity to improve/increase.
- Increased traffic on A3M, and Junction 2 A3(M) Horndean, on B2149, Rowlands Castle Road, Pyle Lane and Dell Piece roundabout, Havant Road to Whichers Gate Road/ Durrants Road and south to Havant or Emsworth linking with the A27.
- Query if a direct access to A3 been considered
- Rowlands Castle used as a cut through off A3M to Chichester and will increase traffic at peak times.
- Increased traffic a danger to existing cyclists, walkers and horse riders.
- Bus travel - no detail is provided as to frequency / destinations served.
- The 37 Bus route from Petersfield to Havant via Horndean, is a wandering route, takes a long time. Due to a shortage of school buses some services are overcrowded making it inaccessible to other users. It's quicker to cycle between Horndean and Havant Centre than to use the 37 bus
- Service 28 is a term time bus service used by students at HTC, Oaklands School and Havant College. The bus company itself has confirmed that it is not used as a public service.
- Failure to work with Havant BC to open up BW24/22 for cycling.
- Walking and cycle route across the A3(M) from the first site to Horndean TC will block access to BW24/22 from the north.
- Cycle Lanes to schools (Horndean) inadequate, obstructed and dangerous.
- Existing highway infrastructure incapable of dealing with a new large scale development.

- A number of planning approvals for housing have been given in Emsworth/Havant and Rowlands Castle will impact the road network.
- Input should be sought from South Western Railway on the scope for increasing the frequency & speed to London of main line services.
- Inadequate proposals for cycling from site to Horndean Junior School and into Horndean Centre.
- Should be increasing sustainable transport – Development car dependant.
- Risk of accidents crossing B2149 to the proposed ‘care home / elderly persons’ area.
- Danger of HGV’s traffic through Rowlands Castle B roads (recent HGV damage to Bumblebee Cafe).
- Will generate commuter traffic - no economic or employment related benefits to East Sussex.
- Bus links must be established before development so driving patterns aren’t established by new residents.
- Transport Assessment does not consider impact of increase of 150 houses to planning application north of this site and the 1000 homes at Hazleton Farm.
- Only one access road into development, which the houses, employment and gypsy traveller sites will all have to use.

### Infrastructure

- No provision for nurseries, primary or secondary schooling, are new schools being considered?
- St. John’s Primary School already full and development about 2km from the school with no footpath proposed along Havant Road.
- Pressure on local already busy services i.e. shops, NHS doctors / hospital, dentists, social services, emergency services
- Drainage would need to be very carefully assessed given the need for ongoing management of the systems – particularly if the choice was to use SUDS which may not be adopted by Southern Water - concern a private company not subject to sufficient public scrutiny.

### Other

- Cumulative effects of developments in Horndean and wider area from urban sprawl, noise, and general overcrowding, inadequate provision for living space or mobility.
- High density on border with national park.
- This development and site to the north will result in 1,800 units, approximately a 50% increase in current population dependant on Horndean. Doubling employment easier to justify.
- The village used to be semi-rural now circled by development.
- Water balance / usage precarious.
- SNG gas pipeline requires an easement around it.
- Building of houses in an area with no centre, no infrastructure and inadequate provision of employment opportunities.
- No further development should be approved until impact of already approved homes are known.
- South Hampshire Coastal strip not taken into account that already has a high percentage of homes.
- The current Adopted Local Plan states that open areas separating towns and villages should be protected.
- Existing planning application 55562/005, no indication that the applicant has made a commitment to consider change, in light of this development and access. School identified in planning application north of the site, but would not accommodate 300

additional primary school places for this 1000 home development. The two sites should be considered as a whole.

- Dormitory development forming its own settlement, with no sense of place with Horndean or Rowlands Castle.
- Historic England – The development site is in the setting of Grade II listed Pyle Farmhouse and two other listed structures. Development should enhance these buildings and should be included in policy as a requirement.

**Consultation question HD4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- Close to transport links
- Improve local health and well-being and a reduction in pollution if good quality cycling infrastructure is provided
- Safe areas for walking, running and cycling
- Close to motorway junction
- New bus routes
- Would revive Waterlooville
- Makes effective use of poor quality agricultural land
- Builds upon existing extension site
- Self contained
- Deliver net gain in biodiversity

**Consultation question HD5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Cross boundary health needs, e.g. Queen Alexandra Hospital and GPs – unclear whether has capacity to support this development
- Views to and from the SDNP, setting of SDNP
- Investment needed in cross boundary transport
- Impact on rural roads in the SDNP – this should be included in the transport modelling
- Transport implications of cumulative development
- Need to assess impact on Havant road network
- Wildlife corridors
- Strategic flood risk mitigation
- No evidence from PfSH of the need to provide 1,000 more homes within Southern Parishes sub region
- Nearest secondary school places will be in Havant
- Impact on West Sussex schools
- Proximity of the site to the safeguarded Havant Thicket Winter Storage Reservoir site
- Provision for access to Havant Thicket be made to ensure that a coherent footpath network is available that links areas both within and outside the proposed site



**Consultation question HD6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- Too many unanswered questions (particularly about the land to the north) and too early to know if this site is deliverable yet. Unlikely to be so by 2036 given the timescales associated with the northern site.
- The long planning history (first application submitted in October 2014) and current status of planning applications for the current LEOH site, and its six owners (of whom the owner of the proposed LEOH extension is only one), change of developers, and now two developers, must be considered. There are three planning applications outstanding for the current LEOH
- Start and completion dates linked to whether site to be considered coherent and integrated with site to the north
- Query the viability of the retail centre
- Housing market slow, difficult to sell properties. Houses in the area are just not selling

**Northbrook Park**

**Consultation question NBP1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- All the uses and infrastructure will create a highly desirable village style sustainable development without detracting from the character of existing villages and settlements
- Only concern is with the hotel provision given the proximity of the Farnham House Hotel nearby - do we need two so close? If this is just the existing wedding venue then that would be OK, but a full-blown hotel may be too much.
- There is no demand for another hotel here within a few hundred yards of an existing one.
- High tech work hub is a great idea
- The natural flood plain, near the river, which should be left "as is" as much as possible, and not "over landscaped" or "prettified".
- The idea for some specialist disabled accommodation seems to be a good one.
- The inclusion of shops, a pub, school and medical facility will take many years to gain momentum
- Good proposed shops employment and community infrastructure on site.
- Support the provision of a care home
- It is a less suitable site for affordable housing and lower-income families due to its relative isolation and lack of community transport, depending on car and road use for access
- Addition of a pub and shops would put the existing facilities at risk. There is already a pub near Northbrook Park that has been shut for some years unable to find a buyer.
- Employment space too limited – still commute
- Taking the constraints into account, 800 dwellings in the net developable area could result in a development of close to 50dph. this makes no allowance for the provision of supporting infrastructure which could increase the density even further. this is considered to be an inappropriate scale of development in this sensitive setting
- Concerns about the high proportion of built development within the red line.

## SANG

- Proposed SANG is too small
- SANG completely unsuitable south of A31. The Government's own criteria for suitability for use as a SANG would be breached in several respects.
- Essential feature of a SANG is that the car parks are easily accessible. This will certainly not be the case under the present plan to have the car park directly off the busy A31. It is recommended that the footpaths on a SANG must be easily used and well maintained. They should remain unsurfaced to avoid the site becoming too urban in feel. The present site is under water for a high proportion of the year and is totally unsuitable for general public walking and dog walking.
- The river meadow at Northbrook most certainly does contain ground nesting birds.
- Unlikely residents will cross over the main road into the SANG
- The RSPB has serious concerns regarding the potential for the SANG to flood given that the SANG is almost entirely located within the flood zone. An area at risk of frequent flooding with waterlogged routes would be undesirable to visitors. In addition, a key feature of a SANG is the provision of an attractive circular walk of around 2.5km in length. The proposed route is contrived, most notably in a section containing a pinch point (where the route is only 20m apart), requiring visitors to effectively 'double-back' on themselves. We do not consider that this creates the type of attractive route that will act as an effective alternative to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Considering our above concerns, the RSPB believe that the proposed SANG will fail to provide appropriate mitigation for recreational disturbance impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths in its current form.
- It is already an area of high ecological importance itself in the floodplain water meadows of the Northern Wey chalk stream which I am surprised is not designated a SINC. There are only around 200 chalk streams in the world with 85% of them occurring in southern and eastern England. They are globally rare habitats. Otter are now known to use the river.
- If this development were to proceed with a SANG partly within Waverley it would be necessary to seek the relevant planning approval from the Council.
- The current proposed location of the proposed SANG and its isolated car park largely behind an employment site will detract from its potential landscape setting appeal and may cause safety issues that could deter use.
- The car park for the SANGs is at the far end of the green areas, surely better near the main entrance to the site?

### **Consultation question NBP2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- Flood defences south of A31
- School places at the start of the development, not years 5-10
- Secondary school provision
- Need detail on how school would be implemented and managed
- Site of at least 1.2ha of useable area should be made available to build a 1fe primary school but as stated above I will be seeking a site of approximately 1.6ha to allow future expansion
- Wildlife corridor, combined with new foot and cycle ways
- Parking at Alton Station and Bentley station
- A full bus service (day and evening), cycling facilities along the whole A31 to Farnham, and increased parking, cycling and public transport provision at both Bentley and Farnham stations
- Busses to town centre
- Bus service to Alton

- Extend cycle track to Farnham and/or Bentley station
- Prefer slip road access onto the A31 as is currently the case with Bentley, with a bridge over the A31 linking the two parts of the site together. This would minimise disruption to through traffic, which a roundabout would impede
- Wrecclesham bypass and/or Western Relief Road
- Assist funding provision of a park and ride in the vicinity of Coxbridge Roundabout with a bus service operated to Farnham Town Centre and Railway Station that could also serve Coxbridge Business Park, any residential development at Coxbridge Farm and other residential development East of Wrecclesham and Farnham such as Bordon and Whitehill
- A rail link
- Paths must be laid to connect to the bridge
- Restore to two lane dual carriageway / road widening
- Traffic amelioration
- A solution to bottleneck at Coxbridge
- Resume dual carriageway
- Footbridge over A31
- Links to Bentley station by foot or cycle
- Electric charging points for electric vehicles
- How this development site might be able to provide funding towards general improvements at Farnham Station should be discussed and understood between Network Rail, South Western Railway and East Hampshire District Council
- How Farnham Station can be better accessed via cycling and walking from the proposed sites should also be considered
- Doctors surgery
- Expand Bentley GP surgery
- Health facilities
- Dentists
- High speed broadband
- SUDs
- Significant capital investment would be needed in sewerage and waste water treatment facilities
- Landscape and access enhancements to the southern area which should be secured by the policy. Sensitive recreation use could be appropriate based on restoring semi-natural habitats. Development of the site should incorporate means of access to Alice Holt/SDNP by means other than private car.
- SANG
- SANG and SAMM mitigation for recreational disturbance that can demonstrate it meets criteria and a Net Gain to Biodiversity Delivery of mitigation in perpetuity.

**Consultation question NBP3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

Environment, landscape, character and heritage

- Site is environmentally sensitive
- Site has historic value
- Landscape is unique / detracts from local landscape / it is a valued landscape – adversely affect views to and from the SDNP
- Damaging to the quality and tranquillity of the landscape
- Land to the north of the A31 is on elevated ground which will be highly visible
- Character of the Wey Valley should be retained
- Detracts from character of area / out of character

- Result in ribbon development
- Loss of countryside/ open countryside
- Adverse impact on ancient woodland / trees
- Adverse impact on SINCs
- Adverse impact on valued landscape
- Destroy views and landscape
- Adverse impact on dark night skies (most of Alice Holt Forest is within the Dark Sky Buffer Zone E1(a))
- Adverse impact on listed buildings
- Adverse impact on late Bronze Age site which exists on site
- Adverse impact on ecology
- Adverse impact on priority species
- Adverse impact on biodiversity along the River Wey / loss of biodiversity
- Adverse impact on nearby conservation areas
- Adverse impact on Bentley / the village's identity
- Development south of A31 will be a blot on special river valley landscape
- Infilling between settlements
- Adverse impact on the wild native brown trout population which is a central feature of the Upper Wey Valley and is widely appreciated by land owners farmers, the angling community and other members of the public in this multi-use recreational area
- Does not align with climate change emergency
- The removal of vegetation, trees etc. to create a circular footpath route will impact on the current wetland management and ecology of the area
- Increase air pollution
- SANG will not mitigate impact
- The proposed SANG location/new access route shown in the Site Information Pack may adversely affect priority habitat and ground-nesting and wading birds, and due to its isolated location and situation within a flood zone, there is the risk that the SANG may not be functionally suitable to deliver its primary reason; i.e. avoid recreational pressures on the nearby Themes Heaths Basin
- On a flood plain / at risk of flooding / current flooding across and to the south of the A31 / mitigation would increase flooding problems upstream and downstream
- Contributes to slowing and alleviating run off
- Concerned about surface water flooding
- The Savills Analysis Plan 1 demonstrates the overlap of Flood Zone 3 into the area designated for Employment and SANG In the Northbrook plans. The site is also susceptible to surface water flooding and groundwater flooding. The Environment Agency requires a Level 2 SFRA and that the allocation must satisfy the Exception test to be deliverable. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed uses and layout of the site are compatible with the water environment.

### Transport and travel

- Too remote / poorly located / isolated
- Totally car dependent
- Additional traffic will make congestion worse
- Adverse impact on A31
- Effect of the A31 dual carriageway in terms of severance
- Farnham will be gridlocked
- Narrow rural lanes become dangerous
- A31 has already been reduced to a narrow one lane carriageway with lengthy queues
- Increase road accidents / A31 dangerous road

- Rush hour queues
- Significant commuter traffic from the site
- Concern about impact on traffic in Crondall and adjacent parishes
- Impact on SRN is expected to be minimal (Highways England)
- Little access to public transport / distant from sustainable transport options
- Proposed solutions such as bus services and car sharing will not happen – as people always prefer to drive
- Not safe to cycle on A31 to Farnham / cycle routes are dangerous
- Car dependent development
- Limited transport links
- Limited parking at station / station car park at capacity / adverse impact on on-street parking
- No access to train on foot
- Access point already very busy
- Accident hot spot
- Concerned about the potential for the development of these sites to impact on traffic flows on the A325 and A31 (SCC)
- Trains station at Bentley and Farnham are operating at capacity (incl. car parking)
- The lack of existing PROW network for potential connectivity
- Several paths skirt the edges of the proposed site: bridleway 071/5/1, 020/66/1 and 020/53/1 the other side of the railway bridge at Holt Wood Farm. These are likely to be fully retained and little impacted, with the exception that increased population nearby will mean increased foot traffic. However, much of that would be dog walkers who would have to cross the A31 bridge. One path crosses the site from A31 south to join Holtwood railway bridge, 017/22/1, which appears to be an intended track or road on the southern part of the proposed site. However it does pass through the industrial area and must be preserved during and after construction. There is a lack of a foot bridge over the A31 near the footpath 017/22/1, so a long deviation of the route is needed to reach and use the proposed footbridge further west and no paths are indicated to reach the bridge.. Given that if a new roundabout is installed, negotiating the dual carriageway would be much harder than now.

### Infrastructure

- Current infrastructure is inadequate to sustain the development
- Any building along the lines of the Northbrook proposals deprives Farnham and Guildford and villages in between of the upstream storage of water and increases the hard surface water run-off. It is a fact that, should the River Wey between Farnham and Alton ever rise to a level of the order of 3 feet above the river bank, Guildford, because the valley narrows at that point, would suffer severe flooding
- No sewerage capacity on site
- A new school would be in direct competition with Bentley which would suffer as a result
- No provision for secondary education
- Bentley school at capacity
- Bentley GP surgery at capacity
- Must assess the impact on facilities (e.g. secondary schools, leisure)
- Most walkers would need to opt for this bridge and take the extra time. Paths must be laid to connect to the bridge.

**Consultation question NBP4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- Addresses transport needs
- Addresses open space needs
- Provides significant proportion of the housing and employment needs
- A sustainable site
- Addresses economic, social and environmental needs
- Provides a range of affordable housing including affordable homes
- Provides community facilities
- Proximity to the A31 access is good
- Can be achieved without impinging on existing towns
- Well advanced, no unaddressed constraints identified
- Not disruptive to other communities/ anyone in the surrounding area as it's a new village
- Developer investment funds are guaranteed to cover bus service for perpetuity residents
- Plans for shops, pub, community/sports facilities well thought through and funded by developer
- The number of jobs planned is appropriate to the size of development (without detracting from business for other local towns e.g. Farnham)
- Achievable new school plan
- Plan does not impinge of Bentley or change its original character
- Cycle paths to Farnham will realistically be used: convenient and safe
- Will be a 'self-contained village'
- Site has better infrastructure to accommodate a growing population and additional housing
- Farnham has links through to other major cities providing employment
- Little impact to environment
- Deliverable within the required time frame
- Single landowner and single developer/ builder
- The site has no historical importance to this country
- No rural area needs to be used
- Road infrastructure already in place
- Good separation from existing housing minimises impact on neighbours
- Retention of listed houses
- 40% affordable houses
- 38 acres of SANG
- No loss of food production
- Does not possess an elevated topography and will not impinge on vistas
- Preserves all heritage buildings and existing dwellings
- Presence of trust guaranteeing, in perpetuity, the central functions of the village
- The build is essentially on flat land
- Utilises existing hotel
- A blue print for a sustainable Garden Town
- Proactive and effective engagement with the local community
- The site would reduce carbon footprint and casual car journeys
- Site Outside flood zone for the River Wey
- 50% Land around the development is accessible green space
- Substantial slip roads
- Specialist accommodation for the disabled and the elderly

**Consultation question NBP5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Farnham shouldn't be expanded – a green buffer should be placed around it
- New road infrastructure across into Waverley needed
- Infrastructure burden will fall on Waverley Borough/Farnham
- Failure to adequately assess the potential significant impacts across the boundaries / no discussion of any travel impact
- EHDC has provided no evidence of support / co-operation from Waverley
- Currently the draft proposals for the development of do not demonstrate effective working together of authorities in addressing cross boundary matters. Nor do they evidence "common ground" on supporting the development.
- Waverley is unlikely to co-operate
- Evidence of common ground between EHDC and Waverley should be published now alongside the consultation, not later, to allow proper judgement of the proposal
- Earlier consultation set out Waverley's significant concern to this site
- The latest Northbrook plan is dependent on the designation and approval of a new SANG in Waverley. Similar Northbrook proposals (on Waverley land) were rejected comprehensively by Waverley as part of its site assessment work for its recently adopted Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites.
- The developer's proposals in neighbouring Waverley have already been rejected by Farnham as part of the development of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan.
- Due to the proximity of Farnham, the residents will probably look there for schools, surgery, recreational facilities etc. Waverley had already achieved its quota for housing and have comprehensively rejected any further building at Northbrook on the Waverley side but they will be asked to provide all these facilities for the Northbrook residents. There is a duty to cooperate with neighbouring councils. Waverley have already rejected the Northbrook development in their area and have set out their concerns about A31 transport infrastructure affecting their borough. This proposal ignores the concerns of Waverley.
- Increase student number to schools and colleges and the numbers of commuters using Farnham railway station
- With a development of 350 houses already set to go ahead at Coxbridge roundabout and 150 houses at Abbey View, Crondall Lane, both on the Western fringe of Farnham and coming under Waverley Borough Council's jurisdiction, the towns' infrastructure is at maximum capacity, and car parking alone is already insufficient for current visitors and residents needs. Waverley Borough Council and Farnham Town Council have never identified the west of Farnham along the A31 as being suitable for development of this scale
- Traffic impact in Hart – the lanes and villages are rural and impact could not be suitably mitigated
- No evidence of co-operation with Hart DC
- Landscape impact in Hart
- Need cross boundary consideration at county council level
- Impact on SDNP from increased traffic, and views and setting of SDNP
- Traffic congestion in Guildford

**Consultation question NBP6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- The proposal is dependent on the designation and approval of a new SANG in Waverley. Waverley categorically rejected similar proposals for this site as part of its site assessment work for its recently adopted Local Plan. No guarantee Waverley will grant permission for development.
- It will be easy for each authority to claim matters are the responsibility of the other
- Query the viability of the proposed school
- Having to work with neighbouring authorities will slow progress
- The supporting proposed financial budget attached to the Village Charter does not show how either provision of the footpath and cycleway or the provision of a bus service “in perpetuity” would actually be funded. The provision of bus services from an early stage of development whilst obviously desirable involves significant costs and with an end development after 16 years of 800 dwellings may never become financially commercial on fares revenue alone and would require ongoing financial subsidies to guarantee continue operation “in perpetuity”.
- A pub and shops cannot be sustained - will be built so can be converted to housing
- Questionable whether there is sufficient and suitable land available for the proposals
- Strong doubts as to whether the development will be of sufficient scale (800 homes) to support on-site infrastructure, sustainable transport, jobs, school, shops etc. in the short, medium and long term (Hart DC)
- A number of references are made to the creation of a village trust that will underwrite the management and operation of the proposed shops and services to be provided, in perpetuity. However, if those shops and services are unviable in their own right it is unlikely that the village trust will continue to underwrite them in the long term without major ‘on costs’ which will be borne by residents through service charges. Such an approach is unsustainable.
- The level of local expenditure generated by 800 dwellings and the, realistic, retention of that expenditure (of between 15-25%, which will be further challenged by Special Forms of Trading), will not support provision of a new pub, three village shops (the range of goods is not clear), a village hall (providing for a range of community needs) and a village hub with coffee shop. The subsidy required from the village trust will be significant and on-going.

**Chawton Park**

**Consultation question CP1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- Too high density
- Too many affordable homes
- Insufficient affordable homes
- Need smaller starter homes (flats or two bed houses) for young people
- Insufficient employment land / will become dormitory town
- Employment land unnecessary
- The real employment land is off site
- The inclusion of an unnecessary industrial site is lacking coherence with the rest of the plan, and would add to congestion and pollution in this area of countryside, and inconvenience and risk to health to those living in the area
- No need for community centre – already in Alton
- Local centre inadequate for size of development
- Pub unviable / not needed



- No evidence another school is needed
- Invest in current schools rather than providing new
- No provision for secondary school places
- Insufficient school places
- Gypsy and Traveller accommodation not required
- Suggest including a tourist centre
- Amenities will be for the estate and not the local community
- Local centre will have negative impact on Alton High Street
- No additional GP surgery
- No provision for family entertainment (cinema, sports centre)
- Proposed play park is not centralised to the site
- Proposed playing pitches re planned in further corner
- Insufficient space for green spaces
- Traveller accommodation inappropriate on this site / need to be more specific about Gypsy and Traveller provision
- Difficult to see how Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation could be accommodated on site
- Lack of garages or adequate parking

**Consultation question CP2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- New bridge
- Road widening scheme
- Widen country lane from the sports centre to the A31 roundabout
- Widen Northfield Lane
- Improvements to roads
- Improvement to public transport
- Cycle route between Farnham and Alton
- Links to existing National Cycle Network
- Improvements to rail links
- Second rail line to Alton
- Parking at Alton station for commuters
- Additional sports facilities
- Sport England notes that the site allocation is adjacent to an existing cricket ground. Consideration needs to be given to the potential ball-strike issues which might arise from introducing any new development into the area on land adjacent to the cricket ground
- Drainage / strategic drainage infrastructure
- Sewerage
- Connect to Alton Wastewater treatment and water supply
- Power
- Internet
- New schools / secondary school in West Alton
- School places early
- Healthcare
- A GP surgery
- Maintain bridleways
- Path 046/4/1 must be linked safely to the other path 046/1/1 going north-west into Bushy Leaze Wood and to Mounters Lane. This will surely require a pedestrian/equine crossing light system.

**Consultation question CP3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

Environment and landscape

- Loss of Natural Landscape area, archaeological potential, greenfield / agricultural land, rural area, woodland (zoned Biodiversity Opportunity Area BOA) and Pending Nature Recovery Network (NRN)). Preservation in light of Climate Change.
- Biodiversity threatened, wildlife displaced and close to SDNP. Bat Habitat.
- Countryside used for walking / cycling / bridleways / horse riding will be lost.
- Close to Chalton Park Woods and Bushy Leaze Wood, and nearby SSSI's.
- Need open space / recreational land use for mental health.
- This site is the last buffer of open space between expanding housing.
- Increased carbon emissions.
- Located in a natural valley between ancient woodland supporting many species of wildlife.
- Current use as farmland for deer and sheep compliment the ecosystem and should be retained as agricultural. Working farms on the decline.
- View from Watercress line impacted by traveller site and development as a whole.
- Site very close to the existing Chawton conservation area.
- The development rises up the slope of the hill and will be visible from other high vantage points in the local community and should be considered that countryside/rural views between Chawton and Four Marks would be permanently damaged.
- Of international importance that the views from Chawton House Estate should be unspoilt 19th century views known to Jane Austen.
- Development site conflicts with valued landscapes policies for protecting landscapes in Local Plan and would render Draft Local Plan unsound at Examination.

Travel and transport

- Existing roads and railway bridge inadequate and dangerous to serve 1200 new homes, plus other developments planned for area, unlikely appropriate roads/pathways can be created
- Traffic lights will cause queues.
- Access to site is through a single lane railway bridge narrow road, dangerous to pedestrians, cyclists and walkers.
- Chawton Roundabout already at capacity.
- Chawton will be most affected by development with only 400 residents, development has no social cohesion with Chawton, and traffic from development will be a rat run through to A3.
- Traffic lights for single lane railway bridge will cause tailbacks on A31 and towards Sports Centre.
- Will the developer upgrade the whole road to the sports centre?
- Northfield Lane Victorian train bridge be preserved.
- Unsustainable access via Northfield Lane/Chawton Park Road.
- New sports centre opening which will create additional traffic.
- Travel to school and work plans not viable due to narrow roads, lack of pavements and increased traffic.
- Bus service inadequate, town too far away even if 64 bus re-routed, increase of car dependency.
- Parking issues in local areas from increased traffic.
- Train line Alton to Woking/London at capacity during rush hour, slow, single track, inadequate and expensive parking at station.

- No employment opportunities in the area meaning more commuter traffic.
- Foot/cycle path from Four Marks (Boyne's Wood) to Alton (Heritage Asset) and National Cycle Route 244 is obliterated by this development.
- 80% of residents in Four Marks travel north east (towards Farnham) on A31 for employment as well as Basingstoke – congestion inevitable at the Chawton roundabout from Northfield Lane.
- Highways England in general, will support a local authority proposal that considers
- Infrastructure improvements on the SRN should only be considered as a last resort.
- Traffic assessment required. Impact on the local road infrastructure has not been appropriately assessed, using out of date information and traffic modelling.
- Access along Chawton Park Road has issue with parked cars along both sides of the road beyond the hospital reducing traffic flow and a busy "T" junction meeting A339.
- Most households have 2 cars - potential for 2,400 more cars or Dept for Transport calculation of 1.4 cars per household = 1,680.
- Increase in traffic would damage 'The Butts' – open area on Chawton Park Road, widely used by residents.
- Increased traffic in village & Alton along Jubilee Playing fields & Alton Sport Centre - used widely by locals.
- Walking / Cycle route proposed to railway station will take an hour to walk and existing route via Mounters Lane is steep/muddy and inaccessible, few people likely to use it.

### Infrastructure

- Cumulative effect on infrastructure from other granted housing sites with 1 – 1.5km of the site, and an employment site at Northfield Lane, and also the neighbouring site of Treloar Meadows of 280 houses.
- Services infrastructure inadequate, GP, hospital/A&E, dentist, water, sewage, schools (especially secondary schools – 21 places required per 100 homes), broadband, electricity, gas
- Additional significant drainage required.
- Lack of community / social / clubs / recreational buildings, nowhere for families, teenagers.
- Many Alton pubs have closed and industrial units & offices in Alton empty for years.
- Flooding from significant rainfall at Lymington Bottom/Five Ash roads & at the end of Grosvenor road/A31. How will the small ponds indicated deal with the extreme rainfall.
- Potential closure of existing school in Chawton village, which is currently unsubscribed – new primary unnecessary.

### Other

- Isolated community, too far from town centres, lose sense of community and become urban sprawl.
- The number of houses built in last 2-3 years exceeds those agreed in LP.
- Chawton is a small historic tourist destination (Jane Austen's house / Watercress Railway), additional houses will overpopulate (quadruple size of village) and endanger the area.
- Conflicts with Neighbourhood Plan and undermines local democracy.
- Sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduces the need to travel.
- Jubilee Fields opposite is a significant leisure area that should not be compromised.
- Sport England – potential ball strike risk from cricket ground needs assessing.
- Alton Town Centre dormant yet many houses being built on outskirts.

- Outside settlement policy area on land designated as countryside (Local Plan policy CP19).
- ESSO pipeline proposed which will cause more disruption.
- Farmhouse and barns listed buildings.
- Impact on existing properties (Hillside and 1,2,3 Chalk Dell Cottages); loss of privacy and amenity value.

**Consultation question CP4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- Least disruption to local people
- Employment opportunities close by
- Easy access to great transport links e.g. Alton train station, bus service, cycle paths
- Easy accessible shops within walking distance
- Provides two direct routes into Alton
- Will improve footpaths/ cycle highways
- Generates a new, largely self-contained, community
- Significant scope for local jobs within neighbouring Alton town
- Alton close by with suitable highly rated secondary schools and sixth form college
- Chawton wood could quite possibly aid their general fitness and health
- The site is largely self-contained/ could provide a significant number of homes
- Opportunity to create an attractive village type of development
- Proximity to new leisure centre and playing fields is an advantage
- Attractive woodland surroundings
- The site would convey a far greater sense of community by offering more of an identifiable and communal area/facilities
- Proposal of a new primary school and local centre are also positive
- Good access to A31
- Offers affordable housing
- Potential to deliver a Net Gain to Biodiversity benefit
- Provides long term certainly over steady/ progressive release of homes through plan period
- Chawton Park could deliver CIL contributions in the region on £15m and this could support an array of local projects in parallel with a Neighbourhood Plan review
- Chawton Park provides the opportunity to safeguard and enhance existing ecological features, creating new habitats, improving connectivity between existing habitats and the adjoining woodlands
- The site is well enclosed being set in a valley/ sheltered within the woodland provides visual containment and minimises impacts on the National Park
- Provides 60 to 400 hectares of semi natural green space in the Alton/ Four Marks area
- Significant contribution to the GI strategy through the provision of a substantial amount of public open space
- Opportunities for solar power generation due to the South facing valley side
- Chawton Park drains into the River Thames - won't add deposition of nitrates in the Solent

**Consultation question CP5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Would involve significant new infrastructure and roads, destroying the local countryside
- The A31 will be compromised
- The South Downs National Park will be boarded by mass concrete housing estates, congested roads and the associated noise
- Entrance to the South Downs National Park
- Site will be overlooking SDNP
- No buffer between the development and the ancient woodland and the South Downs National Park
- Significant traffic will continue onto Northfield Lane, particularly if there is some arrangement of traffic lights in place. This would put pressure on this road
- Chawton's complex planning infrastructure, partly in the South Downs National Park with its specific planning objective of access and recreation and partly within the East Hampshire DC planning zone means both must be considered

**Consultation question CP6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- Given the cost of properties in EHDC at 13 times the average national wage (one of the highest in the UK), one has to question whether this project is financially viable if the price of lower priced housing drops to a more realistic 3-6 times national of the National Average wage
- Employment land is in separate ownership
- A number of owners and developers involved
- Not deliverable due to the site access via a single track 'no through' road
- Infrastructure is listed on land not owned by the developer

**Neatham Down**

**Consultation question ND1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- Traveller sites not identified / allocated.
- No more pubs needed, town has enough.
- Not enough employment or industrial land identified.
- Alton already has facilities that are under used.
- Consider impact of housing on skyline and views from SDNP.
- Good Gypsy and Traveller site due to road connection onto A31.
- Walking and Cycling route lead into industrial area not town centre.
- Pedestrian crossing on A31 not suitable and will cause traffic issues.
- Remove employment land and relocate amenities/facilities at the entrance to site.
- Residents will have to drive through employment area to get to houses.
- Build Primary school & Pub at start of development to integrate into the community.
- Size of primary school site too small to provide for playground, fields, teacher parking etc.

- Not enough children to fill the school.
- Viability of Primary School when considered against HCC Guidance 33 on 2FE v's usable area.
- Landscape will constrain the allocation of traveller sites.
- No visitor parking proposed.
- Amenities/services required not sufficient.
- Will promote commuters and drive property prices up.
- No Care home provision and the services/amenities relationship considered against those existing in the Alton area.
- Affordable supported housing should be considered (mental health/learning/physical disability).
- Village Hall can be multi-use, used for over-burdened GP/health services, for well baby clinics, flu vaccinations or day-care and afterschool activities.
- Primary school within easy and safe walking distance.
- Employment land has direct access to A31 and complement approved employment site at Lynch Hill.
- Support existing and planned infrastructure, services and employment in Alton, Holybourne and wider area.
- Will deliver services for residents and workers on a small scale and be a sustainable community.
- Community space should be 24 hours.

**Consultation question ND2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- Bus route operation must be secured for future longevity.
- Include Park and Ride scheme near roundabout.
- Development include a local gym and pool.
- Increase parking at Alton station for commuters.
- Sufficient woodland screening to ensure site not visible from town and hills to west of town.
- Number of homes unlikely to affect the Gas infrastructure.
- Second rail line into Alton.
- Primary school should be built at the start of development.
- Number of houses would not ensure a 1FE school would be full.
- The County Council will be seeking a School site area to be 1.6ha.
- Safety concern for pedestrian crossing over A31.
- Pedestrian crossing on A31 should be replaced with a bridge or re-route pedestrian access over the existing bridge at Lynch Hill.
- Any sport and recreation provision be met off site given the size of the development.
- Close to existing employment areas, therefore employment area removed and the housing proposed on ridgeline be relocated there with shop, to encourage inbound business.
- Protect biodiversity of wildlife-rich hedgerows and field edges with potential for net gain.
- Support opening up of Footpaths to join existing.
- The new cycle track on the southern edge should double as a footpath.
- Utility supplies would be paid across A31 dual carriageway.
- Site layout to avoid impact on Alton skyline and SDNP.
- A Youth Centre should be included.
- A Doctors surgery should be included.
- Developer should pay for services expansion (water, gas, electric and sewage) and roads.

- Requires a secondary school / increase in secondary school places.
- Requires increase in NHS Hospital capacity.
- Increase to infrastructure services network required.
- High speed broadband and telecommunications links.
- Safe and accessible access for service vehicles (fire/ambulance/refuse/courier).
- Bridge would be a safer option than a pedestrian crossing on A31.
- Opportunity to build to high standards and insulation and sustainability (ground source heat pumps).
- Good access from A31 with addition of a new exit.
- Poor drainage. Surface drainage off access road to site and roundabout likely to bring storm water along kerb lines of A31. More than just side drains required in extreme rainfall.
- Diversity retained; generous buffer zones, access to sunlight, hedgerow connection under canopy.
- Lighting from development does not compromise the SDNP which is also a National Dark Sky Reserve.
- Due to root extension an unmown buffer strip would be needed and avoid footpaths under trees.
- Requires an underpass or footbridge.
- Develop an Alton transport package to address existing and mitigate impacts of future development sites.
- Any proposed large development sites in Alton require significant levels of funding and HCC has identified the need for substantial transport infrastructure to support future growth, including A31 / B3004 Caker Lane new junction.
- Proximity to Alton and existing infrastructure can be accessed for the site. Requires local upgrades to existing wastewater drainage.
- Creation of an eastern arm from A31 / B3004 provides access to the site and required at the early stages to ensure construction traffic access.
- Pedestrian and cycling network into Alton Town Centre provides a toucan crossing at A31 is within the County highway boundary.
- Development will utilise and deliver the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) for Alton residents.
- Expensive to develop road network to link development with Alton Town.
- New bus stops and bus routes will need to be provided.

**Consultation question ND3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

Transport and travel

- A31 access not appropriate.
- Access across bridge for pedestrians not ideal.
- Alton train station at capacity for peak travel times and parking.
- Transport links minimal - No provision for commuters from new development to get to train station, no cycleways and insufficient footpaths/pavements.
- Cycleway/walkway to Alton crosses the A31 on a bridge but is then on a farm track across open fields and stops in the centre of the industrial estate. Other cycleway crosses dual carriageway and unsafe.
- Car dependent development.
- Congestion / traffic at roundabout and London Road and Eggars School as parents park cars at entrance to Barley Fields Development.

- Unacceptable traffic burden to the Holybourne end of Alton, already congested, increased traffic noise and fumes.
- Highways England highlighted impact on SRN if this, and the other 3 Four Marks developments go ahead, alongside two development sites in Alton, and its cumulative effects.
- Sustainable measures to manage demand and reduces need for travel.
- Bus service on eastern side of Alton already severely reduced as commercially unsustainable.
- Existing footpath access across A31 roundabout marked on maps but not provided.
- Proposed pedestrian crossing across a busy road with fast moving traffic.
- Major Trunk road will be interrupted by a proposed new roundabout to access the site.
- Worst impact to footpath 020/1/1 – looking down on many houses and rooflines obscuring views of green spaces. Also to footpath 259/32/3 and 259/31/1, causing erosion/wear and damage by increased use from people in the development.
- WS Atkins Alton Traffic Survey of March 2015 recognised the Montecchio Rd/Mill Lane junction as overcapacity.
- Additional emergency services access required should A31 or roundabout be blocked or closed.
- School and community hub will generate traffic.
- Travel through designated employment area to get to houses and employment area an inadequate size.
- Will impact the A325 and A31 strategic routes to Farnham.
- Use of Froyle as a cut through to the M3 will worsen.
- Transport assessment undertaken by Troy Planning & Design concluded no impact to traffic from development.
- Following the nearby Lynch Hill employment area scheme (consented) showed that the A31 / Montecchio Way roundabout is at capacity and considerable queuing. The development will be car dependent and lack of infrastructure in the wider area, especially by bus, will effect this.
- Technical Paper 3 that supports this representation details that the proposals for an at-grade crossing over the A31 are flawed in safety terms.
- there is an over-reliance on the existing overbridge across the A31 and this recognised issue with overbridges is referenced within Manual for Streets and the Design Manual for Roads & Bridges.
- A fourth arm at A31 roundabout will function within capacity, Existing capacity at A31/Montecchio Way currently performing under capacity,
- The site lies 2km away from local centre and take 25 minutes to walk and through a large industrial estate, unsafe at night.

#### Other infrastructure

- Infrastructure timeline i.e. delivery of school, GP surgery, not until the end, puts pressure on Alton.
- Increased pressure on infrastructure and delivery services, NHS Doctors, hospitals, dentists, primary schools, etc.
- Increased capacity on supermarkets and car parks in Alton.
- Existing local schools at full capacity, especially secondary.
- Question funding of the new electric bus service and its longevity.



- Alton does not have the employment infrastructure to sustain these large developments.

### Environment and landscape

- Landscape character, ecological habitat and green space lost.
- Emissions, noise and light pollution.
- Development might be viewed from SDNP, the Park is a National Dark Sky Reserve and rural transitional landscape between Alton and NP.
- Overshadow / visible from Alton town and ruin skyline
- No natural boundaries to the development / woodland buffer insufficient.
- Lack of infrastructure (pub, shops, meeting places, recreation facilities, parks/playground, roads, public transport).
- Walks and scenery ruined by large development.
- Loss of fields and woodlands would not be compensated by 'biodiversity corridors'.
- Flood risk identified and poor drainage.
- That side of A31 currently forms a natural boundary to urban sprawl and this development could open up further development in a semi rural environment.
- View of houses will destroy the view for the Alton Six Hills Walk – established by the community of Alton and highlight of the annual Alton Walking Festival.
- CPRE Hampshire identified site as a "valued Landscape" according to GVLIA (and submitted their assessment). Court and Inspectors indicate that developments on valued landscapes should be restricted, as well as contrary to the principles for protecting landscape in the Draft Local Plan and may render it unsound at Examination.
- Troy Planning & Design concluded their baseline landscape and visual impact work (assessing 17 viewpoints) and concluded site visually well contained and the built form contained within the valley, therefore will not alter with new development on the site.
- Troy Planning & Design also confirmed: "the landscape-led approach set out in our Neatham Down Information Pack will further support minimal landscape impact and implementation of key landscape features and elements will ensure that any visual impacts are minimal. Strategic landscape master planning, including green infrastructure, green and blue zoning and strategic principles will be developed at the earliest stage and inform the overall masterplan".

### Other

- Contrary to design policies in Alton NP.
- Isolated site from Alton / wrong side of A31 – "poor sense of place".
- Loss of Agricultural land.
- Alton already has large development sites with permission and not yet built, their impact on traffic and services not yet known.
- Too many houses v's environment, wildlife, community and existing infrastructure.
- Creates urban sprawl in a historic market town with valuable character.
- The development falls outside Alton settlement boundary.
- What is the heritage asset?
- Existing shops and pub at Holybourne at risk of closure if development includes new ones.

- Would the development be affected by smell from the sewage plant nearby and noise from the A31.
- Potentially within half a mile of a recycling plant and indicated the plant may be developed into an Energy Recovery Facility.
- The valley sides may trap air pollution.
- There are more suitable sites within the A31 corridor.
- Does not satisfy the requirements of the NPPF (104 part d and 108 part b).

**Consultation question ND4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- Provision of electric car charging points
- Transport by electric busses
- Own facilities including open green space, shops, pub, community building/area, café
- New village centre
- Improvements to walking and cycling links between Alton and Neatham
- Engender its own community spirit
- Easily absorb the extra traffic flow
- Minimal impact on Alton
- Specific bus service linking Neatham Down and Alton
- Transport links via the A31 and South-Western Railway
- Development appears to sit well within the contours of the land
- Good satellite village
- Not affecting other areas in any great way
- Easy walking distance from Alton town centre and the railway
- Makes use of pedestrian bridge which is already in place
- Giving a variety of employment opportunities both on site and close by
- Landscape led development which will enhance the natural topography of the site
- Would create a separate 'Green Village'
- Countryside will have less impact
- Far healthier and less intrusive option
- More viable, carries greater economic benefits
- Does not compromise the skyline
- Very deliverable in 10 years
- Agricultural land is of poor quality
- Low impact on Alton
- Offers separate non- vehicular access into Alton
- Existing shops will benefit from the additional housing
- Near to sewage plant
- Potential to deliver a Net Gain to Biodiversity

**Consultation question ND5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Will impact South Downs National Park
- The current buffer to the national park would be lost
- Light and noise pollution would create a great impact on the landscape which will damage the view from and into the SDNP
- Any development on the 'A31 corridor' will generate more A31 traffic
- Farnham is now a pinch point on the traffic flow

**Consultation question ND6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- 600 houses is below the threshold for a viable retail operation.
- The footbridge from Golden Chair Farm across the A31 is for private use only. How do we know that use of it will be allowed?

**Four Marks South**

**Consultation question FMS1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- No village Hall proposed.
- Waste of resources to demolish existing Victorian school, part of our heritage, to build another school the same size and format on smaller inconveniently located site.
- Primary school does not appear to have any outdoor space or address parking issues / drop off pick up times.
- No sufficient or safe pedestrian / cycling route to proposed primary school site.
- No provision to increase school places in general.
- Already sufficient primary schools in the local area with expansion planned for Four Marks school.
- Moving the school will not alleviate traffic problems, just move them.
- School will be built half way through site build.
- The existing school is closer to the village than the proposed new site. It's near to a recent development where many pupils cycle/walk.
- Why move the existing school, already been extended, HCC are investing to make it a 2FE, new location no more convenient than the existing.
- The school will produce unacceptable levels of traffic on surrounding narrow country lanes, that are dangerous and flooded A31 junction.
- Existing schools should be invested in.
- More appropriate to relocate the school on the Shanly Site, more central to development and Alton Town.
- Proposed school inconveniently located with no additional benefit to community in moving it.
- Employment land area too small and will not deliver employment or training opportunities.
- Do not comply with the 'one new house one new job' policy.
- No provision for leisure facilities, especially teenagers.
- Too many houses and lack of infrastructure.
- Already have care homes close by.

- Location of community facility inappropriate - Poor access to wider community.
- No details of how they will deliver the proposed uses.
- No increase in secondary school numbers which will be impacted by the development.
- Unspecified number of affordable homes - Housing officer at EHDC and Planning inspectorate state there is no demand in Four Marks and Medstead for affordable housing.
- Insufficient infrastructure for such a large development.
- Support care home and extra care facilities.
- Additional 600+ homes not required. Four Marks has already contributed well above target of 175 with already built houses.
- Does not address housing shortfall.
- Too high density in relation to area and site bordering countryside, proximity to SDNP, Draft Local Plan Policy DM30 and Landscape character assessment.
- Away from shops and essential services.
- No allocation or number of proposed gypsy/traveller sites identified.
- Already have a number of Gypsy and traveller sites identified close by, do not need anymore.
- Community use proposed is 1/3 of a football pitch, too small, parking? with no clear funding commitment.
- Cause commuters due to small employment site and create large carbon footprint for every house built. Unsustainable.
- No GP Provision – The GP practices at Four Marks and Medstead are extremely busy, waiting 2-3 weeks for a non-urgent appointment.
- What is a care village? – this is not described in the proposal.
- Affordable supported housing of a smaller scale should be provided to meet specific mental health, learning and physical disability.
- Identified playground in a low lying area and likely to flood.
- Very little green space given amount of green fields this site is taking.
- Fails to meet aging population needs, located away from shops and essential services.
- Combination of residential, commercial and community uses help foster the growth of a diverse new community at Four Marks.
- More space for recreation.
- If shops were incorporated to improve accessibility, this would destroy sense of a village centre as per Neighbourhood Plan.

**Consultation question FMS2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- Youth services/facilities for teenagers
- Play areas
- Sports facilities – with changing facilities / off-site sport and recreation provision to meet the needs of this development. Expect that regard is had to the council's Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor sports facilities strategy
- A new park
- Large multi purpose village hall for Four Marks
- Village hall is dated and needs a new roof, internal and external decoration
- More community areas (the recreational ground at Goldcrest Way is not enough)

- A community centre / social meeting place
- Rebuild scout hut
- More entertainment facilities
- A supermarket
- New town centre with a pub and enlarged community facilities
- More restaurants
- More shops
- More parking at shops
- Environmental improvements at shopping parade
- School in a central location
- Better upgraded school / extend current school
- More primary school places (as at capacity)
- More secondary school places
- A secondary school
- More schools
- Health care facilities for new residents
- New drainage and sewage systems (upgrade sewage system / extend sewage system)
- inadequate utilities infrastructure requiring the reinforcement of water, gas, electricity, drainage and telecoms
- Improved internet connection / fibre connections
- Reinstate rail link to Alton / recommission of Mid Hants railway into a commuter service
- Green infrastructure
- Open green spaces
- A hospital
- More GP surgeries
- More pharmacies
- Enhanced GP surgeries
- More clinical services (especially for elderly)
- More dentists
- Flood defence infrastructure
- Surface water drainage systems
- Allotments
- Additional support for culture and heritage
- A village trust
- Cemetery extension
- Solar panels and wind turbines

#### Highways/transport related

- A safe cycle way through Four Marks
- Traffic calming on Telegraph and Blackberry Lanes
- Traffic calming in Medstead and Bentworth and Beech to encourage drivers to stay on main routes
- Traffic calming to make sure people can safely cross the road
- Speed cameras to encourage drivers to slow down
- Reduce speed limit on Alton Lane to 30mph
- Fix pot holes
- Improvements to Telegraph Lane junction
- Safety improvements to junction of Alton Lane with Lymington Bottom as visibility is poor, blind from certain directions
- Junction of Blackberry/Brisbands and Lymington Bottom needs improvements

- Junction of Lymington Bottom and A31 needs improvements
- Junction of Telegraph Lane and the A31 needs improvements (roundabout?)
- Junction of Alton Lane and Telegraph Lane needs improvements
- Junction of Boyneswood and A31 needs improvements
- The A31 needs major improvement both through Four Marks and towards Farnham and at the access to the A34 and M3
- Lanes down to A32 would need to be made two way for safety of pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and other road users (these are in the SDNP)
- Road widening
- Major highway improvements
- Bridge widening (Lymington Bottom)
- A new connection with the A31
- Better parking at school/new school
- Upgrades to Alton Road highway to provide pedestrian and cycle walkaways to Four Marks Primary School
- A bypass
- Tunnel the A31
- Dual carriageway
- There is one footpath crossing the site, 091/6/1, and this must be preserved and improved to cope with the higher foot traffic. The new residents of Four Marks South would likely use this path to walk their dogs etc moving southwards towards Kitwood and Hawthorn Plantations
- Improve public footpaths bridleways (usually poorly maintained and overgrown so can't be safely used)
- Additional parking at Alton Train station
- Better transport links to Alton
- Double train line from single track from Alton to Farnham

**Consultation question FMS3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

Environment and Landscape

- Loss of important corridor for wildlife (Bats, Badgers, Deer), biodiversity, open space, green belt, rural area.
- Contrary to Council's policy that protect landscape - Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) attributes significant value to the area and NPPF.
- Land acts as a green belt to urban sprawl.
- Development area important for drainage and will cause flooding issues along roads and down to the village of Ropley.
- This is not a sustainable development. EHDC already raised issue of climate change which this development would add to as well as pollution.
- Mitigation for loss of countryside inadequate - The community would not accept a green space in the middle of development rolled out over 10+ years.
- Contrary to Sustainability Appraisal.
- Should not be destroying trees that remove carbon from the air.
- Detrimental effect on adjacent South Downs National Park.
- The argument put forward about 'Grade 3' land being poor is not correct. Grade 3 - good to moderate quality agricultural land: "Land with moderate limitations which affect the choice of crops, timing and type of cultivation, harvesting or the level of

yield. Where more demanding crops are grown yields are generally lower or more variable than on land in Grades 1 and 2. NB Grade 5 is 'poor' “.

- Natural England - Potential to deliver a Net Gain to Biodiversity benefit for this greenfield site needs to be demonstrated through further development of the allocation for Reg 19 Sustainability Appraisal.

### Travel and Transport

- Current road structure and links cannot support development, no pavements or access to safe paths.
- Lack of investment up to now in infrastructure in Four Marks, already behind / at capacity and roads deteriorating.
- Access to site via narrow roads of Blackberry Lane, Boyneswood Road, Alton Lane and Lymington Bottom Road cannot take anymore traffic, Telegraph Lane junction hazardous. Some lanes single track. Increase in accidents. Traffic lights will not solve issue of traffic onto the A31. Side lanes to Farringdon often gridlocked.
- Even a small obstruction on the A31 e.g. a refuse-collection truck causes a long tail-back.
- A31 busy and dangerous runs through village and already bottle neck with 3 sets of pedestrian traffic lights and approx. 15 junctions coming from existing roads.
- Those travelling to the A3 from A31 heading towards A3 will cut through Chawton, already plagued by rat-runners, to avoid the 360° degree turn around one of the two Butts roundabout. Those travelling to Basingstoke will cut through Northbrook Lane and Chawton Park Road, Eggars, Amery Hill and Perins are all oversubscribed.
- Temporary traffic lights put up recently at Lymington Bottom crossroads in the morning caused a tail back beyond Soke Hill into Ropley, which is over a mile in distance.
- Single lane restricted railway bridges with limited pedestrian access.
- Boyneswood Road bridge cannot cope with the traffic now.
- No plan for highways improvements.
- Roads already deteriorating and narrow so larger trucks go up on verges/pavements to get through.
- Impact on new roads proposed detrimental to countryside and rural views.
- Developer mentions footpath on Alton lane but with narrow private verges and electricity poles little scope for footpath, apart from narrowing road, which is already narrow.
- Noise impact from A31 on development.
- Only village on A road without a bypass around Four Marks and Medstead, and not possible due to impact on Ancient Woodland.
- Public Transport inadequate, unreliable and expensive.
- Highways England – we would be concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN as a result of planned growth in East Hampshire without careful consideration of mitigation measures. Would generally support proposals with sustainable measures that reduce the need for travel. Site is equidistance between A3 and M3 therefore impact on SRN expected to be minimal.
- Listed Watercress line opposite the development site.
- Traffic congestion will increase a lot due to an additional 1120 cars (1.4 cars per household SE England, Table NTS9902 Dept of Transport).

- Cycling is a very dangerous option along the A31 or through the unlit muddy paths of Chawton Woods.
- Access to three of the sites via single track road.
- Most of the site also exceeds a 10 minutes walking time (c840m), which the Highways Authority has previously explained (during consultation leading to the refusal of planning permission in relation to FM-015 which now forms part of the FMS site). Exceeds the 5% guided maximum gradient in many parts of the site.
- Surrounding country roads of development site a vital resource for walkers, cyclist, dog walkers and horse riders. Will ruin countryside views.

### Infrastructure

- Impacts to services infrastructure – Water pressure low despite upgrade, Four Marks water tower ran out of water recently, sewage system in Alton already overcapacity, further load on Gas and Electricity (already had power cuts) not addressed in proposals.
- Internet services require upgrade – no fibre broadband and mobile coverage inadequate.
- Inadequate parking at shops and schools causing issues on local roads.
- Community infrastructure full – primary schools, secondary and six form schools, Doctors surgeries, no A&E close by, police station closed (crime rising), supermarkets already busy at peak times, no community buildings / recreational facilities to cope with increase, no “town centre” or places for families to go, inadequate pharmacy provision, no post office in Four Marks, scout/guide hut, village hall in poor state.
- Few if any opportunities to work locally so increase in car use/dependency to commute.
- Road and pavements to Lymington Bottom village hall and hall/parking itself, not fit for purpose.
- Brislands Lane single track road not suited to traffic and regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Also main access to Four Marks Primary School.
- Shop outlets could be better.
- Industrial units proposed next door to large country houses - character of rural & quiet will change.
- Once accessible pub is now a co-op.
- Town centre units empty.
- Government Inspectors and EHDC have stated infrastructure to support previous smaller scale new housing projects has not caught up, therefore large-scale development is un-sustainable.
- No access for children to swimming, cycle/skateboarding facilities within Four Marks and no cinema, youth or nightclub within reasonable travelling distance.
- Development has no retail provision which will exacerbate traffic through increased walking distances to amenities and services.
- These sites are affected by the Nitrate Issue owing to potential discharge of wastewater into the Solent SPA.

### Other

- Tourist area - Huge number of tourists visit Watercress line and Jane Austen’s house – faced with housing rather than English countryside.



- Views of countryside from footpaths ruined and result in irretrievable loss of local amenity space.
- Four separate developers will not work.
- Four Marks gets snow in winter with many roads impassable.
- Flooding at Five Ash Road and Lymington Bottom Road which has never been overcome.
- Disconnected parcels of land on separate sites – not a coherent large development site.
- Development will cause years of development and disruption.
- Will change village to an urban estate and more suited to larger towns.
- Lack of social cohesion, lose sense of village community and be urban sprawl.
- Too high Density and poorly designed layout.
- Detrimental to those already living in Four Marks
- The development includes land that has already been refused permission (S6082/003).
- Already existing traveller sites and more would put pressure on community infrastructure.
- Mention of “Heritage” asset, but none proposed.
- Proposal to build an unspecified number of affordable homes when inspector findings shows no need.
- Impact on Lasham Airfield and narrowing general fly zone away from commercial airport fly zones and houses.
- Conflict with EHDC Joint Core Strategy CP19.
- Light pollution would significantly increase.
- The number of houses built in last 2-3 years exceeds those agreed in local plan. Neighbourhood Plan states minimum of 175 dwellings by 2028, to date 395 dwellings have been built/approved.
- This site does not appear in the NP and is outside the settlement policy boundary, and therefore conflicts, NP already identifies favourable sites.

**Consultation question FMS4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- Site that is least damaging to the character of the landscape
- Less devastating on an ecological basis
- Housing is needed in Four Marks, so the children of current residents don't need to move far away to buy a first home
- More community spirit
- Some areas set aside for small businesses to emerge will also keep people nearby
- Nicely broken up sites which will integrate better than huge single sites
- Will fill gap nicely between, Winchester, Petersfield, Farnham, Basingstoke and even Southampton and Guildford as all are very commutable from Four Marks
- Close to the village centre and the school
- Village centre off the A31 to create more of a village feel
- A new community centre
- It is not visible from the tourist attraction of the Mid-Hants Railway
- It includes improvements to junction with A31
- Surrounded by wide roads with no constraints
- May reduce car use

- Transport companies to offer a long-term transport solution
- Provides the funding necessary to make upgrades required from the village
- Care home facility / elderly care and housing
- Addresses affordable housing need
- Generates employment/ business premises
- Potential to deliver Net Gain to Biodiversity
- Would improve connections of rights of way

**Consultation question FMS5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Affects the setting of the South Downs National Park as it sits adjacent
- Huge additional visual and light pollution encroaching on the views of SDNP
- Against the SDNP Dark Skies policy (SDNP became the world's newest International Dark Sky reserve, its only one of 13 in the world)
- Extra carbon emissions to the SDNP
- Technical reports indicate no harm is caused to the views of setting of South Downs National Park
- Any development on the 'A31 corridor' will generate more A31 traffic
- Farnham is now a pinch point on the traffic flow

**Consultation question FMS6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- The number of developers and owners involved will delay and complicate the development process, and as such put delivery by 2036 into question
- Agreement will be needed between all the parties involved, which will be difficult to achieve
- Historically this approach has caused delays
- Many various assertions as to how many developers/owners are involved
- Not all the land is owned by developers
- Lack of evidence the site is deliverable
- Foot access to the village shops for pedestrians is via one very narrow footpath between houses which is not suitable to pave or widen, so cannot be delivered
- The land allocation is too small to be delivered
- Geographically fragmented so hinders deliverability
- Some of the land included is not within control of the consortium
- The 5 developers referred to on the information packs have disproportional shares of ownership and there is no mention of a developer having a singular role [i.e. main contractor status] to manage and oversee the delivery of the whole site including services and associated infrastructure.
- Within the three sites there are likely to be a number of small plots of privately held land i.e. small paddocks etc., no doubt in a multiplicity of individual types of ownership. Some of these plots will have 'options to purchase' in place others may not; therefore can the land be classified as secured for development?

## **Land South of Winchester Road, Four Marks**

### **Consultation question SWR1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- Already sufficient Traveller sites
- We already have a number of care homes close to this development
- Employment land allocations are too small
- Does not comply with 'One new house, one new job' policy None of the sites have the required number of employment opportunities – increasing the dormitory nature of the current settlement
- Good employment options provided in plan
- Developer hasn't specified how many jobs will be created
- Insufficient provision for extra employment
- Industrial site already on Grosvenor Road
- The proposed business site is the wrong side of the A31
- Employment centre had no pedestrian / cycle access
- Work created is likely to be relatively low wage and low in number of roles
- The proposed primary school is suitable for those in the estate- will be difficult access for the rest of the Four Marks community, not clearly integrated with existing community
- Primary school and pre-school: not enough space allocated
- No evidence that the proposed primary school would be bigger or in a better location – suggested locations are in lanes already compromised by heavy, industrial traffic compromised by bridges and congestion
- No provision for additional shops/doctor's surgeries/family entertainment have been mentioned
- Many shops in Alton are vacant so what is the purpose of building more when there are local shops in Four Marks easily available
- Provision of Traveller and Show people sites at the end of Grosvenor road, will affect the scenic views from the Watercress heritage railway and use up valuable agricultural land
- The development would seriously degrade the panoramic views of the Hampshire countryside
- The proposed uses on this site are drastically out of character for such a key visual site
- Need the hedges, fields and green spaces to buffer existing habitats against secondary effects from disturbance, noise and pollution
- Essential to generate a sense of place and purpose but none of the developers have indicated such content in any meaningful way
- The proposal includes land which is currently known as the (Hampshire Alps) any development here will detract from its character
- Good to see reference to the inclusion of a care home and care units
- No requirement nor justification for building more houses in this already built up environment
- Development of 35 houses per hectare is urban level development not rural
- Proposal to build 260 affordable homes, however planning inspectors (appeal findings- section 68) that more affordable housing is not required in Medstead/ Four Marks
- Such over development and 'affordable housing' will drive property prices sky high

- If the proposed affordable housing is not built then the size of the development drops to 390 units and consequently would not meet EHDC requirement for a Large Development Site
- The development is unattainable to those trying to get onto the housing ladder

**Consultation question SWR2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- Facilities for young people / teenagers
- Community centre / multi purpose village hall
- Four Marks village hall needs a new roof, internal and external redecoration
- Play areas
- A new park
- Sports facilities
- Leisure facilities
- Scout hut
- Supermarket
- Shops
- Pub
- Restaurant
- Environmental improvements at shops
- Health care provision / enhanced facilities
- Hospital
- More GP surgeries
- Extra buildings for clinical services, care of the elderly
- More dentists
- New drainage / drainage strategy
- Sewage – whole length of the service system needs upgrading / pumping station not fit for purpose
- Power
- Internet
- Better upgraded school
- 180 primary places, 126 secondary school places
- New primary school (early, not at end)
- Relocate primary school
- Improved secondary schooling / more secondary places
- Adult education
- Allotment
- Flood prevention measures / incl. on A31 down the hill towards Ropley
- Improvements to deal with run-off as the are where Grosvenor Road joins the A31 is regularly flooded
- Consideration to off-site contributions to improving existing facilities or creating new facilities to meet the demand from the new population. This should be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy and indoor sports facilities strategy
- New school and new village hall should be on Barn Lane to improve access and integration
- Nitrate mitigation
- Water supply is limited and provision for increased supply and/or storage is needed
- Solar panels, wind turbines
- Biodiversity enhancements

## Highways/transport

- Traffic calming measures in Telegraph Lane and Blackberry Lane
- Traffic calming for Medstead and Bentworth
- Traffic calming in Beech
- Traffic safety measures to ensure safe to cross roads
- Reduce speed limit in Alton Lane from 60mph to 30mph
- Average speed cameras
- Road widening
- Rebuild roads
- Bridge widening (Lymington Bottom Road)
- A new connection/junction to the A31 from the site
- Change the A31/ junction
- New junctions and crossings of the A31
- The A31 is dual carriageway – major changes will be required to enable access to the employment area from the housing
- Significant changes to the main A31 would be required to ensure traffic turning onto and coming off the main A31 could do so safely
- Change the junction at Barn Road to enable safe access to the A31
- The roads on the north side will require extensive widening to enable access to the Gypsy and Traveller /Travelling Showpeople site
- A bypass
- Dual carriageway though Four Marks
- Roundabouts on the A31
- A full roundabout at the top of the hill to disperse and regulate the traffic
- More busses for school run
- Improved bus service into Alton
- Better / cheaper public transport
- Parking at Alton station for commuters
- Recommission the Mid Hants Railway into a main commuter service / schools
- Train station should be the commercial hub of Four Marks as proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan
- footpath 091/20/2 will be crossed by the main access road into the main part of the SWR site from the "Barn Lane" section so there will need to be adequate traffic control measures installed. Footpath 199/14/1 crosses the main site down 30m of elevation to The Shant and this again must be preserved in the site if it were ever built
- Railway needs extra track, doubling the single line to double from Alton to Farnham
- Improve public walkways and footpaths
- Improve bridleways – usually overgrown and poorly maintained
- Fix potholes
- Pedestrian and land bridge to cross the A31 and connect the development with the employment area
- Installing a roundabout at the Shant on A31 would help, but it would also need a cycle/ footbridge to allow access to northern sectors of the site.

**Consultation question SWR3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

Transport and travel

- The current road structure and links cannot support this development
- The A31 is already a dangerous road at particular points and it is just not safe to increase the level of traffic
- Impact on traffic on both the A31 and Blackberry Lane.
- Public transport is inadequate for the amount of extra population in the area
- There would be more accidents on the roads especially with additional families and traffic moving either on foot, on a bike or in a car.
- Pavements are crumbling, and verges are being destroyed by cars, builder's trucks and delivery vehicles
- Most elderly residents do not leave the house as to access this facility they would need to drive as the road and pavement system is not fit for purpose.
- Lymington bottom crossing is nowhere near suitable for the high traffic
- Lanes around Medstead and Four Marks are already dangerous with too much traffic on narrow lanes
- Four Marks is a bottle-neck, as at either end of the village it is a dual carriageway
- The A31 is already a major trunking route and further traffic generated by the development would have detrimental impact on the volume of cars accessing and leaving the new developments
- Dangerous access to the business park
- Dangerous "S" bend incorporating the long, single lane railway bridge on Grosvenor Rd with no pedestrian facility
- Plan for 3 T-junctions with the A31 on sections where the speed-limit is 40MPH or national speed limit is very dangerous and does not address safety or ways of improving congestion.
- Alton is the nearest mainline train station with insufficient parking as it stands
- Negative impact on route from Lymington Bottom through Medstead and out to Bentworth where traffic joins the A339 to Basingstoke
- Bus routes to Alton or Alresford, several miles away, for secondary education are already overcrowded
- Public transport will not be able to cope with the increased footfall and there is only a single bus stop within reach of the proposed site
- No roundabout planned onto A31, restricted access onto fast road
- Gravel Lane is very narrow and very steep making a difficult junction with the A31.
- Grosvenor Road is very narrow and floods (which can freeze) every winter and at other times of high rainfall). This makes a difficult junction with the southbound A31.
- No access for large vehicles
- With the lack of job opportunities for the 600 houses meaning all potential home owners would be commuters.

Other infrastructure

- Transport, doctors surgery and possibly more importantly local hospital services which are currently stretched.
- Four Marks has not had the investment to cope with its current expansion

- Internet services are appalling already and have become worse as the new estates are built
- Local police station was closed, and crime is definitely rising in the area
- Don't have community buildings to cope with any kind of population increase
- Site doesn't have an accident and emergency department very close
- sewerage system is inadequate and because the sewage is stored and not pumped away
- Insufficient room for pre-school play and elderly day care.
- Four Marks and Medstead Schools are at capacity
- There is no secondary schooling available near Four Marks. Instead pupils will need to travel some distance to access these facilities, for most too far to cycle or walk.
- No secondary school in the plan and Alton schools are already at overcapacity.
- Site Imposes a further load on the provision of Gas, Water and Electricity

### Environment and landscape

- Damage the long-distance views from the railway towards the South Downs National Park and impact our ability to generate tourism income as a district
- land at the bottom is currently subject to flooding and that will only get worse with houses being built on the land causing even more drainage
- Site compromises the environment and amenities of the area, in particular wildlife.
- Destroys areas of greenfield land and cause environmental damage to currently largely rural areas.
- Wildlife will be massively negatively affected by removing so much land that is populated by insects, birds, small and large mammals
- The site is currently home to protected nesting Red Kites and multiple bat species
- The view from the Water Cress line will be impacted by the traveller site.
- Additional Nitrates look to be an issue.
- The site is in the nitrate exclusion zone
- Gascoigne Lane is almost always under water, indicating that the land in this area is saturated and unsuitable for building.
- The Barn Lane site has underlying clay soil and is prone to flooding in the winter
- Light pollution in an existing rural area
- Degrade vistas from the Ancient Old Down Wood (just 39 metres from the site boundary) and from the historic Pilgrim's Way
- Damage to the character of the highly-valued landscape colloquially known as the "Hampshire Alps"
- Pollution of River Arle where rare white-clawed Crayfish exist
- Heavy rainfall, especially in the winter, flows down the entire length of Grosvenor Road, (starting from the intersection of Upper Soldridge Road, north of the bridge, outside the area) creating at times impassable ford at the intersection with A31.

### Other

- Four Marks and Medstead have already over delivered extensive new housing
- Cause years of unnecessary disruption in local area to existing residents/ businesses.
- Ropley is a small village which will be swamped

- The position of the proposed build is some distance from the centre of the village
- Site will change to the rural character of the town
- Will lose sense of village community and become sprawling conurbation with no social cohesion.
- 15 Traveller sites on prime agricultural land and adjacent to Heritage railway
- Flooding issues here would make this undeliverable and unsuitable.
- Sites in these areas including Chawton are un-sustainable, un-deliverable, unnecessary and unsuitable.
- Much of the development is on slope and the consequences of this make the site unsuitable
- Possible archaeological finds on the sites
- Conflicts totally with Local Neighbourhood plans
- The proposals conflict with the Medstead Neighbourhood Plan
- There will be gradual “linkage” between Ropley and Four Marks forming a single place.
- Would destroy the hamlet of Soldridge.
- Proposed development further fragments an already fragmented village damaging the communities sense of place and sense of identity
- Site is in upper River Alre catchment area
- No proven need for more housing or affordable housing
- The available corner shops and single petrol station are insufficient to supply food and fuel to the villages
- No building contractor is identified

**Consultation question SWR4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- New ‘suburb’ of Four Marks
- Improved community facilities
- Well placed to serve the needs of the communities
- New school
- New early years and primary school provision
- Viable reason for transport companies to offer a long-term transport solution, same for educational facilities and health care
- Potential investment in existing recreational facilities in Four Marks
- The site could demonstrate effective use of land and conservation enhancement of natural environment possibilities with net gains for biodiversity
- Site would meet many of the Summarised Key Issues & Objectives in SA Framework- Figure 49 & 50

**Consultation question SWR5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Negative impact on important vistas from multiple locations within the SDNP e.g. Cheesefoot head and Beacon Hill
- Deconstruction of the countryside



- Increase in road network
- No effort to help traffic through from Winchester and Guildford
- Creates dangerous and harmful divisions on the A31 trunk road
- Site spans the parishes of Ropley and Four Marks – creating coalescence between the settlements
- Removing settlement gap conflicts with JCS Policy CP23
- 80% of traffic will be heading east to Guildford/ London for employment
- Deleterious to the dark skies project
- Light pollution
- A31 bypass in Farnham is now a pinch point in traffic flow

**Consultation question SWR6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- Multiple developers and landowners, unable to agree
- Inadequate size
- The viability of any new local retail provision is highly questionable at this number of dwellings
- No developer on board
- Undeliverable given its extreme ecological and topographic sensitivity
- Nitrate mitigation would affect viability
- Very expensive to deliver due to topography, drainage, sewerage and road safety issues

### **South Medstead**

**Consultation question SM1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- Too many houses for an area lacking in infrastructure
- 600 homes are too many for the site
- Such over development and 'affordable housing' will promote even more commuters and will drive property prices sky high
- Employment land allocations are too small
- None of the sites have the required number of employment opportunities
- Good employment options provided in plan
- The developer has not specified how many jobs will be created
- These developments are not sustainable and do not comply with the 'one new house, one new job' policy
- Employment and land for Gypsy and Traveller pitches is also unnecessary as there are already provisions within the Medstead and Four Marks community
- The type of work created is likely to be relatively low wage and low in number of roles
- Local employment does not seem to be realistic
- The employment centre is too remote and not needed
- The existing business park is already under used
- The small scale of the new employment area means most of the new people will be commuting by car to elsewhere, probably by the A31
- No provision for additional shops, family entertainment or doctors surgeries have been mentioned
- New primary school is unnecessary as the existing should be expanded

- All the developers mention a new primary school but, there is no evidence it would be bigger or, in a better location
- Suggested locations are in lanes already compromised by heavy, industrial traffic, lanes compromised by bridges and congestion
- These proposals are not fully developed and vague at best
- The development plan lacks detail
- Dormitory with homeowners commuting to work causing further congestion/ pollution to the area
- There are ample provisions for play spaces already
- The site is too remote from the village
- Lymington Bottom area has already had a new housing estate built
- No traveller's sites allocated just potential to do so
- The provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites would be inappropriate
- Not all children will be able to walk to school (too dangerous as massive increase on A31)
- Parking within new developments are notoriously under provisioned
- Creating an extra community hub is unnecessary
- No village hall provision
- Propose inclusion of allotments

**Consultation question SM2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- Large multi purpose village hall (Four Marks) / community buildings
- More community areas
- Additional school places now
- Better upgraded school (Four Marks and Medstead)
- New schools
- Sixth form college
- Secondary school
- Youth facilities
- Entertainment facilities
- New supermarket
- New mains sewers
- Upgrade sewage treatment works
- New drainage / strategic drainage infrastructure
- More car parking in Alton generally
- New GP surgery / expand GP surgeries
- A hospital / local cottage hospital
- New health care provision / enhanced medical facilities / additional clinical services
- New dentists clinic
- Better internet connection
- More shops / more parking at shops
- Environmental improvements at shops
- Pub
- Post office
- Restaurants
- Contribute to off site sports and recreation provision, either improvements to existing facilities or creation of new facilities
- Allotments
- Village trust
- Flood management

- Green infrastructure

### Highways/transport

- Fix potholes
- Better public transport
- More busses for the school run
- Improved bus service to Alton
- Improved public transport
- Improvements to bridge on Boyneswood Road
- New two land bridge
- Widen bridge
- Add pavement to bridge
- New tunnel / widen tunnel
- Pedestrian bridge at Boyneswood Road
- Bridge and country roads need to be 2 way
- Road widening
- Widen Lymington Bottom Road
- Footpaths on bridge
- Footpaths on tunnel
- Improvements to Stoney Lane (unadopted road, paid for by residents of Stoney Lane)
- The Green Lane/footpath and Medstead station road will have to be adopted from the landowner
- Traffic calming on Telegraph Lane
- Traffic calming on Blackberry Lane
- Traffic calming for Medstead
- Traffic calming for Bentworth
- Traffic calming for Beech
- Speed cameras
- Reduce speed limit on Alton Lane to 30mph
- Roundabout needed for exit onto Five Ash Road, and Five Ash Road widened
- Improvements to junction of Five Ash Road and Lymington Bottom Road
- Improvements to junction of Lymington Bottom Road and A31
- Improvements to junction of Lymington Bottom and A31 (roundabout or traffic lights)
- Improvements to junction of Boyneswood Lane and the A31
- Improvements to junction of Telegraph Lane and the A31
- Improvements to Lymington Bottom Road
- Improvements to road to Medstead Village from Lymington Bottom Road – there are two blind bends on this road which are dangerous
- Install traffic lights on the A31 to prevent undue delays for traffic emerging from Lymington Bottom Road
- Install traffic lights on the A31 to prevent undue delays for traffic emerging from Boyneswood Road
- Use Mid Hants railway for commuters
- Extra track – doubling of single line from Alton to Farnham
- Trains run from Alresford to Waterloo / extend the railway line from Alton
- More buses at school times
- More busses to Alton
- Better transport links to Alton from Four Marks/Medstead
- Reinstate the bus from Four Marks/Medstead to Basingstoke

- Bus service along Lymington Bottom Road and Five Ash Road
- A 31 bypass
- A 31 tunnel
- Alternative provisions for right of way need to be made
- Improve footpaths
- Improve bridleways (usually overgrown and poorly maintained)
- There is an opportunity to make a new path to take walkers away from Lymington Bottom Road and go through the proposed site to link to footpaths 155//19/1 in the North, and to Station Approach at the south (to then link further east in the village.
- Cycle route to Alton needs proper tarmac cycle path and lights
- More parking at Alton station

**Consultation question SM3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

Environment and landscape

- Bats, foxes, deer, red kites and other species live in the fields between Lymington Bottom and Stoney Lane. Their habitat will be destroyed.
- Extra pollution will be caused by cars, people and builders
- Flooding occurs on Lymington Bottom Road/ Five Ash Road and end of Grosvenor Road
- A loss of wildlife habitat, green fields, woodlands and hedgerows
- Loss of farmland
- Nitrate mitigation will be required as part of the site is within the Itchen catchment

Transport and travel

- Current road structure and links cannot support this development
- Highway infrastructure limitations due to Lymington Bottom Watercress railway bridge
- Impact on traffic on both the A31 and Blackberry Lane
- Four Marks bus route is inadequate (one every hour)
- Bi-pass around Four Marks and Medstead is not possible because of the impact to ancient woodland
- The site would destroy the rural character of the village
- One entrance to main site, hence facilities are hidden and isolated, unconnected to the rest of the community
- The commuter cycle path to Alton station through Chawton Wood is unsafe and unrealistic
- Single lane restricted railway bridges with limited pedestrian access
- Increased traffic within the village increasing the risk of accidents
- Site is beyond a reasonable walking distance to any local facilities, recreational areas or bus routes.
- Access to Medstead under the railway bridge cannot support anymore traffic
- Footpaths and cycle paths muddy and unlit- not suitable for pram pushers, toddler walkers
- Rural roads around Medstead will be used as short cuts to Basingstoke and Alton.
- Increased risk of harm to pedestrians as very few roads have pavements
- Daily traffic jams at Boyneswood Road, Lymington Bottom Road and Chawton Park Road

## Infrastructure

- Internet services are appalling already – getting worse as the new estates are built
- Shops have inadequate parking
- Schools have inadequate facilities
- Doctors surgeries are full – practises can't cope as appointment delays are getting longer
- Local sewage system is already overcapacity
- No local accident and emergency department
- No local police station
- Not enough sporting facilities for children (Alton leisure centre won't be big enough)
- Current infrastructure (schools, doctors, shops, roads) is not suitable to support additional need
- Gas, water and electricity are already or either over capacity
- School are already/ near full capacity
- No street lights in Medstead which is dangerous
- Insufficient provision for toddler groups, older children, the elderly and the disabled
- Infrastructure deficit from 10 years of overdevelopment
- Medstead has suffered from very low water pressure for several years which has become steadily worse with every new house added onto the mains. The street mains are old and there are leaks.

## Other

- Changing a rural village into a dormitory town
- Very few local businesses or opportunities to work locally
- Noise impact from the A31
- Four Marks and Medstead have already over delivered extensive new housing
- Number of houses breaches the neighbourhood plan
- Increased noise and light pollution
- The enormous amount of building around two villages will completely undermine social cohesion

## **Consultation question SM4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- Allows easy access to the main road
- Potential of a new primary school which will accommodate new families
- The street scheme will be attractive, and a rural theme maintained
- Provision for employment
- Funding and delivery of highway improvements
- Improved accessibility to the A31
- Employment land to attract more businesses to the area
- Good road access onto the Winchester road
- Improves and tidies the area
- Already has direct vehicle access to Stoney Lane
- Enables a viable reason for transport companies to offer a long-term transport solution
- Provides a sound platform to underpin further investment in the local area
- Provides a sound basis for a more holistic approach to the growth of the community

- Helping to recover some of the historical lack of provision across a range of infrastructure sectors
- Capacity to deliver school improvements where necessary
- Opportunities to integrate and enhance existing wildlife features
- Train station is within 5-7 mins walking distance
- Protects the surrounding countryside from further encroachment
- Creates a compact and sustainable form of development encouraging walking and relying on existing services and facilities

**Consultation question SM5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Will be considerably worse with traffic cutting across country to Basingstoke
- Site affects the visual amenity of the area, it is visually damaging in the landscape
- There is no effort to help through traffic from Winchester to Guildford
- Impact on views of South Downs National Park

**Consultation question SM6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- Delays caused by multiple developers and landowners needing to agree
- Historically, this approach has been delayed
- Access to the proposed area behind Mansfield is not possible
- The estate behind the butcher has resident run road infrastructure and paid for by the residents, permissions have not been provided to allow access to the proposed field behind it.
- Access to new site is proposed via a recent new development's unadopted road, which is unsuitable even for its present purpose.
- The plan shows a potential footpath leading from the South Medstead development to the Watercress Medical Centre on Lymington Bottom Road. The path is shown as an existing right of way which is certainly not the case as it traverses the new Cala Homes site on Lymington Bottom Road which is a private estate

**West of Lymington Bottom Road, South Medstead**

**Consultation question WLB1: Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**

- Local centre is on the A31 – expansion will be disparate
- Good employment options
- Employment land allocations are too small
- Doesn't allow for sufficient additional employment
- Work created is likely to be relatively low wage/low number of roles
- Does not comply with the 'one new house one new job' policy
- None of the sites have the required number of employment opportunities
- Low number of houses for space allocated
- Affordable housing is not required
- Too dense
- Increasing the dormitory nature of the current settlement
- Four Marks already has traveller sites

- No provision for additional shops/ doctor's surgeries/ family entertainment (cinema's, sports centres etc) or school places
- No consideration for secondary school children
- The proposed primary school increases traffic on Lymington Bottom Road
- Under- provisioned parking within the new developments
- Only 18% of green space in the land

**Consultation question WLB2: What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**

- A new village hall / large multipurpose hall
- Facilities for teenagers
- More community areas
- Cinema complex
- Supermarket
- New doctors
- Hospital
- New / enhanced health care facilities
- New dentists
- New school / schools provided early
- New secondary school
- Better upgraded school
- Parking at a new school
- New main sewers
- New drainage
- Power
- Internet
- Pub
- Restaurant
- Post office
- Environmental improvements
- Sports - Any sports provision should be designed and constructed in accordance with Sport England design guidance. Any proposed sports provision should be informed by the findings of the Playing Pitch Strategy and/or indoor sports facilities strategy
- Improvements or additional support for arts, culture and heritage infrastructure

Traffic/ highways

- More busses on school run
- Better transport links to Alton
- Better bus service to Alton
- Parking at Alton station for commuters
- Reduce speed limit on Alton Lane from 60mph to 30mph
- Average speed
- Traffic calming for Medstead
- Traffic calming for Bentworth
- Traffic calming for Beech
- Reinstate the bus between Medstead and Four Marks and Basingstoke should be reinstated
- Rebuild and widen roads
- Widen Beech Road
- Roundabout required on A31
- Mini roundabouts required in South Medstead

- Pedestrian bridge required over Boyneswood Bridge and Lymington Bottom Bridge
- Replace Water Cress line bridge to enable dual traffic passing under the bridge and pedestrian access
- Widen bridge over Lymington Bottom Road
- New two lane bridges and tunnels with footpaths on both sides of the roadway
- Reinstate Mid Hants Railway
- Additional parking in Alton
- Additional parking at Alton railway station
- Bypass
- Tunnel of A31
- Improvements to junction of Lymington Bottom Road and A31
- Improvements to road to Medstead village (2 blind bends in this road)
- Traffic lights at the junction of Lymington Bottom Road and the A31
- Traffic lights at the junction of Boyneswood Road and the A31
- make a new path to take walkers away from Lymington Bottom Road and go through the proposed site to link to footpaths 155//19/1 in the North, and to Station Approach at the south (to then link further east in the village)
- Improve public walkways, footpaths and bridleways

**Consultation question WLB3: Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site? Please provide detail and evidence.**

#### Environment and landscape

- Pollution issue from potential 1300 new cars using the road
- Loss of wildlife habitat
- Watercress Line views would fundamentally change
- Site will affect wildlife, light pollution, rural environment and countryside
- Site proximity to the headwaters of the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation
- Lymington Bottom Road/ Five Ash Road and the end of Grosvenor Road has flooding issues
- Will create heightened levels of air pollution
- Great loss of habitat for: bats, badgers, deer, squirrels, hedgehogs, birds and small mammals
- Site would take up majority of Green Space between Lymington Bottom Road, Soldridge Road and Grosvenor Road
- Site would be greenfield and would dramatically affect the local community
- Nitrate pollution mitigation required

#### Travel and transport

- The current road structure and links cannot support this development
- Impact on traffic on both the A31 and Blackberry Lane
- A31 and M1 have not go the capacity for any more traffic
- Public transport is very scarce and very expensive
- Cycle and walking paths are inappropriate and inconvenient- car traffic will grow greatly
- Potential for more accidents on the roads due to traffic increase
- Single lane bridges with limited pedestrian access
- A31 is currently the counties most dangerous trunk road



- New jet routes over Four Marks and Medstead from Farnborough – creates new noise footprint of the area
- A31 and junctions are already at over capacity with resulting traffic jams especially during school runs and rush hour
- Site will make the foot crossing over the Mid hans railway very dangerous
- Lack of commuter parking at local Alton railway station
- Local Councillors say all road junctions are a minimum of 85% at capacity with some over 100%
- No streetlights or footpath from site to primary school – very dangerous
- Lack of commuter parking at local Alton railway station

### Infrastructure

- Internet services are appalling already and have become worse as more new estates have been built
- The local sewage system in Alton is already over capacity
- Inadequate infrastructure with no room to improve this
- No accident and emergency department close by
- Police station closed down- crime is rising
- Insufficient community buildings to cope with population increase
- Doctors, dentists and other health services already under considerable strain
- Four Marks and Medstead schools are at capacity now
- Gas, water and electricity already is or close to over capacity

### Other

- Conflicts with Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan
- Changes the whole fabric of their communities
- The noise impact from the A31 to established homes either side of the A31
- Few employment opportunities in Four Marks and Medstead
- Four Marks and Medstead already over delivered extensive new housing
- Site would destroy the rural character of the village
- No social or recreational facilities
- Will lose sense of village community with no social cohesion
- Developer contributions would not be given to Four Marks (new residents would be using the Four Marks facilities)
- Medstead is being eroded and destroyed by excessive building
- Removal of 3 businesses; a pig farm, a logging enterprise and a builder's merchants will create a loss of 10 jobs
- The proposals conflict with the Medstead Neighbourhood Plan which undermines local democracy as this was voted for by local residents.
- The development is neither self-contained nor separate, it is simply more housing "bolted on" to an existing settlement.
- The development diminishes the sense of place and character of Soldridge, which borders the development
- Proposed development is outside the settlement policy boundary for Medstead (Medstead and Four Marks neighbourhood plan).

**Consultation question WLB4: The site promoters have identified opportunities and benefits of their proposal. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring. Please explain how.**

- Provision of new employment opportunities
- The additional primary school
- Well placed to serve the needs of the communities
- Transport companies to offer a long-term transport solution
- Make use of local services and facilities
- Potential to deliver Net Gain to Biodiversity benefit
- Sustainably located
- Would encourage residents to travel on foot
- Access to day- to- day services without the need for short car trips
- Range of services/ facilities
- Provide a nucleated settlement pattern
- Provides an opportunity to consolidate social and economic infrastructure provision
- Builds a more sustainable community
- Consolidation of settlement pattern will also have linked benefits of retaining more day to day expenditure which can, in turn, promote further investment
- Providing a new economic hub
- The proximity to the services at Lymington Barn will be of benefit for homeworkers, providing some informal meeting space, lunchtime and office uses.
- Improving environment/ health and wellbeing of residents

**Consultation question WLB5: What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**

- Increase in use of road network
- Destruction of countryside
- Worse traffic cutting across Basingstoke
- Impact on views
- Farnham now pinch point of traffic flow

**Consultation question WLB6: The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**

- Delays caused by multiple developers and landowners needing to agree
- No access through Longbourne Way at all – this is against the service agreement. The land owner of the field (due to be developed) at the back of Longbourne Way has access only to maintain the hedgerow
- One of the proposed entrances is via a road on which the public has right of way, yet no permission has been granted from the landowner to make any changes on it
- The site will be over a right of way that gives access to the rear of several properties along Lymington Bottom Road. Website shows the developer stating no right of way issues exist
- The estates behind the butcher is privately owned and infrastructure maintained by the residents. Permission needs to be sought from those residents to allow the large number of vehicles to travel through to have access to the fields behind
- The access by 'the school' seems to be over a private track giving access to the rear of several properties facing onto Lymington Bottom Road
- Access to new site is proposed via a recent new development's unadopted road, which is unsuitable even for its present purpose

- The plan shows a potential footpath leading from the South Medstead development to the Watercress Medical Centre on Lymington Bottom Road. The path is shown as an existing right of way which is certainly not the case as it traverses the new Cala Homes site on Lymington Bottom Road which is a private estate.
- The site would be expensive to develop due to drainage and sewerage issues, making it less deliverable

**Other question OQ7: Is there any other Large Development Site that could deliver over 600 homes and other supporting uses by 2036, that is not included in this consultation?**

- The logical place to site a development of this scale is on the land surrounding Bohunt School
- 0.63ha on Kitwood Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5AS (attached location plan) could be made available for extra classrooms/parking for school
- Pennally Farm as an alternative site
- Bohunt Manor is more logical with its proximity to school
- Ropley Dean down to Old Park Road would be a much more appropriate site
- North of Holybourne, Ropley Meadows, Whitehill & Bordon (HCC)
- Penally Farm towards the London Road approach together with Bohunt Manor
- Site at end of Station Road and Longmoor Road would help mitigate A3 access issues
- Land to the West of Liphook which would include a relief road between the Longmoor and Portsmouth roads
- Around Whitehill & Bordon or somewhere nearer the M3
- Former builders yard in Oakhanger (application was withdrawn)
- The old brewery in Alton Town Centre
- Bell Cornwell Partnership's clients site has been omitted from the South Medstead proposal which would leave it surrounded by development
- Stanford Grange Farm
- Pro Vision suggest land south-east of Alton
- Railway station Hub, Four Marks as outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan
- Consider South Medstead and West of Lymington Bottom Road options together

**Other questions OQ8 Do you have any comments on the assessment of large Development Sites, as set out in the Council's background paper?**

General

- Several of the sites appear to score highly and others less, yet EHDC hope to select two sites, one or more of which might score lower than others that are not selected. It appears that "political" factors can override the technical assessment
- The Council acknowledges methodological limitations but doesn't fully clarify how data and analysis will be improved/decisions taken
- The methodology highlights criteria considered relevant by the Council and its advisors but not how factors will be 'weighted' or by whom such judgements will be made
- Whilst the red, amber, green system on Table 8 give a clear indication of constraints, the weight given to each criteria would appear unclear
- The metrics/criteria used by the Council consider only proximity to doctors, schools and town centres. These assessments are reflected in the current consultation

materials. However, it is not clear how the methodology will ultimately fully appraise the critical aspects of site selection and development set out in the objectives. Distances quoted appear only to measure distances from the closest point of a site to the amenity or service, as well as being 'as the crow flies'. Importantly, site dimensions, shape, and topography are not considered although they manifestly affect accessibility (especially by means of travel other than private car).

- These flood zones only measure fluvial flood risk. Whilst this is of course a highly relevant consideration, it does not tell the whole story as regards the vulnerability of a site to flooding
- It appears from all this that there is no equivalent commitment to investigate matters assessed as 'green', nor for all 'amber' ratings, despite the general limitations in the methodology recognised by the Council
- The effect of development on the existing community needs to be considered
- The 'Y' in Table 7 against 'Vehicular Access', and therefore the tick for 'Passes Stage One?' is entirely inexplicable.
- It seems extraordinary that landscape value itself is not one of the tests applied at either Stages 1 or 2 of the Site Assessments, given the requirement of NPPF para 170(a).
- We note that table setting out the Council's Site assessment of the proposed Large Development Sites in traffic light form in the Background Paper does not have a column for landscape, despite this being raised as an issue in several developers' proposals. Such a column needs to be added with a red light for each of the above 4 Sites to indicate "valued landscape".
- In stage one, Ropley Meadows was ruled out because of no mains drainage, however a lot of the sites that made it through this stage in Four Marks and Alton are not fully covered with water infrastructure and where there is some infrastructure in place already it would require significant upgrading to meet the scale of site being considered. We don't think this criteria was sufficiently well defined to be included in stage one.
- Natural England is in agreement with the conclusions of the Site Assessment Background Paper that, for many of the sites, there are environmental issues and there appears to be scope for the mitigation or avoidance of environmental impacts. Table 9 could be amended to recognise the need for mitigation for European Sites for Northbrooke Park, Land SE Liphook and Extn East Horndean although this is recognised elsewhere and doesn't affect the conclusion. The recognition of a potential impact of nutrients on the Solent European Marine sites is very recent and there is a need for agreement which of the 10 sites may be affected and require mitigation. The necessity to go further to demonstrate a positive Net Gain to Biodiversity would benefit from greater emphasis in site assessments
- The background paper seems to 'tick' accessibility for a site when a road can be accessed. The ease of access to local facilities should be the criteria. Rather long and difficult to comprehend Too complicated The document does not provide sufficient information to make a definitive assessment of the priority between each site
- Cumulative assessment needed
- Necessity to go further to demonstrate a positive Net Gain to Biodiversity would benefit from greater emphasis in Site Assessments.
- The assessment does not take into consideration the traffic and infrastructure impact of the proposals on the existing infrastructure and roads
- The assessment of LDSs in the SABP has not addressed the deliverability of the LDS options within the Local Plan period (2017 to 2036).
- There are clear indicators, such as the number of red scores, that some sites are simply not suitable for large scale development, when other more appropriate alternatives are also being considered. The cumulative impacts are also relevant.

These matters are pertinent in considering any strategy against reasonable alternatives

- The distance from a town centre or local centre is scored the same in the traffic light system as red if the site is 1.5km away. A site that is located 1.5km from a Town centre or the Tier 1 centre of Alton cannot be scored in the same way as a site which is 1.5km from a local centre. Indeed a site which is even within 800m of a Local Centre and scored green will not have access to the same level of services as Chawton Park which with its bus, cycle and pedestrian routes far more accessible to services.

#### Four Marks and Medstead related

- This site includes a new, large area of escarpment land, traversing the Four Marks and Ropley Parish boundary and should not be considered for development since a major portion of it is not registered within the EHDC Land Availability Assessment Report (December 2018). An Assessment of Suitability for this new land should have been placed in the public domain (per other LAA sites). It is unacceptable for a significant new area of land to “inherit” the Analyses of adjacent LAA sites, especially as EHDC has employed a GIS-based methodology for ascertaining the impact of the relevant factors
- The Council’s assessment is not underpinned with analysis undertaken to the same degree of rigour, e.g. parts of Four Marks South having bypassed the LAA
- At least three plots of land included in the FMS proposal have not been appraised as part of the Council’s published LAA and and/or Sustainability Processes
- The assessment for Four Marks South understates the constraints relating to: doctors, schools and town centre. AFTER the proposed development the surface water drainage risk would rise to HIGH (as shown on the Government's long term flood risk information) both on-site and at Lymington Bottom. The sloping site does not lend itself to permeable surface mitigation as sloped exceed the 1% limit at established in HCC guidance
- The stage 2 results on Table 8, page 30 of the Large Development Sites Background Paper needs revising to indicate a RED colour for the Ancient Woodland column as the site is less than 50m away. The site is 39 metres from the Ancient Woodland (and SINC), Old Down Wood and will have an adverse effect on the character of its setting, destroying views entering and exiting the woodland from Brislands Lane (SWR)
- Over 50% of the SWR site land is not an assessed area (ie not included in the LAA of Dec 2018) 2. Technical errors in data P36 Table 10 – The SWR site HAS cross-boundary considerations that are not mentioned;
  - a. Views into and out of the SDNP
  - b. Parish boundary coalescence
  - c. Site straddles A31
  - d. Ancient Woodland/SINC – The site is only 39 metres from Old Down Wood (Site of Importance for Nature Conservation) - therefore the stage two table (page 77) should have marked the result as RED (not Amber) for this site.

EHDC has not considered the considerable topological challenges associated with this site. Not only in terms of setting, character, vistas and drainage, but also that of the Cumulative Elevation Gain (CEG) of the site from the village centre (nearly 74metres, one-way!). Not only is the farthest point of this site 2.4KM from the centre of the village, but it is also a very daunting “double uphill” struggle for any pedestrian or cyclist to undertake and therefore more vehicular usage will result.

- There are technical errors within the EHDC documentation. Particularly with respect to site assessment and classification (eg missing cross-boundary considerations for Land South of Winchester Road (SWR) site on page 14 of the Large Development Sites Consultation Paper (marked “N/A” when it should show South Downs National Park and in addition there are also other cross boundary considerations as the Site spans both sides of the A31) This should also be updated for The Land South of Winchester Road (SWR) site on page 36, Table 10 of the Site Assessments Background Paper. Perhaps the reason for these omissions is due to item 4 above, as the without the analysis of these new large areas (including the escarpment), the cross boundary considerations would not apply. In addition, the site does not adjoin the settlement policy boundary (as stated in the consultation document). Instead it extends across a gap from one small corner of an allocated site (SA25 for post 2032 development) at Barn Lane.
- The FMS proposed plan is made up of disconnected pockets of land [including one site referenced as “Shanley site” in the developer’s information pack that was recently refused planning permission] that appear to have no physical connection with each other nor with the wider surrounding settlement. The proposal is not a “large development site” it does not have the physical connections between the disparate pockets of land to make it a single site. It is essentially three separate development proposals corralled together to achieve a certain status i.e. number of homes, to constitute a ‘large development site’.
- Earlier planning documents reference Old Down Wood. However, it appears to have overlooked Gullet Wood – on Grosvenor Road – which is less than a mile from the traveller/retail site. As it is “less than 50m” from the ancient woodland, surely this should have received a “Red Score” in the site assessment criteria
- One of the criteria in the EHDC Site Assessment is that sites further than 2km from a surgery get a red flag. A large proportion of the South Four Marks site should be red flagged on that basis (actual walking/driving distance, not “as the crow flies”). The balance should be given an amber score. There are no facilities planned for a new surgery, together with necessary parking etc, to support the new population of residents. The published assessment for stage 2 approval for access to doctors is factually incorrect in that it gives a “green” assessment
- Closer scrutiny of the SABP notes that only a very small part of the South Medstead LDS is technically within the Solent catchment. For clarification, the only area is the most western portion of the block of land west of Lymington Road. Environment Agency data indicates that the western part of the proposed LDS sits within the catchment for the Arle, which is a tributary to the Itchen, which eventually flows into the Solent. The data utilised by the Environment Agency does not reflect the topographical information available for this part of the site, with the ridge sitting further west, suggesting surface water will drain to the east and into the Wey catchment, leading to the Thames. Notwithstanding the need for a more detailed assessment of the catchments, all waste water will be taken to the Alton Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). As a result, unlike several of the alternative sites and other (non-strategic) draft site allocations, there will be no additional nutrients added to the Solent. The evidence base should be revisited and amended so that the requirement for NN is not regarded as a significant constraint for the South Medstead option. All alternative sites and preferred options should be reassessed against this rapidly emerging issue

#### Northbrook Park related

- p93 of “EHDC Background Paper – Large Development Sites” shows that Northbrook Park has 9 “red” assessments – the most of any proposed sites and is hence the weakest.

- The evidence contained in the Site Assessments actually suggest that there are other more sustainable and suitable sites in East Hampshire. The proposed allocation for NP must therefore be withdrawn by EHDC
- Although it is suggested that the table rankings are not definitive, they cannot be set aside - to do so would lead residents to feel that they have been misled, which cannot be a consequence that EHDC could allow. The rankings show that NP has more Red and Amber marks than any other sites, and fewer green ones. Those scores carry great weight, and since other reasonable alternative sites are available, being more sustainable, they must be considered, and not NP.
- The Wealden case has established that land within 5kms of an SPA should not be considered for development until all sites beyond the 5km buffer zone have been assessed and ruled out. The SA refers to the proposed allocation at Northbrook Park being located within 5-7 km, of the Wealden Heaths SPA but does not appear to take account of the proximity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. When the full SPA buffer zones for both are applied the whole site is within 5km of an SPA. The site should not therefore be considered for allocation until all sites beyond the 5km buffer zone have been assessed and ruled out. This needs to be demonstrated through a Habitats Regulations Assessment, sequential site testing and a fit for purpose SA.
- A simple reorganisation of the Table 8 that ranks the sites by the overall number of 'red' and 'amber' assessments from lowest to highest demonstrates that the development site option at the West of Lymington Road, South Medstead has the fewest 'reds' and 'ambers' (3) and Northbrook Park has by far the most (12). It is also possible to observe that the opposite can be said of the number of 'green' assessments and that Northbrook Park has the fewest. It is accepted that the Council is not required to choose the most sustainable option for development, nor will the decision be made purely on the analysis presented in 'Table 8.' However, if the Council is not taking the most sustainable approach then a greater amount of mitigation will be required for the identified development, and the benefits of the development will need to significantly outweigh the harm

#### Alton related

- The bulk of the site is about 3.5km from Alton town centre (the junction of High Street and Market Street), not 1.5km as stated in EHDC's assessment documents. Similarly the centre of the site is 2km (not 800m) from the nearest primary school (The Butts). Alton Sports Centre, well to the east of the site, is itself over 1.5km from Alton town centre. So the Stage 2 Assessment of this site is flawed, and distance Alton town centre is definitely not an 'insignificant' factor as the assessment claims.
- One of the Stage Two constraints is 'impact from development on Listed Chawton Park Farmhouse'. We do not agree that saying there are 'likely to be' opportunities to avoid adverse impacts on this, taken with the statement on page 64 that says 'this area is envisaged as a new Local Centre where higher density development might be anticipated', is in anyway a strong enough guarantee for the creation of a suitable environment commensurate with the listed status of this building
- Chawton Park Farm is scored Red in the assessment given it is located within 50m of listed building. The Chawton Park Farm Heritage Assessment submitted with this representation has identified that the emerging masterplan for Chawton Garden Village is likely to result in less than substantial harm at the lower end of the spectrum to one Grade II Listed building, Chawton Park Farmhouse. This demonstrates that more detailed assessment is required for the selection of preferred allocations.

### Whitehill & Bordon related

- The criteria used on page 7 and in paragraph 2.20 are not appropriate when development in a place such as Bordon which is composed all around the location with sites of high biodiversity. The choice of this site for an original large brownfield development site only occurred because the Army decided to leave the area. It is not an appropriate location for the extension development areas proposed locally or for a large town to be situated.

### Other sites

- Land to the North of Holybourne was unfairly overlooked for inclusion within this large development sites consultation. We consider the site has superior sustainability credentials than sites that have been included within the consultation. Further information provided.

### Positive comments

- Comprehensive and provides a fair balance of all the considerations involved in identifying development sites.
- A very professional and well "put together" proposal
- The background paper is comprehensive and provides a fair balance of all the considerations involved in identifying development sites.

### Employment

- The Council explains that it requires sites to provide a minimum of 1ha for employment use. This can provide a contribution but is clearly not sufficient to assess the relevant objective within the Council's 'methodological framework', nor to satisfy the requirement at NPPF para 72(b)
- One of the stated objectives should be to consider the creation of local job opportunities

### **Other questions OQ9 Do you have any comments on the relationship between Large Development Sites and the draft Local Plan (2017-2036), particularly in relation to what other policies and proposals the draft Local Plan should contain?**

- Council should show vision and leadership
- Query what the overall vision is – proposals do not meet NPPF para 77
- A holistic approach will provide the opportunity for councillors to deliver on their commitments regarding the environment and the health and well-being of the local citizens
- Major infrastructure investment is needed in advance
- Create a new town rather than add onto existing
- A large site preferable to sporadic development across the district
- Should use the mechanism of reserve sites – only released if shown to be needed within 5 year reviews / include a fall back policy allowing sites that are not allocated but considered acceptable to come forward to help with 5YHLS
- Increase large towns (e.g. Alton) where the scale already exists
- Large scale development should be in the North/A31 corridor
- Large sites that are remote from resident populations are not a sound approach to formulating a spatial strategy
- Large sites should be located by considering integrated community, social cohesion, climate change, affordable housing, NPs and sustainable development



- Focus should be on making place and enhancing existing communities
- Weakness to rely on one LDS or a new settlement – a stronger strategy would be a dispersed strategy where there are opportunities for sustainable growth of existing settlements
- Development sites near adequate infrastructure
- Should be located closer to the facilities of a town / transport interchanges
- Development should be focussed on tier 1 and 2 settlements and existing infrastructure and be a more modest scale
- Smaller sites in selected villages where there is need rather than large sites / smaller developments allow for more organic growth of towns and villages
- Disproportionate distribution of development (4 in Four Marks/Medstead) / should be better distributed around the district
- Spatial strategy flawed because it relies heavily on sites that are unlikely to deliver new homes until later in the plan period, when the need is now
- The consideration of strategic expansion at Four Marks in the Sustainability Appraisal is not underpinned by evidence
- One of the large sites should be within the PfSH area
- Relying on 100 homes per year from the SDNP is a weakness of the emerging strategy
- Build housing where affordable housing is needed
- Within the PUSH area, the Council should allocate additional smaller, sustainably located sites, such as White Dirt Farm
- There is not a local need in Four Marks, many houses struggle to sell
- 600 homes is too small for a large site, a much greater quantum of housing is needed to provide adequate/meaningful mitigation without adversely impacting on viability
- Specialist housing provision should be made for supported housing, including affordable extra care housing for older person and support housing to meet the specific needs of those adults with mental health, learning or physical disability – large sites in established large settlements such as Alton and Whitehill & Bordon would be preferable
- A genuine mix of housing should be built
- Towns are in decline so why build another
- Local Plan needs to acknowledge the climate change emergency and this needs to be reflected in the decisions that are made in the plan / should be a climate change emergency framework by which to assess sites
- Local Plan needs to acknowledge the need to retain and plant more trees
- Building on open countryside or arable farming land is detrimental regarding carbon emissions, air pollution and associated quality of life. Crop fields are a huge carbon sink and replacing these with development sites will contradict the UK's commitment to the Paris Agreement on Climate Change
- No mention of delivering energy efficient or zero carbon dwellings / global need to reduce carbon emissions / need well insulated homes / solar panels etc
- There is no infrastructure plan in this consultation / the commitment to building infrastructure is not clear
- Insisting on a primary school on each site is too rigid
- The plan needs to take account of Electric Vehicles and the monumental shift and infrastructure need by time petrol/diesel is phased out / and for driverless cars
- There needs to be requirement in policy that developers will support healthy sustainable communities through making both CIL and S106 contributions for health services, including hospitals
- No mention anywhere of secondary schools

- There should be a specific policy on the key issue of the provision of sewerage/wastewater (and water supply) infrastructure to service development (Thames Water)
- More needs to be invested in community before more housing is built
- There is no need for more homes / OAN is overstated
- Lack of clear understandable figures to justify the need for more homes
- No justification for large scale housing development
- This approach to house building is not sustainable in the long term
- Brownfield before greenfield
- Alton brewery site should be prioritised / brownfield sites exist
- There should be a strategic gap between the SDNP and any development
- The SDNP designation is pushing too much housing into one place – creating overdevelopment in a small area
- Boundaries are unhelpful and there should be more cross boundary co-operation
- Sites are outside settlement area so should not be considered (especially as Neighbourhood Plans been prepared)
- Development is changing the character of Alton
- Should not develop in the countryside
- Proposals don't align with the Sustainability Appraisal e.g. constraints in South Medstead, support of tourism, foster health safe communities
- Over development of rural areas
- Query the benefit of including local employment sites
- Should require future proof broadband (given the Hampshire super fast broadband initiative)
- Should not lose prime agricultural land for development
- Design should be in keeping with local setting and style
- It is misguided to keep building all over North Hampshire – destroying local biodiversity and removing green spaces, driving overcrowding and pollution
- Lack of information about secondary schools
- Impact of traffic from sites in Four Marks/Medstead on Waverley needs to be considered
- Opportunities for smaller and medium sized housing sites in sustainable locations within the area adjacent to Liphook need to be considered
- Greater emphasis needed on providing employment
- Too late in process to consider large development sites – the large development site strategy was in the public domain in 2018, so there was adequate time for sites to be put forward then
- The Village Trust scheme should be a requirement for any site
- Need to take account of WBC and Farnham TC under the Duty to Co-operate / no public information showing co-operation
- The Council is not carrying out its responsibilities in relation to bats
- Insufficient attention to heritage conservation
- This consultation appears to be driven by an assumption that market-led large development sites are the overwhelmingly pre-eminent means of delivering housing targets. There is zero evidence to support this assumption. The weight of evidence is that reliance on this approach over the past 40 years has failed utterly
- In view of the fact that there are nine other suitable alternative large development sites available, it is not open to EHDC to argue that there are exceptional fully evidenced and justified circumstances that require the creation of a Strategic Policy which would be necessary to permit the Northbrook development to be included in the Local Plan.

- There is no statement of common ground or progress in co-operating to achieve the infrastructure necessary to select Northbrook Park above the other nine possible large sites
- “Working with the support of their communities ...” but none have the support of local communities
- Lack of integration with Neighbourhood Plans
- The potential for non-designated archaeological remains should be considered (Historic England)
- Has the Council undertaken a survey of Grade II buildings at risk? When gathering evidence, it is important to bear in mind that this is not simply an exercise in setting out known sites but, rather, in understanding the value to society (i.e. the significance) of sites both known and potential, without which an understanding of the sometimes subtle qualities of the local distinctiveness and character of the local area may be easily lost. It may be helpful to collate this information within a Heritage Topic Paper to draw together the evidence prepared and the subsequent implications and actions required.
- More detail needed about the implementation of Strategic SANG, SAMM and HIPs (RSPB).
- No adequate reference to Government Policy on forests and woodlands and the core principle of protect, improve, expand (Forestry England)
- Need to define the Neighbourhood Plan areas needs for infrastructure and growth, as required by paras 65 and 66 of NPPF
- More evidence is needed on what has been delivered on self build
- Request early engagement with parish/town councils, prior to formal consultations
- Local Ecological Network map should be considered when allocating large sites at the earliest stage
- Adverse impact on local gaps
- Decisions about Travellers should be informed by consultation with the Traveller community
- Health impacts must be considered from the outset and money collected
- Need to consider the impact of Welbourne Village development of 6000 homes on the EHDC Local Plan
- No HRA
- Further plan-level information and analysis is required for some of the proposed 10 Big Sites allocations to show that mitigation and Biodiversity Net Gain can meet policy requirements, Sustainability Appraisal and, where necessary, Habitat Regulations Assessment for the next Regulation 19 stage of the Local Plan Review
- Draft Local Plan policies imposing any rigid (minimum) local standards in relation to (for examples) internal housing space and external garden space/separation distances, parking provision/highways design, density/housing mix and open space provision will negatively impact on an ability to deliver numbers of houses and similarly also impact on a ‘placemaking’ agenda
- The Settlement Hierarchy Paper remain relevant insofar as the settlement should score more points than identified. However, the provision of services and facilities in the settlement is not simply a quantitative one, there is also an important qualitative element (Medstead)
- The inclusion of Northbrook Park as a strategic allocation, applying an objective and consistent approach to site selection, would result in an unsound spatial strategy. A local plan which was reliant on the delivery of housing on the site to meet its full objectively assessed needs, would be ineffective. There are also fundamental concerns over the progression of spatial strategy which seeks to locate significant growth in the most environmentally constrained locations, this places serious question marks over the soundness of Whitehill and Bordon.

- Groundwater must be considered through relevant policies

### Standford Grange

- No reasonable case has been made for Standford Grange Farm / its impact has not been properly scrutinised
- Standford Grange cannot support any further large scale housing
- Eveley Wood within the curtilage of Standford Grange Farm is designated an Ancient Woodland and should not be considered for SANG designation
- A rare green orchid may grow on Standford Grange (grows on verge of Hollywater Road)
- Loss of green gap at Standford Grange
- Promises made by the Council never to build on Standford Grange
- High archaeological interest
- Adverse impact on ecology and wildlife and habitats
- Too far from local amenities
- SINC and RIGS
- Adverse impact on the setting of the River Wey Conservation Area

### Other sites

- Site originally reserved for Tesco has been empty for years – good position for A31 and transport links
- Liphook site (poultry farm) – access should be restricted to emergency vehicles only

### Transport

- Should be a detailed transport analysis / robust transport appraisal for each site, considering the sustainable transport and masterplanning principles with some suggested essential mitigation packages
- Increase traffic
- The documents contains comments on Community and Wellbeing suggesting there should be opportunities for leisure walking outside the community for exercise. It doesn't address more important points including; a) How residents can exercise as part of their normal daily activities. This might occur in cycling or walking to work or school that is not meaningfully addressed in the documents circulated b) How while they are undertaking these activities they can stay safe from contact with motor vehicles that might result in injury or illness from pollution.
- Cycling infrastructure must comply with national guidance enabling safe and healthy routes that will encourage more users and help to reduce health and well-being problems. Quick, cheap fixes to cycle infrastructure as seen locally don't help.
- Planning applications for large sites should define cycle routes to large employment sites at least up to about 10km away. See HCC Cycling Strategy chapter 2 for supporting data.
- Each large development should include a pavement with sealed surface, away from traffic on which residents including children could learn to cycle.
- No assessment made as to the impact of planned and cumulative development, and what mitigation would be required (West Sussex CC)

**Other Questions, OQ10: Is there any feedback you would like to give us about this consultation?**

- The planning should be independent
- Representation quality is poor
- Stress on the impacted villagers
- Website does not work
- Using email as your website does not support comments from the public.
- This is far too lengthy and difficult for most people to use in reasonable time
- Expected a simple entry form like for EHDC Planning Applications.
- Incorrect link – <https://easthants.oc2.uk.uk/> keeps cycling back to the same pages
- No general comment box
- Consultation is too complex
- It uses terminology like ‘cross boundary’ and ‘constraints’ that most people do not understand in Planning context
- The wrong date for our issued Interim Report
- Travel far to visit your consultation events
- Good that residents are being consulted
- Very disappointed that where 4 sites were being proposed EHDC did not organise a more local viewing with developers.
- Some of the questions are too leading
- South Medstead is not a place
- Very difficult to fit appropriate comments into the questions asked.
- Complete waste of public money
- The system creates a very serious risk of the public's voice not being properly represented
- Public meetings good and helpful to engage the site promoters
- Only a summary of responses received will be published
- Public cannot see unfiltered / non-summarised comments from others in the community
- Difficult feedback process
- Failure of EHDC to inform their constituents of the proposed plans and consultation meetings and their apparent impartiality
- No summary bullet point information has been provided
- Unable to provide any of the common metrics that might be helpful in assessing these proposals
- Few opportunities to access the plans via meetings
- No consultation event held in Liphook
- Daunting online portal
- Young ladies at the Consultation were professional, polite and passionate
- The user's ability to fully convey their comments as each section only allows 100 words
- Latest run of consultations feels rushed and overwhelming
- Not all of the proposed 10 sites were included in the initial consultation at the beginning of the year
- Freedom of speech should apply
- There has been no community involvement
- More clarification about the nature of plots and pitches for Travellers and Show people

- FAQ page of the EHDC website doesn't work
- Cannot read the information in the keys to the maps and cannot determine which colours for the different areas refer to housing, SANGS or employment – The .pdf maps to read the keys, the words become pixilated
- Use ALL sites but only develop them to 25% capacity
- Standardised format should this be repeated every 5 years
- The additional consultation process has resulted in further costs on the community from speculative builders
- It has been very well organised and attended
- Unreasonable for residents to provide feedback on all local sites at once
- Not one of the sites has had any surveys carried out
- The help system is no good – can't find log-in as a new user without a password
- Congratulations on the calm way you have organised it sometimes under fractious conditions
- Unclear if Northbrook and Bordon remain 'preferred' sites
- Large site developments were not properly advertised to local residents
- Proposals are at different stages of development
- All sites express a desire to work with the local community in drawing up the iteration of the application
- Site promoters were not given a sufficiently clear brief in terms of infrastructure requirements
- Whole EHCD 'consultation' process is flawed as it is cleverly designed to endorse large scale development on the Alton and Bordon area.
- A far more open approach needs to be adopted
- No Natural England representative
- Been well done by the officers at EHDC
- Technical issues with the 'OpusConsult'
- Need the SDNPA boundary to be included
- Hard copies of the consultation should be available
- Planning officers should be sprinkled around the venue offering guidance
- Should be more information from neighbouring authorities
- Local residents and elected councillors make their own relative assessments that should come across in written responses to this consultation
- This consultation is not really a proper consultation
- Events should be open later than 19:00
- Advertising this consultation was ineffective as relied on the internet to access proposals
- The public meeting were helpful as could engage with site promoters
- The Consultation for the SWR site ("Land South of Winchester Road") is confusing because the name is identical to that of SA25/FM-013!
- Unreasonable for residents in Four Marks and Medstead to provide feedback on all 4 local sites at once; (it is very onerous to provide comment on 40 questions!)
- Disappointing no evidence of the Duty to Cooperate has been published by the Council
- Focus of the proposals should have been on practical planning
- On major issues of concern to the community such as employment, public transport, traffic, schools, medical facilities, community facilities, utilities, air pollution and other environmental issues there is simply insufficient evidence provided to make a sensible analysis.

- Council has buckled to pressure from developers to carry out an unnecessary consultation