

Responses to Sites and Development Management Consultation Document and Associated Background Papers

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
826k	Southern Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>There is insufficient capacity in the local sewerage system to accommodate the development proposed adjacent to Blackfield Primary School. This means that new and/or improved sewerage infrastructure is required before the additional flows from the development can be accommodated.</p> <p>Ofwat, the water industry's economic regulator, takes the view that enhancements required to the local sewerage system as a result of new development should be paid for by the development. This ensures that the cost is passed to those who directly benefit from it, and protects existing customers who would otherwise have to pay through increased general charges.</p> <p>Connection off-site to the nearest point of adequate capacity is the formal mechanism by which developers should provide the infrastructure required to serve their sites. However, Southern Water has limited powers to enforce this, especially where new development is proposed on previously developed land.</p> <p>We therefore look to the planning authority to support provision of off-site infrastructure by the development through planning policies and appropriate planning conditions. To this end, policy BLA1 should include a clause to require the developer to connect to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity.</p> <p>We propose the following additional bullet point to policy BLA1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of off-site sewerage infrastructure by the development to facilitate connection to the system at the nearest point of adequate capacity. <p>In addition, an existing trunk water main crosses the development site. The layout of the site must ensure that this infrastructure is not built over, so that it can be accessed for future maintenance and upsizing. An easement of width between 6 and 13 metres will be required, depending on pipe size and depth. This should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. Alternatively, diversion of the infrastructure may be possible at the developer's expense, subject to a feasible alternative route being available.</p> <p>Policy BLA1 should include a clause to recognise the need to protect the existing infrastructure and ensure access for future upgrading and maintenance work.</p> <p>We propose the following additional bullet point to Policy BLA1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Necessary easements or diversions to protect the existing underground trunk water main which crosses the site.
549a	Tillyer F	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>In my opinion, if this site were allocated, it would be contrary to Policy CO-R3 of the Local Plan and Policy DM7 of the draft Sites and Development Management Consultation Document.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
725d	Sport England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		This site includes an existing golf course. Sport England will oppose proposals which would result in the unjustified or avoidable loss of facilities for sport unless an equivalent replacement in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility if the loss of a facility is unavoidable or unless it can be proved that the facility is genuinely redundant and there is no demand for a replacement based on thorough local assessment. Therefore, if this site comes forward for development in the future the applicant will need to provide an equivalent replacement or provide evidence that the facility is redundant and there is no demand for a replacement. This constraint should be included within the policy allocation for this site.
641b	Nicola Phipps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development would create extra traffic in an already congested area (and have an impact on the A326). In addition development would have a detrimental impact of locally important views and on the setting and character of Blackfield. Blackfield is adjacent to the internationally important New Forest National Park and already has a high density of social housing. Is there the need for 30 extra homes for people living in Blackfield? There are limited employment opportunities close to Blackfield. This will be a problem for any new residents. Development on this site would add to existing traffic congestion problems close to the site. This extra traffic would put both children and the elderly at risk. Separation from Holbury - Development here would further diminish the vital green gap between Blackfield and Holbury. It would have a significant negative impact on locally important views and on the setting and character of the village which already has a high density of social housing.
822j	New Forest National Park	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The National Park shares the Council's view that development on this site is preferable.
694a	McEvoy Cllr A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Would support in a 'needs must' situation, but would query loss of more green space and whether transport links are sufficient given that there are no transport improvements proposed for this area.
287a	Abbott M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Concern as there is already heavy traffic in this area and particularly at school times as it is near the primary school.
318a	Halliday M and R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		BLA1 would on balance be the preferred choice of the two sites proposed on land east of Bell Lane (Roman Road). This area, when developed as stated, would have least direct impact on surrounding properties, National Park and traffic congestion. This is also a safer option than BLA2 and BLA3, as children will be able to walk safely to school. Additional traffic into Hampton Lane and thence to the A326 is not good but the least problematic, the site is flat and well drained at this point, also well shielded from the National Park. The intermediate fields form

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
						a natural buffer zone; providing land for farming and backup grazing.
345a	Rustell	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I have paid good money for a view of the New Forest, not a housing estate. Will I be reimbursed as my property will be devalued?
105a	Morris AJ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site has good access from Main Road, is adjacent to the primary school and doctors practise, bus stop and village.
355a	Haynes D and Gallagher J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We have worked hard to buy our house. We have semi-rural views that will be swallowed up by houses. Will we end up bordering the edges of Southampton?
385a	King M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	I do not want more housing development in Blackfield but have to agree that this site would be the best choice. I am concerned though that this could lead to further development towards Bell Lane, which could cause traffic problems in the Exbury Road.
1020a	Budd E	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Best site due to easy access from road and not close to any current residences
396a	Barker	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Vehicle access to this site is off Hampton Lane immediately next to the present doctors' surgery. This section of road, Blackfield Crossroads to Rollestone Crossroads, is already over congested at peak times with traffic caused by children going to school, patients visiting the surgery and others trying to get to work. To propose putting a further 60 or so cars directly into this stream of traffic is utter madness.
449a	Wardell C and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I cannot believe that either of these sites is being considered. Both BLA2 and BLA1 are on land which has for decades been protected for a variety of reasons that remain valid today. The proposal will destroy this conservation area, have a negative effect on people and animals alike and cause even more pressure on the area. Any development on this land will be on the precursor of sprawl. This proposal is built of madness. This proposal would be the start of a gradual sprawl down to Bell Lane. A better option would be use the land opposite Gang Warily.
750a	Lynette Early	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The development of this site would destroy the boundary between Blackfield and Holbury. Concerned about the impact of development on traffic, and on the setting of the village.
754b	Gregory S & T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		BLA 1 – Object We, in principle, object to the siting of a development at BLA1 due to the fact that Blackfield does not require this housing.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
-----	--------------	-------	----------	---------	---------------------------	----------

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School

The access to the site will be from Hampton Lane, which will add extra traffic into an area that already struggles to cope. The A326 is already at breaking point. The proposed trains from Hythe may help the traffic flow to a small extent on the main A326 but the centre of Blackfield will not be helped by this as residents will still use their cars to get from Blackfield to Hythe.

If the Council decides that a site in Blackfield should be approved for building then we would suggest that BLA1 is the only viable option. However, we must again stress that we do not believe it necessary or appropriate.

We list some reasons why BLA1 is more appropriate than BLA2 but do not consider these as a reason to definitely allocate:

BLA1 has a frontage to Hampton Lane which, whilst is a more convenient and safe point of access and egress than BLA2 still is problematic due to the already high levels of traffic along this road.

In terms of flooding, BLA1 would be more appropriate for development without adverse impact upon the local drainage regime being of a flatter topography both on site and for its immediate surrounds.

BLA1 is set within a context that can provide for night time safety by better accommodating appropriate levels of street lighting. It has greater opportunity of reducing recreational pressure upon the New Forest SSSI/SPA/SAC given the greater distance to travel to common land and thereby encouraging greater use of onsite facilities.

BLA1 provides sufficient space to provide landscape buffers to the adjacent countryside and allocation of BLA1 would sit in greater accordance with policies contained within PPS1 (e.g. 17, 19, 20), PPS3 (e.g. 38, 69) and key principles within PPS9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation).

BLA1 is set in closest proximity to existing development providing accessibility to community facilities, being in walking distance of shops, school, doctors and Gang Warily to cater for daily needs. This proximity best meets Sustainability Appraisal Objective 5, PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) Policies 5 and 16 and PPS3 (Housing) Policies 10 and 16. On site open space and an equipped play area at BLA1 would better serve the wider community.

Long and short views of a development at BLA1 from Hampton Lane and nearby public rights of way would be viewed within the context of existing development and therefore would not appear out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. It is also better placed to have flexibility in its design and to respond to its context and landscape setting.

BLA1 has direct access to Hampton Lane and is also sited in closest proximity to bus stops as an alternative mode of transport.

BLA1 with access to Hampton Lane and its orientation parallel to a community building enables a site to be accessed without excessive land take (contrary to BLA2) in order to reach the usable area.

It also better enables open space and play areas to be integrated into a site layout.

BLA1 sits remote from residential dwellings therefore any design has to only be mindful of the amenity impact

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
						<p>upon Blackfield Primary School.</p> <p>BLA1 and BLA2 are both safeguarded for mineral extraction therefore it would be prudent to ensure that a site selection best enables any extraction to occur prior to development.</p> <p>It is argued for the reasons given above, the most appropriate site would be that adjacent to Blackfield Primary School (BLA1).</p> <p>However, having stated that, we understand that the Core Strategy policy C12 is requiring sites to be found for housing allocations over and above that required by the South East Regional Spatial Strategy (2008)(RSS). With this in mind we would ask why Blackfield, which already has received a high level of new housing through infill schemes and site redevelopment in relation to the size of the community, is being considered?</p> <p>As there is no requirement or legislation for the housing, why is this allocation even being considered at any of the sites?</p>
336b	Dugdale F	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The proposed site will erode the green area separating Blackfield and Holbury. The entrance would be hazardous in this area which is congested at peak times as is the Rollestone Road cross-roads. There are already numerous junctions with this road. I question the need for more social housing in this area. Blackfield is already an island ringed by social housing. The village school was recently downsized and the medical centre is inadequate for current needs.</p>
97a	Readhead D	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<p>This proposal makes good sense. It has access to the main road and local schools. The land at present is currently under used. It could also be used to extend the school.</p>
294a	Bunday R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
297a	Lawes W J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I appreciate the need for new housing, but can see some potential problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assuming the entry road would be off Hampton Lane, with the Medical Centre and school in the area, vehicles travelling south from the Rollestone Road traffic lights and turning into either of these tend to cause hold-ups during busy times. Another turning would increase the problem. The new road would also be used as parking space for parents dropping off/ collecting from the school. Access road would cause delay along Hampton Lane. 2. Farmland west of BLA1 was New Forest Heritage Area, implying it was useful farmland. The fields are still used for this purpose. Concerned that the new houses built on the edge of the fields will result in rubbish being dumped in the fields or affect the harvest and disturb the sheep. 3. How will the site be landscaped to screen it from the open countryside? <p>Since the area is adjacent to a school, would residents have to undergo a security check?</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
280a	Guy V	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Would this development not be better at Priestcroft as the roads are already in place. To have a major development as a proposed land leads to the problem of access to Hampton Lane.
373a	Ship R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Will not be enough parking at doctors' surgery. Road very busy now. School not big enough to take extra pupils.
375a	Arshad M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		I cannot agree or disagree as I do not know if the need for housing is so great that more green space has to be destroyed, to build more houses and roads.
483a	McNaught M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		If houses are built here it will require access onto Hampton Lane. We already have Pavilion Gardens, the school, the doctors, all within close proximity without another road being built. Parking at the doctors' surgery adjoining the proposed development is a nightmare at present. Could the council not give a piece of land and help the community who already live here instead of adding to the problems by suggesting that we have even more houses.
527a	Jackson V	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
575c	Smith K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This proposed field development will increase congestion on Hampton Lane close to the school, Doctors' Surgery and opposite sheltered housing. The green space between Blackfield and the south of Holbury will be reduced.
99a	Ralls A and J	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site has the advantage of direct access to the main road through Blackfield without taking more traffic into the village. The main services are nearby and the site will not disturb any established housing.
103a	Read S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Unnecessary use of recreation land for few houses.
107a	Moore H and A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This would probably have the least harmful impact on the general Blackfield area provided that the 'exposed' boundaries of the development are well screened by bushes and deciduous trees, but please see my related general comment.
262a	Haines P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		If more houses are needed this proposal could support some building. However, there does need to be thought and care put into how buildings are put into place.
276a	Sadler M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The only site acceptable but various considerations to take into account as stated in your memo.
279a	Sherwood R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I feel strongly that no building should take place on what once was the Forest Heritage Area (in effect, green

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
						belt). The last government removed the green belt status in creating a National Park. The reasoning was somewhat flawed in that the writer spoke of the Rollestone Road fields were open and of no interest and would not detract from Bell Lane, a pleasant country lane, by not being included in the National Park. If these fields are built on this would cease to be a rural lane.
284b	Coles R and R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Why are you using Blackfield as a dumping ground for all this housing. It is full of social housing and we know that people have to live somewhere, but surely there are other sites more suitable. This again is right next to the school and the traffic can be horrendous at the moment during school hours. We feel this to be a very dangerous place to consider more and more housing.
286a	Atkinson B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The already over-developed road will be further congested but this may be the best of the three options. Don't actually like any of the proposals.
289b	Cocker P and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
290a	Alvey A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Already a major development of affordable housing in the area. Additional traffic movements next to school/doctors' surgery . This is already a bottleneck at various times of the day.
302b	Chester-Sterne R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	2nd best proposal with access to existing main road.
312a	Richards A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Agree in principle but a substantial boundary change should be made between the site and adjacent land to prevent further development and to safeguard the green gap between Holbury and Blackfield.
313a	Smith L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Further infill development between Blackfield and Holbury is to be resisted if the two centres are to retain any separate identity. The open fields and grazing animals add to the overall quality of life of an area next to heavy industrial development.
323a	Cozens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Most suitable as good roads and pavements already insitu and school nearby. Least upheaval for existing residents.
331a	Rich E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Increased traffic in the area is unacceptable. This will lead to further development towards Roughdown. It would appear that the Council is intent on destroying this unique eastern end of the New Forest which is part of the National Park.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
332a	Law J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Extra traffic would be unacceptable in this area and we would need to safeguard a green area so no further development could take place in the future.
338a	Kollar J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Vehicle access to this site is off Hampton Lane immediately next to the present doctors' surgery. This section of road, Blackfield Crossroads to Rolleston Crossroads, is already over congested at peak times with traffic caused by children going to school, patients visiting the surgery and others trying to get to work. To propose putting a further 60 or so cars directly into this stream of traffic is utter madness.
343a	Bassett M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Development here would seem to be the best option.
349a	Trim C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This site is much better suited to development than BLA3. It's straight off the main road and next to amenities. It will have less impact on the village as traffic doesn't have to go through it.
360a	Halliday R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Flat site, able to accommodate up to 30 dwellings with plenty of open space to the north and west of the site allowing for green infrastructure between Blackfield and Holbury. It is probably more economical to build all the required dwellings on one site. Easier access to and from Hampton Lane where traffic is less congested and there are fewer pedestrians. If the development can be built on the outskirts of the village it would relieve the congestion of more vehicles passing through the village centre. Residents would be within walking distance of the infant and junior schools, the medical centre, the village and Gangwarily Sports and Recreation Centre. This would prevent further congestion at the school, medical centre and in the village, where parking is limited. There is a bus stop outside Blackfield School and the medical centre, and a cycle track from Rolleston Road to Hardley School.
367a	Cornelius B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		As this will directly affect us we would not appreciate affordable housing built in such close proximity to the rear of our or our neighbour's property. This sort of development is much better housed next to the same sort of properties as in Priestcroft Drive in Blackfield where there is plenty of room to build 30 properties with infrastructure in place.
392a	Hough S and T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		To develop here would only lead to further development. A substantial boundary should be made to ensure an access road does not continue through to service the roads beyond and to provide a definitive boundary to Blackfield itself to safeguard the green gap between Holbury and Blackfield.
394a	Duffner K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The joy of living in this area is the beauty of it all, green grass, trees and quiet. We have lost too much already. And the so called 'affordable' houses built by Blackfield School did not sell as expected. We do not need more of

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
						the same.
395a	Legg P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
403a	Etheridge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We don't agree with any of the building work to take place. We have moved here for its natural beauty and we don't want this spoilt. This is the New Forest, a green area, we have enough unsold houses already.
409a	McLuckie L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Whilst I do not agree that more housing is needed in the Blackfield area, of the three proposed sites, if building has to go ahead, this would appear to be the most sensible site. This is due to the location of local amenities, i.e. school, doctor's surgery, shops and recreation centre. The proximity to local public transport is also a bonus as would the fact that more transport would not have to go through an already busy village. It also does not encroach onto the forest as the other sites do.
429a	Ward-Best A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I have studied the aerial plans and have the view that you should not develop BLA1. I cannot understand why "Site BLA1 is the preferred site of NFDC ". Since the creation of the 'old primary school' estate, next to the Blackfield Heath Centre, there has been a huge increase in traffic congestion problems on Hampton Lane. Any new estate in the local area will result in even more population related traffic concerns on this section of Hampton Lane. These would be dramatically increased with the traffic from another new estate onto an already congested section of Hampton Lane, so please do not select BLA1.
454a	McLuckie M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The preferred site: Good access for village centre, buses, doctor, school, Gang Warily. Little (if any) upgrading of roads to facilitate access to the site.
456a	Wood K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Any proposal which would threaten the semi-rural area environment is not acceptable. In particular the loss of fields in the Rollestone Road area would be a huge mistake.
463a	Leggett L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
467a	Zadari D and A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		There are no distinct boundaries shown to this boundary which leaves the site open to be used as a total infill and would allow the possibility of an access road to be put into the fields and expand the site into what is considered to be Green Belt to local residents.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
477a	Simpson S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Increased congestion around Blackfield Primary School and potential for increased accidents near the school. Does this area really need more social housing? Can the services i.e. schools support this, as well as the employment opportunities.
484b	Walker M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		BLA1 seems to be the best site of the three proposed but it is a shame to lose such prime agricultural land for housing - good for allotments. The fields on the other side of Hampton Lane next to Priestcroft appears to be a more suitable site.
487a	Laville P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This seems a good site with minimum impact to the local area. Providing a substantial boundary was included to prevent future development.
494b	Molyneux S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Blackfield has a significant proportion of social housing development. In developing this site there is a danger of triggering the joining of Blackfield and Holbury.
514a	Davies R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Blackfield has expanded far too much recently. The existing Medical Centre is too small to cope with this expanding population.
515b	Keitley N J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampton Lane is already congested because of the previously mentioned existing development. • Further development at this site would detract from the character of the village. • The open space beyond Rolleston Rd is vital to delineate Blackfield from Holbury and prevent the area from becoming a contiguous urban strip along the Waterside.
550a	Topp M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Your report quotes - 'Hardley, Holbury, Blackfield, Langley, Fawley' as defined villages - please keep their individual identity - 'No more building'. As a Rolleston 'hands off our Green Belt strip between Holbury and Blackfield'. The government gave us back our forests - now let us keep our Green Belt fields.
572a	Nicholls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This area is already too congested at peak times for vehicles. - Area already recently been developed. - Further contraction of green gap between Blackfield and Holbury. - The village already has a high density of social housing.
585a	McInally A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Plan for housing at this location will reduce the green space between Blackfield and Holbury. The traffic increase will put the children in the adjacent school at high risk.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
590b	Smith P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The proposal for 30 houses on the proposed sites is illogical. The volume of traffic in Blackfield is already too high. In addition development will put pressure on Blackfield School and the Doctors. There is enough social housing in the area, why are you proposing more?</p> <p>More housing will put even greater pressure on the A326 which is already over capacity. Proposals to reopen the waterside railway are unlikely to happen.</p> <p>Building next to the school would be unsuitable. Due to the volume of traffic, school children and the elderly would be at risk. Increased congestion would be caused as a result of development.</p> <p>In addition to the above building on BLA1 would lessen the gap between Blackfield and Holbury village.</p>
591a	Stickland J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Traffic, congestion and noise for the elderly people opposite the school entrance.
592a	White J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Proposal would increase traffic congestion adjacent to the school and Doctors' Surgery.
597a	Meadows H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>If we understand the proposal correctly, the site is currently used as a modestly sized golf course. If part of the land was used to accommodate 30 (or even 15) houses, it is unlikely that the remaining area would be suitable for golf and would probably end up being the ideal target for future housing development. This would inevitably result in the merging of Blackfield and Holbury. If this is of no consequence to the planners, there is very little to be said about the loss of this aesthetic amenity. Clearly the open space surrounding our property is an attractive feature which we would be disappointed to lose.</p> <p>However, if the development was located on the east side of Hampton Lane (south of Newlands Road), the Gang Warily Recreational Area would form a natural break between Blackfield and Holbury. Furthermore, we understand that some consideration is being given to the construction of a new church on the corner of Hampton Lane and Newlands Road. Surely, consideration of the two projects as a single concept, might well result in an elegant solution.</p>
602a	Paterson R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I feel the plans for this site are appropriate for current proposed plans, but not to open the gateway for further development onto Bell Lane and open fields close to the open forest. A substantial boundary should be made between the site and adjacent land to safeguard the fields beyond, in order to protect further expansion onto grazing land and the New Forest access. Significant trees should be retained as stated.
611c	Paronio R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Council's preferred choice on the face of it would appear sounds to develop. However, the development has no actual boundary, further erodes the strategic gap between Blackfield and Holbury and could provide access to develop the fields beyond. If development were to be considered it should be as a top up to the BLA3 site with a strong boundary, similar to Priestcroft Drive opposite, to ensure that Blackfield has a future robust

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
						settlement boundary.
646a	Carcas T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		There should be no more new development in Blackfield until the congestion problem on the A326 is addressed. In addition it does not make sense to put social housing in an area that has poor public transport links and few job opportunities. However social housing for retired people is acceptable here because they will probably not use the A326 at peak periods and the site is close to shops and the medical centre.
660a	Yanoff C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site is completely inappropriate for the following reasons: the increased traffic on an already overburdened road. The eroding of green belt the saturation of social housing in the area.
701a	Waterman C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		- Lack of local employment and the means of travel to higher employment areas. - A326 issues. Volume of traffic is already too high, especially early morning/late afternoon. - If the development were extended to Holbury, there would be traffic safety issues around roads of the Spur Estate and Rollestone Road. - Lack of general infrastructure, i.e. doctors, entertainment etc. - Loss of green land.
711a	Serbatoio V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Agree in principle but want a strong boundary to be created to prevent further adjacent development taking place.
752a	Early D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The development of this site would destroy the boundary between Blackfield & Holbury. Access via either Hampton Lane & Rollestone Rd would have serious traffic implications. During school times, & Peak times there are already traffic issues, & to have access to an estate in close proximity would cause further road safety issues. An estate at this location would also become a school time car park, as is the case with Pavilion Gardens & Priest Croft, & the neighbouring doctor's surgery to this proposed site. Which have already been flagged as a risk during school times. Development here would have an enormous visual impact on the village, which has already had several large developments built on both the school site & large back garden developments. Blackfield already has a very large amount of social housing.
844a	Betteridge L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I feel that there is a great risk to the elderly resident opposite this site as they already have to cope with a lot of traffic to get to the doctors. This site would also increase the risk to children going to and from the school.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
678d	Oliver T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TRAFFIC: Vehicle access would be on to Hampton Lane next to the surgery which is heavily used by elderly people and mothers with small children. It is opposite a development of sheltered housing, on the route to the local Primary School and close to a day nursery. This area is already heavily congested at peak times. A development of 30 homes would add another 60 or so vehicles to this stream of traffic increasing the level of risk to vulnerable children and elderly people. There is also the question of access for delivery vehicles etc. Separation from Holbury: Development here would further diminish the vital green gap between Blackfield and Holbury. It would have a significant negative impact on locally important views and on the setting and character of the village which already has a high density of social housing
942a	Peters G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Close to school better infrastructure
962a	Trim A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This is the best site for development, it's directly off a main road and close to all shops, schools and doctors, also means no more traffic through the vey busy village.
976a	Tillyer B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Development is contrary to Policy CO-R3 of New Forest District Local Plan 1st alteration adopted Aug 2005 and Policy DM7 of the draft sites and development management development plan document dated Jan 2011.
981a	Lockyer K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	My main objection to development at sites BLA1, BLA2 and BLA3 is that they are all outside the current boundary line for development. These boundaries, which I am very happy with, were presumably decided upon with great care and consideration. They need to be maintained and not chipped away at; otherwise what was the point in having them in the first place? These areas are in very sensitive positions on the edge of the New Forest, housing wildlife, ancient trees and hedgerow. Access to BLA2 and BLA3 is restricted and not available from a main road. Any additional vehicular movements around these sites would have a major detrimental impact on the narrow country lanes around these two sites and would be a particular worry for the safety of pedestrians. BLA3 has already been refused planning in the past, nothing has changed and the reasons for refusal of BLA3 could easily be argued for BLA2. There are hundreds of reasons why not to allow building on these sites but they have all been heard before and we all know more homes are needed, but please, please, please maintain the existing boundaries to protect these green field sites for ever.
987a	Coates R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	This site would cause increase traffic congestion in an already congested area. It would be the thin end of a wedge used to degrade the strategic gap between Blackfield and Holbury
989a	Levett C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Least disruptive to existing home owners and limits traffic through Blackfield village

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA1, Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School						
1004s	Belson N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	
1016c	Cantello N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Additional housing in Blackfield is not needed, and here in particular would make the congestion onto Hampton Lane intolerable. Not forsaking the fact that the land is currently used for back-up grazing for Commoners animals, and no thought whatsoever has been given to how the use of this land will affect Commoners and the New Forest habitat.
1017a	Johnson R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This area has useful direct access to main road, minimising disturbance to residential areas from traffic. The area is self-contained and any development would cause limited local impact.
1024a	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Another example of erosion of demarcation between the villages. Even more traffic pressure.
1039a	St John-Johnson S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This is the least disruptive site to develop. It also would generate less traffic through Blackfield and the narrow roads as it has direct access. There is potential to expand this area at a later stage without addition access roads.
1049a	Westbrook K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	This is a good choice, close to amenities, thus reducing vehicle movements in the area. It is in a small gap in the development line between Blackfield and Holbury and thus has little negative environmental impact. Being on the north side of Blackfield, it will generate less traffic through the village centre, especially during peak times.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
742I	RSPB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Land at Kings Copse Road is situated within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA. The redevelopment of Land at Kings Copse Road for residential purposes has the potential to adversely affect the integrity of the New Forest SPA due to increased urban effects such as cat predation, increased uncontrolled fires and recreational disturbance.</p> <p>Without suitable avoidance and mitigation measures, it is acknowledged in the NFDC Core Strategy that the cumulative effect of new housing within the District (in combination with that in neighbouring authorities) could lead to an adverse effect on the integrity of the New Forest SPA. We have raised our detailed concerns against Policy DM1 regarding the absence of any link between the provision of the necessary mitigation and avoidance measures and the allocations for new housing set out within the Sites and Development Management DPD. However, we are particularly concerned regarding the proposed housing allocations within close proximity of the SPA.</p> <p>Since the adoption of the NFDC Core Strategy, the New Forest NPA has adopted its own Core Strategy which includes the following policy in relation to new housing development within close proximity to the New Forest SPA:</p> <p>Policy CP1: Nature Conservation Sites of International Importance</p> <p>“.....In particular, any new housing that is proposed to be located within 400m of the boundary of the New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) will be required to demonstrate that adequate measures are put in place to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects on the ecological integrity of the SPA.”</p> <p>We can see no reason why such a policy that directs housing development outside of this most sensitive zone around the SP should not be applied to housing development within the same distance from the SPA in districts and boroughs outside of the National Park boundary, including the New Forest District.</p> <p>Paragraph 17 of PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development prescribes “planning authorities should seek to enhance the environment as part of development proposals. Significant adverse impacts on the environment should be avoided and alternative options which might reduce or eliminate those impacts pursued...”.</p> <p>In accordance with the precautionary approach, we would therefore urge the Council to consider more appropriate locations for new housing development in the District.</p> <p>We welcome the conclusion, set out in Table 3.3 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment of Sites and Development Management DPD Consultation Document – Screening Statement, that “a full Appropriate Assessment will be required if this site is allocated for residential development”. The RSPB agrees that potential impacts of the proposed development on the international sites will need to be investigated as part of the appropriate assessment of the Site Allocations DPD, however we are very concerned that in this location, the impact of net new residential development is likely to be such that, even with mitigation/avoidance measures in place, it is not possible to conclude no adverse effect on the integrity of the European Sites.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
888an	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The site lies within Flood Zone 1, although an "ordinary watercourse" runs adjacent to the site boundary. As this watercourse is not designated as Main River, the flood plain associated with it has not been mapped. However, it should be noted that the adjacent land may be subject to flooding during extreme events, increasingly so with climate change.</p> <p>A sequential approach should be taken to locating development within the site, to safeguard land that will be required for current and future flood management e.g. conveyance and storage of flood water, and to protect the watercourse. An FRA must also demonstrate how surface water will be managed, as a site of this size has the potential to generate significant surface water flows once developed. Consent will be required for any proposed works to the watercourse under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991.</p> <p>Any development proposed at this location must consider any impacts to New Forest SSSI, SPA, SAC and RAMSAR. We would recommend any watercourse present on this site must also be protected from the development by means of an adequate buffer strip. This will ensure there is no adverse impact on the ecological integrity of the river channel and its corridor.</p>
826l	Southern Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>There is insufficient capacity in the local sewerage system to accommodate the development proposed at Kings Copse Road. This means that new and/or improved sewerage infrastructure is required before the additional flows from the development can be accommodated.</p> <p>Ofwat, the water industry's economic regulator, takes the view that enhancements required to the local sewerage system as a result of new development should be paid for by the development. This ensures that the cost is passed to those who directly benefit from it, and protects existing customers who would otherwise have to pay through increased general charges.</p> <p>Connection off-site to the nearest point of adequate capacity is the formal mechanism by which developers should provide the infrastructure required to serve their sites. However, Southern Water has limited powers to enforce this, especially where new development is proposed on previously developed land.</p> <p>We therefore look to the planning authority to support provision of off-site infrastructure by the development through planning policies and appropriate planning conditions. To this end, policy BLA2 should include a clause to require the developer to connect to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity.</p> <p>We propose the following additional bullet point to policy BLA2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of off-site sewerage infrastructure by the development to facilitate connection to the system at the nearest point of adequate capacity. <p>In addition, an existing trunk sewer crosses the development site. The layout of the site must ensure that this infrastructure is not built over, so that it can be accessed for future maintenance and upsizing. An easement of</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						width between 6 and 13 metres will be required, depending on pipe size and depth. This should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. Alternatively, diversion of the infrastructure may be possible at the developer's expense, subject to a feasible alternative route being available. Policy BLA2 should include a clause to recognise the need to protect the existing infrastructure and ensure access for future upgrading and maintenance work. We propose the following additional bullet point to Policy BLA2: - Necessary easements or diversions to protect the existing trunk sewer which crosses the site.
738p	Natural England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Potential impact on New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. The site is within 400m, where impacts are most difficult to avoid. This will require full Appropriate Assessment if proposed as part of the DPD.
549b	Tillyer F	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I own the freehold interest in this site and would like to support its allocation for residential development. The land benefits from vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access to the South East corner. It is , at the narrowest point, 8m wide. It has a mains water supply and non connected electricity by the main entrance. Gas main is close by. There is a public fowl sewer within and along the eastern boundary. Also, along the eastern boundary line there is a 3ft pedestrian footpath, which would form a vital link to The Drove and Backfield village centre. The site would provide for local housing needs in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS15 of the Core Strategy and it meets the critical criteria set out in the draft Sustainability Appraisal Annex 2. Alternatively, in order to address the shortfall of 120 dwellings in the Hardley, Holbury, Blackfield and Fawley area, all three sites BLA1, BLA2 and BLA3 should be allocated. Comments are also made relating to the assessment of BLA2 in the Draft Sustainability Appraisal.
641c	Nicola Phipps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development would create extra traffic in an already congested area (and have an impact on the A326). In addition development would have a detrimental impact of locally important views and on the setting and character of Blackfield. Blackfield is adjacent to the internationally important New Forest National Park and already has a high density of social housing. Is there the need for 30 extra homes for people living in Blackfield? There are limited employment opportunities close to Blackfield. This will be a problem for any new residents. This is land that was within the new Forest Heritage Boundary. The considerations that led to this land being kept within the New Forest heritage boundary are still relevant today. The most significant of these is its potential for back up grazing for New Forest Commoners. The land which is directly adjacent to the New Forest National Park boundary is currently grazed by leisure horses and clearly has the potential to supplement the pool of back up grazing (of which there is a desperate shortage).

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						<p>The land under discussion is classified as Grade 3a "best and most versatile" agricultural land. According to Planning Policy 7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas - there is a presumption against development of agricultural land of this quality .</p> <p>Access - Access to the site is across a cattle grid and on a narrow unadopted road owned by the Forestry Commission. The road is adjacent to the national park boundary and cuts across common land used by pedestrians and animals. Increasing traffic on this road would destroy the character of the road and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Traffic - Additional traffic would place an unacceptable impact on local roads including the crossroads in the centre of the village.</p> <p>Flooding - Properties to the south and east of the proposed development would increase the flood risk. Developing this area would increase the flood risk.</p> <p>Nature Conservation - The site borders an area of international importance.</p> <p>Natural boundaries and features - Longstanding natural landscape boundaries exist. Development would impact upon these boundaries.</p>
822k	New Forest National Park	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Land at Kings Copse Road has recently been used as back-up grazing land. The site is also within 400m of the New Forest SPA.
694b	McEvoy Cllr A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Could not support under any circumstances.
287b	Abbott M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is restricted access on an unadopted narrow road 2. There would be more traffic along Exbury Road and The Drove 3. There is a flood risk with a stream running through the site 4. Historically it is of some importance. It is a greenfield site next to a Conservation Area.
318b	Halliday M and R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This area is close to the New Forest National Park and such a development would seriously affect adjacent properties, all of which are of mature character in a rural setting with distinctiveness. Particularly badly affected would be properties close to the proposed access to/from King's Copse Road, transforming the rural quiet nature of the later.</p> <p>A considerable number of vehicles would have to exit over a new cattle grid into the National Park. They would then have to negotiate a tricky turn at the existing cattle grid (restricted visibility) and then run the gauntlet of parked cars on the small hill on Exbury Road (potential black spot). This would be followed by exiting the very busy Blackfield cross roads, exacerbated by illegal parking (never enforced), into Hampton Lane, diagonally opposite the garage.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						There would clearly be an increase in traffic should BLA2 be established, this will cause a noise and safety issue. There is already a litter and dog fouling issue which would clearly multiply with such easy access from BLA2. More fly tipping is almost inevitable (easy wheelbarrow access); hardly to be condoned by NFDC or the NPA. Significant areas of hardstanding/concrete may give rise to an additional flood risk to properties along the line of the drainage stream from BLA2 to 'Copper Beach' in Exbury Road and beyond. NB I have witnessed flooding up to the front step of this relatively new, well drained bungalow (plenty of rejects in footings). The Drove is already subject to a minor 'rat-run' problem, having no pavements and being used by parents on route to school from King's Ride. A new estate could well increase that risk. Exits from The Drove are tricky. Photos are enclosed to illustrate the normal use of the land concerned, with its distinctive character and suitability as a buffer/screen between the National Park and built-up area beyond.
345b	Rustell	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This area is used by the whole family walking dogs and riding bikes. It is safe now. What will happen to the wildlife and ponies?
105b	Morris AJ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Impossible to access.
106a	Martin G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Access is very limited. Too small for proposal. Will create bottleneck at cattlegrid. Will increase traffic and pedestrians on The Drove (which has no pavements) to access school.
106b	Martin G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site offers good access onto Main Road and could include a roundabout. It does not affect existing housing. School access will not require vehicles.
355b	Haynes D and Gallagher J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Can infrastructure cope with extra housing? We know it won't just stop at 30, this will be the beginning of the areas downfall. No village will ever be distinct as we'll all merge into one.
385b	King M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	I do not agree with development on this site. We already have problems with flooding from the fields on the west side of The Drove and building on this site would make matters worse. I also believe that The Drove would become a 'rat-run' due to the increased traffic from the site.
1020b	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Worst site: buffer between built-up Blackfield and the national park; site would be accessed from an unadopted road in the national park where animals roam freely; access would be through an SSSI; would not be integrated into existing development (access is not through Blackfield); Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment of 2008 found that the site should 'only be considered if no suitable sites are available inside the built up area [of Blackfield]', and I can't see any reason why this would have changed since then; the site currently provides

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						grazing land. If the status of the land does need to change, it should be designated as back-up grazing land for commoners' animals; the site contains a spring which has been known to flood over the land. I am concerned that a development would cause the spring to flood into nearby properties.
396b	Barker	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This site should not even be considered.</p> <p>Vehicle access to this site is off King's Copse Road - an unadopted road owned by the Forestry Commission. The road forms part of the New Forest and it is very important that the nature of this road be maintained as it is now. Putting up to 60 cars per day extra onto it would destroy the character of the road and the surrounding area completely. There is also the possibility of a legal challenge to the access. Permission has to be obtained from the Forestry Commission for a direct access onto the New Forest and that would have to be granted. If the road were adopted then the nature of the road and surrounding area would be destroyed. It should not be permitted.</p> <p>Not only would there be 60 cars streaming out of the site daily but these cars would have to negotiate a tight 90 degree left hand turn into Exbury Road. The traffic would then cause massive congestion at Blackfield Crossroads which is already heavily congested. Do you realise that 3,000 vehicles per hour go through Blackfield Crossroads already? It does not stop with 60 cars. The houses would need visits from traders, delivery lorries, etc. in addition to the present housing in the area. There are just two houses in King's Copse Road from Exbury Road to the entrance to this site and a further five houses down a narrow gravel track. A further twenty houses, spread spaciouly, are in King's Copse Road further on. A concentration of thirty house will more than double the likelihood of service vehicles, delivery lorries, etc all trying to negotiate the tight turn from Exbury Road into King's Copse Road. The area (of Outstanding Natural Beauty) will be destroyed. Ponies and cattle frequently graze in the area and will be destroyed. Ponies and cattle frequently graze in the area and will be seen wandering around the road. Think of the extra danger to them of yet more vehicles in the dark (winter) when drivers may not realise until it is too late that the animals are just round the tight turn off Exbury Road. Because of the congestion likely to be found at Blackfield Crossroads some will start to use The Drove as a 'rat run' to avoid the crossroads. This will be dangerous as The Drove is narrow without pavements. Putting barriers or ramps in The Drove is not the answer. All this extra traffic, whether via The Drove or the crossroads, will put pedestrians at more risk, especially children going to school.</p> <p>This land is presently used for grazing and is important for that use. It is also suitable for agricultural use being top quality agricultural land.</p> <p>This area is designated as being of international and national importance as a conservation area. As stated above the proposal will completely destroy the character of the area.</p> <p>Landscaping do you really expect this to happen? It will take several years for even quick growing trees to</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						<p>become established during which time there will be no screening. If the said trees be vandalised, as is likely, then the screening will take even longer if it happens at all. This attempt to 'hide' the development smacks of sweeping the dust under the carpet - it is still there but you try to pretend it is not.</p> <p>Housing in the area is mainly old - in some cases very old (at least one of the houses dates back over 500 years). The only new building in the immediate area is a replacement for an old decrepit building at the far end of the gravel track adjoining the proposed site. It is well away from the area, merely replaces a previous building (i.e. does not increase traffic etc) and is NOT social housing. All the houses in the area are of good character and generally very expensive. This proposal for social housing is totally out of character with the buildings already in the area.</p>
449b	Wardell C and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I cannot believe that either of these sites is being considered. Both BLA2 and BLA1 are on land which has for decades been protected for a variety of reasons that remain valid today. The proposal will destroy this conservation area, have a negative effect on people and animals alike and cause even more pressure on the area. Any development on this land will be on the precursor of sprawl.</p>
750b	Lynette Early	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Concerned about traffic, and noise from the cattle grid. Access to the site is over common land and therefore unsuitable. The site is used as backup grazing land and may be prone to flooding.</p>
754a	Gregory S & T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>We are particularly concerned over the proposed allocation of BLA2 which, in our opinion, is wholly inappropriate.</p> <p>Access to BLA2 is directly from Kings Copse Road which is a generally unmetalled, forest road which falls partly inside the National Park Boundary and totally within land allocated for its environmental sensitivities (SSSIs etc). Increasing the level of traffic along this track would increase potential conflict and risk to all.</p> <p>The turn into the proposed site is extremely tight and the junction with Exbury Road is a very tight turn, at the brow of a hill which abuts a cattle grid. Visibility is extremely poor in all directions, further restricted by vegetation on Blackwell Common and by boundary hedges of properties – outside of the control of any potential developer. Harm to the rural character and appearance of the area will result from engineering works. The access road will have to, at least for some distance, run alongside the existing well established trees. The root protection zone would make the construction of access road impossible.</p> <p>Although BLA2 is not considered at risk from fluvial flooding, there are known ground water risks with adjacent dwellings receiving waters via underground springs. Any changes to the local drainage regime has potential to affect the local trees and their future growth.</p> <p>In accordance with PPS25 an appropriate sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS) would be required in this location. This is further complicated by the fact that the underlying ground conditions comprise of clay which</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
-----	--------------	-------	----------	---------	---------------------------	----------

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road

make the use of soakaways extremely unlikely and expensive.

The underlying ground conditions in this area are River Terrace deposits overlying Headon and Osborne Beds and/or the Becton Formation (both rich in clay). Springs are present. The houses in the lane alongside the site and various properties in the Drove and Exbury Road sit in a natural valley and will be prone to flooding. I understand, from my neighbours that flooding has occurred on the site in the past.

BLA2 which has significant trees adjacent to the access and dividing the site to nearby properties that have amenity and also ecological value, particularly for nesting birds and roosting bats. Any development at BLA2 would place unacceptable pressure upon the long term growth at both ground level from compaction and ground works and also from pressure to prune or fell due to overshadowing and impact upon residential amenity.

Street lighting would be required in an area where this will have an adverse landscape and ecological impact contrary to the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives 10 and 11 in this respect

A large level of landscaping would be required (e.g. 10-15m buffers as a minimum) at a high cost to any potential developer and will take a significant period of time to be effective.

BLA2 sits in extremely close proximity to the SSSI/SPA/SAC. BLA2 should be discounted from consideration due to this direct and unacceptable impact upon the landscape sensitivities.

Any allocation of BLA2 would sit contrary to the Sustainability Appraisal Objective 10 because for the reasons above, it would not 'maintain', 'enhance' or 'protect' local, national and international conservation interests for which the New Forest SSSI/SPA/SAC is recognised. There will be further pressure upon the SSSI/SSSI/SPA/SAC through an increase in predatory pets.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 7 requires support to be given to ensuring that commoning is supported. It is recognised that BLA2 has been previously been used as back up land and further weight should be given to the opportunities that are provided at this site in the long term given its proximity to the common.

Sites BLA2 does not have the same convenience to local facilities as BLA1 and therefore further consideration would be contrary to guidance within both PPS1 and PPS3, with BLA2 remote from Hampton Lane where most local facilities are located and access via the New Forest National Park.

An Open play area at BLA2 would not serve the wider community. BLA2 being in an isolated location has few properties in the vicinity.

BLA2 has a predominately rural setting and any development would sit contrary to this.

BLA2 could not achieve visual integration as the access and position of the land would result in a development visually harmful in local views being set in proximity to individually designed properties giving a mixed character commensurate with the location on the rural/urban fringe of the village and accessed via an rural road.

Allocation of BLA2 would be sit contrary to Objective 10 of the Sustainability Appraisal to the DPD (Jan 2011) in

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
-----	--------------	-------	----------	---------	---------------------------	----------

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road

that the location of the development would not maintain, enhance and create a high quality landscape or protect the character of the New Forest National Park. BLA1 however achieves this objective more reasonably. Allocation of BLA2 would sit contrary to PPS1 Policy 20 which seeks the protection of the wider countryside and the impact of development on landscape, due to its closest proximity to land subject to national and international designations.

Where the site abuts existing homes, they comprise of low density residential properties of varying age, size and design, set within individual mature plots. Boundaries to the site are demarcated with hedgerow and mature trees which contribute to the distinctive countryside edge. Development in this location would have no physical and social connection to the adjacent built form, with the resultant urban grain likely to sit contrary to properties abutting the site. Such a development, to be economically viable, would be expected to have limited house designs and contain a site layout with dwellings set in close proximity and in regular form, creating the appearance of an urban cul-de-sac. This would not sit well with the existing character and appearance of the area.

PPS1 (delivering sustainable development) indicates that development which is inappropriate in its context, or fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted (para 34).

Accessibility to public transport and village centre

BLA2 is the least accessible site under consideration being set furthest from Hampton Lane and is accessed from a residential highway which would do little to encourage a reduced use of private vehicles even for local journeys.

Any additional housing will put further strain on the, already overcrowded, A326 and particularly Blackfield village centre.

476a	Smedley I	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>1.) Back up grazing is important for commoners' ponies if they need to be taken off the forest.</p> <p>2.) Loss of greenfield land which I enjoy whilst dog walking down Bell Lane.</p> <p>3.) Traffic increasing by at least 30-40 cars probably, which will cross very fast over two cattle grids. The speed they travel, they take no notice of the 30mph limit. Parking is often outside houses etc down Exbury Road. If they use The Drove as a shortcut it will be dangerous as there are no pavements and several children from Langley go to school this way. Coming out of Exbury Road and The Drove is very dodgy. The extra people will obviously register at the surgery where the car park is inadequate, at 10.30 this morning it was full with cars coming in and out leaving which blocked the main road, and could have caused an accident. Exbury Road is difficult if you need to go straight across because of traffic both ways.</p>
------	-----------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
336a	Dugdale F	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Entrance to this site on unadopted road bordering the National Park with free-roaming cattle. New intensive buildings would not be in keeping with existing houses. The field is used for grazing and could be used for back-up grazing. This is an essential buffer for the Forest and Fawley Refinery. It also separates the built up areas of Blackfield and Holbury. The access roads are narrow and without pavements. The vast increase in traffic would be dangerous for all.
96a	Kennedy P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I have two concerns about the plot shown on map BLA2 which effectively borders my property. In short these relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - vehicular access from Kings Copse Road; and - hedgerow and tree retention. The hedge provides sanctuary for small birds from predators. <p>I would urge you to leave the mature trees and hedgerow bordering this proposed plot in place. I feel it is important that the hedgerow is maintained as it provides cover for smaller birds from crows that have proliferated of late. At present we have a T junction where an extension of Kings Copse Road runs a short way down the side of this plot serving some houses behind me. If the proposed development were to go ahead and the 'lane' with its hedge retained then it would cause traffic difficulties. The T junction would become a V junction joining the main section of Kings Copse Road. As per the former correspondence from me, this would be at the very point where people from nearby areas choose to park in order to walk their dogs on Blackwell Common. In a nutshell, if one preserves the vegetation and habitat, vehicular access would be difficult at times with traffic coming from four directions. The alternative would be a simple T junction which would get round this problem at some considerable cost to the local habitat.</p>
97b	Readhead D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	This proposal is totally unacceptable. The land has always been for agriculture and back up land for commoners animals. Also the proposal to use a Forestry Commission road as a means of traffic flow is also not acceptable.
294b	Bunday R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		A few years ago when you wanted to build on the last two fields in Blackfield you agreed you would leave a space between Holbury and Blackfield for the birds, deer and horses. Now you are going back on your word.
297b	Lawes W J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Potential loss of farmland. Access to this area would cause many problems.
473a	Young E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This piece of land has always been used as back up grazing in times of drought for the forest ponies. Gaining access to this site via King's Copse would encroach on an area of forest where forest ponies graze. The increased traffic would create a rat run through The Drove , which is a road without pavements.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						Properties to the east of the proposed site have been affected by flooding due to a watercourse that comes through the field. Any development would increase these problems . The area is one of natural beauty and a clear boundary between development and the national park and therefore should not be developed.
280b	Guy V	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		To make up the road to accommodate 30 houses seems a major proposal. It is not Crown land that a road is planned to cross.
373b	Ship R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Will spoil character of forest. Endanger ponies etc. Will need cattle grid for access. Danger of traffic in Exbury Road which is hazardous now (30mph, not kept). Also danger Blackfield crossroads turning into Exbury Road.
375b	Arshad M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We live in The Drove and are not happy about more traffic on our narrow road which has no pavements. Also we feel that a housing development, almost in the New Forest will destroy our part of the forest with the wildlife habitat being destroyed too.
483b	McNaught M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The gardens of houses adjoining the proposed development area are prone to flooding, anymore house building will only increase the problem. There will be increased traffic if new houses are built and Exbury Road only has a pavement one side of the road and is a busy road. The only other route is The Drove which has no pavements and is used by Families walking to school from Langley.
267a	Cassidy P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Our garden tends to flood when we have heavy rain, a stream runs through our neighbours garden and across the bottom of ours. If the field behind this is built on the situation will only get worse. The field has always been used for grazing, especially backup grazing for commoners horses, if built on access would be onto Kings Copse Road which is open to the forest and would need to be fenced. The Drove is a narrow road, not suitable for a lot of traffic, which could be used as a short cut, instead of using the crossroads. Emergencies vehicles would also have traffic, also school children.
527b	Jackson V	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		- The field is backup grazing for commoners' ponies if they need to be taken off the forest. - The field is in the New Forest Heritage Area. - Loss of greenfield site/agricultural land. This is classified in the top third of agricultural land in the country. - Access - The only way is via a narrow unadopted road and over the cattle grid. - The road is adjacent to the national park boundary and cuts through common land used by pedestrians and animals. - Increased traffic and risk to children's safety.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flooding. The field at the bottom of my garden floods with the smallest bit of rain. - All the surrounding houses are individual and full of character. - Does this area really need any further social housing? - Can the local schools cope? When Pavilion Gardens was built the school had an increase in class sizes in my son's year. - Can the Doctors' Surgery cope with extra families - The drains from my house go into the fields.
427a	Simpson T M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>1.) The creation of 30 homes would more than double the traffic turning in/out of King's Copse Road into Exbury Road. The current junction with slope and bends is a semi blind corner.</p> <p>2.) The 30 homes would have a single access route for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>3.) The additional traffic on Exbury Road would cause further congestions at Blackfield crossroads - where the school crossing is. The use of The Drove is not an option as it is narrow with no pavements.</p>
575d	Smith K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The New Forest Park has been formed to protect the remains of the old New Forest for the future generations but the Council are proposing an access through the Park to build on the fields adjacent this can only be detrimental to the New Forest Park.</p> <p>Access to Hughes Common via Exbury road, Kings Copse Road {Forest road} Heritage area, alongside the National Park. This would have a direct impact on the National Park. The development would require street lights, turning the area from rural to urban.</p> <p>I do not think the proposal has considered the intrusion and impact on the wildlife. The deer that graze in the fields, the foxes, sign of badgers, slow worms, Buzzards, Tree Creepers, Nut Hatches, Lesser Spotted and Green Woodpeckers, let alone the threatened Plover and Nightjar.</p> <p>Speaking to the older members of the very local area they can remember animals often turned out from the fields and being retained for back up grazing.</p>
99b	Ralls A and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>We strongly oppose the generation of increased road traffic, this site would bring, across New Forest National Park land , where many forest animals gather and pedestrians walk. More traffic would also increase the danger of the blind summit on Exbury Road, between The Drove and the British Legion. The proposed site would eliminate the land's potential of back up grazing, that has always existed, for Blackwell Common.</p>
92b	Wallbridge J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Kings Copse Road itself is within the National Park and is a forest track. The Forestry Commission will not allow it to be properly surfaced or adopted as a public highway. The Forestry Commission currently charge £3,000 for a licence for each household requiring vehicular access across its land to dwellings and I wonder if the £90,000 has</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						been taken account of. Perhaps most importantly though is the junction at Kings Copse Road with Exbury Road. This is an obtuse angle meaning traffic existing Kings Copse Road has very poor vision of traffic approaching (often at speed) from the direction of Blackfield. I believe the trebling of traffic existing this junction will create an accident blackspot. The options to realign the exit without demolition of properties in Exbury Road are extremely limited because of the hill, the bend and the angle. Road safety does not seem to have been a consideration throughout the plan except for the general caveat about providing satisfactory vehicular access.
103b	Read S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Encroachment onto existing homes. Running waterway and traffic issues.
104a	Alvey J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This proposed development would encroach upon the forest visually and physically. The New Forest is a precious possession and we harm it at our peril.
137a	Foster O	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More concrete in this area would be a disaster, my garden was flooded 3 times in the winter of 09/10. 2. The road out is on National Park land, it is narrow and an area where animals congregate. Dangerous. 3. Waste of good agricultural land. 4. It was part of the New Forest Heritage area until the National Park arrived and Mr Tillyer lodged an objection and unfortunately won. 5. In this area we have a lot of social housing already. 6. Greenfield site.
250a	Stannett P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Over the past 18 years we have witnessed on a number of occasions flooding at our daughters (& adjoining) property. This property lies adjacent to the proposed site where on some winters a large pond forms.</p> <p>This land is used for Forest backup grazing during dry summers.</p>
253a	Walsh A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The increase in traffic and consequent confusion at the Blackfield crossroads would turn the drove into a 'rat run'. The Drove is narrow, has no footpath, and is used by both schoolchildren and pensioners alike. It also has many almost 'blind' driveways onto it, therefore it would certainly become an "accident waiting to happen". The noise of a second cattlegrid would effectively double the noise at night from traffic passing over it. Any development on the access, and view from the open forest would be an eyesore, and devalue the station and charm of a National Park.
260a	Leavens M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We wish to object to housing on site BLA2 in the Sites and Development Plan for the following reasons: Increased Traffic - As householders on the southern side of Exbury Road we know only too well how traffic has

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						<p>increased on this section of road over the past thirty years. More cars and vans are parked on the northern side of the road causing an increased hazard particularly in bad weather. During the recent snow falls it was almost impossible for cars other than 4x4's to negotiate the hill and parked cars. This is not a road that warrants gritting by the council. A further 30 to 60 cars would make Exbury Road far more dangerous.</p> <p>Access - Access to the site would be via King's Copse, very close to the cattle grid. This area is used extensively by dog walkers, children (to and from school) and grazing ponies. This would create an increased risk of accidents, particularly as there is likelihood of a large number of young drivers with their inherent higher accident risk. I would expect the Health and Safety report to confirm this.</p>
262b	Haines P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This area is still untouched and accommodate wildlife and trees that enhance the area. As little thought has been given to the local environment, its now time the Council stops putting homes anywhere without thought for what it will look like.
276b	Sadler M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The reasons you have given make it totally unacceptable.
279b	Sherwood R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I feel strongly that no building should take place on what once was the Forest Heritage Area (in effect, green belt). The last government removed the green belt status in creating a National Park. The reasoning was somewhat flawed in that the writer spoke of the Rolleston Road fields were open and of no interest and would not detract from Bell Lane, a pleasant country lane, by not being included in the National Park. If these fields are built on this would cease to be a rural lane.
284a	Coles R and R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We cannot think how you can consider suing this land for building. This is a spot on the entrance of the New Forest Park and is in our opinion a most inappropriate place to use for this purpose. The Drove is very narrow and has no pavements. Wheelchairs use this. Also there is a very dangerous corner half way down the house leading to Kings Copse Road. Also Exbury Road has a hill that is dangerous.
286b	Atkinson B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Exbury Road is already busy, not wide enough for more traffic. More housing will destroy character of area. Site access will require major road work on Kings Copse Road with cattle grid etc. and will have to be fenced off from the New Forest.
289c	Cocker P and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
290b	Alvey A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Major access difficulties.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						Encroaching onto an area that is conjoined to the forest, and would be further visible from Kings Copse Road and Bell Lane.
302c	Chester-Sterne R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Not viable due to rural nature of access point. More traffic over cattle grid causing nuisance to many surrounding houses. Blackfield cross-roads is scene of many near misses involving pedestrians and vehicles, Exbury road is narrow and lacks pavements. Extra traffic caused by this development will result in increased hazards. Why was tree blocking access point removed in 2010 if this proposal is still under consideration?
312b	Richards A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Access and position of proposal is totally inappropriate for what is the gateway (Kings Copse Road) to the Forest. Concerned with the increase in traffic at the crossroads but more relevant The Drove. A narrow road without pavements already used as school run but also by many children walking to and from the local schools.
313b	Smith L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Totally inappropriate development in this area next to the National Park, which would change the nature of the semi-rural area adjoining the heath and farmland. Increased traffic in Exbury Road incurs risks to pedestrians and at Blackfield cross roads. There is more danger that The Drove will become a rat run at busy times. Increased noise from vehicles using the (two) cattle grids.
323b	Cozens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Access would be dangerous. Mostly retired people live on Exbury Road. We don't want more traffic than we have already. The junction at Blackfield crossroads is already very dangerous. We do not want more traffic and noise.
331b	Rich E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Access is on an unmade road. Exbury Road is already hazardous without extra traffic. Back-up grazing will be lost. Risk of flooding. No need for more social housing in this area. We already have enough. Value of existing properties in Kings Copse Road will be affected.
332b	Law J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Any development here will destroy the Forest and increase traffic on a unique part of Blackfield.
338b	Kollar J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site should not even be considered. Vehicle access to this site is off King's Copse Road - an unadopted road owned by the Forestry Commission. The road forms part of the New Forest and it is very important that the nature of this road be maintained as it is now. Putting up to 60 cars per day extra onto it would destroy the character of the road and the surrounding

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
-----	--------------	-------	----------	---------	---------------------------	----------

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road

area completely. There is also the possibility of a legal challenge to the access. Permission has to be obtained from the Forestry Commission for a direct access onto the New Forest and that would have to be granted. If the road were adopted then the nature of the road and surrounding area would be destroyed. It should not be permitted.

Not only would there be 60 cars streaming out of the site daily but these cars would have to negotiate a tight 90 degree left hand turn into Exbury Road. The traffic would then cause massive congestion at Blackfield Crossroads which is already heavily congested. Do you realise that 3,000 vehicles per hour go through Blackfield Crossroads already? It does not stop with 60 cars. The houses would need visits from traders, delivery lorries, etc. in addition to the present housing in the area. There are just two houses in King's Copse Road from Exbury Road to the entrance to this site and a further five houses down a narrow gravel track. A further twenty houses, spread sparsely, are in King's Copse Road further on. A concentration of thirty house will more than double the likelihood of service vehicles, delivery lorries, etc all trying to negotiate the tight turn from Exbury Road into King's Copse Road. The area (of Outstanding Natural Beauty) will be destroyed. Ponies and cattle frequently graze in the area and will be destroyed. Ponies and cattle frequently graze in the area and will be seen wandering around the road. Think of the extra danger to them of yet more vehicles in the dark (winter) when drivers may not realise until it is too late that the animals are just round the tight turn off Exbury Road.

Because of the congestion likely to be found at Blackfield Crossroads some will start to use The Drove as a 'rat run' to avoid the crossroads. This will be dangerous as The Drove is narrow without pavements. Putting barriers or ramps in The Drove is not the answer. All this extra traffic, whether via The Drove or the crossroads, will put pedestrians at more risk, especially children going to school.

This land is presently used for grazing and is important for that use. It is also suitable for agricultural use being top quality agricultural land.

This area is designated as being of international and national importance as a conservation area. As stated above the proposal will completely destroy the character of the area.

Landscaping do you really expect this to happen? It will take several years for even quick growing trees to become established during which time there will be no screening. If the said trees be vandalised, as is likely, then the screening will take even longer if it happens at all. This attempt to 'hide' the development smacks of sweeping the dust under the carpet - it is still there but you try to pretend it is not.

Housing in the area is mainly old - in some cases very old (at least one of the houses dates back over 500 years). The only new building in the immediate area is a replacement for an old decrepit building at the far end of the gravel track adjoining the proposed site. It is well away from the area, merely replaces a previous building (i.e. does not increase traffic etc) and is NOT social housing. All the houses in the area are of good character and generally very expensive. This proposal for social housing is totally out of character with the buildings already in

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						the area.
339a	White J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Is no practical as it would add to the amount of traffic already on the road. Houses would not be in keeping with what 's there already.</p> <p>Who would be responsible for the gravel tracks made into roads or would new residents have to pay extra upkeep for these roads? If it is social housing how will residents be able to afford this?</p>
343b	Bassett M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development on this site would spoil the rural setting and peaceful nature of this area - popular with walkers and horse riders.
360b	Halliday R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The land is suitable for back-up grazing with access on to the New Forest. Horses are currently grazing on the land directly behind our property in Kings Copse Road. The land has also been used for agriculture in the past. There is a Spring running through part of land which may cause problems with drainage and affect water levels along it's course. The water runs through the gardens of existing properties in The Drove, Exbury Road and off Kings Copse Road.</p> <p>Access to and from the land leads directly onto the New Forest SAC/SPA where ponies and cattle graze freely. CS3 relates to the protection of this special environment (Heritage and Nature Conservation). It has local character and distinctiveness. Wildlife thrives here.</p> <p>Although development may be planned to north of site, and be screened, residents will still use access leading onto the forest, which will need a cattle grid. The influx of 80 to 100 new people in the area, with at least one vehicle per household, will impact on the natural environment and the wildlife.</p> <p>We already find rubbish in the ditches and on the forest area along Kings Copse Road, bottles, cans and polythene bags which can all be hazardous to the ponies, cattle and wildlife in general. Broken glass is a fire risk on the forest in the summer. We also have concerns for the Council run cemetery on the other side of Exbury Road, which is in the National Park. Kings Copse Road borders the National Park.</p> <p>Exbury Road, leading from the forest to the village centre, is a fairly narrow but busy road. There is a pavement along one side. From the cattle grid there is a dip and bend in the road, an exit with poor visibility from The Drove, a hill with cars frequently parked on it and cars parked all along the road to the cross roads at the centre of the village.</p> <p>Delivery vans to the local shops and the garage on the opposite comer all contribute to vehicle congestion in this area. The Drove is a narrow but busy road, without pavements, and with poor visibility on the exits at either end. Residents from the BLA 2 site would be more likely to use their cars to take their children to school, visit the medical centre or go to Gang Warily Sports and Recreation Centre. This would add to the present congestion in the village, at the school and at the medical centre, where parking space is already limited. Lots of children have</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						to cross Exbury Road, and the exit from The Drove that leads on to Hampton Lane, when walking to and from school.
371a	Jacobs J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The proposal for land off Kings Copse Road would inevitably increase traffic in Exbury Road and more importantly in The Drove. The Drove is already over used, being a narrow lane with much access to long shared drives. There is no footpath and delivery vehicles struggle to pass through. It would have to be footpathed and made one way for any increased use.
384a	Wills C and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This land should be kept for grazing. This should remain green fields for people to enjoy for free.
392b	Hough S and T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Any development here will totally destroy the character of this gateway to the forest. Not only will the road need to be improved to a highway standard but the volume of traffic will ruin this natural area. Most inappropriate site allocated for development.
394b	Duffner K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The joy of living in this area is the beauty of it all, green grass, trees and quiet. We have lost too much already. And the so called 'affordable' houses built by Blackfield School did not sell as expected. We do not need more of the same.
395b	Legg P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I object on grounds of access, the proposed layout will spoil the amenity/gateway to the open forest and is unsuitable for increased traffic caused by further housing.
403b	Etheridge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This area planned for building, should remain unspoilt. It's not practical to build in this area when other areas are more practical i.e. Calshot, Holbury Trading Estates.
409b	McLuckie L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This proposal would be out of place in this area. Access is not appropriate and the type of development proposed would not be in keeping with existing properties. The impact on the wildlife of the forest would be detrimental.
428a	Simpson A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The proposed development of 30 homes would mean a possible 60 or so extra cars using a very narrow access onto King's Copse Road, via a cattle grid and sharp right hand turn, not a suitable junction for this extra traffic. Properties to the south and east of the proposed development are already prone to development. Surely developing this area would increase the flood risk. There are also issues concerning conservation and the impact on forest ponies and cattle.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
429b	Ward-Best A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Regarding BLA2/BLA3, I see no particular problem with splitting the development onto these 2 sites. BLA2 is well served by The Drove and Exbury Road. Likewise BLA3 is well served by Chapel Lane and Kings Ride. In both of these cases-vehicular access is available from 2 different directions. So in summary, please do not select BLA1 for the new estate.
433a	Gorgeon Y	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site is most inappropriate for development as its access comes across a cattle grid and through a narrow unadopted road owned by the Forestry Commission. Loss of green field which over the years has been used for crop growing, hay making, grazing for cattle and horses. Back up grazing for forest ponies owned by New Forest commoners. To currently used for leisure horses. The area also supports wildlife owls, flowers etc. Flooding: Developing this area would increase the flood risk , a stream runs through the field where springs rise. Congestion in The Drove. Road is not wide enough, no pavements, to take extra traffic.
437a	Wareham F	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I disagree with developing this area. It would have a major impact on the forest which is a site of national importance. Developing this area would increase flooding to the south and east which is already prone to flooding. Big springs.
454b	McLuckie M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		A new development immediately adjacent to the National Park. No matter what level of screening the site would impact views from the National Park. The roads would have to get significant upgrading. Imagine all the heavy vehicles turning right at the top of Exbury Hill?
456b	Wood K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Any proposal which would threaten the semi-rural area environment is not acceptable. In particular the loss of fields in the Rollestone Road area would be a huge mistake.
463b	Leggett L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
467b	Zadari D and A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The roads surrounding this site are unmade and would need therefore to be upgraded. Increased traffic flow to this site could make it dangerous to local residents and others with this size of development.
470a	Baker L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		How much more traffic can Blackfield take? The village comes to a standstill twice a day at school times as it is and with more homes, children etc. Some day, someone is going to get hurt.
477b	Simpson S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The site access is totally unsuitable for any vehicle let alone heavy vehicles. There will be increased traffic both to Exbury Road and The Drove. At present many parents use this as a relatively safe way to walk their children to

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						school therefore reducing congestion near the school and encouraging a healthy walk to school, especially given the rising obesity epidemic in the population.
484c	Walker M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		There are many reasons why this is the least favourable site. Access is the most obvious and roads such as The Drove are little more than country lanes with no pavements. Being so close to the national park raises many environmental issues.
487b	Laville P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I have lived in The Drove for most of my life. It has become a rat run in recent years. This development would make it worse to the point of being dangerous. Also of the three proposed sites this one would have the biggest impact on the local environment.
493a	Molyneux S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		It is very important that this land is retained as use for possible backup grazing for New Forest commoners. Access for proposed site would cut through common land used by walkers and forest stock. The Drove, which is unpaved, would become dangerous with the extra traffic.
494a	Molyneux S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Access to this site could mean increased traffic in The Drove as it could make a shortcut from the north side of Hamptons Lane. It is inappropriate to increase traffic flows significantly in semi-rural areas. I also believe this land is backup grazing.
508a	Clark B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Inappropriate access via Exbury Road or The Drove creating potential dangers for pedestrians, noise and pollution. King's Copse Road - unmade and adjacent to open forest - potential dereliction of wildlife habitat, further dangers to families using forest for recreation.
514b	Davies R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I disagree that this site is used, as it cuts across the boundary of the New Forest which is common land. Bell Lane is a favourite peaceful walk to a great many people - the build up of traffic in this area is unacceptable and would greatly decrease property prices in this area. Children walk up The Drove to school from Langley - no pavements to cope with the increase in traffic.
515c	Keitley N J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area was within the former New Forest Heritage Boundary, and is vitally important as a potential back-up grazing area for Commoners. • The proposed site is directly adjacent to an area of the New Forest National Park that is important to New Forest Ponies and native wildlife, which will be adversely affected by the inevitable increase in traffic and other disturbance.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This inevitable increase in traffic and other disturbance will detract from the character and enjoyment of the area surrounding this gateway onto the Forest from Exbury Road. • Additional vehicles accessing and exiting the proposed site would have to cross the cattle grid in Exbury Rd, which would generate significant noise nuisance to residents for some considerable distance. . • All the additional traffic will have to negotiate the already congested crossroads at the centre of the village, or choose to deviate via The Drove, which is highly unsuitable to through traffic, being a narrow residential road, without footpaths.
521a	Foster D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The extra traffic this would cause on The Drove and Exbury Road would be unacceptable as The Drove is just really a lane, with no pavements and Exbury Road is not much better.
523a	Jenkins V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I would like to recommend that this BLA2 site should be allocated for residential development, as it would be a natural extension of the built up area along the western boundary line of the Blackfield settlement, and go towards accommodating the local housing needs, for the local people in the local community.
572b	Nicholls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extra weight of traffic could pose a very real danger to dog walkers, visitors to the area and animals. - Access is not suitable for potential weight of traffic. - Development would have a major impact on ponies and cattle and seriously affect recreational enjoyment.
585b	McInally A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Houses planned to be built on this greenfield site will have a detrimental effect on the New Forest National Park, disturbing and frightening the wildlife - some endangered species will probably disappear.
590c	Smith P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The proposal for 30 houses on the proposed sites is illogical. The volume of traffic in Blackfield is already too high. In addition development will put pressure on Blackfield School and the Doctors. There is enough social housing in the area, why are you proposing more?</p> <p>More housing will put even greater pressure on the A326 which is already over capacity. Proposals to reopen the waterside railway are unlikely to happen.</p> <p>In addition to the above increased traffic on the forest would be a danger to the ponies, cattle and many dog walkers. The Drove, which is quiet country road, would be used as a rat run to avoid the Blackfield crossroads. Development which would result in lighting and cars would impact upon the wildlife and would spoil an area of natural beauty. It would also have a negative impact on the New Forest.</p> <p>Furthermore the proposed development would not be in keeping with the present houses in the area of King's Copse Road.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						The field has previously been used for back up grazing and has always been used by ponies and cattle since we moved here 27 years ago.
591b	Stickland J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Please keep this area rural, no more houses, cars, etc.
592b	White J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Proposal would develop a rural area and intrude and disturb wildlife by accessing the national park. Development would add to traffic at Blackfield Crossroads and the school.
597b	Meadows H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Our familiarity with the King's Copse Road is the result of many pleasant country walks. It is difficult for us to understand how the necessary infrastructure could be provided to support a housing development without encroaching upon National Park land. Perhaps this is a possibility, in which case there is potential for provision of more houses in response to the next demand. It is conceivable that a new service road could be constructed across the southern end of the golf course (beside the Blackfield Medical Centre) to facilitate access to Site BLA2. This would have minimum impact upon the area of the golf course.
601b	Kelly C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We believe that BLA2 is the least unsuitable in terms of visual impact and loss of amenities, but would, of course, ideally prefer none of the options to be implemented.
602b	Paterson R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I feel the proposed plans for this site are highly inappropriate. Any development of this location will devastate the integrity of the open forest accessed from Exbury Road. Development of the road to highway standards will completely alter the character of this public land that is part of our heritage, and is of great historical importance. Furthermore, increased local traffic in The Drove and Exbury Road will significantly decrease safety for pedestrians, as there is narrow or non-existent kerbing on these roads.
611b	Paronio R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Unlike site BLA3 there are other reasons why this site should not be developed even though it is outside the National Park. The access to the site is from the National Park boundary and would result in the character of an important gateway to the New Forest being destroyed by the necessary upgrade work required to make the access road an acceptably high standard. There would need to be an additional cattle grid that would not allow satisfactory disabled access and would result in noise pollution from when it was used. The site would be out of character with the remainder of the area and would also provide an access into the fields beyond for potentially further development that could result in Blackfield and Holbury merging. The access to the site is also potentially from two narrow roads with single or no pavements (Exbury Road and The Drove) that have dangerous junctions onto Hampton Lane and would increase the risk of road traffic accidents occurring from the

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						60 or so cars that development would potentially bring in.
646b	Carcas T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Most inappropriate site. There should be no more new development in Blackfield until the congestion problem on the A326 is addressed. In addition it does not make sense to put social housing in an area that has poor public transport links and few job opportunities. (Respondee refers to being opposed for the reasons outlined in a letter. A letter which was probably was being circulated amongst local residents).
660b	Yanoff C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site is completely inappropriate for the following reasons: the increased traffic on an already overburdened road. The eroding of green belt the saturation of social housing in the area. Access affecting a forest track
701b	Waterman C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		- Lack of local employment and the means of travel to higher employment areas. - A326 issues. Volume of traffic is already too high, especially early morning/late afternoon. - If the development were extended to Holbury, there would be traffic safety issues around roads of the Spur Estate and Rolleston Road. - Lack of general infrastructure, i.e. doctors, entertainment etc. - Loss of green land.
711b	Serbatoio V	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Concerns about impact on eh New Forest, particularly in terms of traffic. There are also issues regarding road safety as The Drove does not have a pavement. The site has open access to the Forest and would therefore require a cattle grid which would result in additional noise.
752b	Early D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Access to Kings Copse Rd would be via Exbury Rd, or The Drove. The Drove (which joins Exbury Rd) is a narrow pavement free road, & has little scope for alteration, as several properties are already close to the road. It also contains some of the oldest homes in the area, which are considered to be of such importance that the local school even organises school outings to study them. Exbury Rd is already a busy road, & houses the British Legion social club at its entrance. To increase traffic flow by approx 60 cars along this road would be of great concern. To access the proposed development this additional traffic would have a cattle grid to travel over & even though I live some distance from the grid it is still quite easily heard, so the noise impact would have to be considered.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
						<p>Access is over common land only a matter of feet from the national park, & an unadopted road, which is used by forest walkers, dog walkers, & forest animals. Is this really a suitable access for a 30 house estate?</p> <p>The land itself, as I have always understood it, is available as backup grazing for commoners, something which I understood there was a shortage of.</p> <p>I also understand that due to the local springs (which feed wells in The Drove) & the stream arising from them that this area can be prone to a degree of flooding. Measures would need to be put in place to protect the springs & network of wells, whilst protecting residents from flooding.</p>
761a	Gould B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Concerned about the impacts of traffic on the surrounding roads, particularly delivery vehicles. Kings Copse Road is an unadopted forest track. This proposed development would completely destroy its character. The fields are currently used as backup grazing land and have also been used for growing hay. Concerned about impacts on the adjacent SPA/SAC/SSSI. Concerned that proposed landscaping would not be retained.</p>
821a	Davis C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The access to this site is across common land putting animals at risk. Development would bring increased traffic on Exbury Road and The Drove. The site is used as back-up grazing for forest animals. Houses are prone to flooding and development will increase the risks. Query whether schools and medical facilities are adequate to cater for new development.</p>
827a	Wallbridge G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
844b	Betteridge L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Totally unsuitable access from Exbury Road. It would pose extreme risk to New Forest livestock. This has always been a green belt site and is backup grazing for forest ponies.</p>
678e	Oliver T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>It is directly adjacent to Blackwell Common. Access to it would have to pass through the Common and adjacent to the National Park Boundary.</p> <p>The considerations that led to this land being kept within the New Forest Heritage Boundary are still relevant today.</p> <p>The most significant of these is its potential for back up grazing for New Forest Commoners. The land which is directly adjacent to the New Forest National Park Boundary is currently grazed by leisure horses and clearly has the potential to supplement the pool of back up grazing (of which there is a desperate shortage).</p> <p>The land under discussion is classified as Grade 3a "best and most versatile" agricultural land. This classification was a key element of the debate relating to the land and it's suitability for back-up grazing when the Heritage</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
-----	--------------	-------	----------	---------	---------------------------	----------

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road

Boundary was being considered

According to Planning Policy 7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas – there is a presumption against development of agricultural land of this quality. The 3a classification appeared to have been overlooked when the NFDC Scoping Report for the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal was produced.

Development on this site would have a significant negative impact on locally important views and on the setting and character of the village which already has a high density of social housing. The area is heavily used by recreational walkers from a wide area including Holbury and Langley as well as Blackfield.

The only way in to the proposed site is across the cattle grid and through a narrow unadopted road owned by the Forestry Commission. The road is adjacent to the National Park Boundary and cuts through common land used by pedestrians and New Forest animals. Putting up to 60 cars a day on this road would destroy the character of the road and surrounding area completely.

Old maps show the area needed for access has been Common land for centuries. Is it appropriate that common land should be used for access? Development here would have a major impact on forest ponies and cattle and seriously affect recreational enjoyment of an important amenity for local people.

The additional traffic would place an unacceptable burden on Exbury Road and the already heavily congested crossroads in the centre of the village. The Drove is a small road with no pavements. It could become a rat run. Upgrading it is not an option as it would destroy its character.

The area immediately to the rear of properties off The Drove is marked as a network of springs and sinks. I believe this is in line with the geology of the area which has a clay bed. Properties to the south and east of the proposed development area are already prone to flooding. Developing this area would increase the flood risk. In 1999 this area was rejected for planning.

The site borders an area designated as being of international/European and/or national importance. Would 30 homes on this site constitute an extension of an existing settlement? Homes surrounding the site are established and have a distinct character.

The boundary between houses along the Drove and the proposed site is an ancient field boundary dating back to before 1797 and marked by 200+ year old boundary oaks. The land beyond this on which The Drove was developed at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century was formerly Common Land – Hughs Common. The line of development has remained unchanged.

The boundaries indicated for the part of this site nearest to Bell Lane are not in line with any longstanding field boundaries. There has been some very recent subdivision of this site to accommodate leisure horses but this should not outweigh the fact that this field pattern has been unchanged for centuries.

Appropriate screening would need to be in keeping with the character of the area. Planting would take many years to grow to a size sufficient to provide any kind of screening.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
749a	Gray C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Drove would see a dangerous increase in traffic. Higher noise levels and more cars also more noise from extra traffic using the Exbury Road cattle grid. The character and beauty of the area would be destroyed.
942b	Peters G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Forest land and access and through routes would be a problem
962b	Trim A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	
976b	Tillyer B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This land is ideal for allocation of affordable housing which would accommodate the housing needs of people who want to live and work in Blackfield.
981b	Lockyer K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	My main objection to development at sites BLA1, BLA2 and BLA3 is that they are all outside the current boundary line for development. These boundaries, which I am very happy with, were presumably decided upon with great care and consideration. They need to be maintained and not chipped away at; otherwise what was the point in having them in the first place? These areas are in very sensitive positions on the edge of the New Forest, housing wildlife, ancient trees and hedgerow. Access to BLA2 and BLA3 is restricted and not available from a main road. Any additional vehicular movements around these sites would have a major detrimental impact on the narrow country lanes around these two sites and would be a particular worry for the safety of pedestrians. BLA3 has already been refused planning in the past, nothing has changed and the reasons for refusal of BLA3 could easily be argued for BLA2. There are hundreds of reasons why not to allow building on these sites but they have all been heard before and we all know more homes are needed, but please, please, please maintain the existing boundaries to protect these green field sites for ever.
987b	Coates R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	There is no sensible access for this site. It would cause damage to a sensitive area of the National park. Both Kings copse rd and Exbury rd are not suitable for such an increase in traffic.
989b	Levett C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Access direct off forest seems hugely in conflict with other strategies.
1004t	Belson N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	
1016a	Cantello N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	To access this site would mean 60+ cars or thereabouts going continually across open forest land, which is totally unacceptable. Again this land is currently used for back-up grazing by Commoners, land that is already scarce. Green field land should remain just that. Green. Not covered with houses.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA2, Land at Kings Copse Road						
1017b	Johnson R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Access to this area is limited to a route over a narrow Forest road and Exbury road.
1024b	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Greed is driving this proposal on what is rightfully National Park land. Underhand manipulation is prevalent.
1039b	St John-Johnson S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Access would be required over the Forest.
1049b	Westbrook K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<p>This is such an awful choice you almost have to assume an ulterior motive behind it. Not only is the environmental impact unacceptable, the access is poor, through national park land and an unadopted road. The further access in Exbury road is unsuitable for increased traffic flows due to bad visibility at the brow of the hill, and the extra traffic generated will have a high negative effect at the crossroads in the middle of the village. There is also a possibility of The Drove becoming a rat run. This would eventually require measures to be taken, as this is a narrow, residential road, with no pavement, and the increased traffic movements would pose a danger to the other vehicles, pedestrians and horses using the road. Development here would also increase the existing high risk of flooding of adjacent properties. The field patterns here have remained unchanged for centuries, the development would have a negative effect on adjacent common land and the amenity it provides to residents from a wide area and borders a designated AONB.</p> <p>I am truly dismayed that BLA2 could have been even considered and trust that it will not be developed.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
742m	RSPB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Land at Chapel Lane is situated within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA. The redevelopment of Land at Chapel lane for residential purposes has the potential to adversely affect the integrity of the New Forest SPA due to increased urban effects such as cat predation, increased uncontrolled fires and recreational disturbance. Without suitable avoidance and mitigation measures, it is acknowledged in the NFDC Core Strategy that the cumulative effect of new housing within the District (in combination with that in neighbouring authorities) could lead to an adverse effect on the integrity of the New Forest SPA. We have raised our detailed concerns against Policy DM1 regarding the absence of any link between the provision of the necessary mitigation and avoidance measures and the allocations for new housing set out within the Sites and Development Management DPD. However, we are particularly concerned regarding the proposed housing allocations within close proximity of the SPA.</p> <p>Since the adoption of the NFDC Core Strategy, the New Forest NPA has adopted its own Core Strategy which includes the following policy in relation to new housing development within close proximity to the New Forest SPA:</p> <p>Policy CP1: Nature Conservation Sites of International Importance</p> <p>“.....In particular, any new housing that is proposed to be located within 400m of the boundary of the New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) will be required to demonstrate that adequate measures are put in place to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects on the ecological integrity of the SPA.”</p> <p>We can see no reason why such a policy that directs housing development outside of this most sensitive zone around the SPA should not be applied to housing development within the same distance from the SPA in districts and boroughs outside of the National Park boundary, including the New Forest District.</p> <p>Paragraph 17 of PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development prescribes “planning authorities should seek to enhance the environment as part of development proposals. Significant adverse impacts on the environment should be avoided and alternative options which might reduce or eliminate those impacts pursued...”.</p> <p>In accordance with the precautionary approach, we would therefore urge the Council to consider more appropriate locations for new housing development in the District.</p> <p>We welcome the conclusion, set out in Table 3.3 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment of Sites and Development Management DPD Consultation Document – Screening Statement, that “a full Appropriate Assessment will be required if this site is allocated for residential development”. The RSPB agrees that potential impacts of the proposed development on the international sites will need to be investigated as part of the appropriate assessment of the Site Allocations DPD, however we are very concerned that in this location, the impact of net new residential development is likely to be such that, even with mitigation/avoidance measures in place, it is not possible to conclude no adverse effect on the integrity of the European Sites.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
738q	Natural England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Potential impact on New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. The site is within 400m, where impacts are most difficult to avoid. This will require full Appropriate Assessment if proposed as part of the DPD.
588a	Marc Paronio Representing Trustees of the Late Mrs E.M. Read	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Site forms part of the last remaining phase of the development that was formally allocated for development under the 1974 Blackfield and Langley Local Plan. The land put forward does not include the land to the southern end of the site, which was previously indicated for development in the 1974 Local Plan. This land could provide the necessary children's play area as well as vital amenity land. There is also the option of the woodland being opened up as a publicly accessible area.
641d	Nicola Phipps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development would create extra traffic in an already congested area (and have an impact on the A326). In addition development would create an unacceptable level of traffic on Chapel Lane and in the village. A rat run may be created along the gravel road past the cemetery to Exbury Road. In addition development would have a detrimental impact of locally important views and on the setting and character of Blackfield. Blackfield is adjacent to the internationally important New Forest National Park and already has a high density of social housing. Is there the need for 30 extra homes for people living in Blackfield? There are limited employment opportunities close to Blackfield. This will be a problem for any new residents. Nature Conservation - The site borders an area of international importance and is directly adjacent to the National park.
822l	New Forest National Park	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Land at Chapel Lane has recently been used as back-up grazing land. The site is also within 400m of the New Forest SPA.
694c	McEvoy Cllr A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Could not support under any circumstances.
318c	Halliday M and R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		As for BLA2, additional low cost/social housing would result in a degrading of the 'special' nature of a very quiet forest area, close to the National park. The traffic from the caravan site is quite enough additional vehicles, without adding to the volume. There is a risk that more traffic would tend to use the ford and rough track beside the cemetery as a 'rat-run' to school etc. This is currently only occasionally used by 4x4s and forestry vehicles. A small estate could only worsen the Exbury Road, Drove, crossroads problem.
105c	Morris AJ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Not large enough.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
355c	Haynes D and Gallagher J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Can infrastructure cope with extra housing? We know it won't just stop at 30, this will be the beginning of the areas downfall. No village will ever be distinct as we'll all merge into one. The green belt is obviously unimportant. The benefits to the new potential dwellers will not cover the costs of losing the country's beautiful landscape. Will building never cease?
385c	King M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	I have no objection to this site being used for development, but hope it would not increase the number of cars using the track past the cemetery as a short cut to Blackfield.
1020c	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Preferable to BLA2
396c	Barker	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This land is directly backing on to the New Forest. Any development here would result in up to 30 cars plus delivery vehicles etc causing unacceptable extra traffic on Chapel Lane itself. This traffic may at peak times be so bad that a 'rat run' across the old gravel road past the cemetery to join Exbury Road may be created giving rise to similar problems with traffic as mentioned for BLA2. For much of the reasons in BLA2 above this development should not be permitted.
449c	Wardell C and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Best of a very poor set of options. Similar objections apply (proposal will destroy this conservation area, have a negative effect on people and animals alike and cause even more pressure on the area), although there has been some precedent of development in the past.
750c	Lynette Early	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site is the best suited as it has the infrastructure in place. However, there are still issues relating to traffic and the use of the old cemetery path from Exbury Road.
280c	Guy V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Are there not spaces for all 30 houses in this area, completing the area around King's Ride which is already housing.
375c	Arshad M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		I cannot agree or disagree as I do not know if the need for housing is so great that more green space has to be destroyed, to build more houses and roads.
483c	McNaught M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Once again, more traffic, more problems trying to park at the surgery. Why Blackfield? There must be other areas which have sites for building. We have become a huge housing estate without many amenities.
427b	Simpson T M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		1) The use of land adjacent to Kings Ride , which has already been allocated in the 70s and 80s is an implementation of previously planned arrangements - with access and integration into the existing road system

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
						all in place.
575e	Smith K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development on this field with access on a country lane and the proximity of the National Park make this a poor choice. The track across Blackwell common alongside the Cemetery would soon become a rat run instead of a pleasant walk to the village or school.
103c	Read S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Unnecessary. 15 homes may be found elsewhere where access is less obtrusive to wildlife/rural setting.
262c	Haines P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Seems the best option, as sewers already in place, and road would support houses.
276c	Sadler M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The reasons you have given make it totally unacceptable.
279d	Sherwood R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I feel strongly that no building should take place on what once was the Forest Heritage Area (in effect, green belt). The last government removed the green belt status in creating a National Park. The reasoning was somewhat flawed in that the writer spoke of the Rolleston Road fields were open and of no interest and would not detract from Bell Lane, a pleasant country lane, by not being included in the National Park. If these fields are built on this would cease to be a rural lane.
286c	Atkinson B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		If housing has to be developed right alongside the New Forest and I don't see why as there is wasteland on the Cadman estate. This is almost the only place in Blackfield that is reasonable to a small degree.
289a	Cocker P and J	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		As this has been allocated already this seems to be the best site for housing, is also has sufficient space.
302a	Chester-Sterne R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Best proposal for this area with best access and least disturbance to existing housing.
312c	Richards A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Originally allocated for housing. And as area (although adjacent to the forest land)is already developed seems the most appropriate if a new development is required.
313c	Smith L	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This proposal is the least worst of the three, providing some provision for open space is retained for recreation.
323c	Cozens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Further reduction of our lovely forest area.
331c	Rich E	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
332c	Law J	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
338c	Kollar J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This land is directly backing on to the New Forest. Any development here would result in up to 30 cars plus delivery vehicles etc causing unacceptable extra traffic on Chapel Lane itself. This traffic may at peak times be so bad that a 'rat run' across the old gravel road past the cemetery to join Exbury Road may be created giving rise to similar problems with traffic as mentioned for BLA 2. For much of the reasons in BLA 2 above this development should not be permitted.
343c	Bassett M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The reasons given in February 1991 for refusal on appeal for development on this site are still valid. Also the lane is used by many horse riders and dog walkers, leading as it does, directly on to the forest. Moreover, development would completely alter the peaceful nature of the area and cause disturbance to the wildlife that currently exists.
349b	Trim C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The field you propose to build on is a nature haven, I have seen adders, owls, grass snakes, bats, slowworms, plus lots of nesting birds in the hedges and trees. There is a preservation order on the hedge off the Kings Ride entrance - but strangely enough the birds and animals next in all the fields around the entrance not just that one. It is totally in keeping with surroundings next to the forest. Keep it so. We moved here because of the peaceful forest land and not to be surrounded by buildings.
360c	Halliday R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Site not large enough for required number of dwellings. Site in close proximity to New Forest SAC/SPA and the National Park where ponies and cattle graze freely and wildlife thrives. Also in close proximity to the Council run cemetery, off Exbury Road, which is in the National Park. Concern again regarding rubbish and its effect on the natural environment. Residents would probably need to use cars to go to the village, schools, medical centre, Gang Warily Sports and Recreation Centre, etc. leading to more traffic congestion, especially where there is limited parking.
367b	Cornelius B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We recommend this area for as many properties as possible as this does not directly affect existing householders in properties around.
386a	Ellins S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		1. Many extra cars. The lane is now mainly used by pedestrians going to the national park with their dogs. Children being escorted to and from the Blackfield School. Horse Riders. 2. No play area, other than the park, for children. 3. One new bungalow under construction and original bungalows made into two houses, more cars 4. Water pressure already very low at the park end of the lane. 5. A quiet, semi rural, fairly narrow lane, changed forever.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
392c	Hough S and T	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development here would appear acceptable if some of the land was used for a childrens' play area/open space and the adjoining woodland opened up for public access.
394c	Duffner K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The joy of living in this area is the beauty of it all, green grass, trees and quiet. We have lost too much already. And the so called 'affordable' houses built by Blackfield School did not sell as expected. We do not need more of the same.
403c	Etheridge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This area of planning is far too close to the forest area. The road and infrastructure is not man enough to take the traffic. This area needs careful thought, when although we need houses this area is not practical.
409c	McLuckie L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Again this proposal is not in keeping with its direct neighbours. Access along, what amounts to no more than a country lane used by a lot of horse riders and walkers is not appropriate. Again the wildlife of the area would be affected. This area to my understanding is Green Belt land and planning was refused some years ago because of this. What has changed to be considering consent now?
416a	Trim S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I do not agree at all with the proposal to build up to fifteen houses at Chapel Lane. Currently Chapel Lane, is peaceful, tranquil and a nature haven. It is my belief that this will change drastically if these plans are carried out. As for congestion, currently next door is having a new house put in, and therefore a lot of building work. Even with this small level of cars and other plant machinery I have been unable to get in my drive several times. Chapel Lane is very small and certainly will not accommodate the sheer volume of traffic that will accompany your plans. Especially once the building work has been completed. The amount of wildlife that lives and survives within Chapel Lane is huge. Your plans would have a serious adverse affect on this.
417a	Harrison P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I am concerned at the added amount of traffic that this will cause, on Hampton Lane, let alone the problems, it will cause in Chapel Lane. Hampton Lane is very busy and fast road, with many domestic animals being killed each year. I feel very strongly that building more houses in such a small rural area will endanger not only the wildlife but also the quality of those living around it.
428b	Simpson A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		As this development is a continuation of the adjacent King's Ride development this would seem to be an acceptable solution if more housing is required.
429c	Ward-Best A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Regarding BLA2/BLA3, I see no particular problem with splitting the development onto these 2 sites. BLA2 is well served by The Drove and Exbury Road. Likewise BLA3 is well served by Chapel Lane and Kings Ride. In both of these cases-vehicular access is available from 2 different directions. So in summary, please do not select BLA1 for

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
						the new estate.
454c	McLuckie M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Twelve to fifteen dwellings does not satisfy the need to provide affordable housing in the area . Back in 1991 planning permission was refused for this site, I do not believe the reasons for refusal have changed. The site is a natural refuge for a varied range of wildlife. Chapel Lane would need upgrading to cope with the additional traffic.
456c	Wood K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Any proposal which would threaten the semi-rural area environment is not acceptable. In particular the loss of fields in the Rolleston Road area would be a huge mistake.
463c	Leggett L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
467c	Zadari D and A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Although limited in size this site at least has the benefit of a public sewer mains and all the infrastructure also better positioned . With the costs pertaining to building affordable housing this is the best site. I would support this site with if necessary and overflow into BLA1.
470b	Baker L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Someone use their common sense, there is no more room in Blackfield for 30+ houses.
487c	Laville P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This land seems the most acceptable as the adjacent land has been developed over the last thirty years and further development would not have such a big impact.
493b	Molyneux S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This land, being so close to the forest, needs to be kept for possible back up grazing for commoners stock. The amount of houses proposed would mean an unacceptable level of traffic in Church lane. A short cut would be used alongside the cemetery to Exbury Road.
494c	Molyneux S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This land is very close to the open forest. If developed it could lead to a significant change in character of this area. Increased traffic could mean possible adoption of a short cut at the side of the cemetery.
514c	Davies R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Blackfield has expanded far too much recently. The existing Medical Centre is too small to cope with this expanding population.
515d	Keitley N J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This land is also directly adjacent to the New Forest National Park Boundary • Development at this site would also put unacceptable additional traffic volumes through the centre of Blackfield.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
572c	Nicholls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		- Access is not suitable for potential weight of traffic. - A rat run may be created along the gravel road past the cemetery. - Development would have a major impact on New Forest animals.
585c	McInally A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Another greenfield site in close proximity to the New Forest National Park. A quiet country lane for pedestrians made more dangerous by increased car traffic.
586a	Jebb G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The area around Chapel Lane is already overdeveloped. Further development will detract from the area.
589a	Drodge A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Chapel Lane will not take anymore traffic movements. Peace and tranquillity of Chapel Lane will be gone for good.. House prices will plummet. Keep fields for wildlife not extra houses. The area would be overcrowded i.e. schools, Health Centre, public transport and roads are becoming overcrowded and we do not want this area turned into an urban estate.
590d	Smith P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The proposal for 30 houses on the proposed sites is illogical. The volume of traffic in Blackfield is already too high. In addition development will put pressure on Blackfield School and the Doctors. There is enough social housing in the area, why are you proposing more? More housing will put even greater pressure on the A326 which is already over capacity. Proposals to reopen the waterside railway are unlikely to happen. In addition to the above building on BLA3 would be detrimental to the National Park. There would be an increase in the volume of traffic on local roads. In addition development would also possibly cause a rat run across the National Park in front of the cemetery to Exbury Road. This could lead to accidents involving wildlife or pedestrians.
591c	Stickland J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This would cause even more traffic on Hampton Lane. Hampton Lane is already fast and noisy road.
592c	White J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Proposal would access onto a country lane with access to the national park. Development would add to traffic at Blackfield Crossroads and the school.
597c	Meadows H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		In view of the available infrastructure and readily available building space there is a strong argument in favour of maximising their use.
601c	Kelly C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We would like to register our opposition to the proposal for development at site BLA3, which is, in our opinion, the least appropriate of the three options. This site is unsuited to development - it is in a beautiful wooded area

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
						directly adjoining the New Forest and would bring unnecessary disturbance and traffic to a quiet area. This is the least appropriate of the proposed sites.
611a	Paronio R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site is ideal for development where it forms the last phase of the adjacent site known as Kings Ride. Where the land has been subject to a public enquiry and the exclusion of the land from the National Park has been agreed by a government inspector, there is no case remaining for the land to be considered other than for development. The necessary infrastructure has been put in place including road improvements for the main estate and the area would benefit from affordable housing where currently it is limited to the north and east of Blackfield. A small sympathetic development could be provided and there is enough space to the southern end to accommodate a play area as well as provide amenity land to the benefit of everyone in the locality.
646C	Carcas T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		There should be no more new development in Blackfield until the congestion problem on the A326 is addressed. In addition it does not make sense to put social housing in an area that has poor public transport links and few job opportunities. This site is a long way from facilities e.g. schools, shops and the medical centre. Future residents would have to use a car for simple things like shopping, taking children to school and visiting the doctor.
652a	Watts R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Concerned about loss of privacy and quiet living for the older residents of Kings Ride backing onto the proposed site. The destruction of a unique area which now gives shelter to many wild birds and all kinds of wild-life.
654a	Norton C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Concerned about noise during construction, overlooking of existing properties, traffic and light pollution from streetlights. Also concerned about the impacts on the New Forest, in particular maintaining a coherent boundary between the forest and residential areas.
660c	Yanoff C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		This site I don't have strong views on except the saturation of social housing.
701c	Waterman C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Although there are issues with this site, such as a lack of employment locally, poor public transport, congestion on the A326 and a lack of general infrastructure locally, this option probably causes the least disturbance to green land. In addition it does not affect the volume of traffic on the Spur Estate or Rolleston Road.
711c	Serbatoio V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site would be satisfactory subject to adequate access arrangements. Development should be set back so as not to impose on the access to the New Forest.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
752c	Early D	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This area having already had a major development in the past 35 years (building several hundred homes) does have the infrastructure to support a further housing development & would therefore in my opinion be the best suited.</p> <p>However, there would be issues regarding access via Lepe Rd, Lea Rd & Chapel Lane, (which could already do with traffic islands) due to the standard of driving entering & exiting the estate. Measures would need to be put in place to prevent the issue of people cutting corners & therefore driving on the wrong side of the road. A method of preventing people using the common access to this area via the old cemetery path from Exbury Road would also need to be put in place. The road would also require widening, which would eat into the land available for housing.</p>
844c	Betteridge L	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This would seem the most suitable site although I feel that it is not necessary to increase the housing in the area as there are no jobs.</p>
678f	Oliver T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This land backs directly on to the New Forest. Many of the objections to BLA2 also apply to this site. Development would create an unacceptable level of traffic on Chapel Lane and in the village. A rat run may be created along the gravel road past the cemetery to Exbury Road.</p>
942c	Peters G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<p>Forest land and access and through routes would be a problem</p>
962c	Trim A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>very strongly disagree with any development here, it is a nature haven for many rare birds and i have seen adders, owls, bats, slowworms, hedgehogs. It is far too narrow to survive another 14 homes, it already is the main road for the caravan site, homes in the lane as well as dog walkers, horse riders, rambles and push bike riders. There is a lack of fields in which to keep horses in this area once this is developed that is even less space.... DON'T DEVELOP IT</p>
981c	Lockyer K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<p>My main objection to development at sites BLA1, BLA2 and BLA3 is that they are all outside the current boundary line for development. These boundaries, which I am very happy with, were presumably decided upon with great care and consideration. They need to be maintained and not chipped away at; otherwise what was the point in having them in the first place? These areas are in very sensitive positions on the edge of the New Forest, housing wildlife, ancient trees and hedgerow. Access to BLA2 and BLA3 is restricted and not available from a main road. Any additional vehicular movements around these sites would have a major detrimental impact on the narrow country lanes around these two sites and would be a particular worry for the safety of pedestrians. BLA3 has already been refused planning in the past, nothing has changed and the reasons for refusal of BLA3 could easily be argued for BLA2. There are hundreds of reasons why not to allow building on these</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA 3, Land at Chapel Lane						
						e sites but they have all been heard before and we all know more homes are needed, but please, please, please maintain the existing boundaries to protect these green field sites for ever.
987c	Coates R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The most suitable site.
989c	Levett C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Increased traffic through the village and disruptive to other home owners
1004u	Belson N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	
1016b	Cantello N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The increase in traffic onto Hampton Lane would be considerable. This road is already grid-locked as soon as you get to the petrol station in Blackfield (during rush hours) and would completely destroy the peace and tranquillity of this area (as peaceful as it can be when there is already circa 600,000 cars a year that go up and down the road to Lepe country park, we really don't need any more traffic.
1017c	Johnson R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Building here was rejected on appeal in 1991. This land was runback land and this was a reason for rejection as was potential damage to the fragile Forest. Any development would be contrary to DM6 - open character of area. The impact on residents would be severe, particularly those in Chapel Lane. Assurance has been given to me on several occasions by NFDC staff that this would remain Green Belt.
1024c	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	I object to the previous multiple choice question as I have NO most preferred only three LEAST preferred
1039c	St John-Johnson S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Development of this area was refused on appeal in February 1991. The grounds were preservation on run-back land for depasturing and damage to the nearby SSSI Forest. Development would be in opposition to DM6 (Open Character).
1049c	Westbrook K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This has been earmarked for development for a long time and has the least environmental impact. Measures would be required to ensure that a rat run is not set up past the cemetery.

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: FAW1, Fawley Oil Refinery

888ai	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Due to historic uses of the site contamination may be present. Providing contamination can be satisfactorily addressed in line with PPS23, we have no objections to the redevelopment of this site.
766a	Esso Petroleum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We welcome the retention of this policy.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: FAW1, Fawley Oil Refinery						
988c	Fawley Parish Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The area in question includes a large gravel pit that could be used for general employment use i.e. and Industrial Estate. Many years have passed since this policy was introduced and petroleum plants and related industries are using much smaller sites. There are other sites within this area to accommodate these types of firms, but the large brown site of the gravel pit could be put to general use.
1020f	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
942d	Peters G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
987d	Coates R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
989e	Levett C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1004v	Belson N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1017e	Johnson R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1024g	Bradford S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1049d	Westbrook K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR1, Land adjoining Hardley Industrial Estate						
692v	Hampshire CC - Env't Dept	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Allocation should include the possibility of waste facility development.
1020g	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
249a	Cooper N, E and S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Objection to the industrial allocation at Hardley Industrial Estate. Land should be allocated for a supermarket use instead.
279c	Sherwood R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Why can you not build houses on the land adjoining Hardly Industrial Estate? There are several sites in the industrial estate unoccupied which could be redeveloped for industrial use as well as large areas in the Totton area which were formally industrial areas.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR1, Land adjoining Hardley Industrial Estate						
942e	Peters G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
987e	Coates R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
989f	Levett C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Better used for housing rather than industry
1004w	Belson N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Some provision for housing could be made as this site as been underused for years since the closure of Racal
1016e	Cantello N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Well this is an area that certainly needs developing its currently an eyesore.
1017f	Johnson R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1024h	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Build housing here (if there is enough profit for the developer.) Make use of the empty / abandoned units already on the estate.
1049e	Westbrook K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA4, Proposed changes to Blackfield Local Shopping Frontage						
1020h	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Agree with 'Delete small area of Local Shopping Frontage on Walkers Lane North solely covering an office use' and 'Move area of Local Shopping Frontage east of Hampton Lane to cover the front of the retail units as opposed to the Car Park'. Disagree with 'Delete area of Local Shopping Frontage east of Hampton Lane which currently covers a mixture of residential uses and a B8 use on New Road'.
942f	Peters G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
987f	Coates R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
989g	Levett C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1004x	Belson N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1016f	Cantello N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Nothing wrong with the way it is. It works so don't try and fix it. Not exactly as if the council/govt has spare money to spend really, do they?

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: BLA4, Proposed changes to Blackfield Local Shopping Frontage						
1017g	Johnson R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Agree with 'move area of Local Shopping Frontage east of Hampton Lane to cover the front of the retail units as opposed to the Car Park'. No view on other changes.
1024i	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1049f	Westbrook K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		I can't find any definition in the documentation of what this phrase actually means, so am unable to comment on these proposals.

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HOL1, Holbury Drove local shopping frontage proposed changes

1020i	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
942g	Peters G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
987g	Coates R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
989h	Levett C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1004y	Belson N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1017h	Johnson R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1024j	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1049g	Westbrook K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HOL2, Long Lane, Holbury local shopping frontage proposed changes

766h	Esso Petroleum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		While we would normally be opposed to any new development within the HSE inner consultation zone, we recognise that these premises have been operating for many years and the changes are just making the plan accord with what is the current reality.
1020j	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
942h	Peters G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HOL2, Long Lane, Holbury local shopping frontage proposed changes						
987h	Coates R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
989i	Levett C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1004z	Belson N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1017i	Johnson R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1024k	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Pedestrian safety
1049h	Westbrook K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: FAW2, Fawley Village local shopping frontage proposed changes						
766i	Esso Petroleum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		While we would normally be opposed to any new development within the HSE inner consultation zone, we recognise that these premises have been operating for many years and the changes are just making the plan accord with what is the current reality.
1020k	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
942i	Peters G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
987i	Coates R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
989j	Levett C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1004aa	Belson N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1017j	Johnson R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1024l	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1049i	Westbrook K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR/HOL/BLA/LANG/FAW, Other Hardley/Holbury/Blackfield/Langley/Fawley Comments						
549c	Tillyer F	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Core Strategy seeks about 30 dwellings at each of Blackfield and Langley, Hardley and Holbury and Fawley. The Council has concluded that the only area where there are sites which merit further consideration is Blackfield and Langley and proposes the allocation of up to 30 dwellings in this area, with no provision in either Hardley and Holbury, or Fawley. This will leave a shortfall of around 120 dwellings which would not comply with the full requirements of Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy. Why not allocate all the identified sites in Blackfield for residential development, thus compensating for the lack of suitable sites in other parts of Fawley parish?
988b	Fawley Parish Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Parish Council object to the provision of more Social Housing in the Parish (at approx. 16% we have more than our fair share in the New Forest District) and that any new housing should be private affordable housing. On these sites it is proposed to ask for the provision of allotment plots, whilst this is a move in the right direction, allotments should not be spread across the Parish piecemeal, but a financial contribution be provided for new sites that are manageable. The Parish Council ask this should be changed to a Financial Contribution to the Parish Council for the provision of new allotment sites. The Parish Council would also like to add, that all new housing developments of 20 houses or more should provide a small Children's Play Area (similar to the one in Harrier Green) at the time of construction. This would stop problems of residents objecting when it is proposed to provide one at a later date.
731a	RWE npower	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Fawley Power Station: The closure of Fawley Power Station's main generating units by 2016 should be considered in this DPD. Comprehensive re-development of the Fawley Power Station site should be considered and planned for through the DPD process.
318d	Halliday M and R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Proposals to alleviate peak hour congestion, particularly through the re-instatement of rail services along the waterside are supported. Despite such efforts, even residents of low-cost housing buy cars so there is a need to curb developments to a minimum until the infrastructure is in place. Policy CS12 - Agree with proposal to develop a series of small sites at smaller villages to provide affordable housign up to a maximum of 30 per site where appropriate. Unhappy with policy CS15 (b) in the Core Strategy and the disproportionate amount of social housing in Blackfield being increased still further. A slowing of the population increase towards zero has been predicted by NFDC studies. Thus younger tenants may be housed in properties vacated by the elderly. Replacement of sub-standard social housing may be achieved by re-design and building on existing council estates.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR/HOL/BLA/LANG/FAW, Other Hardley/Holbury/Blackfield/Langley/Fawley Comments						
750d	Lynette Early	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development Principles: Can Blackfield accommodate additional dwellings? The school is already oversubscribed. The roads are in poor condition and are not suitably maintained. There are a lot of problems relating to traffic and parking.
754c	Gregory S & T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		In principle I am in disagreement with all three of the proposed sites due to the fact that Blackfield is already at saturation point in terms of the number of houses compared with the local facilities including transport.
280d	Guy V	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Can the school and GPs cope with the extra customers?
575b	Smith K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The proposal for additional social housing in Blackfield is difficult to understand as the present level of social housing is at 16%. Above the average. I propose a change of policy and develop sites in the north of the Parish. The increase in motor car movements in a very congested village, particular problem areas being the crossroads; the Doctors' surgery and the new poorly planned school entrance onto Hampton lane. This will increase the risk to the children attending the school. Bus stops outside the school have no lay-bys causing further congestion.
92c	Wallbridge J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Transport: Given the increased traffic possible from sites BLA2 and BLA3 it would have been sensible to have taken the opportunity to improve the traffic management at Blackfield crossroads with the introduction of traffic lights similar to those at the bottom of Rollestone Road. This junction is a staggered 4 way crossing with the added complications of a service road exit adjacent and an entrance to a garage forecourt also on the crossroads. In the case of BLA2 without improvement it seems possible that much of the traffic at busy times (school times) will avoid the junction and choose instead to use The Drove as a cut off. This road is not suitable for increase traffic as it has no pavement, has a bend, is narrow in places and the exit onto Hampton Lane is difficult if another vehicle is trying to enter.
107b	Moore H and A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I have lived in the Blackfield area for more than 20 years and during that time much local development has taken place with no apparent expansion of the overall infrastructure e.g. road capacities/traffic flows, schools, medical support, sewage and drainage, integrated transport plan e.g. easing traffic congestion on A326 perhaps by road widening and/or re-opening of passenger rail link from Fawley to Southampton.
386b	Ellins S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The village of Blackfield: 1. More traffic, more congestion outside the school morning and afternoon. Parking spaces taken up in the

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR/HOL/BLA/LANG/FAW, Other Hardley/Holbury/Blackfield/Langley/Fawley Comments						
						<p>Health Centre.</p> <p>2. More children in the school, the overall area of which has already been reduced.</p> <p>3. More people needing medical and dental care.</p> <p>4. Some newly built houses still unoccupied.</p> <p>5. No work in the village so more traffic on the A326 which is now very busy. Accidents which cause diversions and hold ups.</p> <p>6. There is a possibility that the Hythe ferry may close which again will add to traffic congestion.</p>
484a	Walker M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development in this area will be seriously handicapped by the infrastructure and job opportunities. The A326 is congested for most of the time especially now the new speed limits have been imposed.</p> <p>There is a serious lack of job provision in the area. Jobs in the refinery and the petrochemical industry tend to be few and far between and require quite specialised knowledge. At Hardley Industrial Estate about a quarter of the site is derelict and of the rest several units are up for let.</p>
515a	Keitley N J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I am writing to object to the planned development of the three proposed sites at Blackfield & Langley, namely at plans refs. BLA1, BLA2 & BLA3, on the following grounds.</p> <p>The village of Blackfield has recently been subject to significant development on the site of the former Blackfield First School, which has had a detrimental affect on traffic volumes and noise levels. As predicted, traffic congestion particularly at starting and finishing times for Blackfield Primary School, has become noticeably worse, and access and egress from the Health Centre and The Drove has become more difficult.</p> <p>Blackfield Village does not have the infrastructure to support new inhabitants, with a very limited selection of shops and a poorly served public transport system.</p>
752d	Early D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>As a general comment I would ask if after the recent housing developments of the last 5 years, (totalling over 100 properties) Blackfield can support any further developments.</p> <p>There are already issues with the school being oversubscribed. The school has also (within the last 4 years) already sold off some of its land for development (which is almost entirely social housing) & been extended so there is little scope for further expansion without impacting on the oldest properties in Blackfield (in The Drove).</p> <p>The roads are in poor condition & are not suitably maintained. Hampton Lane has a recent history of motorcycle accidents; Rollestone crossroads has long history of accidents. I would question if our roads infrastructure could cope with another 60 cars given the increase of 150- 200 cars in the last 4 years.</p> <p>School time parking already overflows as far as Gang Warily, & all roads & parking close to the school suffer from</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR/HOL/BLA/LANG/FAW, Other Hardley/Holbury/Blackfield/Langley/Fawley Comments						
						<p>demand far higher than they can support, therefore causing vehicles to park on verges opposite the school & doctors surgery.</p> <p>Traffic flow is poor during peak times within a 1/4mile north & south of Rollestone crossroads, & is especially poor at the school & doctors during school times.</p> <p>I feel that BLA1 & 2 are extremely poor choices, but do question whether any further development is advisable.</p>
678c	Oliver T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>These comments are common to ALL the sites put forward for potential development in Blackfield.</p> <p>All would create additional traffic in an already congested local area (and have an impact on the A326). Your full plan sets out hopes for improving the A326 but we have been hearing this for years and in the current economic climate doubt this is a viable proposition. You also talk about re-opening the Waterside rail line. Again this is unlikely to be viable in the current economic climate. In addition, even if it was to be re-opened, people would have to travel by car to any station and may well decide it is easier to drive into Southampton ... so local and wider traffic concerns would be unchanged.</p> <p>All would have a detrimental impact on locally important views and on the setting and character of the village which is adjacent to the internationally important New Forest National Park and already has a high density of social housing.</p> <p>Is there a need for 30 extra homes for people already living in Blackfield? Or would these homes be made available to applicants from across the NFDC area? There do not appear to be any employment prospects for potential inhabitants. This (Holbury and North Blackfield) is already an area of deprivation. There is a danger it could become ghetto-ised.</p> <p>Having already built on two local schools and creating unsafe parking/access for the young children who attend these schools, you now are intent on building on agriculture land. The traffic/parking situation at school times is a nightmare for local residents, planning should take into consideration all of the local residents, not the 60 or so single parent families that these developments will bring into our area.</p>
942j	Peters G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Transport:</p> <p>Please consider the impact of a higher volume of traffic through The Drove and Exbury Road causing a higher risk of injury to pedestrians.</p>
1016g	Cantello N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development Principles:</p> <p>Before you think of building any more houses in this area just consider these points. The schools are already over-subscribed. Unless you are planning on building new schools, don't build houses that families are likely to occupy. The roads are already chocca and do not need any extra traffic on them which would be generated by</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR/HOL/BLA/LANG/FAW, Other Hardley/Holbury/Blackfield/Langley/Fawley Comments						
						more houses. Have you ever had to travel down the A326 in the morning or evening during rush hour? Sometimes it can take an hour to reach the M27. There are very limited employment opportunities in Blackfield and the Waterside, don't build houses where people will then have to travel miles just to get to a place of work. And lastly and very importantly, the New Forest is an area of outstanding natural beauty. We in Blackfield are very lucky to have it on our doorstep. Any building on land that would be seen from the forest or would result in people having to travel across the forest, would be detrimental to the beauty and quite possibly, the animals. A lot of this land proposed is currently used for Commoners back-up grazing, land that is already scarce. Without Commoners grazing their animals on the New Forest you wouldn't have a new forest. Don't make their existence even more difficult. Go build on areas that already have strong road, school, business infrastructures and stop pilfering our green land. Development in Blackfield is not needed or wanted.
1017k	Johnson R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development Principles: Greenfield Housing Sites. The preferred option would be new towns where proper infrastructure can be designed and provided. This causes less disruption to existing residents, enables more efficient construction (by scale) and generally leads to greater satisfaction from new owners. Such developments will eventually be needed in any case. However, if this is not currently possible and greenfield sites must be used, those in Totton and Marchwood should first be fully used. A high percentage of residents commute out of the area leading to high usage of the A326. Additional properties in Hythe, Holbury and Blackfield will exacerbate the congestion.
1017l	Johnson R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Transport: The A326 should be upgraded at Exxon's expense not the Council's. When the bypass was initially built it was agreed that Exxon paid a large percentage for a dual carriageway. A single carriageway was built as the upkeep was deemed too expensive. The time has come to re-examine the agreements and obtain a significant contribution from the company rather than effecting piecemeal improvements at the County Council's expense.
1049j	Westbrook K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development Principles: Blackfield already has a high level of social housing, and I have yet to see a justification for the developments at any level.
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR/HOL/BLA/LANG/FAW-S, Other Hardley/Holbury/Blackfield/Langley/Fawley Sites						
1020d	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Land to the east of Hampton Lane between Newlands Road and Priest Croft Drive - would give the benefits of BLA1 but wouldn't take up sports ground; would be further from national park

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR/HOL/BLA/LANG/FAW-S, Other Hardley/Holbury/Blackfield/Langley/Fawley Sites						
1020e	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Land between Newlands Road and Blackfield Road - large area of no scientific interest could easily accommodate a development. A new development here would be more in keeping with the area than building against older housing, as in BLA2 and BLA3.
396d	Barker	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>There is land available off Newlands Road opposite Gang Warily behind Priestcroft that could be used. Any traffic generated there would join the main road at Rollestone Crossroads and therefore avoid causing even more congestion at Blackfield Crossroads (BLA 2 and BLA 3) and in Hampton Lane by the doctors' surgery (BLA 1). Instead of trying to shoehorn more buildings into inappropriate sites why not try Calshot or Badminton. There is more space there and the traffic would not be such an issue. Wherever any extra estates are built the traffic generated will have to use the A326. This is already too busy. Whilst I am sympathetic for housing needs, is it not time to take a practical approach and say that there really is no more room for estates in the area? You should also remember that all proposed sites are in the refinery blast zones. In the event of evacuation being needed the roads would be unable to cope already.</p> <p>If you absolutely must build then, much as I hate having to say this BLA 1 next to the surgery is the best of a bad choice.</p>
575F	Smith K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I propose a change to the housing policy to move the sites to the north of the parish as the level of social housing is well above the norm in Blackfield.</p> <p>1] The present Industrial units at Hardley Industrial Estate have been unoccupied for a number of years, to the south of this site the land set aside for industrial unit should be reclassified as a buffer zone and the proposed 30 homes required. Vehicle movements from the homes will not create the congestion of the Blackfield developments.</p> <p>2] The old sports pavilion and land along Rollestone road would prove suitable with a roundabout access to Rollestone road, reducing traffic speed and resolving added congestion in Blackfield village whilst retaining the green area between Holbury and Blackfield.</p>
92d	Wallbridge J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I am surprised that no consideration has been given to including some of the land in Newlands Road opposite Gang Warily. Some of this is currently used as public open space but one thing the area is not short of is access to such space. There is certainly room to put 30 homes plus allotments etc. on this site without significant reduction of the open space.
338d	Kollar J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		There is land available off Newlands Road opposite Gang Warily behind Priestcroft that could be used. Any traffic generated there would join the main road at Rollestone Crossroads and therefore avoid causing even more

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR/HOL/BLA/LANG/FAW-S, Other Hardley/Holbury/Blackfield/Langley/Fawley Sites						
						<p>congestion at Blackfield Crossroads (BLA 2 and BLA 3) and in Hampton Lane by the doctors' surgery (BLA 1). Instead of trying to shoehorn more buildings into inappropriate sites why not try Calshot or Badminton. There is more space there and the traffic would not be such an issue. Wherever any extra estates are built the traffic generated will have to use the A326. This is already too busy. Whilst I am sympathetic for housing needs, is it not time to take a practical approach and say that there really is no more room for estates in the area? You should also remember that all proposed sites are in the refinery blast zones. In the event of evacuation being needed the roads would be unable to cope already.</p> <p>If you absolutely must build then, much as I hate having to say this BLA 1 next to the surgery is the best of a bad choice.</p>
573t	Rutland C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Within the proposals for employment in Hardley, Holbury, Blackfield, Langley and Fawley, whilst the Core Strategy makes no current provision for major employment sites, the land to the north east of the access road to the Fawley Power Station, adjacent to the access to the Southern Water Works, should be encouraged for employment Uses.</p>
590e	Smith P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>It would make more sense to build the houses near an already established estate with lighting and an easier access to the main roads. There is land opposite Gang Warily, although traffic would still have to approach the school and it would not stop congestion. Perhaps further on to the Netley View area, where there is a field just beforehand.</p>
989d	Levett C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>HARD-BU-02 (HAR1): Hardley - gap between industrial estate and other housing (HAR1) should be considered for development.</p>
1016d	Cantello N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development should take place in Southampton. Urban area that has already built on areas that could no doubt be re-developed. Also job prospects in centre of Southampton more likely than the very limited number in the waterside, particularly Blackfield.</p>
1017d	Johnson R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The Council owned land between Gang Warily and Blackfield would seem to be an obvious site for development. Selling some of this for private development would permit a suitable mix of affordable and Council owned properties at zero cost and generate an income for the future.</p>
1024e	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Areas not putting incipient pressure on the integrity of the New Forest National Park.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: HAR/HOL/BLA/LANG/FAW-S, Other Hardley/Holbury/Blackfield/Langley/Fawley Sites						
1024f	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Areas not rejected by developers for reasons of smaller profit gains. Upgrading agricultural land is blatantly the driving force behind these proposals for the instant gain in value of the land.
1024d	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Any brownfield site.