

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: Eastern 1, Improvements to the A326 Dibden to Totton Western Bypass						
57c	Ramswell J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Widening of the A326 would encourage greater car use and would affect local quality of life through greater noise and environmental pollution. Other options should be given priority.
92a	Wallbridge J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Whilst I applaud the desire to re-open railway access I believe the issue of the A326 is purely being tinkered with by the provision of bus priority lanes etc. The opportunity should be taken to express the intention to upgrade the A326 to dual carriageway between Dibden and Totton Western Bypass. This would help significantly with the large volumes of heavy goods traffic at least until the local Marchwood and Hythe traffic is able to leave this route.
573a	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This is supported as a necessary requirement to allow for effective use of existing developed sites and the opportunity to develop other sites in the future.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: Eastern 2, Bury Road to Totton cycle route						
742p	RSPB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Eastern 2 proposes to introduce a cycle route adjacent to Bury Road to link to the Totton cycleway network at Jacob's Gutter Lane. It is understood from the Habitats Regulations Assessment of Sites and Development Management DPD Consultation Document – Screening Statement (the HRA), that “the scheme would result in the loss of BAP habitat (hedgerow) which is adjacent to the Solent & Southampton Water SPA”. The HRA also acknowledges that “further information is needed to ascertain whether the hedge is in the SPA, or is a functional part of the SPA, or if its removal would affect a functional part of the SPA”. This information is fundamental to ensure that the proposal is properly appraised.</p> <p>If it is determined that the route of the new cycle path immediately adjoins or indeed coincides with the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site, the proposed cycle path could adversely affect the integrity of the European Sites due to habitat loss and/or recreational disturbance.</p> <p>A detailed study into the cumulative effects of recreational pressure on the Solent European sites is currently underway – the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project (SDMP). Until the results of this work are available, we consider that policies which could facilitate access to the designated sites are inappropriate and a precautionary approach should be taken.</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...”. In accordance with the precautionary approach, we would therefore urge the Council to consider whether a more appropriate location or route exists for the proposed cycle path.</p> <p>We acknowledge the work that has been done in the Habitats Regulations Assessment of Sites and Development Management DPD Consultation Document – Screening Statement to appraise the impact of the proposed cycle path, however it does not appear that a conclusion has been reach on whether a full appropriate assessment is required.</p> <p>Given the sensitive location of the cycle path and the potential impacts of the proposal on the international sites, the RSPB considers that it will need to be investigated as part of the appropriate assessment of the DPD. However, particularly ahead of the results of the SDMP, we are very concerned that in this location immediately adjoining the European Sites, the potential impact of the cycle path is likely to be such that it may not be possible to conclude no adverse effect on the integrity of the European Sites.</p>
888r	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The proposed cycleway adjacent to the road will cross a minor watercourse, designated as 'ordinary watercourses'. The provision of the cycleway may require additional culverting of this watercourse in order to accommodate it. If this is the case, it will require consent under the Land Drainage Act 1991, will be subject to certain design requirements, and must be kept to the absolute minimum necessary in order to safeguard the</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: Eastern 2, Bury Road to Totton cycle route						
						watercourse and flood risk management interests.
738h	Natural England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Potential for impact on Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar sites and the Solent Maritime SAC. Clarification of route required – it appears proposal could result in direct loss of SPA. Coastal access is important; however this should not be facilitated where it is likely to have a significant effect on European sites. Whether or not direct loss is expected, full Appropriate Assessment will be required if proposed as part of the DPD.
56a	Cole D	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		MAR8.4: If this will be safe, i.e. separated from traffic then all for it. We desperately need cycle and walking links to surrounding villages including Totton.
57b	Ramswell J	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		MAR8.4: Much needed pedestrian/cycle route between Marchwood and Totton - a good thing!
889m	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The principle of the enhanced cycle route (which is located adjacent to Sunnyfields Farm on Jacob's Gutter Lane) and the principle of encouraging walking and cycling as a viable alternative to car travel between the settlements is supported.
889x	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		A considerable amount of this proposed cycle route is located within land that is owned by the TBME. It is acknowledged in the draft policy supporting comments that the route requires non-highway land to implement. The TBME support this proposed policy and would be happy to enter into discussions with the Local Planning Authority with regard to how this route maybe progressed to the benefit of the wider community.
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
890b	English Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Para.2.13: Para. 2.13 refers to national policies providing protection for heritage assets. For consistency with national guidance, it is desirable that the DPD should also recognise the importance of the settings of heritage assets and not just the assets themselves.
890a	English Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Para.2.8: Para.2.8 refers to the Council's programme of conservation area appraisals without reference to any associated management plans. Core Strategy Policy CS3(e) makes specific reference to such management plans and it would be consistent for this paragraph to do likewise.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
888a	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>We acknowledge that some development may be required in flood risk areas where it provides regeneration benefits as per Para 6.6 1 in the supporting text. Please be aware that “a further Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (level 2) may be required, if following the sequential test, sites within areas at risk of flooding need to be considered”. Additional work, including justification, may be needed to show why development in flood risk areas is required. The additional work may need to be produced to demonstrate that part C of the exception test can be passed and the proposed allocation is deliverable.</p> <p>As of yet the above information has not been provided and the application of the sequential test (as per para 4.17 PPS25 Practice Guide) is still not clear within the current document and therefore we have questioned the deliverability of some of the sites. We are happy to help with this work when and if it is required.</p>
899i	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of Barker Mill Estate & Taylor Wimpey UK	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Disagree with the colours used on diagrams in the document.
899b	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of Barker Mill Estate & Taylor Wimpey UK	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		2.119 - parking: NFDC should consider revising the Parking Standards SPD in light of recent revisions to PPG13 or confirm why this is not necessary in this paragraph.
740e	Highways Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The potential impacts of planned development on the Strategic Road Network will need to be considered.
766f	Esso Petroleum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Para 3.8:</p> <p>We have no fundamental objections to proposals to use part of the freight line, up to and including Hythe, for passengers. However, we need to make it clear that we do not wish the passenger line to run through the refinery, for security reasons.</p>
826b	Southern Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Southern Water owns and operates several wastewater treatment works and pumping stations in New Forest District (outside the National Park).</p> <p>Land-use conflict can arise if sensitive development such as housing and certain types of commercial development is built adjacent to wastewater treatment facilities. Sensitive development such as housing must be adequately separated from wastewater treatment works and major pumping stations, to safeguard amenity and to ensure that facilities can continue to fulfil their function.</p> <p>The Sites and Development Management Development Plan Document should contain a policy to facilitate</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
						<p>adequate separation and protection of amenity. We propose the following wording: Development proposals that would have a negative impact on the operation of sites and premises currently used for the provision of utility infrastructure will be resisted, unless evidence is presented to demonstrate that the sites are no longer required.</p> <p>Development proposals in proximity to existing wastewater facilities will only be permitted if there is no unacceptable impact on the amenity of future occupants. The distance between the infrastructure and the development must be sufficient to allow adequate odour dispersion.</p>
826c	Southern Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>It is important that the DPD includes a development management policy to co-ordinate development with provision of necessary infrastructure. If development is allowed to proceed without sufficient capacity, both new and existing customers are likely to experience unsatisfactory levels of service, for example increased risk of foul water flooding or poor water pressure.</p> <p>With regard to funding of additional capacity, 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 offsite 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>Taking the above considerations into account we propose inclusion of the following policy: New residential and commercial development will be permitted only if sufficient water supply and wastewater service capacity is either available, or can be provided in time to serve it.</p> <p>When there is a capacity problem and improvements in offsite infrastructure are not programmed by the water company, planning permission will only be granted where the developer funds appropriate improvements which will be completed prior to occupation of the development.</p>
826a	Southern Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Southern Water's Water Resources Management Plan, shows how the company proposes to secure water supplies for the next 25 years.</p> <p>The plan includes increasing capacity at Testwood Water Supply Works (WSW) up to the current license limit. Testwood WSW is located within New Forest District, and new plant and structures would be required to increase the capacity. It is anticipated that the new structures would be located within the footprint of the existing site. A pipeline would also be required to transfer water from Testwood to Otterbourne.</p> <p>A policy should be included within the Development Management and Sites DPD that will facilitate delivery of</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
<p>water supply infrastructure required to ensure a continuity of public water supply. Proposed policy wording: The District Council will support delivery of water supply infrastructure required to ensure a continuity of public water supply. To this end, it will work in close co-operation with Southern Water and the Environment Agency.</p>						
405a	McCarthy & Stone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Status of DPD	<p>McCarthy and Stone in the first instance question the role that the DPD will play when looking at specific sites in each settlement at a time when the out workings of the Localism Bill are yet to be realised and the role that Neighbourhood Plans will be taking. In particular the Site Specific Proposals which could be subject to significantly different priorities at the local level. A period of confusion and drawn out consultation could result, giving uncertainty to developers and local residents.</p> <p>Housing Need for the Ageing Population The second principle objection that McCarthy and Stone have to the statement stems from the need to ensure that greater weight and emphasis should be placed upon the ageing population and their associated housing needs. It should not be underestimated that unless it is properly planned over the next 20 years there is likely to be a serious short fall in specialist accommodation for the older population throughout the New Forest area, which has a knock on effect in the overall provision of housing both affordable and open market family housing. Although the net number of households is predicted to rise by a modest amount over the Core Strategy period the percentage of those over 65+ will continue to rise and will represent an even greater proportion of the resident population of the District.</p> <p>The Sites and Development Management DPD has the opportunity to become a more positive planning guide to local development. Specialist retirement housing meets a number of Core Strategy aims and yet is given little weight in the current overall document.</p> <p>Please see full representation for supporting information on the need for specialised accommodation for older people.</p> <p>Site Specific Designation for Retirement Housing/Close Care It is recommended that further consideration be given to "Site Specific designations" for retirement housing and</p>

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments

close care development to address this specific housing need throughout the District. There are limited sites available which meet the necessary criteria for developing retirement housing in sustainable, accessible locations which are close to local facilities, shops and public transport. Often they will be at a premium competing with other forms of development including open market housing and other commercial uses. These alternative uses for land are not subject to the same risks associated with construction and development constraints, and selling requirements that retirement housing is subject to; for example there is not the opportunity to phase a retirement scheme as inevitably it has to be constructed, fitted out and landscaped in its entirety upon first occupation and will take longer to sell the whole scheme, particularly when dealing with a larger total number of selling units.

Conclusions

Well located and designed specialist housing for older home owners is a highly sustainable form of housing. There should be a presumption in favour of sustainable housing and in particular specialist housing which is being proposed on suitable sites. It is recommended that greater weight is attached to this approach alongside the desire to release residential land or indeed a separate policy to cover the housing need for the ageing population. This accommodation will come from a number of sources both public and private and with varying levels of care and shelter provision enabling individual people to remain in their own home with independence and security. In effect there should be more of a positive policy supporting older people's accommodation in the same way that affordable housing is given a high priority.

884a	HCC Services for Young Children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	---------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

My role is to ensure that we have sufficient childcare facilities for the whole community but with particularly emphasis for the 3 & 4 year olds who are eligible for the 15 hours Early Education funded sessions. It is essential when managing the market that I am kept informed of the residential and commercial development plans, to ensure that we have a spread of services that meets the demands expressed to us by communities. Thus enabling the signposting and offers of support to existing and new developments for a complementary childcare workforce that matches market demands and that can be self sustaining by have a balanced economy.

I am keen that I am kept informed of the developments of a new full day care business in Totton as currently the childcare provisions in this area have capacity to take additional children, I understand with new families arriving in the area for housing or employment the childcare demands are likely to increase and I would welcome the

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
						opportunity to work closely with the developers of this facility to ensure that it will offer the best outcomes for children whilst offering additional services that are required. The same applies to other areas of development across the whole area. I would request I am involved in discussions/consultations on plans as most developments identified in this document have childcare implications either for local residents or for employers.
939g	Whitsbury Parish Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		In general there must be a more relaxed interpretation of the 'rules' by the Planners when local opinion and land availability are the true constraints on development provided capital is on tap. Your inclusion of 'other impacts' in many Policies is a real catch all to mop up any objections you may have to a development.
624k	Ringwood Town Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		An additional policy should be included to reaffirm the District Council's commitment on housing provision, as set out in its adopted Community Strategy.
869b	Dorset County Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Transport: We would like to note the importance of considering the cumulative impact of a series of developments particularly on the A337 and the A31 into Dorset, and the impact on the reliability of journey times into Dorset. There is a longstanding issue with an HGV restriction at Ampress Bridge on the A337, which impacts upon Dorset's side of the border. Furthermore the deferment of the proposed A31 improvement scheme (para 5.58) makes mitigation measures for the traffic impacts of developments in Ringwood even more essential. We encourage the delivery of the scheme as soon as funding allows.
869c	Dorset County Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Transport: We and NFDC agree on the need for cross boundary continuity and for the strengthening and improvement of sustainable cross boundary links. We support the continuation of regular dialogue regarding cross border transportation issues between officers and members of Dorset County Council, East Dorset District Council, Christchurch Borough Council, Borough of Poole, Bournemouth Borough Council, New Forest National Park Authority and Hampshire County Council. We therefore would like to see reference to links into Highcliffe, Christchurch and the wider South East Dorset conurbation from New Milton and the coastal towns and villages. Similarly we would like to see parts of East Dorset considered within the Ringwood and Fordingbridge hinterlands.
869a	Dorset County Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Transport: There could be more explicit emphasis on encouraging self-containment and reducing the need to travel.
869a	Dorset County Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Green Infrastructure:

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
						<p>The following references to Dorset in NFDC documents are noted:</p> <p>In the Sites and Development Management DPD: FORD4.8: Footpath along disused railway line from Ashford to Dorset.</p> <p>This will provide a recreational route from Ashford to footpaths in Dorset</p> <p>In NFDC GI Strategy: R/B Castleman Way to Crow Lane via Embankment Way cycle route</p> <p>This route continues the existing "Castleman Trailway" route, providing a recreational route from Dorset to the National Park.</p> <p>While the importance of these links is recognised, it is considered that there may be other opportunities to link environmental assets in SE Dorset with those in New Forest District, particularly on the coastline between Christchurch, New Milton and Lymington. There is a need for cross boundary continuity and for the strengthening and improvement of cross boundary links in terms of green infrastructure. We therefore support the continuation of regular dialogue regarding cross border green infrastructure issues between officers and members of Dorset County Council, East Dorset District Council, Christchurch Borough Council, Borough of Poole, Bournemouth Borough Council, New Forest National Park Authority and Hampshire County Council.</p>
869d	Dorset County Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Transport:</p> <p>Partners within South East Dorset have undertaken a major multimodal transport study. Out of this process, the potential to develop Hinton Admiral station as a rail based park and ride emerged as a means of reducing trips into the conurbation. DCC is currently in dialogue with local authority partners to find a way to bring this forward. We suggest that this possibility be included within the DPD.</p>
762b	New Forest Business Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Housing:</p> <p>We are fundamentally supportive of the approach taken, the increase in numbers proposed and their general locations. We would wish to ensure that a suitable number of 'live-work' units were incorporated where possible, especially in rural locations where minimal or non-existent public transport exists.</p>
762c	New Forest Business Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Dibden Bay:</p> <p>Unsurprisingly, perhaps, there is no reference to Dibden Bay. While NFBP is not necessarily supportive of ABPs possible aspirations in this regard, there would appear to be no particular reason why less 'sensitive' areas of the total site should not be identified for development in the longer term.</p>
762a	New Forest Business Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Employment:</p> <p>It is understood that all employment safeguarded sites that had been included in the New Forest Local Plan remain and that there has been no derogation therefrom.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
725b	Sport England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Open space, sport & recreation:</p> <p>In developing Development Management Policies consideration should be given to identifying key factors which could impact on the way sports facilities are provided, protected and enhanced. However, it is noted that the document makes no specific provision for formal sporting facilities other than playing fields. The Chapter mainly makes reference to green infrastructure including open space and recreation. However, there is little reference to 'formal sporting facilities' and it is unclear the extent to which the green infrastructure theme relates specifically to the provision of formal indoor and outdoor sports facilities which include formal pitches, tennis courts, all weather pitches, sports halls, swimming pools, indoor bowls rinks etc.</p> <p>Sport England therefore requests that a specific policy relating to the provision, protection and enhancement of formal sporting facilities – both indoor and outdoor – be included. It may provide greater clarity if the document includes a specific chapter on Sport Facilities so as not to blur the lines between informal recreation and formal sport.</p> <p>In addition, detailed policies should demonstrate that consideration has been given to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of key factors in the district which could impact upon the way in which the sport facilities are protected, provided and enhanced. - Anticipated need for sport and recreation facilities through development of a sound evidence base, using the various resources available relating to facility planning and gauging demand - Cross-referencing with advice such as design guidance which can assist in delivering better quality facilities - Consideration of where conditions and obligations might be best employed to advance the interests of sport and recreation as part of measures to protect, enhance and compensate facility provision - The recognition of the contribution that sport might offer to achieving aspirations across a range of areas, particularly in mixed use developments and as catalyst in stimulating development - Policies to ensure that planning applications are submitted with adequate information through the use of early negotiation, checklists, needs assessments and consultation with interested parties. <p>Sport England objects to the omission of policies which seek to protect existing sports facilities, both built and non-built. Sport England also objects to the omission of policy which promotes the provision of new built and non built sports facilities.</p>
641a	Nicola Phipps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>There appears to have been a reliance on the internet for this consultation. Consequently many local people have been unaware of this consultation and have not had an opportunity to comment on the consultation document. As a result questions must be raised about the extent to which the consultation reflects the views of local people.</p> <p>In addition to the above I found the online questionnaire confusing. I am also concerned that that there was not</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
						a 'none of the above' option in the sites ranking. This could lead to the Council erroneously assuming that they have the support of local people for development.
822g	New Forest National Park	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		2.71: The Council has based its additional gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople provision on the local assessments of need. These assessments looked at needs arising over the period to 2016 rather than the period of the Council's Core Strategy (to 2026). Clarification is therefore sought over the Council's approach to provision over the second half of the plan period and the statement in paragraph 2.71 that "...some of the additional requirements will be made in the National Park."
876b	Puttock D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Consultation Process: It is very annoying that a so called "consultation" does not get anywhere near enough publicity to those affected - I have not spoken to anyone who had heard of this "consultation".
647b	Howells M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Consultation Process: The method of consultation is very devious. There has been no publicity about the consultation. I live adjacent to RING3 and only found out through a 3rd party. You are trying to get things through the back door by not telling people.
643a	Martin W	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		CS11 - Surely brownfield sites should be the first option for new housing not greenfield. CS18 - I do not believe Ringwood needs so much employment land.
275a	Simmons J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I feel there has been an unacceptable lack of proper public consultation with the general public, who, unless they read the Lymington Times, would be unaware that a consultation was available.
912d	Cox M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Map GI-HYD: The Strategy map fails to take into account the value to the community of the private open space occupied by the small animal farm at the east end of Frost Lane. This is an essential part of the local community and I can only assume that it has been excluded from the map to facilitate allocation for housing.
896g	Pennington Residents Assn	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Para 2.99: It is noted that new Government proposals and national policy changes will lead to revisions of this document. Why is NFDC determined to 'rush' this DPD through, ahead of Government policy changes, risking public time and additional taxpayer's expense?

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
896h	Pennington Residents Assn	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Para 2.102: 'Policy to allow small scale residential development' – the policy in the Core Strategy(CS22) should contain a definition of 'small scale development' in order to control 'over development'.
896i	Pennington Residents Assn	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Para 2.117: Paragraph 2.117 contains a statement that 'schemes may need to be modified at detailed design stage' which raises a serious question about the sustainability of schemes and the justification for inclusion in Background Paper 44 and Site Selection criteria.
22a	Coal Authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.
1020l	Budd E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Consultation Process: This online form has certain options highlighted in blue: the line about BLA2 and the line BLA4 (b). Possibly this is a feature of the web content management system you are using. I think you should be more careful as it looks like you might be highlighting these lines to draw attention to them. Each option should be given equal weight.
575a	Smith K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The management of consulting the local people is very poor, almost all of the local residents have no idea of this final public consultation.
898a	HCA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Homes and Communities Agency has no comment in its role as a statutory consultee.
679a	New Forest Access Forum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The New Forest Access Forum would like to congratulate the New Forest District Council on the high level of professionalism that has gone into the production of these documents. The detail and amount of forethought that has gone into the preparation and presentation of the documents are to be commended. The proposals are well balanced, and it is refreshing to see how such fringe considerations as biodiversity, protection of a town's character etc. have all been taken into account. Consideration of green issues is prominent. The Forum believes that it is extremely important when planning is considered everything is done to make the life of pedestrians and cyclists easier and safer. In these documents, walking and cycling are well provided for. It is evident that a very considerable amount of consultation and research has gone into the drafting of the documents.
10b	Groves I	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		On no account should areas of risk of flooding i.e. water meadows be built upon. Whatever developers may promise the insurance premiums would be well beyond the purse of local residents.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
28a	Swales H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Has the question of sewage disposal been addressed by planning & in particular, by Bournemouth & West water & sewage authority?
86c	Foster R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I would like to know what price bracket the freehold houses would be? And why even have any freeholds - why not 100% social housing as this is where the shortage lies?
266a	Kent J and Deacon-Kent R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>As you can see from our address, our property is extremely close to the proposed development on the land east of Whitsbury Road and although we do not own any of the land (for the proposed development), we were astonished to learn that no effort had been made to contact our good neighbour, who does own a part of this land. Indeed - your planning reps at the recent consultation display at Avonway Community in Fordingbridge showed surprise and embarrassment at not knowing this basic fact about ownership of the agricultural land, East of Whitsbury Road.</p> <p>Our conclusion, therefore, is that this strategy and proposal has been found to be seriously devoid of basic facts at the research stage. Not knowing who the true landowners are smacks of 'back of fag packet' planning, and NOT contacting the true owner of part of this land is tantamount to gross discourtesy. Already, an atmosphere of distrust and subterfuge has been created and that really does not bode well for any future strategy or proposals. We bought our property because it is surrounded by beautiful agricultural land - this proposal will have a profound effect on us and therefore we strongly oppose it.</p>
277a	Russell B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Can the local schools cope with the extra children that a large development would bring to the area and are the transport and medical facilities adequate?
359a	PUSH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		PUSH would not wish to comment on the individual site allocations contained in this document, but supports the District Council's identification of a sufficient number of housing and employment sites in the Totton and the Waterside area to deliver the development requirements as set out in the South Hampshire Strategy and subsequent delivery frameworks.
364b	Cockings R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		In future when you have one of these meetings at least send an individual who knows the local area.
422a	New Forest Commoners Defence Assoc	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Concerned that the issue of pressure on back-up grazing is not addressed in the document. Nor are interrelationships between the national park and policies pursued close to its boundary.</p> <p>The future of the Forest depends on the continued economic viability of commoning. One of the threats to commoning is the lack of affordable grazing land for livestock or to make hay and silage. This shortage is a reflection of development pressure and alternative uses such as recreational horse keeping. This issue has been</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
						recognised in the Development Management Policies of the National Park Authority. All proposed allocations will reduce the total land area available for commoning, whether or not they are used for back-up grazing. There should be policies to address this issue and efforts made to avoid identifying sites in agricultural use close to the national park.
445a	Lawrence S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Consultation publicity was inadequate.
482b	Campbell E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I would like to add that the so called public consultation at the village hall was not well publicised - it appeared that NFDC did not want to advertise this. Furthermore the area has a drainage issue. These points have been raised at the public consultation but not answered.
492a	Stevens S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I received no notification from you at all regarding the plans for this development, and only heard about it from neighbours. Therefore, I feel you have failed in your statutory obligations to inform and consult with local residents.
496a	Prevost J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The whole plan is derived from central government which is no longer in power and current government has stated the project will be deleted.
496b	Prevost J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The first proper notification the residents of Lymington had of these proposals, was made in January 2011 with all representations to be made by 11th March 2011. This is not a reasonable consultative period and is probably against UK and European Law especially with regard to Human Rights.
518h	Trenerry R and A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		3.9: Reopening of the railway line is great but would require the crossing to be automated. The current system causes tail backs across the top of Long Lane, into Long Lane and back into Marchwood. Building 100 + houses at Marchwood would only increase this congestion with or without an automated crossing point.
526a	Stevens J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		No notification was received from NFDC regarding these proposals - only heard from neighbours. Therefore I feel you have failed in your obligations to inform and consult with local residents.
566a	Henvest D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Would appreciate a better way of notifying local residents of important meetings so that we could view proposals and ask the necessary questions early on.
568a	Fosker A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I must as owner of "Lynes Corner", Nouale Lane, a property that is possibly one of the most likely to be significantly affected protest that no individual notice has been given to me and, so far as I am aware, neither

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
						has any public notice been displayed in the vicinity of the site the subject of such consultation. Whilst I appreciate that a consultation document such as that now before the Council does not constitute a proposal to carry out specific development, it constitutes the first stage in a chain leading to possible future use of land affecting numerous people and should by individual and public notice displayed on site be drawn to attention of those most likely ultimately to be affected. If I am correct in my understanding I must protest that such action does not appear to have been followed in this instance. If on the other hand my belief is erroneous then I consider that there should be such a requirement or the practice should be followed voluntarily as a matter of course by the authority concerned. Unfortunately that does not seem to have been done.
583c	Parry A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		With a waiting list for housing of up to eight years you are not building enough homes. What you are proposing will make the list grow longer. It is no good preserving green land to look at if people have no where to live.
578a	Wallace K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Core Strategy Comments</p> <p>CS11 - There is no need for any more land to be allocated for housing, the current allocations have not be used up, and indeed you intend to delete area that has already approved for housing from your plan, this is a ludicrous scenario.</p> <p>Table 2 (page 54) With regard to the Totton and Eling (although I am not sure where the village of Calmore comes into this) Table 2 clearly shows that you have already plenty of potential for development under the previously agreed plans, 505 houses, that have not yet been built, there is no need for any more housing. The thriving nature of the local estate agents certainly show that there is no shortage of housing in the area.</p> <p>Point 7.3.16 States that the area is a draw for the elderly and so to balance this you need to build new homes. This is totally contradictory to other parts of your strategy where you have already closed one Care Home, Stocklands, and are proposing to close two more, Sarum House and Compton House. If this really is an area for the elderly you will need to reopen/not close these homes.</p>
589b	Drodge A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The proposal for housing at BLA3 not been widely publicised to the public, is it to keep the public in the quiet and push proposals through on the quiet.
590a	Smith P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I am disappointed that the proposals have not been widely publicised. From speaking to friends it appears that many people are not aware of what is being proposed.
601a	Kelly C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We only found out about this consultation by chance. Surely these proposals should have been widely announced by mailshots, as developments of this nature can have a significant impact on the surrounding areas.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
684a	Williams P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Consultation Process:</p> <p>A consultation event was held to discuss the development, however, no one in the local area was notified of this meeting prior to it occurring and therefore their comments and suggestions were not heard. It was not until after the event, and close to the end of the consultation period, that a member of the community heard of the plans.</p>
704a	Webb R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Consultation Process:</p> <p>Very few people were aware of the consultation. There was too much reliance on electronic methods. The Council staff at the exhibitions did not have the authority to give any guidance about future developments. They did not take notes, did not appear to be counting visitor numbers and did not take names.</p>
710c	Harper D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Consultation Process:</p> <p>Consultation was inadequate. There was not enough publicity and there was not enough notice given of the exhibition in Totton.</p>
743b	Kellingley P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Core Strategy:</p> <p>The S+DM DPD relies on the adopted Core Strategy. However, there are flaws in that strategy which seriously undermine certain parts of the Development Plan. A glaring example (CS9) is that it considers the whole of Totton & Eling as one amorphous mass (A Level 1 "Larger Town") rather than a collection of separate and, indeed, widely separated areas. That there is a distance of six miles between the southern edge of Totton and the northern edge, for example, has wholly escaped detection. Therefore, actions which affect one area within Totton & Eling are likely to have very little impact on any other although these have been lumped together for planning convenience. The distance across Totton is almost identical to that between the centres of Totton and Lyndhurst and is greater than an 'edge to edge' measurement. It is utterly irresponsible to assume that any provision at one side of Totton will have any benefit to the other side – yet such assumptions have obviously been made.</p>
743a	Kellingley P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Consultation Process:</p> <p>The consultation period was too short, and specifically designed so as to make the public generally unaware that it was going on. There was very short notice for public meetings in larger population areas such as Ringwood, Milford and Totton.</p>
831a	Leighton R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Agree with general policies in Section 1 & 2 with the proviso that any future housing development be on a brownfield site - not greenfield or a Green Belt area.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
856a	Ronchi F	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Consultation Process:</p> <p>The consultation display was impressive although there were so many people that it was not easy to study the maps!</p>
862h	Vernon-Jackson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development Principles:</p> <p>Minor amendments to the green belt are OK.</p>
678a	Oliver T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Consultation Process:</p> <p>There seems to have been a heavy reliance on the internet for this consultation. As a consequence many local people have been unaware of the consultation and have not had an opportunity to comment on the document. It should be remembered that NFDs website is not something that people access as a matter of course. Despite the perception that we are all internet-savvy in 2011, many people directly affected by these proposals do not use the internet regularly, are unfamiliar with it or have no access to it.</p> <p>This consultation is therefore very limited in its scope and questions must be raised about the extent to which it reflects the views of those local people who have been excluded from it because of the reliance on e-contact.</p>
678b	Oliver T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Consultation Form:</p> <p>I am also concerned that there is no "none of the above" option in the sites ranking. This could lead to the Council erroneously assuming that they have the support of local people for development. It is my understanding that if no site in an area is considered suitable the requirement for development would be lifted.</p>
879a	Solent Protection Society	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The Society wishes to emphasise the considerable importance of the appearance of all developments, from the water and when viewed across the water from the eastern side of Southampton Water or from the Isle of Wight. The concept of landscape character is important irrespective of whether it is already developed and reflects the United Kingdom's obligations under the European Landscape Convention, which covers land, rivers and seascapes.</p> <p>For example the area around Fawley is highly developed but this does not mean that any future development should not be handled in a sensitive manner. The incinerator at Marchwood is an example of good design, the gas power station near to it, is not.</p> <p>The importance of landscape and development lies not just in aesthetics, but in the contribution that tourism makes to the local economy. When considering planning and development the seaward side of a development should be given as much, or more importance as the landward side as it is often the seaward side that has the greatest impact on the landscape and is seen by the greatest number of people over a wider area.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
889h	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		In addition to the policy specific points we have raised above, we would also like to comment on the use of the colour green to identify the extent of the sites that are proposed for housing allocations. A more typical 'housing' colour should be used (such as brown) so as to avoid any confusion with areas that are designated for open space (as these are more typically coloured in green). Paragraph 2.119 of the draft document refers to the Council's SPD on 'parking standards for residential developments'. We note that this SPD was published prior to the changes that were made to Planning Policy Guidance 13 in January 2011 in relation to parking standards. On this basis we would suggest that the Council considers referring to these changes by way of amendments to this paragraph.
889j	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Para 2.80 - 2.81: Agree in part. Disagree in part. Paragraphs 2.80 and 2.81 confirm that new allocations will be required to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS18 for 5ha of employment land in Totton. Three possible allocation sites are identified comprising land at Little Testwood Farm, Salisbury Road and land at Sunnyfields Farm, Jacobs Gutter Lane. The identification of land at Sunnyfields Farm is supported. However, it is considered that the specific and important requirement for employment land in Totton as well as New Milton and Ringwood should be confirmed through an over arching Development Management Policy with reference to allocation sites. No indication is given to the type of employment development required or the suitability of the sites to provide certain types of employment floorspace.
889n	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Paras 3.35 and 3.36: Paragraphs 3.35 and 3.36 refer to employment provision in Totton and confirm that following a site assessment three sites which already have some form of employment use/designation have been selected. The inclusion of land at Sunnyfields Farm is supported and acknowledges the scale of the operation on the site including existing buildings, numerous structures, access from Jacobs Gutter Lane, retail farm shop and facilities for weekly Farmers Markets.
922p	Kelly R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Green Infrastructure: The greener the better in my view
961b	NFU South East Region	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Para 2.98: This section makes no mention of the strategic importance of food and fuel production. We are lobbying for the inclusion in the emerging National Planning Policy Framework of policies that encourage economic growth and a thriving agriculture and horticulture industry.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
961a	NFU South East Region	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Para 2.73:</p> <p>We would oppose the expansion of the Bury Brickfields Traveller site on the basis of long-term disruption to agricultural operations on adjoining land. We would support the Little Testwood option.</p>
961c	NFU South East Region	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Para 2.106:</p> <p>We are concerned that the detailed national guidance on rural matters contained in the outgoing PPS/PPG (especially PPS7) will be lost. We are encouraged that the Council is considering a review of DPDs to fill this vacuum.</p>
980j	Porter H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Consultation Process:</p> <p>If the Council wishes to engage consultation with the local community as to its proposals, please provide more advance notice of consultation events in the future. The letter sent out was dated 25 January 2011. Received 29 January. Event in Ringwood 2 February. Resulted in lack of awareness of the event in time to allow for attendance. In addition, the circulation list was restrictive as not all affected households were sent a copy. Finally, the Consultation Document does not provide sufficient (indeed any) reasoning as to the need to redefine part of Blashford as a "built up" area creating divisions within this small residential community. The Parish Council have provided some clarification, but it would have assisted if this information was provided within the Consultation Document and proper notice allowed for Public Consultation Events.</p>
993o	Kelly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development Principles:</p> <p>We do not subscribe to the view that "affordable" housing equates with "socially problematic" housing. Therefore, we feel that new development, especially if it becomes necessary to use Green Belt land, should contain as high a proportion of affordable housing as possible. We welcome the 70% guideline. The idea of mixed housing is appealing but has, in the past, apparently served mainly to allow private developers to argue that their particular scheme did not need to provide any. Green/Open Space: Similar arguments have been used by developers about not providing green/open space. We strongly welcome a development strategy which seems to give these two priorities real priority. Sustainable energy use: In a high demand area such as Lymington, we feel there is a real opportunity to add this to the list of priorities for development building. We welcome any policies which put pressure on builders to go beyond minimum national requirements towards "carbon neutral" buildings. In a competitive climate for planning permission, this should be possible, and we hope the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan will encourage this.</p>
1010g	Etheridge S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development Principles:</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: S+DM DPD, Other Plan Comments						
						The percentage of social/affordable housing is too high for Milford on Sea and would be unbalanced in a high owner occupier area. There is not sufficient employment in Milford on Sea to warrant this amount of social housing.
1012e	Etheridge J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Affordable Housing:</p> <p>I have not been able to find a definition of affordable housing and whether housing built would be handed over to a housing association for allocation or sold to local families trying to get on the property ladder. To encourage integration and acceptance, any affordable housing should be in small pockets as larger areas create an imbalance in the housing stock in Milford on Sea. Item 12.1 states that the Council want to improve accessibility whilst reducing the reliance on private cars. There is very little employment and virtually no public transport in Milford on Sea so any extra housing created will inevitably lead to more vehicular use as transport to and from employment. Public transport is virtually non existent. MOS3.1, and 3 assumes that people would use these cycleways if created. Judging by the rapidly increasing number of cars being used to drop pupils at School and also the large number of pupils arriving from outside the Village and Everton, cycleways and pavements are not going to help the situation. Personally, my route when cycling to the Village from Manor Road is down Knowland Drive to The Orchard and walking down the footpath past Hillyfield into Barnes Lane. I cannot see the need for an official transport scheme for the route which I have used for well over 20 years. The Council should be looking into the viability of a walking bus to the School which would cut out the vehicles and small inexperienced children cycling along busy main roads. I would also surmise that parents using cars to drop their children off at the School are doing so on their way into work so would not walk or use cycleways.</p>
1024m	Bradford S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Why do I feel a distrust of the integrity of the planning system, where pressure from speculators and developers have precedence over common sense and the protection of the elements that make this area an amenable place to reside? Why when people look at this area (Hadley, Holbury, Blackfield, Langley and Fawley) do they see the lamentable result of an ad-hoc policy and not a properly reasoned coherent policy to enhance this once beautiful rural side of the Solent?
1027n	Ringwood and Fordingbridge Footpath Society	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Presentation:</p> <p>I felt this plan was well presented and easy to read. I am agreement with its suggestions related to Ringwood and Fordingbridge.</p>