

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: TOT1, Land at Durley Farm, Hounslow						
888h	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The site lies largely within Flood Zone 1, although the Bartley Water runs through the site. A small section of this watercourse is designated as a Main river, which has a flood plain associated with it. This places a small section of the site within Flood Zones 2 and 3, which will increase with climate change.</p> <p>The site should incorporate a SuDS scheme and ensure a suitable corridor is established along the Bartley Water which flows South to North through the site.</p> <p>Our previous comments relating to flood risk in our letter dated September 2010 continue to relate to this site. Any development at this location should ensure there is no detrimental impact upon the Hounslow Meadows Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and an adequate buffer strip is agreed to protect the Bartley Water. This will ensure there is no adverse impact on the ecological integrity of the river channel and its corridor. This site lies within the Danes Stream surface water body, as designated under the Water Framework Directive, which is currently assessed as meeting “good” status. The proposed developments should not result in any deterioration in the status of this water body and we would encourage improvements where possible.</p>
899d	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of Barker Mill Estate & Taylor Wimpey UK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>As stated in relation to paragraph 3.16, TBME/TW believes the requirements of Policy CS12 should be kept separate, as intended in the adopted Core Strategy DPD (2009). Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy DPD (2009) confirms that its requirements are in addition to the CS11 sites and that “additional sites will be identified adjoining the main towns and villages to allow for housing to specifically address identified local needs for affordable housing and low cost market housing (in accordance with Policy CS15(b)) which will not otherwise be met’ (our emphasis). TBME/TW therefore recommend that reference to „CS12” in this policy is removed.</p> <p>TBME/TW strongly support the allocation of this reserve housing site for around 100 dwellings, with up to 50% of these being affordable homes. The attached Technical appendix confirms that this remains an available, suitable and achievable allocation to make; it accords with the adopted Core Strategy DPD (2009), and can deliver the proposed TOT1 policy requirements to the benefit of the local and wider community of Totton.</p> <p>The following comments respond specifically to the criteria set out within TOT1: Satisfactory resolution of concerns regarding impacts on the local road network, particularly Jacob’s Gutter Lane.</p> <p>Transport assessments have been updated by consultants Mott MacDonald and the results shared with HCC Highways Department. This concludes the development would not result in unacceptable impacts on Jacob’s Walk or the wider network. The development of the site is also likely to deliver local infrastructure improvements, directly as a result of the off-site planning obligations; and indirectly via the governments New Homes Bonus. The latter could attract funding for local projects in the order of £1 million, which is specifically designed to benefit the local/wider communities within which the development is located. The proposed</p>

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT1, Land at Durley Farm, Hounslow

development would also provide more than sufficient parking on site for new residents and their visitors to avoid the need to park in Jacob's Walk. This is a commitment the TBME/TW feel they can now make following recent revisions to PPG13. It is hoped this will alleviate concerns that may be raised by local residents with regard to this issue.

HCC have accordingly confirmed they have no objection to the allocation of this site for around 100 dwellings (see Appendix 5 of the attached Technical Appendix). Vehicular access to the site via Jacob's Walk and pedestrian and cycleway links to the A35.

Consultant engineers Mott MacDonald have confirmed in consultation with HCC that access into the site from Jacob's Walk remains the best access for general traffic because it offers the most appropriate route and is of sufficient standard (5.5m wide) to meet and exceed established standards for a development of around 100 dwellings.

In addition, it has been demonstrated that pedestrian and cycle access for the site is achievable from the main access proposed onto Jacob's Walk and also from the likely emergency access onto the A35. A connection into the existing recreation route east of Hounslow Business Park is also capable of being delivered to provide greater east/west accessibility south of Totton.

Provision of a cycle route through the site between Jacob's Gutter Lane (west) and Hounslow Business Park. It has been highlighted within the accompanying Technical Appendix that there is an opportunity in the south east corner of the site to connect to an existing footpath/cycleway that runs to the south of the Hounslow Business Park. This provision enables the recreational route to the east of Hounslow to link through the site to the A35 and Jacob's Walk, providing greater accessibility east/west in the area south of Totton. It is considered this would provide tangible benefits for the local/wider communities. Accordingly, TBME/TW support the inclusion of this link through the site as part of its allocation for a new community of around 100 homes. The retention of existing woodland, mature trees and hedgerows within the site.

The Technical Appendix illustrates existing natural features on site and seeks to incorporate and enhance these within the proposals for the site wherever possible. Existing field access through such features will be made fit for purpose or landscaped and relocated to facilitate the development of the site in an efficient and sensitive manner. Accordingly TBME/TW recommend the words "wherever possible" are added at the end of this criterion. This is in recognition that there may well be a need to create footpath accesses through existing features to create a successful layout. Where this is necessary, appropriate landscape and ecological mitigation measures would be deployed to ensure there is a net gain in landscaping features/ecological connectivity across the site.

Provision of a landscape buffer to the Totton western bypass and with land to the west, in order to screen the development from the New Forest and protect new dwellings within the site from excessive traffic noise;

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT1, Land at Durley Farm, Hounslow

The proposals for the site will include retention and enhancement of the landscape buffer in the site's southern boundary. Noise assessments on site have demonstrated that around 100 dwellings can be delivered from areas outside NEC-C noise zones.

TBME/TW therefore feel that the use of words “excessive traffic noise” may therefore be misplaced in this policy and are not consistent with the text/approach used in the draft TOT2 policy. Suggest these words are omitted or revised accordingly. Protection, or appropriate compensation for, the nature conservation value of the SINC designated within the site.

The Technical Appendix has shown that the area of land devoted to SINC conservation can be maintained, consolidated and enhanced through management, something that is currently lacking. These areas also provide additional informal amenity space and will contribute towards the green infrastructure network in this area. Provision of land for a minimum of 10 full sized allotment plots within the site in order to provide for local needs arising from the development and the wider community.

Ten full size allotment plots are capable of being delivered to the benefit of the development and the wider community. It is proposed the best location for these is to the north of the site in the vicinity of the main access. However, other locations may also be suitable and will be agreed in consultation with NFDC and the local community at a subsequent detailed stage.

No built development taking place beneath power lines on the site (open space/allotments may be appropriate). Areas in close proximity to power lines will be kept free from housing and left to open uses. The Technical Appendix submitted as part of these representations confirms up to 100 dwellings are deliverable without the area of land beneath the power lines. The development should include a significant new area of formal public open space which should be accessible from Hounslow School.

The development will meet and exceed the Core Strategy CS7 public open space requirements on site and will include a children's play area. This will be accessible from Jacob's Walk, the A35 and Hounslow Business Park through the development. There may also be potential to explore the provision of a pedestrian access to Hounslow School. This would be subject to further discussion and agreement with NFDC and the school at a future detailed stage.

TBME/TW note reference to background paper 40 “Sustainability Appraisal Report” in the supporting text to the TOT1 policy. The attached Technical Appendix is provided as a more detailed and up to date assessment/evidence base upon which to confirm allocation of this site. TBME/TW are happy to share the independent consultant reports commissioned on this site with the Council and provide further detail in support of this site's allocation as necessary.
(Supporting Document submitted.)

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT1, Land at Durley Farm, Hounslow						
724f	Howard Sharp and Partners Representing Cancer Research UK/OpenSight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	
826e	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 Durley Farm. 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 TOT1 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 TOT1:</p> <p>Provision of off-site sewerage infrastructure by the development to facilitate connection to the system at the nearest point of adequate capacity.</p>
1060c	Cllr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Entirely unsuited to any form of development on basis of ecological importance reflected by SSSI status. Also vital, in terms of addressing acknowledged public open space deficit.
822h	New Forest National Park	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		If development on this site is supported, the authority considers the provision of a landscape buffer to screen development from the National Park is essential and welcomes the text requiring this. The proposed requirement for a significant area of open space is also supported. Consideration should be given to retaining an area of grazing land on site to compensate for the loss of land currently used for grazing with commoning rights attached.
692g	Hampshire CC - Env't Dept	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Hampshire County Council supports the identification of its surplus land adjacent to 65 Main Road, Totton for inclusion within the TOT1 site for residential development. As Highways Authority, the County Council considers that the identified site considerations should be amended to better reflect the potential traffic impacts.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT1, Land at Durley Farm, Hounslow						
						Therefore, the first bullet point should be amended to read: Satisfactory resolution of concerns regarding impacts on the local road network, particularly on Jacob's Gutter Lane and its junction with the A326 spur road;
622a	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Town Council strongly objects to any form of development on this land due to the unsuitable access from Jacobs Gutter alone, high risk of flooding and conservation value as a SINC.
317c	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	
319b	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		There is no public access to this site and it is therefore difficult to comment objectively about it. However ,as mentioned above, I would object to this site being used as it would mean intrusion into open country whose ecological value is unknown. As it sits west of Hounslow School and adjacent to A326, access would be difficult as would the provision of adequate public transport.
354d	Latham R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		When read in conjunction with TE/T44 this is the most appropriate site to develop for 100 houses, plus one would hope, 50 units for local needs.
362d	Partridge C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I can see no reason why this area cannot be developed. However I do feel provision should be made to provide a new slip road down to the existing A326 from the A35 (just past Spicers Hill).The old part of the A326 from Rushington roundabout could then be used as access to Marchwood (Jacobs Gutter Lane) and the industrial estate Newmans cople Road etc only. The existing slip on to the A326 could be closed as this is a rather dangerous junction and would add to road safety.
573b	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		In general terms I support the housing policies for Totton comprising Policy TOT1, 2, 3 & 4. Whilst the total number of plots exceeds the 150 dwellings required, I recommend that all of them be allocated for development but that they be released, as practicable, in phases to meet this target. In practice there are often reasons why sites cannot come on stream that are not planning reasons and are factors over which you have no control. As regards Durley Farm, the access through Jacobs Walk is considered satisfactory and the Policy is supported.
936a	Clapp N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Good access to Southampton and waterside areas.
943a	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT1, Land at Durley Farm, Hounslow						
972a	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	
992a	Luken Beck Ltd Representing Mr Brian Cooper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Substantial adverse impact on the rural character of this part of the Totton by-pass.
1031a	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	
1044a	Best J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
724a	Howard Sharp and Partners Representing Cancer Research UK/OpenSight	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<p>These submissions are made by Howard Sharp & Partners LLP on behalf of Cancer Research UK and OpenSight who are the co-owners of land north of Loperwood Lane shown as possible site TOT2. The proposed combining of requirements of policies CS11 and CS12 is supported. The main points to make are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> TOT2 has been consistently found to be one of the most sustainable and appropriate development sites in Totton by successive Inspectors. Site TOT2 has a history of successive independent Inspectors finding this site suitable for housing development and inherently unsuitable for formal open space/playing fields. The previous Local Plan Inspector felt that the site should be held up no longer. TOT2 has the best package of planning gain and community benefits in comparison with other possible sites that are considered by the Council as potentially suitable in Totton, TOT2 has the best package of planning and community measures in the best and most sustainable location. Accordingly the co-owner Charities are firmly of the view that this site should be the priority location to meet the overall requirement of 150 new homes in Totton. TOT3 is completely separate from TOT2 - it is in different ownership and has its own planning constraints. Such constraints do not apply to TOT2. TOT2 should need to play a greater roles in ensuring housing need is met. Furthermore, the CS depends on 150 dwellings coming forward within the urban area of Totton. In our view some of these sites will not come forward or should not come forward in preference to TOT2. Evidence has already been submitted to a number of preceding housing land supply debates from the objectors, showing why these sites are either unsuitable and/or will not deliver the housing needed. A summary of the problems are given below and further evidence can and will be submitted as necessary to support these findings. TOT2 should be the priority location to absorb the main need for Totton. The policy TOT2, as correctly described by the draft policy wording, includes a number of social and community uses and projects for the benefit of the local population. No other allocation can match the benefits offered here. Where development is to take place in Totton, it would be sensible to plan that area as efficiently as possible and to have future residents as close to these facilities as possible, as they serve the wider Totton catchment. Accordingly it makes better planning for the numbers of new homes needed to be located on this site where possible. The site area of the whole allocation is 10.8 acres. The copse and pond take up 2.8 acres (which will be a great asset within the site as a central focal point, enhancing the mixed use layout) - the net developable area is therefore around 8 acres (3.2 hectare). The community uses take up 2 acres, leaving 6 acres for housing (2.4 Ha). At around 40 dwellings per hectare this would provide around 100 homes. There was no preference found for the suitability of TOT1 Durley Farm over TOT2 Loperwood Lane (see previous local plan Inspectors Reports). It was purely an arbitrary selection by the Council that Durley Farm became a Reserve site. Accordingly, and in the light of the range of benefits offered now on TOT1 compared with the constraints identified on TOT1 (see wording of policy TOT1), there is no longer any justification to treat TOT1 as having any different status to TOT2.

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane

5. No proven need and inappropriate to use TOT2 for open space. Over successive local plan inquiries it has been proven and (according to the Council's own report following the last local plan inquiry) accepted by the Council that TOT2 is not an appropriate location for large areas of open space. Furthermore there is a great deal of space available adjacent at the existing play area and field. The balance of the land should be either built for housing immediately or reserved for future phases of housing. More details are available of the social and community uses offered as follows:

- 1) Visionary Centre
This would be the hub of all the activities for services offered by Open Sight. There are an increasing number of people in the New Forest with some degree of visual impairment. This is partly due to the fact of the ageing population, partly due to a clear lack of education in eye care from young children through to adults, but also because when the consultation has finished with the NHS Trusts after a six week period, people do not know where to go for advice, many people lose their sight unnecessarily through lack of understanding about what to do to slow the progression of their sight loss or what to do to be able to live independently longer having been diagnosed with an eye impairment. The Visionary Centre would be a place where everyone with sight loss or their carers/families/friends could come for advice, support and training and learn how to deal with the issues rather than 'cope' or worse still become reclusive. This facility would of course be also invaluable for schools as we are forging closer working partnerships with them to apprehend future eye damage caused by a variety of issues.
- 2) Sensory Garden as an extended part of the Visionary Centre, a 'Sensory Garden' would prove invaluable to people who cannot get out much because of their impairment, or who lack the confidence to go out in their own garden for fear of slips trips etc. This would be a place of solitude or a place of community whichever is preferred by the different clients OpenSight work with.
- 3) Charitable partnerships
OpenSight do believe that the centre will provide an opportunity for some of their partner organisations in the field of visual impairment, or indeed other charitable organisations to utilise space to give advice. OpenSight are very aware that they would like to offer more services that work with dual sensory loss, often sight loss is accompanied by hearing loss and other disabilities. Already some of their partners are extremely interested in supporting them in this, including: Action for Blind, Deaf plus, Hampshire County Council, Macular Degeneration Society, Hampshire Sensory Services. Other interested parties include some local opticians who have specified that this would be of great value to them.
- 4) Library services
OpenSight work very closely with Hampshire County Council Library Services where there are currently VI units but the council is currently reviewing the services they offer and they do not know what the future holds. It would be practicable to hold this in mind as they are very aware of how important this service is.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
<p>5) Day Nursery with specific disabled facilities In partnership with local organisations, OpenSight would appoint a well respected Day Nursery provider to partner with them on this. It would be not only state of the art, but Eco-friendly also providing an advanced range of activities for Nursery age children yet in a peaceful environment and at an affordable cost. They have already opened initial conversations with Hampshire County Council Early Years department, and will consult further to discuss the options that are available, and the unique selling points of a Nursery in this area without severely affecting other providers in Totton.</p> <p>Summary of Constraints on other Totton sites: TOT4 - woodland and trees should be protected and electricity pylons constraint. TOT7 - Brokenford Lane - tight access, surrounding commercial character and noise. TOT8 - other specialist housing to be considered first. TOT9 - other use class uses to be considered first.</p> <p>Changes Required to the draft Sites DPD: Housing provision increased from 'around 75' to 'around 100' dwellings. Delete reference after the remainder of the site should be used 'to provide a significant area of new public open space....requirements'.</p>						
826f	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 Loperwood. 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 TOT2 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 TOT2: Provision of off-site sewerage infrastructure by the development to facilitate connection to the system at the nearest point of adequate capacity.</p>
1060a	Cllr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The ecological and environmental importance of this remaining area of Loperwood Manor parkland (previously

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						defended from development by NFDC at Appeal), cannot be overstated. It also provides vital 'back up 'grazing in line with district council policy.
2a	Bovis Homes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This land provides a visually pleasant green buffer between existing residential development and the A326. Development here would constitute infilling of a site which should instead be retained for formal and informal purposes.
622b	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The environmental value of TOT2 and TOT3 would override any kind of sustainable development. Also, there is the potential for increased traffic congestion and the proposal for a community centre for the blind and children's nursery has been too weakly suggested as a compromise.
80a	Collinson M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Open Sight want to build a Vision Centre on their land at Totton. As a visually impaired adult, this would be a wonderful opportunity to have a centre close by. Visually impaired children would also benefit - and it would also create local employment - not to mention some affordable housing. There is a lack of facilities for people with sight loss in this area and I feel the whole community could benefit from this proposal.
93a	Stone A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I am against the council's proposals to build additional housing and any affordable housing in my back garden. I am appalled this has not been given any public consultation and am of the opinion this has been rushed through the development process without the consideration of local residents. The drainage and known flooding problems will worsen and the knock on effect to my own property will be to reduce its appeal and value. The King George Recreation Ground already floods, and will not cope with additional surface water created from flooded natural drainage. This is a small example of a much larger negative impact. I do not agree we need a community centre for the blind and a childrens' nursery without evidence.
134a	Riordan A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Open Sight's idea of building a 'Vision Centre' on land at Totton is a very good scheme. It would be so good for visually impaired people in this area to have somewhere local to go for help and advice. Also the education side of it is very important for young people and children to learn how to protect their eyes and so, hopefully, to avoid problems in future years. I think that overall, it is a very good scheme.
139a	Chapman D	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I would like to support the Open Sight plans to develop a site in Totton. I think this would be a good facility for all ages. I am registered blind and therefore understand the needs of people with sight impairment. From what has been read to me by my friend I think the proposals would be good for the community as it would create much

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
needed employment along with much needed housing. The sensory garden would be ideal for people to be together in a common setting and for others to learn about the effects of sight loss. Please support this project as a facility like this would enhance Totton greatly.						
145a	Scorey M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>We object most strongly to the proposal to designate the land at Loperwood lane for housing provision based on the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. West Totton development - Open Space provision The land at Loperwood Lane was required to provide open space provision and allotments for the new residents in West Totton. The housing development is now complete except for the acquisition and laying out of the 2.51ha and 0.7ha of land at Loperwood Lane as was required by the District Council to meet the needs of the new residents. Clearly, the whole area of land is not available for the allocation of housing, otherwise there will be a serious shortfall in the required open space provision as set out above. Any further allocation of housing will also require open space - where would the council find this? Why has the land not been laid out as required and where are the developers' contributions? 2. Previous planning application In April 1999, a planning application was submitted to build 100 houses on the land. This was refused and a subsequent appeal dismissed. There were many objections to this proposal. Clearly nothing has changed since that time. 3. Windfall sites There has been unexpected windfall sites in Totton where additional housing has become available, e.g. Testwood Farm and the BAT sites. These were over and above the existing designations in the last Local District Plan. There should not therefore be any additional pressure to build on our last remaining greenfield sites. 4. Identification of potential development sites The council has identified many available alternative sites within the existing built up area of Totton that are far more suitable for development. 5. Historical use and history of the land The land at Loperwood Lane was originally the landscaped gardens of the former Loperwood Manor. Since that time, the land has been continuously used for grazing. There is still a clear local need for grazing land. 6. Flora and fauna The land is classed as grade 2 grazing land. There are a number of TPO's on individual trees on the land. There are native bluebells on and around the perimeter of the site. They are a protected species. 7. Open Space and recreation This area of land is highly valued and vital as a local amenity . This is the only area of significant informal open

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane

space in this area of Totton that is easily and safely accessible from the wider community. To designate the land for housing would have a severely negative impact on the quality of life for all the residents in the wider local community.

8. Flooding
In the centre of the site is a natural spring. The water table is high. Just one day of heavy rainfall causes the water table to spill over and downwards onto properties on Calmore Road and the adjacent recreation ground. Throughout the winter months much of the recreation ground is too wet to use and many of the rear gardens of properties on the Calmore Road from Loperwood Lane to the recreation ground are flooded. Further along Calmore Road to Michigan Way there are continuing severe flooding problems after heavy rain. If houses are built on the land at Loperwood, where is all the additional water going to go? The drains in Calmore Road cannot cope with the current excess.

9. Highways
It is suggested that any development of the land at Loperwood would require Loperwood Lane as the main access. It is a small residential lane. One hundred new homes would create hundreds of additional daily traffic movements onto our small lane posing a danger to all vehicles users. Further along the Calmore Road there is another very serious accident black spot at the crossroads with Pauletts Lane. The junction at Pauletts Lane with the Salisbury Road is yet another very serious accident black spot. One person has recently died in an accident at this spot. To even consider placing more cars directly onto these roads is ridiculous in the extreme.

10. Calmore Cottage
Calmore Cottage is one of, if not the oldest listed building in this area. The cottage would be vulnerable to vibration and flooding should a housing development occur in such close proximity. The council should protect our built heritage from irreversible damage.

143b	Bran P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The gardens in Loperwood Lane and Calmore Road already flood when it rains heavily, the field in TOT2 has a natural soakaway, if you were to build on this land the houses would end up being flooded as well. This land (TOT2) was left to two charities to be used for green use only (see the will). You are breaking a legal binding will. TOT2 is heritage land as well. Owls occupy this field, they are protected by law. Bats occupy this field, they are protected by law. Many of the trees have a preservation order on them. Loperwood Lane would be blocked by lorries making entry/exit impossible to the properties whilst the
------	--------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	---

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						<p>building takes place.</p> <p>8. The 2 local schools, doctors and dentists cannot cope with anymore people.</p> <p>9. The crossroads by the church is a well known blackspot for accidents and fatalities. There would be even more with the extra traffic.</p> <p>10. The proposed entrance/exit in Loperwood lane would create extra noise and pollution to the residents and would devalue their properties.</p>
146a	Hickman K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Access onto Loperwood Lane is limited and the junction out is dangerous due to a blind spot. The increase in traffic would change the whole atmosphere within the 'lane'.</p> <p>Houses would be subject to flooding. King George's Recreation Ground is subject to flooding after every downpour already.</p>
248a	Wilkinson K and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Letter with petition (117 signatures)</p> <p>Petition signed by residents of Loperwood Lane, Calmore Crescent and Calmore Road opposing the building of properties at Loperwood. The development would be detrimental to the local area with extra traffic, shortness of school places, doctors, dentists, etc. Calmore Road and the junction with Loperwood Lanes is already dangerous. Access to the site from Loperwood Lane would be dangerous for children crossing to the local school. Flooding is also a concern. The gardens of properties in Calmore Crescent have flooded since the building of Amy Gardens opposite. Please take this petition into consideration when making a decision on proposed building. Other sites are available.</p>
257a	Thome M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I object to the proposed development of houses at Loperwood on the basis of the drainage reasons and traffic problems it would cause.</p>
263a	Davie J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Concerned about increased traffic and insufficient access to the site as well as possible flooding implications. Increased demand on facilities already stretched, i.e. schools.</p>
270a	Brooker R and A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Loperwood Lane is inappropriate for access to the development. The junction with Calmore Road is insufficient. Calmore Crescent would be used as a rat run, whilst it is currently a quiet street.</p>
277b	Russell B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This field is a natural soakaway for rainfall and any building on it would result in flooding for the existing houses and rec. ground - even with extra drainage.</p>
285a	Cronan L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Does the Council not think that enough houses were built on the estate between Morrisons and Calmore Road a</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						<p>few years ago? We already have drainage problems in this area that were supposed to be corrected on the completion of the above estate.</p> <p>Have they carried out a wildlife survey as we have much wildlife in the proposed area - where will it go? Calmore Road cannot cope with any more traffic - it is full of potholes and erosion as it is, let alone cope with another estate full of cars!</p> <p>Finally and by no means least - I absolutely love the view from my house of the fields over the road, and the peaceful (until a few years ago) atmosphere.</p> <p>Does the Council want to eradicate all green and open space left in Calmore!!</p>
288a	Phillips B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Since coming to live in this village 45 years ago, we have seen the eating up of most of the local fields until all we have left is this area. The field is precious to us as a respite from all the housing.</p> <p>Should this go ahead, we will be subject to yet more noise pollution, litter, traffic and noise - very many unhappy people.</p> <p>Can't one beautiful, uplifting space be left? We have the continual noise from the motorway as it is. Calmore was once beautiful, this would be the final insult and nail in the coffin.</p>
296a	Bran L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) you would be breaking the law if you affect, damage or destroy the bats and owls (that live here) or their roosts. This field is a soakaway. The gardens of local residents flood in heavy rain now. This would be much worse if this field was built on. Certain trees have preservation orders on them .</p> <p>The TOT2 field was left to a charity to be used for allotments or horses. You would be breaking the terms of this will.</p> <p>The crossroads by Calmore Church is dangerous and has seen deaths - we do not need further vehicles and more deaths. Calmore Rec is badly flooded in winter. It would be completely underwater if building took place next to it. Calmore is overdeveloped now. Leave out last green field to the horses.</p>
298a	Bonning K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Run off of water from King George's Recreation Ground causes problems, need measures to control the current flooding situation, the amount of water that currently runs off onto our property is unbelievable. This time of year the Recreation Ground is always water logged. If you go ahead with the proposed development it is only going to add to an already bad problem. Besides that walking down Calmore Road after a rain storm currently poses it own problems as the drains will block up, over flow and produce huge puddles by and across the road. Calmore Road - volume of traffic that uses this road makes it difficult to cross. This development will no doubt bring an increased flow of traffic to both Calmore Road and the road running up to Loperwood. The cross roads at the end of Calmore Road by the church are already extremely dangerous, and this will only intensify with a</p>

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane

larger volume of traffic. I fear for the safety of my children walking along these main roads now, with the amount of extra traffic your proposed development will bring, it will be further intensified. The proposed vehicular entry points to this development will be highly dangerous to get out of.

I am also intrigued as to where any children from housing on this proposed development will be educated as the local infant school for the last few years has been full to capacity with children on the waiting list and the nearest NHS dentist taking on new patients when we moved here a few years ago is Romsey, all dentists within our local area were full. Totton's infrastructure as it currently stands will surely not be sufficient to cope with this sudden increase.

It also saddens me as my young children love to walk that way around the field, looking at the horses and natural wildlife that makes that field it's home, why would you think it is a good idea to remove them from such 'natural' wildlife to subject them to urbanisation and yet more 'man-made natural play areas'?? As you develop these little snippets of natural beauty even further, we have to travel that much further out of town for our children to sample this.

317a	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<p>I object to this site for the following reasons. It is very rural and has small roads leading away in all directions, dangerous road junctions, where a lot of accidents have happened due to the shape of the road and speed of traffic. The ground must be liable to flooding, or existing properties will be flooded as whole area is very wet in winter months, especially the playing fields. This includes the gardens of Calmore Crescent, Calmore Road, Loperwood Lane & King Georges Playing Fields. There is already a lot of 'afordable housing' in the area which already brings far to much anti social behaviour, from both parents and children. I live in Calmore Crescent and overlook the 'afordable housing' of Jesica Gardens Calmore, Police visits are far to common to this area allready. The street lighting is poor, and being right on the edge of the town it's nice not to have the light polution, being able to see the stars at night. Paulets lane will become a gr eater rat run than it already is. all routes from this site are small and already over used. An increased voliume of trafic (allowing for the average 2 car per household puts an extra 140 cars on this site alone, thus causing greater dangers for children playing on King Georges playing Field, or just on there way to School. Calmore Road by the Church at the cross roads with Paulets Lane (approx 20ft from edge of proposed site) is a nightmare to pass on a sunday morning or when a funeral is taking place now, due to cars parked by the road side, with the people going church, without this extra volume of trafic. I do not think the local shop (tesco express at Calmore) will cope as you often have to queue for a while and parking is very limited. Can the local schools cope ? I think not. Calmore crescent a quiet road will become a short cut, it is already a single track road as a lot of the houses do not have drive ways and park in the quiet street. The main supperm arket Morrisons will support the food needs of these 70 houses and all those shopping there will have to drive along Calmore Road, far to much traffic already and the junction with Michegen Way,</p>
------	-----------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						just wont cope. The need for a centre for the blind, nice idea but is it really needed ? why not use existing buildings like Calmore Community Centre a short distance away and utilise that better. I feel this site has everything going against it and should be left as a green field site. Make it an extension to the King George playing field
319c	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The land north of Loperwood Lane has been defended against development in the past and again I would object to any housing being constructed on this pleasant open field and adjoining farm which act as a buffer between A326 and the existing properties off Calmore Road. This site should only be considered as a last resort when all 'brownfield' sites have been exhausted.
321a	Galvin M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Not only have I had a whole estate built in front of my house, I do not want extra traffic as well as extra noise and pollution. Calmore Crescent is a busy road now. Too much green space has already been built on. I have lived in Calmore for 50 years and seen all the green fields built on around me.
326a	Sweetnam J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		My garden is adjacent to the large field off Loperwood Lane. In spite of very heavy rainfall this winter at no time has my garden become waterlogged. I understand that the field provides a natural soakaway for rainfall. I have seen large areas of standing water in the field , not far from my boundary. If the field is covered in houses I fear that heavy rainfall will follow the contour of the land and flow into my garden. In a heavily built up area such as Totton, I do feel that some areas of open space should be preserved for the benefit of all present residents.
329a	Poulton J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		What evidence is there that this development and facilities are needed? Fatalities already occurred at Loperwood, an access there will precipitate more on an already dangerous road. Water drainage in Calmore Road is already unable to sustain high rainfall, 95 houses will turn the area into a floodplain for Calmore Road residents.
333a	Aldridge L	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Support building of an Open Sight Vision Centre in Totton, there is not enough provision locally for ophthalmic-medical check-ups. Will provide 20-30 jobs in the area. Possible construction of Day Nursery would help young parents in the Totton area.
335a	Effemey E	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I wish to support the proposal for Open Sight to build a vision centre in Totton.
346a	Hemsley E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I am writing concerning the proposed development at north Loperwood lane, Loperwood Farm.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						<p>My main reason for opposing this is the increase in traffic this will generate. It is already very busy through the village and around Calmore Drive to the school etc. I live in Woodgreen Walk immediately off Calmore Drive from Calmore Road. It is quite dangerous to emerge from the service road at the back of the houses to turn right with the volume of traffic to and few cutting through to Morrisons and down to the school, pub and community centre etc.</p> <p>Most residents these days have two cars to each house and therefore cars, vans and lorries are parked in the roads around the estate. The proposed new development will be no different.</p> <p>We have already lost many green areas so please consider all these facts in your deliberation.</p>
344a	Elcombe H and P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>As dwellers who have lived here, at this address since 1970, we wish to voice our main concerns:</p> <p>a) vehicular access as indicated on the plan b) vast increase of traffic during construction period c) the increase of families and their practical needs d) the water table</p> <p>a) With regards to TOT3, Calmore Road/Pauletts Lane crossroads are surprisingly busy and efforts to slow traffic have been unsuccessful. Restricted visibility has resulted in frequent nasty accidents , two of which were fatal. The Calmore Road already carries more traffic than is comfortable for a curving road, in what was originally the village. We have the new development opposite the Calmore Road and Crescent already adding considerably to that from the other estates around us.</p> <p>b) If we consider the volume of heavy, large, noisy construction vehicles to the above comments, this will become a poorly served place.</p> <p>c) although fairly near amenities such as schools, shops, railway, health and leisure centres, to reach anywhere one needs transport, public or private. Obviously given our address, we know this 100 yards or so of Loperwood Lane. The junction with Calmore Road has also limited visibility needs care Adding traffic such as above - once again almost dangerous, certainly Inadvisable.</p> <p>d) All these gardens flood in heavy rain.</p> <p>e) We all, not just in Calmore, need green spaces.</p>
348a	Robinson K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>As a resident of Calmore for over 50 years I strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>(a) New dwellings will only bring more traffic into this area which to date is grossly over used by traffic from all directions. One only has to stand at the Calmore Cross Roads for a short while to witness the potential danger from the flow of traffic coming from all directions.</p> <p>(b) Your proposals to provide extra recreation facilities for younger children may lead some people to think this</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						<p>could be an extra bonus - I hope they won't be fooled. Forty years ago when we had many youngsters here in Calmore we continually approached the council to supply more play items for King George's Recreation Ground. To this day we are still waiting for any new items to appear.</p> <p>I have given these proposals a great deal of thought and I cannot see this being an advantage to anybody here in Calmore. Slowly our villages are being overtaken by plans such as these so I shall do all I can to oppose this development.</p>
354f	Latham R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This area must revert to that under the Hanger Farm Development Brief - public open space and allotments, especially as land east of the A36 is now private open space. It also makes sense to expand the King George V playing fields for new generations.</p>
368a	Underhill B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The roads in this area are not suitable for extra traffic which would be generated by building on these sites, There have been numerous accidents at the crossroads of Calmore Road/Loperwood and Pauletts Lane, and also on the bends in Calmore Road. Traffic has increased greatly since Tatchbury Mount site has accommodated offices. I do not feel that we could cope with anymore without adding to accident statistics in the area, King George's Recreation Ground is constantly flooded and I cannot see why you should be considering taking this area and the field behind to develop, as this is the only natural soakaway for rainfall in this area, There is already drainage on the recreation ground but in spite of this the field and the car park get flooded leading to water runoff onto Calmore Road and across the road into the drive of my home. When rainfall has been particularly heavy my home, the bungalow next door and the house opposite have been protected by sandbags to divert the water. I am sure other residents on Calmore Road will tell you that they too have this problem, You will be aware that the slope of the land is downhill towards the properties on Calmore Road. This recreation ground is in constant use by local groups for children to play football and cricket and also by adult clubs. The play area is greatly used. I cannot see that it would benefit to encroach on this field by adding additional recreation facilities. Why would you be considering a community centre for the blind in such a remote area? There are poor transport links and I would have thought that anyone who is partially sighted would need such a facility more to the centre of the town. This would also apply to a children's nursery - it would neither be close to a school or to employment. It could only add to vehicular movements.</p> <p>There are very limited spaces to register with both doctors and dentists in Totton, the amount of people who would be living in the proposed homes would find it difficult to register with either in the local area. Whilst I appreciate that there is a need for homes, I feel sure that there are sites which would be far more suitable than TOT2 and TOT3.</p>
380a	Browne E	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>As a registered blind person, development on land at Loperwood north of Loperwood Lane sounds ideal to</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
provide not only affordable housing, a day nursery, but for people like me a vision centre so vital to many of us. It will bring employment as well as volunteering opportunities and open space for local people.						
381a	Snelling F	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>We object most strongly to the proposal to designate the land at Loperwood lane for housing provision based on the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. West Totton development - Open Space provision The land at Loperwood Lane was required to provide open space provision and allotments for the new residents in West Totton. The housing development is now complete except for the acquisition and laying out of the 2.51ha and 0.7ha of land at Loperwood Lane as was required by the District Council to meet the needs of the new residents. Clearly, the whole area of land is not available for the allocation of housing, otherwise there will be a serious shortfall in the required open space provision as set out above. Any further allocation of housing will also require open space - where would the council find this? Why has the land not been laid out as required and where are the developers' contributions? 2. Previous planning application In April 1999, a planning application was submitted to build 100 houses on the land. This was refused and a subsequent appeal dismissed. There were many objections to this proposal. Clearly nothing has changed since that time. 3. Windfall sites There has been unexpected windfall sites in Totton where additional housing has become available, e.g. Testwood Farm and the BAT sites. These were over and above the existing designations in the last Local District Plan. There should not therefore be any additional pressure to build on our last remaining greenfield sites. 4. Identification of potential development sites The council has identified many available alternative sites within the existing built up area of Totton that are far more suitable for development. 5. Historical use and history of the land The land at Loperwood Lane was originally the landscaped gardens of the former Loperwood Manor. Since that time, the land has been continuously used for grazing. There is still a clear local need for grazing land. 6. Flora and fauna The land is classed as grade 2 grazing land. There are a number of TPO's on individual trees on the land. There are native bluebells on and around the perimeter of the site. They are a protected species. 7. Open Space and recreation This area of land is highly valued and vital as a local amenity . This is the only area of significant informal open space in this area of Totton that is easily and safely accessible from the wider community.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						<p>To designate the land for housing would have a severely negative impact on the quality of life for all the residents in the wider local community.</p> <p>8. Flooding In the centre of the site is a natural spring. The water table is high. Just one day of heavy rainfall causes the water table to spill over and downwards onto properties on Calmore Road and the adjacent recreation ground. Throughout the winter months much of the recreation ground is too wet to use and many of the rear gardens of properties on the Calmore Road from Loperwood Lane to the recreation ground are flooded. Further along Calmore Road to Michigan Way there are continuing severe flooding problems after heavy rain. If houses are built on the land at Loperwood, where is all the additional water going to go? The drains in Calmore Road cannot cope with the current excess.</p> <p>9. Highways It is suggested that any development of the land at Loperwood would require Loperwood Lane as the main access. It is a small residential lane. One hundred new homes would create hundreds of additional daily traffic movements onto our small lane posing a danger to all vehicles users. Further along the Calmore Road there is another very serious accident black spot at the crossroads with Pauletts Lane. The junction at Pauletts Lane with the Salisbury Road is yet another very serious accident black spot. One person has recently died in an accident at this spot. To even consider placing more cars directly onto these roads is ridiculous in the extreme.</p> <p>10. Calmore Cottage Calmore Cottage is one of, if not the oldest listed building in this area. The cottage would be vulnerable to vibration and flooding should a housing development occur in such close proximity. The council should protect our built heritage from irreversible damage.</p>
401a	Cobern R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This area in particular has had its share of housing development, with 265 houses built at Hazel Farm. Too much strain has been placed on doctors, dentists, schools etc also roads, drainage services.
402a	Cobern M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Worried about the increased volume of traffic on local roads. Strains on all local services: drains, sewers, doctors, schools etc. We value the green areas left to us, otherwise we have gone from a rural situation 25 years ago, to one of feeling more in a small town. The 265 houses which now closely face us, are surely enough development in this area.</p>
418a	Cutler J and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Please accept this letter as our support for the proposed and hoped for development plans of Opensight on the land which they own.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						A project such as this will mean so much more for the future of people with visual impairment and will also provide low cost housing, and employment. We heavily commend this application.
425a	Goss L and Cutler A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We've had our quota for building work in Calmore over the recent years. Quote 'promised' lots of trees/hedgerows on opposite site to Calmore Crescent, evidently not enough. Drainage already a big problem in this area. Roads too small especially in Loperwood Lane. The area is losing that 'country feel' that many have moved here for. Wildlife - again forced to move on. Schools already stretched. Our children play there, in a natural environment, man made parks are full of glass and graffiti.
430a	Jones A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		With all the brownfield site in Totton why use the last of the greenfield sites. The roads etc are too busy now. Drainage is a problem now so more houses will not help. I phoned forward planning and was told that there would be no building on this site for 10 years. This was only 8 months ago.
441a	Le Clos A and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Calmore Road is already a busy Road. Drivers do not adhere to the speed limits. It is difficult to get out of our driveway and 75 dwellings would create a lot more traffic. Local services could not service the extra residents. This area is near the New Forest and retains a rural feel. It would be very sad to see the loss of any trees surrounding King George Recreation Ground.
445b	Lawrence S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		NFDC already has a minimum 5-year supply of housing land. The fields currently flood which could be made worse by building. Flooding in Calmore Village could be made worse. The access onto Loperwood Lane will be dangerous. Calmore Crescent is a bottleneck due to parking. The cross-roads is dangerous with accidents every other week some of them fatal. Current schools are full.
447a	Ray J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The area surrounding the proposed sites are in a semi-rural location and the surrounding lanes already take more traffic than they should. Loperwood Lane and Pauletts Lane do not have pavements (not child friendly) and the lanes are not really suitable for the heavy traffic they have to take now (rat runs for Tatchbury and new developments in Calmore). The crossroads at Pauletts Lane, Calmore Road and Loperwood has always been a danger spot. Any future housing in the area will put an added burden on the lanes and as the area is prone to flooding, I do not feel this is an appropriate site for building a lot of houses.
453a	Curry P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I am objecting to these developments as I feel Totton does not need more houses. Having lived here all my life it appears that any green land there once was is disappearing. Totton is already overpopulated so where are all

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						these people going to work , and where will the children go to school? Traffic will also be worse adding to the already too busy roads, causing more pollution etc. These houses really are not needed, please keep Totton semi rural.
466a	Marshall H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I understand there is some land which belongs to Opensight in Totton that may be built upon. I would like to see a vision centre built for partially and non-sighted people and a sensory garden would be an added bonus with a coffee shop too perhaps.
495a	Ancell D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insufficient road access for the number of properties proposed and current housing 2. Poor drainage already 3. Overpopulated with previous development in Calmore Road 4. Congestion 5. Inadequate facilities to support additional residents i.e. public transport, schools 6. Access via Loperwood would be very dangerous 7. Access via Loperwood Lane would be too restrictive and cause severe problems to residents 8. Social problems already exist from previous development in Calmore Road
509a	Purves	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I would just like to make known my support for the proposed project at Loperwood by the Opensight people. The planned facilities, as I have read, would surely be of considerable benefit to us lo-vision sufferers - and also to the general local community if all their aspirations are realised. Good luck to them I say.
516a	Humphrey L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>We are concerned that the junction will be dangerous with 1200 extra car movements a day. There is no infrastructure to accommodate this development locally. We need to keep this as agricultural land as there are very few green spaces.</p> <p>About 15 years ago planning was refused for the ten acre field in Loperwood. Nothing has changed and these proposals should not be accepted this time either.</p>
524a	Sutton Y	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The traffic for one is bad enough now. 2) Flood to park and surrounding area as poor drainage. 3) Very little green land in Totton - future generations. 4) Nature life - trees all destroyed. <p>We have enough housing already. Unable to meet local needs now, parking, schools, doctors, dentists, all have waiting lists now.</p> <p>Strongly object to anymore building. Over the last 10 years with the new road and estate we have had enough</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						upheaval.
566b	Henvest D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>1) 75 dwellings would create more noise and pollution and traffic congestion in the neighbouring area.</p> <p>2) A new nursery and community centre for the blind would also create more traffic adding to the congestion.</p> <p>3) 10 New allotments would increase traffic adding to pollution - Development should provide adequate ground per dwelling, for the inhabitant to grow vegetables etc.</p> <p>4) There appears to be no provision for a local shop within the development, so residents will then travel to the nearest Tesco's or Morrisons, again adding to both noise traffic and pollution.</p> <p>5) Access to the new development along Loperwood Lane would be narrow and would cause congestion with heavy site traffic. Likewise a new access road between Calmore Road crossroads and the bridge may be dangerous as visibility is already an issue for on coming vehicles.</p> <p>6) Owls and existing wildlife would be disturbed - what's the point of retaining the pond if you've frightened all the wildlife away?</p> <p>7) Whilst I would greatly uphold the decision to keep the Pond intact, ponds and nursery children/children, don't go together - Health and safety issue here.</p> <p>8) Drainage;- Local water table would be altered and would affect nearby levels which are already at times inadequate. For example, King George's Recreation ground always floods after a good downpour, and stays wet for days. Also many gardens take time to drain.</p> <p>9) There are a number of large trees around the proposed site and it would be detrimental to see any of these cut down. They should all, in my opinion, have preservation orders.</p> <p>10) This site was said to be "outside the built up area and consequently should only be considered if no sites are available inside the built up area". Can you confirm this is the case?</p> <p>11) Would spoil our view of the open field with grazing horses, rabbits, birds, foxes.</p>
573c	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>In general terms I support the housing policies for Totton comprising Policy TOT1, 2, 3 & 4.</p> <p>Whilst the total number of plots exceeds the 150 dwellings required, I recommend that all of them be allocated for development but that they be released, as practicable, in phases to meet this target. In practice there are often reasons why sites cannot come on stream that are not planning reasons and are factors over which you have no control.</p>
578b	Wallace K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This land was previously agreed, under the Hampshire Plan, that it was designated a green space, nothing has changed since this plan was agreed, indeed the land has not been fully utilised in accordance with the Hampshire</p>

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane

Plan for its Green Space purposes. In addition there are still significant areas within the old Hampshire Plan that have still not been developed in accordance with that plan.

This land is directly opposite a Grade 2 Architecturally Important Building, accordingly any development of this land will have an adverse impact on this building. The building is over 400 years old and the proposed development will completely remove it from the countryside aspect which is an important part of its listing. The field acts an important 'soakaway' for rainwater in the area, approximately 35 years ago the traditional drainage of the village of Calmore was removed, namely the drainage ditches', and to this day flooding still occurs in the field, the adjacent King George Recreation Ground, not to mention the continual flooding of Calmore Road and its adjacent properties due to the run off from this higher ground, the supposed new drainage installed at the time was and still is inadequate. It should also be noted that when the West Totton bypass was built, a significant balancing pond had to be constructed in Loperwood Lane to cope with the removal of natural drainage caused by the road. The drainage system of the local area cannot cope with any more rainwater. There is no suitable mains sewer in the area that can take the increased volumes of sewage that will be created by the new properties. The existing properties surrounding the proposed development are at the top of the small sewer system that exists, there is neither the pipe diameter or pipe fall to cope with any additional flow. Your provisions within your plans are contradictory, it is impossible to retain/provide screening to the existing properties to the South-East of the site and at the same time have vehicular access into Loperwood Lane, these are one and the same locations.

These proposed developments would adversely increase the traffic on what are still country roads, the local infrastructure simply could not cope with any increased traffic volume, let alone that caused by huge construction traffic.

Loperwood Lane, is precisely that, a Lane, it is not suitable for construction traffic, either for this proposed development or any other development. The proposed entrance to this site is totally unsuitable, Loperwood Lane is little more than the traditional country lane it has always been, and due to the West Totton bypass it is also a dead end. The lane could in no way cope with traffic from 75 dwellings for TOT2, let alone the extra 20 dwellings from TOT3. The entrance to the site could only be site directly opposite the Grade 2 Listed Building, as detailed above, which again would totally detract from its Listed Status. Any proposal for access/egress of these sites on to the other side of Loperwood would also be totally unacceptable, this is a road which has unfortunately accounted for the death of at least one road user and

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						<p>numerous accidents, this is since the West Totton bypass was constructed causing additional traffic usage of the local roads.</p> <p>Your provision of cycleway connections to the route running on the Western boundary will be totally ineffective. This existing route is merely a gravel path, actually designated a 'bridleway' that runs for a few hundred metres between two roads, these roads have no designation/road marking as cycle ways and so any new connections will have no use in the cycle network what so ever.</p> <p>Your proposal states that you will be providing suitable screening around the new site, to give a high quality development. This however will not deal with the noise that will inevitable emanate from the site and will only act as a further funnel for the noise that comes from the West Totton bypass and the motorway.</p> <p>Your proposal states that you will retain the 'central pond and woodland'. As soon as you put housing around this area you will have removed the total status of this natural wildlife habitat and removed it from the ecology chain it currently enjoys.</p>
584a	Mariner L and Walsh M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The area that is in question provides a natural soakaway for rainfall. Our back garden backs onto the proposed site and we get flooding after a day's rainfall. There is a problem with speeding traffic, the increase in traffic from the development is likely to make the problem worse.</p> <p>There is no local doctor or dentist and a very inadequate bus service in this area. This are will not meet local needs. There has to be more suitable areas to infill in Totton that would be more desirable.</p>
625a	Waugh S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The idea that the New Forest may be in line to have a unique facility for the visually impaired and their families or carers is fantastic. There is an increasing number of visually impaired people in our area and a facility such as this would bring a new dimension for many people's lives. I would definitely use and encourage others to use this facility and you have my wholehearted support.</p>
655a	McDermid J	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Support for Open Sight Centre.</p>
667a	Pink E	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Support for provision of the Open Sight centre.</p>
668b	Russell B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Support for provision of the Open Sight centre.</p>
669a	Waldron F	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development will worsen the situation at an already dangerous crossroads. There will be additional traffic congestion on Calmore Road. Poor existing land drainage will be worsened by intensive building development.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
There are too many houses being planned for these sites.						
697	Russell B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Access from the proposed development via Loperwood Lane, a sub standard semi-rural lane, is untenable given the extreme narrowness of street which currently struggles to cope with any two way traffic exacerbated by street parking. An additional 200 plus vehicles funnelling into and out of this Lane will result in gridlock, road rage and accidents. Vision of Loperwood Lane is particularly restrictive given the blind spots that prevail in this area.</p> <p>Public transport infrastructure is already substandard and will be further disadvantaged by this development.</p> <p>Drainage - Loperwood Lane has had long term and significant drainage problems. The slightest rainfall results in front gardens flooding. The Lane requires substantial structural and remedial rectifications.</p> <p>Parking - The substantial increase in traffic that will accompany any substantial development will render this Lane untenable and impassable. Residents who need to park in the Lane will either be unable to do so in the future and will be apprehensive given a fear of damage and accident.</p> <p>Quality of Life - The deficits of this proposed development will not sustain or improve the quality of the current residents' lives. Indeed it is very probable that the health and contentment of the current residents, many of whom are elderly, will be significantly and adversely affected.</p> <p>Economic Value and Compensation - The above deficits will substantially reduce the value of properties in Loperwood Lane. There will need to be substantial compensation paid to the residents to compensate their economic losses. Additional compensation will be required for the loss of amenity, privacy, safety and enjoyment and the probable health and contentment losses suffered by residents.</p> <p>Infrastructure is presently substantially deficient in this area. An accompanying increase of schooling, shops, social, community, medical, recreational, pathways, street lighting etc infrastructure must occur to meet the additional needs of an additional 500 plus residents.</p> <p>Social Housing, if managed appropriately is a necessary resource, for those who are unable to purchase accommodation. However social housing does possess a high potential for increased social dysfunction and crime rates. This well known feature will cause residents in Loperwood Lane to perceive additional fears and concerns regarding the quality of their amenity, enjoyment, privacy and safety as well as integration and harmony of the local community.</p> <p>Screening Pre/Post Development - Screening has been proposed to shield the development from the residents in Loperwood Lane. The provision of screening whilst necessary is also an acknowledgement of the negative impact of the development on Loperwood Lane.</p> <p>Development Traffic - There appears to be no provision made to screen and protect residents from the truck and trades traffic that will accompany the development including the noise and safety concerns.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
703a	Simm S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Support for development of site, especially Open Sight centre.
709a	Gidley B	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Support for the Open Sight Centre.
710a	Harper D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This is the last piece of green space before the National Park. Concerns regarding traffic, inadequate public transport service and lack of local services. It will also be difficult to create a safe access to the site. The site should be used to extend the playground and park.
717a	Hookings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Concerned about the loss of green spaces and biodiversity. This would turn a semi-rural area into an urban area. It would spoil the view from our window. Concerned about additional traffic on Loperwood Lane.
722a	Guyll D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Our family has lived at Loperwood for decades and feel that building houses at Loperwood would be detrimental to both the local environment and wildlife. The land at Loperwood and all surrounding fields, hedges and trees are teeming with wildlife. Over the years many species of birds have come to the area to nest and have made this area their home. In our garden we regularly see many birds which come to our bird tables or nest in the local trees / hedgerows. If their habitat is built on where do they go? The fields in and around Loperwood are also home to many animals. The plan mentions vehicle access via Loperwood to the land at Loperwood Farm. This would be extremely dangerous due to the current road being very busy at peak times of the day and the lack of visibility when cars come over the bridge or come up from the junction. By increasing the traffic with another road and more turnings is just going to make things much more dangerous. Although we feel that something needs to be done with Loperwood Farmhouse if it is not viable to repair the current house, building 20 houses on it would overcrowd and spoil the area. Building on this area will spoil the enjoyment of all those local people who use this beautiful area everyday for recreation. Future generations will lose this wonderful part of nature that is right on their doorstep.
741a	Stone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		These are practically the last greenfield sites in Calmore which has been substantially over developed in the recent past. Concerned about traffic resulting from the development on Calmore Road, Paulettes and Lane and Loperwood. Any access from the sites directly onto Loperwood would impact adversely on the cross roads at the junction between Calmore Road, Paulettes Lane and Loperwood. These sites were the subject of a previous planning enquiry which resulted in refusal to allow housing development. The Planning Inspector highlighted poor access and traffic impact as major factors.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
743c	Kellingley P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Section 3.14 states "... Core Strategy CS12 allows for sites for a further 50 dwellings to be identified specifically to address local housing needs..."</p> <p>It does not say that there is such a need. Nor does it provide any evidence that one exists. If there is no evidence of such a need then it is a misuse of council assets to attempt to provide it.</p> <p>Section 3.16 suggests that CS11 (100 dwellings with 50% affordable requirement) and CS12 (50 dwellings with a 70% affordable requirement) should be merged.</p> <p>Unfortunately, CS11 doesn't state anything about 50% affordable housing requirement and CS12 indicates that all 50 dwellings should 'meet a local need' It doesn't address affordability at all. Therefore, any such merger of numbers is simply imagination.</p> <p>However, even if the numbers were correct (which they demonstrably aren't) the mathematics are wrong. Somehow, 3.16 has decided that 50% of 100 plus 70% of 50 equals 60% of 150. In reality 50% of 100 is 50, 70% of 50 is 35 and 60% of 150 is 90. If 50+35=90 then perhaps the other arithmetic in this document should be overhauled.</p> <p>The assumption must be that the document's authors are trying to inject claims that are neither true nor supportable.</p> <p>Section 3.20 assumes that TOT2 and TOT3 should be developed together. It is noted that none of the problems identified in BP40 have been reiterated in this proposal.</p> <p>Examining the proposal in the order presented:</p> <p>The proposal calls for a community centre for the blind and a children's nursery. There is no justification for either and such provision would increase traffic flow considerably through a residential area. If a centre for the blind were to be provided then placing it on the outskirts of Totton in an area of poor public transport seems to be justified only by the fact that the land is partially owned by a charity for the blind.</p> <p>Realistically, it goes against common sense and many of the declared council policies e.g. CS3 Protecting and enhancing our special environment (it is believed that evidence is available of protected species living in the development area).</p> <p>The area already has children's nursery provision, for example at Calmore Community Centre.</p> <p>Section 3.20 says development on this site would be subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vehicle access from Loperwood Lane. Any such access would be dangerous without major road restructuring at the entrance to the development and/or the junction of Loperwood with Calmore Road - Provision of footpath/cycleway connections... Unfortunately, the connections would be to cycleways that don't exist - ...additional formal public space ... to link in with King George Recreation Ground....recreational facilities for young people on site or on King George RG.. All of which takes no account of the indisputable fact that the King

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						<p>George Recreation Ground is frequently underwater as the current drainage for both the recreation ground and the northern edge of Calmore Road (on to which water escapes from these sites) is overloaded and inadequate for purpose. Nor does it take into account that Totton and Eling has by far the largest number of existing recreational sites of any NFDC area.</p> <p>- ...minimum of 10 full size allotment plots .. for local needs and wider community... There is no justification for this requirement at all. The nearby housing is virtually all houses with private gardens. Totton already has 304 allotments.</p> <p>- Vehicle access from Loperwood . Any such access would be very dangerous without major road restructuring at the entrance to the development</p>
748a	Maiden S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Support for provision of Open Sight centre.
759a	Gifford R and A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The drainage could not cope making this a flood area. The doctor, dentist and school would be overflowing. Totton is rapidly becoming a concrete jungle, please leave some green land to see.
501a	Garrett	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I wish to voice my objection to the proposed developments of TOT2 & TOT3. I object for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) The roads around both of these developments are simply not suitable for any additional traffic. The cross roads at the junction of Calmore Road & Pauletts Lane is very dangerous with an almost blind bend approx 20 mtrs from the cross roads. This junction has already seen a significant increase in traffic, since the redevelopment of the old Tatchbury Mount Hospital site. A number of serious accidents and lots of minor accidents have already happened at this junction, this will only increase if the proposed development goes ahead. Only this time, instead of it being only vehicles colliding at this junction, it is likely to be children on bicycles or children just trying to cross the roads, colliding with vehicles because their homes have been built right on this accident black spot.</p> <p>2) The whole area around these proposed development is water logged for the whole of the Autumn through to Spring months, this includes the gardens of the properties in Calmore Crescent, Loperwood Lane, Calmore Road, and beyond. The King George's playing field is always under water when it rains, particularly the lower part by the car park and cricket pavilion. Building on the land above the playing field will only encourage more water to flow down towards Calmore Road and risk flooding the houses that are built below the height of Calmore road. Of course the proposed development will have drainage, but this drainage will have to link into existing drainage systems, systems that struggle to cope now and are below the proposed site. The fact that the plans detail 'the central pond and woodland should be retained' should in itself be a warning of just how water logged this land really is.</p> <p>3) The plans state building a centre for the blind, I would support any centre that looks after or</p>

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane

helps any disabled person, however building a centre so far away from Totton town centre seems a crazy idea, the links to this part of the town are not the best, who would want to come this far out of the way to a centre when we already have enough halls or community centres closer to transport links and are under used now. The plans also state a children's nursery to be built on this site, my previous comments apply to this as well.

4) As the northern side of these proposed sites is mainly, well below the height of the existing road, which goes to the bridge over the A326, vehicle access will be impossible or very dangerous. Therefore the 95 proposed dwellings (assuming an average 2 car family per household) will add 190 extra cars using the part of Loperwood lane that at present probably has no more than 20 cars using it. Plus any visitors, post & parcel vans coming and going all day. Calmore Crescent runs off of this part of Loperwood Lane, Calmore Crescent is a narrow road with minimal street lights, cars park in the road due to the houses being built many years ago and without driveways, making it single carriageway for a good length of the Crescent. Children play in the quiet roads and building on TOT2 & TOT3 would make Calmore Crescent a route used to access the new properties, this road is totally unsuitable for any extra traffic.

5) On the eastern side of the development, behind King George's Playing Fields is Calmore Road, on the corner of the Calmore Road, Pauletts Lane cross roads is the Church with its entrance approx 6 mtrs from the cross roads. The Church has no off street parking and every Sunday or whenever a funeral takes place the road outside for approx 300 mtrs becomes a single carriageway, with no passing places. This is another reason why I feel that both the proposed developments should not be allowed to go ahead.

6) Pauletts Lane would be the natural route taken by any vehicle leaving the M27 to access the proposed properties. As the road name suggests, Pauletts Lane is nothing but a lane with Calmore Village Hall half way down it. The lane is narrow, it has no street lighting and no footpaths. This lane would become a greater rat run, leading to the very dangerous cross roads, mentioned already.

7) If 95 houses are built, each house could house an average 2 children, where are these extra 190 children going to go to School? Where are these possible 380 people (allowing for 4 people per household) going to go to the Dentist & Doctors etc. It is already hard enough to get a Doctor's appointment let alone a Dentist's.

8) There are still areas of land inside newer developments that have not been fully utilised yet. For example the plot of land between Crabbs Way and Morrisons Supermarket,

9) I am also concerned by the thought that the properties or a larger proportion of the properties would be for so called 'affordable housing' I live in the quite Calmore Crescent which is opposite Jessica Crescent, another 'affordable housing area'. It has become a standing joke, sadly, guessing how many police cars will be outside

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						<p>certain properties on any given day. To increase the number of this type of property, in such close vicinity, sadly would cause an extra strain on our already over stretched police force. Calmore Crescent would be an island, surrounded by affordable housing, this would have a disastrous effect on the value of the properties including others bordering the proposed development.</p> <p>This proposal should not be given the go ahead, but instead be given protected green field status due to the environmental damage (flooding) that would be caused to the surrounding area as a result of building on it.</p>
820a	Metcalfe M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This is our last natural field. We are saddened and angered by what our community has become with successive high density developments in west Totton. This will lead to increased traffic problems and anti-social behaviour.
829a	Newbury E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		75 new houses in an all ready crowded area, no extra provision of amenities, the schools are already over subscribed, no more school places or doctors surgeries to cope with the extra people.
830a	Essex D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Object because there will be no extra services for all these people; the visibility at junction at Calmore Road/Loperwood is hazardously dangerous at the best of times; flooding - the drainage ditches are constantly full, the drains are not up to the job; wildlife will be lost - deer, rare finches & birds.
840a	Baker F and V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Support for development of Open Sight Centre.
847a	Open Sight	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Open Sight believe that this opportunity will provide not only a state of the art facility but will also achieve many of the requirements stated in the consultation document for the benefit of Totton and the New Forest residents and visitors.</p> <p>1) Vision Centre This would be the hub for all the activities and the much needed services provided by Open Sight. There are an increasing number of people living in the New Forest area with some degree of visual impairment.</p> <p>2) Sensory Garden As an extended part of the Open Sight Vision Centre, a 'Sensory Garden' would prove invaluable to people who cannot get out much because of their impairment, or who lack the confidence to go out in their own garden for fear of slips trips etc.</p> <p>3) Charitable partnerships We do believe that although the space will be limited, the centre will provide an opportunity for some of our partner organisations in the field of visual impairment, or indeed other charitable organisations to utilise space to give advice.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						<p>4) Library services We work very closely with Hampshire County Council Library Services where there are currently VI units but the council is currently reviewing the services they offer and we do not know what the future holds. It would be practicable to hold this in mind as we are very aware of how important this service is.</p> <p>5) Day Nursery with specific disabled facilities In partnership with local organisations, we would appoint a well respected Day Nursery provider to partner with us on this.</p> <p>6) Schools/Colleges/General Public We will be looking to have small group visits to our centre in an attempt to enhance the good quality teaching that schools offer.</p> <p>7) Allotments As part of the non developed area, we will be providing full sized allotment space for local residents. There are of course other on site facilities that could be considered, however we do believe that these are the strongest required needs and this is something we are keen to provide. Open Sight rely upon charitable giving and legacies. Therefore the importance of the housing part of the development is essential. Whilst the Open Sight Vision Centre would be self financing through its various facilities, the build would be reliant upon the agreement of housing on site. In conclusion, we would welcome a positive outcome of this site to move to the next stage. We are aware of the other sites being considered, but we do believe that with the mix of development, the site on Loperwood Lane is the best move forward. It will have the amenities to accompany a development. It will have the capacity to deliver yet still leave open space. It has the full support of organisations, general public, service users and carers. Willing to work closely with authorities and local community, Open Sight will provide an exciting new facility for the New Forest area and wider afield. We look forward to your support.</p>
870a	Jones R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The 1991 document 'Hazel Farm West Totton Development Brief No. 4' stated that this site would not be developed. It was allocated for open space and allotments. The remainder of the site was to continue in agriculture or other appropriate countryside uses. Also development could increase the risk of flooding, noise and light pollution. The roads would be unable to cope with additional traffic. Access points are narrow and dangerous. Parking is likely to be inadequate and so will 'spill over' into surrounding areas. There is also concern about road safety. This is a historic region and further house building, especially if 60% affordable, could mean a loss of its distinctive character. Nearby is 17th century Calmore Cottage which is a listed building. There could be a loss of community spirit and an increase in anti-social behaviour.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
						Infrastructure and services would not be able to cope with the increased demand. The development also may not meet expected standards relating to proximity of dwellings, individual identity and privacy.
936b	Clapp N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Percentage of social housing would create a pocket of deprivation due to the deprivation in the area already (Calmore is the poorest area of housing in Totton). The percentages of social housing proposed would create an area of social exclusion in Calmore. I also have great concerns about the drainage as the site is on a hill which would mean properties on Calmore Road would be flooded due to land drainage not being adequate. The recreation ground is often flooded, therefore the additional infrastructure would make the situation worse! There are also no local amenities close by way of shops and doctors surgeries to support this development. Paulettes lane would also be under further pressure as it is not large enough to take the amount of cars already using it.
937a	Le Clos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Don't develop what little open green space we have. Old Calmore needs to be protected and remain untouched instead of being surrounded by badly planned estates that will create traffic problems and social imbalance.
943b	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	
956a	Green K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	As a resident of Loperwood Lane I strongly object to having a housing estate built on my doorstep it is stated that our road would be used for main access the road is too small for large vehicles to have access and also worry how 2 years of building work will effect our home environment as a mum of 2 young children. I am also concerned how this will affect my house price as we are classed as a semi rural location I wish for it to stay this way.
972b	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	
974a	Cain M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The entrance to Loperwood Lane is virtually opposite my property. Having lived here for approximately 25 years, I have witnessed an every increasing volume of traffic outside my home on what is a dangerous bend. Quite frankly this plan is only going to exacerbate the situation and change the Old Calmore village into a rat run for traffic. Since the last development and it's inclusive social housing, we have experienced unruly youths disposing beer cans and have also had dog mess disposed of into our garden. so clearly we are not in favour of this development which could devalue our property and effect our quality of life.
992b	Luken Beck Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT2, Land at Loperwood, north of Loperwood Lane						
	Representing Mr Brian Cooper					
1031b	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	If the proposed site is covered in houses, increased flooding in Calmore Road is likely to occur due to the land contour. There are numerous underground springs running from the fields. In addition, vehicle access to the proposed site will increase the traffic flow onto Calmore Road, at a junction which is likely to result in an increase in accidents. Also, there are insufficient facilities such as doctor, dentist, and school places to accommodate this number of properties and approximately 400 persons.
1044b	Best J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Enough building at Calmore, enough large estates with all their problems, schools too small to cope with more children. A waterlogged area, terrible traffic area with constant accidents. Paulettes Lane has enough people cutting through without more houses.

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm

724g	Howard Sharp and Partners Representing Cancer Research UK/OpenSight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	
826g	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 Loperwood Farm. 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 TOT3 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 TOT3:</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						- Provision of off-site sewerage infrastructure by the development to facilitate connection to the system at the nearest point of adequate capacity.
1060d	Cllr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		One of the few remaining areas of farmland within the Parish, it is also deserving of retention. More especially in view of recent statutory public open space requirements having substantially increased (i.e. from 2.8Ha to 3.4Ha's, per 1000 populace).
306a	Reid Cllr M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I object to any planning permission being granted for this land because of the flooding issues which are already apparent and also Totton's infrastructure is not sufficient to handle any further intensification, e.g. fire service, police, schools etc.
622c	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The environmental value of TOT2 and TOT3 would override any kind of sustainable development. Also, there is the potential for increased traffic congestion and the proposal for a community centre for the blind and children's nursery has been too weakly suggested as a compromise.
849a	White Young Green Representing Persimmon Homes (South Coast) Ltd.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The principle of development of this site was most recently considered as part of the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration. The site was promoted as a formal housing allocation and considered at a formal appearance at the Local Plan Inquiry. Matters such as sustainability, accessibility and landscape impact were all addressed in detail and the Inspector was clear in recognising that the site was suitable for residential development without adverse effects. This is borne out in the more recent Sustainability Appraisal document (SDM DPD background document 40) which does not identify any negative impacts associated with the potential development of Loperwood Farm (unlike the other proposed sites). The Sustainability Appraisal does raise a query regarding drainage but WYG are not aware of any drainage problems associated with the development of the site.</p> <p>In summary, the development of this site would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not result in negative impact to important issues such as the National Park, the wider open countryside, highways, SINCS or other ecologically sensitive areas; Not result in a built up area boundary that is any less defensible than that which exists at present (see 2004 Local Plan Inspector's Report). <p>On the contrary, the development of the site would;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> represent a logical allocation, rounding of the settlement policy boundary in this location; provide an opportunity to improve the adjacent King George's recreation ground and associated children's play area; improve surveillance and therefore security of this public open space; accord with the other aspirations of the SDM DPD.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						<p>It would be more appropriate to improve the quality of the under-utilised formal public open space facility at King Georges Recreation Ground as part of any development allocation at Loperwood Farm than to provide a small area of informal public open space on site. This not only means that the existing public open space can be enhanced, increasing usage, but the site can also provide in the region of 26 residential units increasing the affordable provision from 12 to 16 whereas market housing would only increase from 8 to 10. This is illustrated in the attached promotional brochure but clearly this only represents one option for developing the site. Access to the site via Loperwood is the safest and most unobtrusive means of providing vehicular access into the site and enables appropriate frontage development to Calmore Road, without driveways, which means that there will be no interruption to the free flow of traffic, a bus route and pedestrian movement whilst also minimising disturbance to existing residents and the church whilst also creating a more attractive street scene. In conclusion, it is considered that, whichever permutation of site selection is adopted to achieve the 150 unit requirement at Totton, Loperwood Farm should be confirmed as an allocation. Revised policy wording suggested and additional supporting material provided.</p>
248a	Wilkinson K and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The development would be detrimental to the local area with extra traffic, shortness of school places, doctors, dentists, etc. Calmore Road and the junction with Loperwood Lanes is already dangerous. Access to the site from Loperwood Lane would be dangerous for children crossing to the local school. Flooding is also a concern. The gardens of properties in Calmore Crescent have flooded since the building of Amy Gardens opposite.</p>
257b	Thome M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I object to the proposed development of houses at Loperwood on the basis of the drainage reasons and traffic problems it would cause.</p>
263b	Davie J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Concerned about increased traffic and insufficient access to the site as well as possible flooding implications. Increased demand on facilities already stretched, i.e. schools. Concerns over access to an already difficult junction. Concerned at overdevelopment and loss of open space. Do residents actually want to live next to a busy, noisy dual carriageway? Is this required in the current economic climate?</p>
270b	Brooker R and A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Loperwood Lane is inappropriate for access to the development. The junction with Calmore Road is insufficient. Calmore Crescent would be used as a rat run, whilst it is currently a quiet street.</p>
277c	Russell B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Loperwood Lane is too narrow and totally unsuitable for access to a large number of houses. The huge lorries used for what could be a two year building time with their constant noise and dust also the parking problems from the builders would be an absolute nightmare for local residents!</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						<p>The cross roads at Loperwood Farm are a hazard and there have been fatal accidents there. I understand that some trees in the field are protected and that owls and bats in the copse area are protected species.</p> <p>Calmore has had more than its fair share of housing being crammed on to the surrounding green fields in recent years and the proposed sites at Loperwood should be allowed to remain green. I understand that the land was left to two charities because it was not designated for building.</p>
288b	Phillips B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Not quite so unhappy about this area but still disagree.
296b	Bran L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) you would be breaking the law if you affect, damage or destroy the bats and owls (that live here) or their roosts. This field is a soakaway. The gardens of local residents flood in heavy rain now. This would be much worse if this field was built on. Certain trees have preservation orders on them .</p> <p>The TOT2 field was left to a charity to be used for allotments or horses. You would be breaking the terms of this will.</p> <p>The crossroads by Calmore Church is dangerous and has seen deaths - we do not need further vehicles and more deaths. Calmore Rec is badly flooded in winter. It would be completely underwater if building took place next to it. Calmore is overdeveloped now. Leave out last green field to the horses.</p>
298b	Bonning K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This objection again relates to the hazards that such an increase in traffic flow would bring along an already hazardous stretch of road. The amount of accidents and near misses that currently take place at the crossroads by St Anne's Church, Calmore Road is already at an unacceptable level and that is with a speed restriction of 30 mph. The increased traffic flow up to Tatchbury Mount has already had an impact and where as along Calmore Road there were 'busy periods' you can now guarantee a busy flow of traffic all day. Making it harder and more dangerous to cross with young children as no traffic calming or designated crossings have been provided.</p> <p>I have my concerns regarding the further intensification on Totton's infrastructure and the increased impact this would have on the flooding issues as mentioned above.</p>
317b	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<p>I object to this site for the following reasons. It is very rural and has small roads leading away in all directions, dangerous road junctions, where a lot of accidents have happened due to the shape of the road and speed of traffic. The ground must be liable to flooding, or exsisting properties will be flooded as whole area is very wet in winter months, inc Calmore Crescent, Calmore Road, Loperwood Lane & King Georges Playing Fields. There is already a lot of 'afordable housing' in the area which already brings far to much anti social behaviour, from both parents and children. street lighting is poor, and being right on the edge of the town it's nice not to have the light</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						<p>pollution. Paulets lane will become a greater rat run than it already is. all routes from this site are small and already over used. An increased volume of traffic (allowing for the average 2 car per household puts an extra 50 cars on this small site alone, thus causing greater dangers for children playing on King Georges playing Field, or just on there way to School. Calmore Road by the Church at the cross roads with Paulets Lane (approx 20ft from edge of proposed site) is a nightmare to pass on a sunday morning or when a funeral is taking place now, due to cars parked by the road side, with the people going church, without this extra volume of traffic. I do not think the local shop (tesco express at Calmore) will cope as you often have to queue for a while and parking is very limited. Can the local schools cope ? I think not. Calmore crescent a quiet road will become a short cut, it is already a single track road as a lot of the houses do not have drive ways and park in the quiet street. I feel this site has everything going against it. Make it an open space for all to enjoy, an extension to King Georges playing fields.</p>
319d	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The land north of Loperwood Lane has been defended against development in the past and again I would object to any housing being constructed on this pleasant open field and adjoining farm which act as a buffer between A326 and the existing properties off Calmore Road. This site should only be considered as a last resort when all 'brownfield' sites have been exhausted.</p>
321b	Galvin M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Not only have I had a whole estate built in front of my house, I do not want extra traffic as well as extra noise and pollution. Calmore Crescent is a busy road now. Too much green space has already been built on. I have lived in Calmore for 50 years and seen all the green fields built on around me.</p>
329b	Poulton J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>What evidence is there that this development and facilities are needed? Fatalities already occurred at Loperwood, an access there will precipitate more on an already dangerous road. Water drainage in Calmore Road is already unable to sustain high rainfall, 95 houses will turn the area into a floodplain for Calmore Road residents.</p>
344b	Elcombe H and P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>As dwellers who have lived here, at this address since 1970, we wish to voice our main concerns: a) vehicular access as indicated on the plan b) vast increase of traffic during construction period c) the increase of families and their practical needs d) the water table</p> <p>a) With regards to TOT3, THE Calmore Road/Pauletts Lane crossroads are surprisingly busy and efforts to slow</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
<p>traffic have been unsuccessful. Restricted visibility has resulted in frequent nasty accidents , two of which were fatal.</p> <p>The Calmore Road already carries more traffic than is comfortable for a curving road, in what was originally the village. We have the new development opposite the Calmore Road and Crescent already adding considerably to that from the other estates around us.</p> <p>b) If we consider the volume of heavy, large, noisy construction vehicles to the above comments, this will become a poorly served place.</p> <p>c) although fairly near amenities such as schools, shops, railway, health and leisure centres, to reach anywhere one needs transport, public or private. Obviously given our address, we know this 100 yards or so of Loperwood Lane. The junction with Calmore Road has also limited visibility needs care Adding traffic such as above - once again almost dangerous, certainly Inadvisable.</p> <p>d) All these gardens flood in heavy rain.</p> <p>e) We all, not just in Calmore, need green spaces.</p>						
348b	Robinson K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>As a resident of Calmore for over 50 years I strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>(a) New dwellings will only bring more traffic into this area which to date is grossly over used by traffic from all directions. One only has to stand at the Calmore Cross Roads for a short while to witness the potential danger from the flow of traffic coming from all directions.</p> <p>(b) Your proposals to provide extra recreation facilities for younger children may lead some people to think this could be an extra bonus - I hope they won't be fooled. Forty years ago when we had many youngsters here in Calmore we continually approached the council to supply more play items for King George's Recreation Ground. To this day we are still waiting for any new items to appear.</p> <p>I have given these proposals a great deal of thought and I cannot see this being an advantage to anybody here in Calmore. Slowly our villages are being overtaken by plans such as these so I shall do all I can to oppose this development.</p>
368b	Underhill B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The roads in this area are not suitable for extra traffic which would be generated by building on these sites, There have been numerous accidents at the crossroads of Calmore Road/Loperwood and Pauletts Lane, and also on the bends in Calmore Road. Traffic has increased greatly since Tatchbury Mount site has accommodated offices. I do not feel that we could cope with anymore without adding to accident statistics in the area, King George's Recreation Ground is constantly flooded and I cannot see why you should be considering taking this area and the field behind to develop, as this is the only natural soakaway for rainfall in this area, There is already drainage on the recreation ground but in spite of this the field and the car park get flooded leading to water runoff onto Calmore Road and across the road into the drive of my home. When rainfall has been particularly</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						<p>heavy my home, the bungalow next door and the house opposite have been protected by sandbags to divert the water. I am sure other residents on Calmore Road will tell you that they too have this problem, You will be aware that the slope of the land is downhill towards the properties on Calmore Road. This recreation ground is in constant use by local groups for children to play football and cricket and also by adult clubs. The play area is greatly used. I cannot see that it would benefit to encroach on this field by adding additional recreation facilities. Why would you be considering a community centre for the blind in such a remote area? There are poor transport links and I would have thought that anyone who is partially sighted would need such a facility more to the centre of the town. This would also apply to a children's nursery - it would neither be close to a school or to employment. It could only add to vehicular movements.</p> <p>There are very limited spaces to register with both doctors and dentists in Totton, the amount of people who would be living in the proposed homes would find it difficult to register with either in the local area. Whilst I appreciate that there is a need for homes, I feel sure that there are sites which would be far more suitable than TOT2 and TOT3.</p>
401b	Cobern R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Possibly this corner of land (which at present is an eyesore) could be used for twenty houses which would not add too greatly to the local burden of services, infrastructure and amenities.
402b	Cobern M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Worried about the increased volume of traffic on local roads.</p> <p>Strains on all local services: drains, sewers, doctors, schools etc.</p> <p>We value the green areas left to us, otherwise we have gone from a rural situation 25 years ago, to one of feeling more in a small town. The 265 houses which now closely face us, are surely enough development in this area.</p>
425b	Goss L and Cutler A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Loperwood Lane is a quiet country road. You are trying to make it a main route into an estate. There are lots of other 'places' already developed in which you can build on, i.e. - stocklands, the old unigate site. We have already had so much 'trouble' due to the new estate opposite. We have had our fair share. This is a terrible site for housing due to roads, drainage, schooling, healthcare - the list goes on.
441b	Le Clos A and J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Calmore Road is already a busy Road. Drivers do not adhere to the speed limits. It is difficult to get out of our driveway and 75 dwellings would create a lot more traffic. Local services could not service the extra residents. This area is near the New Forest and retains a rural feel. It would be very sad to see the loss of any trees surrounding King George Recreation Ground.
445c	Lawrence S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		NFDC already has a minimum 5-year supply of housing land. The fields currently flood which could be made

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						worse by building. Flooding in Calmore Village could be made worse. The access onto Loperwood Lane will be dangerous. Calmore Crescent is a bottleneck due to parking. The cross-roads is dangerous with accidents every other week some of them fatal. Current schools are full.
447b	Ray J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The area surrounding the proposed sites are in a semi-rural location and the surrounding lanes already take more traffic than they should. Loperwood Lane and Pauletts Lane do not have pavements (not child friendly) and the lanes are not really suitable for the heavy traffic they have to take now (rat runs for Tatchbury and new developments in Calmore). The crossroads at Pauletts Lane, Calmore Road and Loperwood has always been a danger spot. Any future housing in the area will put an added burden on the lanes and as the area is prone to flooding, I do not feel this is an appropriate site for building a lot of houses.
495b	Ancell D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insufficient road access for the number of properties proposed and current housing 2. Poor drainage already 3. Overpopulated with previous development in Calmore Road 4. Congestion 5. Inadequate facilities to support additional residents i.e. public transport, schools 6. Access via Loperwood would be very dangerous 7. Access via Loperwood Lane would be too restrictive and cause severe problems to residents 8. Social problems already exist from previous development in Calmore Road
516b	Humphrey L	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>We are concerned that the junction will be dangerous with 1200 extra car movements a day. There is no infrastructure to accommodate this development locally. We need to keep this as agricultural land as there are very few green spaces.</p> <p>About 15 years ago planning was refused for the ten acre field in Loperwood. Nothing has changed and these proposals should not be accepted this time either.</p> <p>Too many houses in Totton already.</p>
524b	Sutton Y	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Enough houses. 2) Boundaries inadequate. 3) Loperwood Road - Fast traffic and crossroads, blind spot now. 4) Noise/light pollution. <p>We have enough housing already. Unable to meet local needs now, parking, schools, doctors, dentists, all have waiting lists now.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						Strongly object to anymore building. Over the last 10 years with the new road and estate we have had enough upheaval.
566c	Henvest D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development of this site would encroach on the rural environment, and would more than likely lead to development of TOT2 which is unacceptable.</p> <p>1) More dwellings would create more noise and pollution and traffic congestion in the neighbouring area.</p> <p>2) There appears to be no provision for a local shop within the development, so residents will then travel to the nearest Tesco's or Morrisons, again adding to both noise traffic and pollution.</p> <p>3) Access to the new development along Cooks Lane would be narrow and would cause congestion with heavy site traffic. Likewise a new access road between Calmore Road crossroads and the bridge may be dangerous as visibility is already an issue for on coming vehicles.</p> <p>4) Owls and existing wildlife would be disturbed</p> <p>5) Drainage;- Local water table would be altered and would affect nearby levels which are already at times inadequate. For example, King George's Recreation ground always floods after a good downpour, and stays wet for days. Also many gardens take time to drain.</p> <p>6) There are a number of large trees around the proposed site and it would be detrimental to see any of these cut down. They should all, in my opinion, have preservation orders.</p> <p>10) This site was said to be "outside the built up area and consequently should only be considered if no sites are available inside the built up area". Can you confirm this is the case?</p>
573d	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>In general terms I support the housing policies for Totton comprising Policy TOT1, 2, 3 & 4.</p> <p>Whilst the total number of plots exceeds the 150 wellings required, I recommend that all of them be allocated for development but that they be released, as practicable, in phases to meet this target. In practice there are often reasons why sites cannot come on stream that are not planning reasons and are factors over which you have no control.</p>
578c	Wallace K	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>These proposed developments would adversely increase the traffic on what are still country roads, the local infrastructure simply could not cope with any increased traffic volume, let alone that caused by huge construction traffic.</p> <p>Loperwood Lane, is precisely that, a Lane, it is not suitable for construction traffic, either for this proposed development or any other development.</p> <p>The proposed entrance to this site is totally unsuitable, Loperwood Lane is little more than the traditional country lane it has always been, and due to the West Totton bypass it is also a dead end. The lane could in no way cope with traffic from 75 dwellings for TOT2, let alone the extra 20 dwellings from TOT3. The entrance to</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						the site could only be site directly opposite the Grade 2 Listed Building, as detailed above, which again would totally detract from its Listed Status. Any proposal for access/egress of these sites on to the other side of Loperwood would also be totally unacceptable, this is a road which has unfortunately accounted for the death of at least one road user and numerous accidents, this is since the West Totton bypass was constructed causing additional traffic usage of the local roads.
584b	Mariner L and Walsh M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The area that is in question provides a natural soakaway for rainfall. Our back garden backs onto the proposed site and we get flooding after a day's rainfall. There is a problem with speeding traffic, the increase in traffic from the development is likely to make the problem worse. There is no local doctor or dentist and a very inadequate bus service in this area. This are will not meet local needs. There has to be more suitable areas to infill in Totton that would be more desirable.
612a	Goswell T	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development proposed will increase the risk at the dangerous crossroads close to the site. There are poor school facilities locally. There is too much traffic heading for the A326 and the motorway.
669b	Waldron F	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development will worsen the situation at an already dangerous crossroads. There will be additional traffic congestion on Calmore Road. Poor existing land drainage will be worsened by intensive building development. There are too many houses being planned for these sites.
710b	Harper D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This is the last piece of green space before the National Park. Concerns regarding traffic, inadequate public transport service and lack of local services. It will also be difficult to create a safe access to the site. The site should be used to extend the playground and park.
717b	Hookings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Concerned about the loss of green spaces and biodiversity. This would turn a semi-rural area into an urban area. It would spoil the view from our window. Concerned about additional traffic on Loperwood Lane.
722b	Guyll D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Our family has lived at Loperwood for decades and feel that building houses at Loperwood would be detrimental to both the local environment and wildlife. The land at Loperwood and all surrounding fields, hedges and trees are teeming with wildlife. Over the years many species of birds have come to the area to nest and have made this area their home. In our garden we regularly see many birds which come to our bird tables or nest in the local trees / hedgerows. If their habitat is built on where do they go? The fields in and around Loperwood are also home to many animals. The plan mentions vehicle access via Loperwood to the land at Loperwood Farm. This would be extremely

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						<p>dangerous due to the current road being very busy at peak times of the day and the lack of visibility when cars come over the bridge or come up from the junction. By increasing the traffic with another road and more turnings is just going to make things much more dangerous.</p> <p>Although we feel that something needs to be done with Loperwood Farmhouse if it is not viable to repair the current house, building 20 houses on it would overcrowd and spoil the area.</p> <p>Building on this area will spoil the enjoyment of all those local people who use this beautiful area everyday for recreation. Future generations will lose this wonderful part of nature that is right on their doorstep.</p>
743d	Kellingley P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Section 3.14 states "... Core Strategy CS12 allows for sites for a further 50 dwellings to be identified specifically to address local housing needs..."</p> <p>It does not say that there is such a need. Nor does it provide any evidence that one exists. If there is no evidence of such a need then it is a misuse of council assets to attempt to provide it.</p> <p>Section 3.16 suggests that CS11 (100 dwellings with 50% affordable requirement) and CS12 (50 dwellings with a 70% affordable requirement) should be merged.</p> <p>Unfortunately, CS11 doesn't state anything about 50% affordable housing requirement and CS12 indicates that all 50 dwellings should 'meet a local need' It doesn't address affordability at all. Therefore, any such merger of numbers is simply imagination.</p> <p>However, even if the numbers were correct (which they demonstrably aren't) the mathematics are wrong. Somehow, 3.16 has decided that 50% of 100 plus 70% of 50 equals 60% of 150. In reality 50% of 100 is 50, 70% of 50 is 35 and 60% of 150 is 90. If 50+35=90 then perhaps the other arithmetic in this document should be overhauled.</p> <p>The assumption must be that the document's authors are trying to inject claims that are neither true nor supportable.</p> <p>Section 3.20 assumes that TOT2 and TOT3 should be developed together. It is noted that none of the problems identified in BP40 have been reiterated in this proposal.</p> <p>Examining the proposal in the order presented:</p> <p>The proposal calls for a community centre for the blind and a children's nursery. There is no justification for either and such provision would increase traffic flow considerably through a residential area. If a centre for the blind were to be provided then placing it on the outskirts of Totton in an area of poor public transport seems to be justified only by the fact that the land is partially owned by a charity for the blind.</p> <p>Realistically, it goes against common sense and many of the declared council policies e.g. CS3 Protecting and enhancing our special environment (it is believed that evidence is available of protected species living in the development area).</p>

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm

The area already has children's nursery provision, for example at Calmore Community Centre. Section 3.20 says development on this site would be subject to:

- Vehicle access from Loperwood Lane. Any such access would be dangerous without major road restructuring at the entrance to the development and/or the junction of Loperwood with Calmore Road
- Provision of footpath/cycleway connections... Unfortunately, the connections would be to cycleways that don't exist
- ...additional formal public space ... to link in with King George Recreation Ground...recreational facilities for young people on site or on King George RG.. All of which takes no account of the indisputable fact that the King George Recreation Ground is frequently underwater as the current drainage for both the recreation ground and the northern edge of Calmore Road (on to which water escapes from these sites) is overloaded and inadequate for purpose. Nor does it take into account that Totton and Eling has by far the largest number of existing recreational sites of any NFDC area.
- ...minimum of 10 full size allotment plots .. for local needs and wider community... There is no justification for this requirement at all. The nearby housing is virtually all houses with private gardens. Totton already has 304 allotments.
- Vehicle access from Loperwood . Any such access would be very dangerous without major road restructuring at the entrance to the development

501b	Garrett	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I wish to voice my objection to the proposed developments of TOT2 & TOT3 I object for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The roads around both of these developments are simply not suitable for any additional traffic. The cross roads at the junction of Calmore Road & Pauletts Lane is very dangerous with an almost blind bend approx 20 mtrs from the cross roads. This junction has already seen a significant increase in traffic, since the redevelopment of the old Tatchbury Mount Hospital site. A number of serious accidents and lots of minor accidents have already happened at this junction, this will only increase if the proposed development goes ahead. Only this time, instead of it being only vehicles colliding at this junction, it is likely to be children on bicycles or children just trying to cross the roads, colliding with vehicles because their homes have been built right on this accident black spot.</p> <p>2) The whole area around these proposed development is water logged for the whole of the Autumn through to Spring months, this includes the gardens of the properties in Calmore Crescent, Loperwood Lane, Calmore Road, and beyond. The King George's playing field is always under water when it rains, particularly the lower part by the car park and cricket pavilion. Building on the land above the playing field will only encourage more water to flow down towards Calmore Road and risk flooding the houses that are built below the height of Calmore road. Of course the proposed development will have drainage, but this drainage will have to link into existing drainage</p>
------	---------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm

systems, systems that struggle to cope now and are below the proposed site. The fact that the plans detail 'the central pond and woodland should be retained' should in itself be a warning of just how water logged this land really is.

3) The plans state building a centre for the blind, I would support any centre that looks after or helps any disabled person, however building a centre so far away from Totton town centre seems a crazy idea, the links to this part of the town are not the best, who would want to come this far out of the way to a centre when we already have enough halls or community centres closer to transport links and are under used now. The plans also state a children's nursery to be built on this site, my previous comments apply to this as well.

4) As the northern side of these proposed sites is mainly, well below the height of the existing road, which goes to the bridge over the A326, vehicle access will be impossible or very dangerous. Therefore the 95 proposed dwellings (assuming an average 2 car family per household) will add 190 extra cars using the part of Loperwood lane that at present probably has no more than 20 cars using it. Plus any visitors, post & parcel vans coming and going all day. Calmore Crescent runs off of this part of Loperwood Lane, Calmore Crescent is a narrow road with minimal street lights, cars park in the road due to the houses being built many years ago and without driveways, making it single carriageway for a good length of the Crescent. Children play in the quiet roads and building on TOT2 & TOT3 would make Calmore Crescent a route used to access the new properties, this road is totally unsuitable for any extra traffic.

5) On the eastern side of the development, behind King George's Playing Fields is Calmore Road, on the corner of the Calmore Road, Pauletts Lane cross roads is the Church with its entrance approx 6 mtrs from the cross roads. The Church has no off street parking and every Sunday or whenever a funeral takes place the road outside for approx 300 mtrs becomes a single carriageway, with no passing places. This is another reason why I feel that both the proposed developments should not be allowed to go ahead.

6) Paulets Lane would be the natural route taken by any vehicle leaving the M27 to access the proposed properties. As the road name suggests, Pauletts Lane is nothing but a lane with Calmore Village Hall half way down it. The lane is narrow, it has no street lighting and no footpaths. This lane would become a greater rat run, leading to the very dangerous cross roads, mentioned already.

7) If 95 houses are built, each house could house an average 2 children, where are these extra 190 children going to go to School? Where are these possible 380 people (allowing for 4 people per household) going to go to the Dentist & Doctors etc. It is already hard enough to get a Doctor's appointment let alone a Dentist's.

8) There are still areas of land inside newer developments that have not been fully utilised yet.

For example the plot of land between Crabbs Way and Morrisons Supermarket,

9) I am also concerned by the thought that the properties or a larger proportion of the properties would be for

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						so called 'affordable housing' I live in the quite Calmore Crescent which is opposite Jessica Crescent, another 'affordable housing area'. It has become a standing joke, sadly, guessing how many police cars will be outside certain properties on any given day. To increase the number of this type of property, in such close vicinity, sadly would cause an extra strain on our already over stretched police force. Calmore Crescent would be an island, surrounded by affordable housing, this would have a disastrous effect on the value of the properties including others bordering the proposed development. This proposal should not be given the go ahead, but instead be given protected green field status due to the environmental damage (flooding) that would be caused to the surrounding area as a result of building on it.
829b	Newbury E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		More houses on another plot of land close to the area of TOT2, means nearly 100 houses on such a small area and no more amenities.
830b	Essex D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Object because there will be no extra services for all these people; the visibility at junction at Calmore Road/Loperwood is hazardously dangerous at the best of times; flooding - the drainage ditches are constantly full, the drains are not up to the job; wildlife will be lost - deer, rare finches & birds.
860a	Barbier M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The roads and public services will be stretched due to extra traffic and property prices will be lowered.
861a	Barbier H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This would spoil the area and property prices would fall. Access is unrealistic - there are already numerous accidents at the top of Calmore Road. Flooding would be worse as there would be nowhere for the water to runoff. Amenities are not efficient enough to encompass another 90+ households.
936c	Clapp N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Percentage of social housing would create a pocket of deprivation due to the deprivation in the area already (Calmore is the poorest area of housing in Totton). The percentages of social housing proposed would create an area of social exclusion in Calmore. I also have great concerns about the drainage as the site is on a hill which would mean properties on Calmore Road would be flooded due to land drainage not being adequate. The recreation ground is often flooded, therefore the additional infrastructure would make the situation worse! There are also no local amenities close by way of shops and doctors surgeries to support this development. Paulettes lane would also be under further pressure as it is not large enough to take the amount of cars already using it.
937b	Le Clos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The old Calmore area is bordering on the New Forest and is located around a rural setting, leave this as it is, why

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT3, Land at Loperwood Farm						
						develop land that is not suitable to be built on and for the sake of 95 houses to sacrifice the local community in their investments that they have in their houses that are not structured nor built to the same standard as the estate developments that are so common now days: There is not enough infrastructure to support this development.
943c	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	
972c	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
974b	Cain M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This area has a cross roads with notoriously poor vision for drivers and has become extremely busy these past years. An additional entrance road to the proposed site and the increased traffic would make this area potentially very dangerous.
992c	Luken Beck Ltd Representing Mr Brian Cooper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	
1031c	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	
1044c	Best J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Enough building at Calmore, enough large estates with all their problems, schools too small to cope with more children. A waterlogged area, terrible traffic area with constant accidents. Paulettes Lane has enough people cutting through without more houses.

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT4, Land south of Jacob's Gutter Lane

888i	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		There is a small risk of flooding in the north east corner of this site, we would advise a sequential approach is taken within the site in order to develop outside of the flood area and leaving a suitable corridor clear adjacent to Jacob's Gutter. Any proposals for development at this location must provide an adequate buffer strip to protect Jacob's Gutter Stream. This will ensure there is no adverse impact on the ecological integrity of the river channel and its corridor.
724b	Howard Sharp and Partners Representing Cancer Research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Woodland and trees should be protected and electricity pylons constraint.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT4, Land south of Jacob's Gutter Lane						
UK/OpenSight						
1060b	Clr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	History of serious flooding problems in this locality not conducive to further development.
692h	Hampshire CC - Env't Dept	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		As Highways Authority, the County Council considers that the identified site considerations should be amended to better reflect the potential traffic impacts. Therefore, the an additional bullet point should be added as follows: satisfactory resolution of concerns regarding impacts on the local road network, including the junction of Jacobs Gutter Lane and the A326 spur road.
622d	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site is considered as an extreme flood risk area and an important urban space serving as a buffer to relive urban sprawl.
837a	Barker Mill A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The owner of the site wishes to support its allocation for housing purposes in relation to policies CS11, CS12 and CS15. The site is well related to the existing settlement, access from existing roads is achievable and there are no constraints for delivery.
317d	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	
319e	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Although I am not familiar with this site, the small development here may not be inappropriate but only after alternative 'brownfield' sites have been utilised.
495c	Ancell D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
573e	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		In general terms I support the housing policies for Totton comprising Policy TOT1, 2, 3 & 4. Whilst the total number of plots exceeds the 150 dwellings required, I recommend that all of them be allocated for development but that they be released, as practicable, in phases to meet this target. In practice there are often reasons why sites cannot come on stream that are not planning reasons and are factors over which you have no control. The development of the land to the south of Jacobs Gutter Lane under Policy TOT 4 is supported with access onto Jacobs Gutter Lane, which would be practicable if the access to Durley Farm was revised.
936d	Clapp N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Good access to Southampton and waterside areas.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT4, Land south of Jacob's Gutter Lane						
943d	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	
972d	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	
992d	Luken Beck Ltd Representing Mr Brian Cooper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Modest housing generation for significant impact on character of Jacobs Gutter Lane.
1031d	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	
1044d	Best J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT5, Land north of Michigan Way, east of Garland Way

1060i	Clr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
622e	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The site acts as amenity provision for the surrounding high density development. Also, the site has the potential for highways implications with regard to access.
712a	Department of Health Representing Department of Health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site is owned by the Department of Health and is surplus to requirements. A statement is included which explains that the site is available, suitable and deliverable.
317f	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Small are of land already built around, I could never understand why this was not built on at the same time as the other houses were built.
319f	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		No objection here - already surrounded by houses.
354h	Latham R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Reserve for future public building of private clinic.
401c	Cobern R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This comparatively small area of green should be left. Enough housing imposed on this corner of west Totton, plus we need the natural drainage.
936e	Clapp N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This land already has appropriate connections.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT5, Land north of Michigan Way, east of Garland Way						
943e	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
972e	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1031e	Townsend G	<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: TOT6, Land at Hanger Farm, Totton						
826h	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 Hanger Farm. 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 TOT6 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 addition to policy TOT6: Development of this site would be subject to:</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, existing water mains and sewers cross 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 TOT6 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 TOT6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Necessary easements or diversions to protect existing underground water mains and sewers.
725c	Sport England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<p>There is an existing bowling green and eight tennis courts belonging to Totton and Eling Tennis Club located on the east of the site. 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</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT6, Land at Hanger Farm, Totton						
						redundant and there is no demand for a replacement. This constraint should be included within the policy allocation for this site.
622f	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Town Council supports the already approved housing allocation for this site.
317g	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Area already built up with fairly new houses, so makes sense to build here.
319g	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		No objection as planning permission already exists.
354e	Latham R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The development of this site to complete the road system from the bowling centre to the supermarket is long over due.
936f	Clapp N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
937c	Le Clos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
943f	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972f	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1031f	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT7, Land at Brokenford Lane, Totton

888f	Environment Agency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We welcome the removal of the residential allocation for the land west of Brokenford Lane.
888j	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3 of the Bartley Water and may not be considered suitable for residential development in line with PPS25. We would encourage you to revisit this site in terms of flood risk. The loss of flood plain storage may be an issue and this site would have to provide floodplain compensation and reduce the flood risk to the existing communities to be acceptable.
724c	Howard Sharp and Partners Representing Cancer Research UK/OpenSight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Tight access, surrounding commercial character and noise.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT7, Land at Brokenford Lane, Totton						
1060j	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
692i	Hampshire CC - Env't Dept	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The TOT7 site is considered by the County Council in the draft document "The Suitability of Industrial Areas for Waste Management Uses in Hampshire", (February 2011) as a potential location for a waste management facility. However the assessment indicated the site itself unlikely to be suitable as a location for a waste use, due to the narrow single carriageway nature of the access road (Brokenford Lane) and the inadequate provision of vehicle parking. However residential development of the site should take into account the potential for waste-rail use on the neighbouring rail sidings site to the north.
622g	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The contamination issues would need to be fully addressed before any proposal could be considered on this site.
317h	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Road network not suitable, already long traffic delays and pollution caused by excessive traffic.
319h	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		No objection as planning permission already exists. Please ensure that this development includes a footpath/cycleway connecting Brokenford Lane with Junction Road.
354g	Latham R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Too close to railway, traffic in Brokenford Lane.
936g	Clapp N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
943g	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1031g	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT8, Stocklands, Calmore Drive

724d	Howard Sharp and Partners Representing Cancer Research UK/OpenSight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Other specialist housing to be considered first.
1060k	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
692k	Hampshire CC - Env't Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Supports residential allocation.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT8, Stocklands, Calmore Drive						
622h	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The preferred use for this site would be provision of a residential elderly facility or a Community Centre.
317i	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Already on a housing estate, would cause minimum disruption. Property vacant at the moment so better make use of it.
319I	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		No objection.
401d	Cobern R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Possibly this site at Stocklands could accommodate some residential development which would not add too greatly to the local burden of services, infrastructure and amenities.
936h	Clapp N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
937d	Le Clos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972g	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1031h	Townsend G	<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: TOT9, Salterns School, Commercial Road, Totton						
742c	RSPB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The site immediately adjoins the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site. The redevelopment of the site for residential use has the potential to negatively affect the European Sites due to increased urbanisation including increased recreational disturbance. 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).</p> <p>Until the results of this work are available, a precautionary approach should be taken in respect of residential development within close proximity to the Solent.</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 (the HRA), 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 DPD. However, particularly ahead of the results of the SDMP, we are very concerned that in this location immediately adjoining the European Sites, the impact of the development is likely to be such that it may not be possible to conclude no adverse effect on the integrity of the European Sites.</p>
888k	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This site is currently in Flood Zone 1 and appears to be at low risk, however the site is immediately adjacent to the tidal River Test with an extreme tide predicted in 2115 of 4.2mAOD. Therefore in the future it is highly likely to be inundated with tidal flooding and could only be safely developed if a flood management scheme was designed and constructed to protect the proposed development. We would ask you to consider if public funds would be available to defend this development.</p> <p>Any development proposed at this location must consider any impacts to The Lower Test Valley SSSI, SPA, SAC and RAMSAR designated for its international importance for nature conservation.</p>
724e	Howard Sharp and Partners Representing Cancer Research UK/OpenSight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Other use class uses to be considered first.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT9, Salterns School, Commercial Road, Totton						
738e	Natural England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		In the North Solent SMP the policy for this section of the coast (Policy unit 5C13) is no active intervention. Potential for impact on Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar sites and the Solent Maritime SAC, as site lies adjacent. Consider suitability of site under climate change. Consideration also to be given with regards to SMP. Will require full Appropriate Assessment if proposed as part of the DPD, and it may not be possible to conclude no adverse effect on the European sites.
1060l	Clr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
692l	Hampshire CC - Env't Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Supports residential allocation should the site become surplus to requirements.
622l	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site is considered highly vulnerable in terms of flooding and any development would have an adverse impact on the natural state of the area.
317j	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Far to much traffic in this area already and very close to flood plain of conservation area.
319j	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Object on account of flood risk and difficult access on to Commercial Road. If the school were eventually vacated I would suggest that this area be incorporated into the adjoining nature reserve.
362c	Partridge C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The area around the Salterns School is totally unsuitable as it is within the flood plain.
573f	Rutland C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The development of Saltern School under Policy TOT9 for residential purposes is seen as tenuous having regard to the amount of development on site. It is considered that this site, using the existing buildings, could be adapted for Employment Use since it has an independent access onto Commercial Road. It would make a useful site for an Enterprise Centre, mainly for B 1 office use.
936i	Clapp N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
943h	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972h	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1031i	Townsend G	<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: TOT10, Land off Blackwater Drive, Calmore						
1060m	ClIr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
622j	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		As a valuable piece of open space, the site acts to improve the living conditions of existing residents on estates that were designed to include large green areas. Any development would override its present value.
317k	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
319k	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Undesirable as I believe that this land is used as informal open space of which Totton is deficient.
936j	Clapp N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
937e	Le Clos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
943i	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972i	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1031j	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT11, Bus Depot, Salisbury Road

1060n	ClIr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
622k	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
317l	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I would be concerned about how the junction would join the Salisbury road as the bus depot is close but not on an existing traffic light. Traffic leaving this site would cause problems.
319l	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		No objection. Good brownfield site but beware of contaminated land and traffic implications on Salisbury Road.
573g	Rutland C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The development of the Bus Depot at Salisbury Road under Policy TOT11 results in the loss of an employment site that has been well established on that site. It is recommended that this site be retained for employment uses, compatible with the surrounding residential area.
936k	Clapp N	<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: TOT11, Bus Depot, Salisbury Road						
943m	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972j	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
1031k	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT12 , Land off Oleander Drive, north of Michigan Way						
890e	English Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT12: Land off Oleander Drive that abuts the Hazel Farm conservation area. Policy should refer to this.
824a	Woolf Bond Planning LLP Representing Taylor Wimpey UK LTD and The Meyrick Estate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The site represents a sustainable opportunity to help meet identified housing needs in the area. There are no overriding physical or ownership constraints to bringing the site forward for development within the plan period. Development of the site will comply with Core Strategy policies including provision of affordable housing. Additional supporting information provided.
1060o	Clr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Already surrounded by high density residential development. Favour retention for purpose of addressing public open space deficit.
692m	Hampshire CC - Env't Dept	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		3.31: Delete reference to highway safeguarding.
622l	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Any development would only act as infilling in an already high density overdeveloped area.
319m	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		No objection.
354l	Latham R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Reserve for future possible junction improvements to Totton By-pass/Michigan Way.
401e	Cobern R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This comparatively small area of green should be left. Enough housing imposed on this corner of west Totton, plus we need the natural drainage.
936l	Clapp N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
937f	Le Clos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
943n	Ashley S	<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: TOT12 , Land off Oleander Drive, north of Michigan Way						
972k	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031l	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT13, Land at LittleTestwood Farm caravan site						
888l	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The site lies within Flood Zone 1, although an "ordinary watercourse" flows through the site. As this watercourse is not designated as Main River, the flood plain associated within it has not been mapped. However, this does not imply that there is not a risk of flooding from the watercourse, and the land adjacent to it may be subject to flooding during extreme events. We would advise that development be set back from the watercourses, in order 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. Culverting will not be permitted unless for essential access purposes. The required FRA must demonstrate how surface water will be managed, as a site of this size has the potential to generate significant surface water flows once developed. We would also advise that our prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency under the terms of the Water and Resources act 1991 may be required.
1060e	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Proposed increase in Gypsy Caravan Pitches not favoured on ecological and conservation grounds.
622m	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
317m	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Due to its close proximity to Testwood Lakes conservation area or wildlife park, I feel the land would be better used a an extension to this very popular recreational area used by dog walkers, bird watchers and people just out for a nice walk in the country, without having to drive miles.
674a	Dawson J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Planning conditions have not been met for the existing plots adjacent to this potential allocation. It would be better to allocate this land, along with the adjacent existing plots, for employment development.
936m	Clapp N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
937g	Le Clos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
943o	Ashley S	<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: TOT13, Land at LittleTestwood Farm caravan site						
972l	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031m	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT14, Eling Wharf						
890d	English Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT14: Eling Wharf refers at bullet point 8 to avoiding unacceptable impacts on nearby areas of nature conservation importance, but no mention is made of the conservation area that abuts the site.
742d	RSPB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The site immediately adjoins the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site. The redevelopment of the site for employment and/or residential purposes therefore has the potential to negatively affect the European Sites due to increased urbanisation including increased recreational disturbance (particularly due to the proposal to introduce public access to the waterfront) and traffic movements. 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).</p> <p>Until the results of this work are available, a precautionary approach should be taken in respect of residential development within close proximity to the Solent.</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 more appropriate locations for new 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 (the HRA), 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, particularly ahead of the results of the SDMP, we are very concerned that in this location immediately adjoining the European Sites, the impact of the development is likely to be such that it may not be possible to conclude no adverse effect on the integrity of the European Sites.</p>
888m	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Site specific constraints</p> <p>The majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 1 at the present day, with small areas lying within Flood Zones 2 & 3. However, according to the PUSH SFRA, the probability of flooding is projected to increase with climate change,</p>

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT14, Eling Wharf

placing a much greater proportion of the site at risk of flooding in the future.

Deliverability

In line with Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning (PPS12), it must be demonstrated that the Development Plan Document is deliverable. Prior to allocating the site, we would therefore recommend that a preliminary assessment is undertaken by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to ensure that the residential element in particular is deliverable in the context of flood risk. This ideally should outline the range of control measures that could be employed to make the site safe, and identify a preferred option for managing risk. This could be in the provision of flood defences, land raising, building design or a combination of these. It should be demonstrated that this preferred option is feasible and deliverable (e.g. it is affordable, technically viable and will not conflict with national planning policy considerations) before the site is allocated.

It should be demonstrated that any necessary control measures:

- are appropriate i.e. are consistent with the relevant Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) and Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy, if applicable
- will not result in an increased level of flood risk to others
- have clear responsibilities for their provision
- have suitable arrangements in place for their future maintenance, where relevant.

If it can be confirmed that the residential development is to be restricted to Flood Zone 1 in the year 2115 according to Mapset 1E of the PUSH SFRA, this work need not be undertaken.

Sequential Approach

In line with the PPS 25 Flood Risk Management Hierarchy, a sequential approach should be taken across the site when developing a masterplan. This should be informed by an appropriately detailed FRA, and development located away from any areas of land which may be susceptible to any source of flooding now and into the future. Where development is proposed in an area that is, or will be at risk of flooding in the future, its use must be compatible with the Flood Zone within which it lies.

Flood Risk Assessment

The FRA should then assess any significant sources of flood risk in detail, and inform the necessary control and mitigation measures that might be needed to manage risk both to and from the development to an acceptable level, considering climate change and addressing and residual risk issues.

As the site is greater than 1 hectare in size, the FRA must demonstrate that appropriate surface water drainage arrangements could be provided across the development lifetime. Taking into account future climate change

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT14, Eling Wharf

predictions and sea level rise, it is likely that surface water outfalls will experience tide locking. As a result, the FRA will need to show how surface water will be managed during joint probability events i.e. tide locking in combination with a large rainfall event.

Reduction of flood risk
Opportunities should be sought to reduce flood risk where possible, in line with PPS 25.

Consent requirements
We would also advise that our prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency under the terms of the Water and Resources act 1991 may be required.

Groundwater
As stated in the DPD, this site suffers from serious contamination. It is essential that the risk of pollution from developing this site is minimised. This is required not only to protect and enhance the status of the designated water body, designated under the Water Framework Directive, on which the site lies but also in relation to the Habitat Directive and Shellfish Water and Water Framework Directive designations in the Southampton Water and the Solent.

The Eling Wharf site has been investigated as a potential Special Site under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 by the Environment Agency on behalf of new Forest District Council. Discussions regarding contamination at the site are ongoing between the local authority, site owners and ourselves. Further investigations and assessments are required to characterise contamination at the site to enable an appropriate remediation strategy to be designed.

To date, a remediation strategy has not been agreed for either Part 2A or development purposes in line with PPS23 an understanding of the risks should be demonstrated for this site. Due to the contamination issues at Eling Wharf, we are unable to comment on whether development is appropriate at this site at this time (please note contamination is likely to restrict development and impact, for example, the drainage scheme and foundation design).

Any proposed development must take into account the increase of sewage flows into the receiving Sewage Treatment Works (STWs). Slow Hill Copse STW is currently operating at Best Available Technology (BAT) standards, and any increase in flows and nutrients would need to be re-assessed.

724h	Howard Sharp and Partners Representing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
------	--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT14, Eling Wharf						
	Cancer Research UK/OpenSight					
738f	Natural England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Potential for impact on adjacent Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar sites and the Solent Maritime SAC.</p> <p>Will require full Appropriate Assessment if proposed as part of the DPD, this assessment should consider all disturbance impacts on feeding and roosting birds, as well as any land reclamation which may be necessary as a result of de-contamination works.</p>
1060f	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Entirely suited to mix of high quality residential development (around 200 dwellings) coupled with generous public amenity services.</p>
877d	Southampton City Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>We support the overall principle of more intensive development on Eling Wharf. However, the following amendments should be made:</p> <p>Policy TOT14: Insert new 2nd criterion: "Office development will be subject to consideration of the sequential approach"</p> <p>Paragraph 3.37, add: "For office proposals, the sequential approach will be considered (i.e. whether the proposal could be located in nearby centres, including Southampton city centre); alongside regeneration and viability considerations. This consideration will take place in consultation with neighbouring authorities".</p> <p>Eling Wharf is not within a centre. PPS4 steers office development to city or town centres first. The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire is promoting major economic growth, including major office growth, focussed on the two city centres. Southampton's adopted core strategy reflects this, promoting 322,000 sqm of offices in the city centre, and designating a major development quarter (MDQ). These represent highly sustainable and accessible locations. The aspirations of New Forest District Council to promote employment led regeneration of Eling Wharf is acknowledged. The proposed wording is intended to ensure a scheme emerges which strikes an appropriate balance between these objectives.</p>
676c	Barton Willmore Representing Burt Boulton Holdings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Paragraph 3.37 states that the Eling Wharf site suffers from 'serious contamination'. This is not a technical description and therefore references to the contamination present should be removed.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.37 states that the Council wishes to see higher intensity development of this site, primarily for employment uses, but with a limited amount of housing and community/recreational uses. The word limited should be removed as the site is unlikely to be economically viable with only a limited amount of housing.</p> <p>The site should be amended to include land north of the A35, as included in the Eling Wharf Draft Development Brief. This will allow to access improvements to be delivered.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT14, Eling Wharf						
						<p>The first bullet point should be amended to seek higher intensity employment rather than high intensity. The current wording suggests that only high density office blocks would be acceptable. The wording should be made more flexible to allow for medium/lower density employment uses. The text should be amended to recognise and encourage other forms of economic development including Care Homes.</p> <p>The second bullet point should be amended to remove reference to the "may" in "some housing may be permitted". A significant proportion of high value uses will be required to fund the delivery of the new access, environmental improvements and flood protection works.</p> <p>The policy should be made more positive and should state that "approximately 150 dwellings will be permitted on the western and southern part of the site..."</p> <p>Whilst the southern part of the site may be appropriate for some community and recreational uses, the current wording suggests that this would be the only appropriate use. The south of the site would also be suitable for some residential, retail and employment uses.</p> <p>Text should be added to the sixth bullet point to acknowledge the environmental improvements that could be created to the existing environment of Eling Lane by the addition of residential development on the western boundary of the site.</p> <p>The seventh bullet point should be amended to state that the primary access for employment should be from the A35 and that for residential should be from Eling Lane. This would allow flexibility for some appropriate secondary routes to be included.</p>
622n	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Town Council considers this site as top priority for full maximisation of residential housing allocation to relieve the pressure on other sites in Totton, provided that access to the industrial areas would be via the Totton by-pass.
317n	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
319n	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		I fully support increased housing provision, and the employment proposals, on this site which should be given priority. Having looked at the agent's development brief, whilst supporting the HGV entrance and exit off A35 the Highway Authority will need to address the interruption of the cycle track and ensure that it remains safe.
362a	Partridge C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>I fully agree with the development of this site. At the moment the site is unsightly and to clear and develop the site should be absolute priority.</p> <p>It is an ideal brownfield site for development and facilities to benefit the people who live in Totton should be foremost. It would provide a large area for housing provided the design is in keeping with the Eling Area. It would lend itself to restaurant and other facilities. I do feel a promenade should be provided from the Eling Mill</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT14, Eling Wharf						
						all the way to the flyover, with car parking facilities. It could be similar to the Hythe Marina development with recreational facilities for the people of Totton and Eling to walk and stroll enjoying the sea and surround view of the marshes etc. A small marina could be included adding extra interest. Access would need to be considered but a new roundabout could be provided at the western end of the Totton flyover (Where the emergency access to the old Tar Works is). This would improve the opposite turning into the High street and slow down the Traffic. I believe this development to be of great benefit to the people in the area.
573h	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The proposals under TOT14 for the development of Eling Wharf are supported subject to adequate revision being made for Employment Uses.
889o	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Para 3.37 to 3.39: The Eling Wharf site extends to 15ha. The land faces considerable constraints including poor environment, contamination, flood risk and access constraints. The land is located within the existing built area settlement boundary and is allocated for employment uses. As such, it is considered that the site would have come forward for more intensive development if this was preferable to the market and viable in economic terms. The potential of this area for additional housing (to effectively enable more employment development) is also questioned. The site accommodates Class B2 uses and this is further encouraged under draft Policy TOT14 which are not considered to be good neighbours adjacent to residential development. Draft Policy TOT14 also indicates the environmental (including international designations and flood risk issues) which constrain this site. The timescales for achieving the changes envisaged on the site are also questioned and it does not appear that this site will provide a short term solution for the need for employment land.
936n	Clapp N	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
943p	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972m	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031n	Townsend G	<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: TOT15, Land at Little Testwood Farm						
888n	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The site lies within Flood Zone 1, although an ordinary watercourse flows through the site. As this watercourse is not designated as Main River, the flood plain associated within it has not been mapped. However, this does not imply that there is not a risk of flooding from the watercourse, and the land adjacent to it may be subject to flooding during extreme events.</p> <p>In line with the PPS 25 Flood Risk Management Hierarchy, we would advise a sequential approach be taken across the site, locating development away from any areas of land which may be susceptible to flooding both now and into the future. These areas may not necessarily be apparent as they may not have been mapped. We would advise development to be set back from the watercourses, in order to safeguard land that will be required for current and future flood management e.g. conveyance and storage of flood water. Culverting will not be permitted unless for essential access purposes. in line with PPS25 a FRA must assess all sources of risk in detail and inform the necessary control and mitigation measures that may be needed to manage risk both to and from the development to an acceptable (safe) level, considering climate change and addressing any residual risk issues. In addition to river flooding, the 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.</p> <p>For the range of annual flow rate probabilities up to and including the one per cent annual exceedence probability (1 in 100 years) event, including an appropriate allowance for climate change, the developed rate of run-off into a watercourse, or other receiving water body, should be no greater than the existing rate of run-off for the same event. Volumes of run-off should also be reduced wherever possible using infiltration and attenuation techniques. Priority in achieving this must be given to Sustainable Drainage Systems, as advocated by government policy. Opportunities should be sought to reduce flood risk wherever possible, in line with PPS 25. We would also advise that our prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency under the terms of the Water and Resources act 1991 may be required.</p>
1060q	Cllr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Proposed employment use, conflicts with Public Inquiry Inspector's recommendations on open space allocation.
622o	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Town Council agrees with this proposal, but would object to any change in the open space provision as originally planned.
268a	RPS Planning & Development Ltd Representing Glenbeigh Developments Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This site is constrained and its development potential is to an extent restricted. First, as confirmed by page 104 of Background Paper 40, a large part of the site is covered by TPO'd trees. Secondly, it is known that, as part of the football stadium development on land to the south, a landscape buffer, open space and car parking is required to be retained on the southern portion of the site. Thirdly, in accordance with Policy TOT15, landscape buffers need to be provided on all site boundaries. The effect of these three factors is to reduce the developable area of the site, probably by at least 50%. Consequently, although the site is 1.8ha in size, it only has the

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT15, Land at Little Testwood Farm						
						capacity to deliver in the order of 1 hectare of employment land.
317o	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Due to its close proximity to Testwood Lakes conservation area or wildlife park, I feel the land would be better used as an extension to this very popular recreational area used by dog walkers, bird watchers and people just out for a nice walk in the country, without having to drive miles. There are plenty of vacant buildings on Calmore industrial estate already, there is no need for any more.
319o	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Generally support your proposals although have some misgivings about Little Testwood Farm as this means straying beyond the existing built up area. Probably best avoided.
573i	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The development of Little Testwood Farm under Policy TOT15 is generally supported but because of physical constraints, may not be able to be brought forward early in the plan and since the development of Eling Wharf is likely to be similarly delayed, provision requires to be made for employment uses in the shorter term.
674b	Dawson J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This land was only allocated for open space last year, and it was this allocation that led to the appeal in favour of the moving of the two football clubs out of the town and allowing the land vacated to be allocated for housing. I contend that this allocation should be implemented.
889p	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Para 3.40: The site is currently public open space within the built up area boundary and as such in planning terms would normally be protected for such purposes or an appropriate alternative community use.
938a	WYG Planning Representing Linden Homes and Waters Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We fully support the allocation of this site for employment use. Part of the site already has lawful employment use and it is contained on all sides by existing development. Furthermore, there is an established employment presence around the site, it is located on a principal route into Totton and this will be a commercially attractive location to the employment market. Additionally, there is a considerable surplus of informal open space in Totton and a pressing need for additional employment provision. For all of the above reasons and those detailed in para 3.40 of the DPD this proposed allocation is strongly endorsed.
943q	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972n	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031o	Townsend G	<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: TOT16, Land at Sunnyfields Farm, Jacob's Gutter Lane						
888o	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>The site lies within Flood Zone 1, although an ordinary watercourse runs through the site. As this watercourse is not designated as Main River, its associated flood plain has not been mapped. However, it should be noted that land adjacent to the watercourse may be subject to flooding during extreme events. Part of the watercourse appears to be culverted at present. This should be confirmed by a site specific survey.</p> <p>We would advise development to be set back from the watercourse, in order to safeguard land that will be required for current and future flood management e.g. conveyance and storage of flood water. There may be opportunities to deculvert the watercourse and we would strongly advise this to be investigated fully. Deculverting could bring significant benefits in terms of improved conservation value, reduced flood risk, and would enable the watercourse to be used as an attractive feature to add value within the site.</p> <p>As the site is greater than 1 hectare in size, the required FRA must demonstrate that appropriate surface water drainage arrangements can be provided across the development lifetime. Surface water arising from the site should, as far as practicable, be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic the surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development.</p> <p>We would also advise that our prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency under the terms of the Water and Resources act 1991 may be required.</p>
1060g	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Strongly favour consolidation of food production employment use.
622p	Totton and Eling Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Town Council strongly objects to any development on this site that does not currently have full planning approval and questions why enforcement issues have not been upheld or resolved.
268b	RPS Planning & Development Ltd Representing Glenbeigh Developments Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>This site is shown as falling within the strategic gap within the New Forest Local Plan (First Alteration). The site already contains former agricultural buildings, used for industrial purposes by a rural enterprise. Consequently it is not appropriate to classify this site as a new employment allocation. In any event, as clear from Policy TOT16, this site is specifically for the development of food production and processing activities, and therefore will not be available to the majority of businesses in the area. In reality, therefore, its ability, to meet the employment requirements of the area is extremely limited.</p> <p>The site is divorced from the built up area of Totton and as is clear from the draft DPD falls within the countryside. It is surrounded by open fields and does not relate to the built up area. Consequently, in any event, the site's suitability for increase in the level of built development must be questioned, as a result of visual impact.</p>
317p	Garrett S	<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: TOT16, Land at Sunnyfields Farm, Jacob's Gutter Lane						
319z	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Generally support this proposal.
889q	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Para 3.41 to 3.42 and map TOT16: Agree in part. Disagree in part.</p> <p>The recognition of the rural enterprise which has developed at Sunnyfields Farm and the identification of land within Sunnyfields Farm under Policy Draft Policy TOT16 is supported. It is agreed that further development of the site has the potential to provide a wide variety of employment opportunities.</p> <p>The site is within a countryside location but is located adjacent to the A326, in close proximity to Hounslow Business Park and within an area already the subject of significant landscape change which results that its landscape value is not of the quality or character of that of surrounding land between Totton, Eling and Marchwood.</p> <p>Sunnyfields Farm has two clear areas of potential. The first (as noted within Policy TOT16) is for the expansion of the Sunnyfields Organic Farm enterprise which rents the land from the land owner on whose behalf these representations are submitted. The second is the wider suitability of land at Sunnyfields Farm for employment development to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS18.</p> <p>A review of draft Policy TOT16 confirms that the potential of the Sunnyfields farm site has not been considered comprehensively in terms of its inherent merits as a development location or its potential contribution to meeting the requirements of Policy CS18 of the adopted Core Strategy. This alongside the constraints to development at both Eling Wharf and Testwood Farm results that required employment land will not be achieved with resultant implications for the local economy.</p> <p>The recognition of Sunnyfields Organic Farm under Policy TOT16 is welcomed. However, it is considered essential that an amended policy or new policy is provided acknowledging the suitability of the site for wider employment use.</p> <p>Please see full representation for further detailed comments including specific comments on the criteria set out within Policy TOT16.</p>
943r	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972o	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031p	Townsend G	<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: TOT17, Town centre boundaries						
1060r	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Essential in terms of need to improve Social and Economic environment. Accords with adopted policy, in terms of core objectives including; reducing traffic dominance, reducing air pollution and improving pedestrian safety as well as public transport links.
622q	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
317q	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Brokenford lane should be the logical boundary, not diverting around it.
943s	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972p	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031q	Townsend G	<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: TOT18, Town Centre Opportunity Sites						
742e	RSPB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The following town centre sites are situated within 400 metres of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Totton retail park servicing area 5. Land north of Commercial Road (nos. 81-97 including Red Lion PH) 6. Railway sidings, Junction Road 7. Totton Timber 8. Land between Asda and Junction Road 9. Land at Junction Road and Rumbridge Street 10. 12-16 Eling Lane 11. Land south of High Street 	<p>Due to their proximity to the Solent, development within these areas has the potential to negatively affect the European Sites during construction and ongoing operation, including urbanisation impacts, such as increased recreational disturbance. We are particularly concerned with Site 6 – Railway sidings, Junction road, which comprises a mixed use retail, office and residential development. 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).</p> <p>Until the results of this work are available, a precautionary approach should be taken in respect of residential development within close proximity to the Solent. 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 development in the District.</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 development in these locations and we welcome the mitigation measures that have been identified in Table 3.3. We are however concerned that, particularly ahead of the results of the SDMP, the measures identified may not be adequate to effectively mitigate the impact of the proposed developments and therefore to conclude no adverse effect on the European Sites.</p>
1060z	Cllr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TOT18.9:	

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT18, Town Centre Opportunity Sites						
1060s	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.1: Opportunity to improve visual aspect with modern landmark architectural design feature, suitably landscaped.
1060u	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.3:
1060w	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.5:
1060y	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.8:
1060t	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.2:
1060aa	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.10:
1060ab	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.12:
1060ac	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.13:
1060x	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.6:
1060v	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.4:
633a	CLlr Tipp	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.2: I believe this would cause a serious loss of parking to the detriment of the retail businesses operating in the Totton Precinct. In fact, there are, currently, a number of empty retail units among the existing shops. Without the adjacent parking, which is in constant use and well managed, the current units would be struggling to survive.
692j	Hampshire CC - Env't Dept	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.6: The County Council has identified Totton rail yard as a site likely to have support-in-principle for a future waste use and where no major 'showstoppers' in terms of deliverability have been identified. This site is considered suitable for the following type of waste development: Category 1: Activities requiring open sites; and Category 2: Activities requiring sites with buildings, plant and ancillary open areas. These findings are based on the established rail access at the site and the existing industrial use of it. Opportunities to utilise part of the site for the storage and transhipment of waste materials (e.g. recycled aggregates) has been identified.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT18, Town Centre Opportunity Sites						
685a	Britton Cllr D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.2: This car park is a vital asset in helping the businesses to survive in this very harsh economic climate and there are already numerous empty retail units. This proposal will not support the existing retail units.
680a	Lagdon Cllr C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.2: Any redevelopment of this area should be preceded by a replacement car park area. If this should not happen business and employment would suffer.
622r	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
283a	Davidson B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.2: Recently our company opened a store in Totton, where there are still a number of empty shops. As our store draws customers from West Southampton, Waterside and the surrounding area, it is essential that we are sited near good parking as is the case in central Totton today. However, we have noticed on your future development proposals that the Library Road car park has been zoned for new retail units. This would not only reduce trade to our own store, but would also make Totton less attractive to prospective tenants for the existing empty units in the centre. Totton gains shoppers from Southampton because of the high cost and difficulty parking there, so it would be short-sighted to throw away this advantage by making it more difficult to park. Surely it is in the interests of all of us to have a vibrant town centre with successful business rather than adding more empty shop units delaying recovery even more.
317ae	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.14:
317ac	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.12:
317w	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.6:
317x	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.7:
317z	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.9:
317u	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.4:

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT18, Town Centre Opportunity Sites						
317y	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.8:
317ab	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.11:
317ad	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.13:
317v	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.5:
317s	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.2:
317af	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.15:
317t	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.3:
317aa	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.10:
317r	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.1:
319q	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.5: The Red Lion site No.5 must be preserved for a good quality public house or small hotel. It is a prominent site which should be able accommodate a high quality landmark building at the entrance to the town.
319r	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		No.6 Railway Sidings - I believe there is a long term aspiration to resite the railway station here and I would object to any development which might prejudice this.
573j	Rutland C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The proposals for TOT18 whilst supported in principle, are likely, because of land value implications, to have little opportunity for success due to the underlying intrinsic value of the land. Any development that requires new structures is unlikely to be viable in the Plan period. The potential for the development of the Q8 site for retail purposes is not practicable. It should be redefined to allow a mix of uses including as a Petrol Filling Station, car wash, retail or offices. It is important that employment uses be encouraged in existing buildings within the Totton Centre boundaries, under Policy TOT17. This particularly applies to buildings in Rumbridge Street, High Street, Junction Road, Commercial Road and some sections of Ringwood Road. My experience is that even the conversion of existing buildings may not be viable, dependent upon the state of the market at the time, but the choice for the occupation of these units for either residential or office purposes should be maintained. This will

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT18, Town Centre Opportunity Sites						
						allow small businesses to get a toe hold on the office ladder whereas new and larger developments would be too expensive. The Change of Use of first floor residential accommodation to office accommodation should be permitted for the same reason. Likewise the car sales site north of Totton By-Pass is unlikely to be developed for Office use. Any development that requires new structures is unlikely to be viable in the Plan period.
700b	Planware Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>TOT18.5:</p> <p>Site 5 is identified for 'retail' purposes amongst other uses. From speaking to yourselves I understand that you consider retail to refer to A1 uses. Retail use refers to all 'A' class development. The historic use of the site is for non-A1 retail uses and this should be reflected in the policy. It is unclear as to whether the definition of 'Entertainment' refers to restaurants and public houses. If this is the case, the policy should reflect this by confirming their use.</p> <p>Part of the site historically formed a public house and restaurant (until a fire in August 2010). The historic use for a non-class A1 use should remain. The development opportunity identified for this site should clearly include non A1 uses.</p> <p>The site may also be suitable for a range of uses including the potential for some residential. Such uses should not be disregarded at this stage.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the site is reallocated as a site suitable for all uses appropriate for the town centre.</p>
700a	Planware Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The word 'retail' as used by the policy is a generic term and does not refer to any specific use class. However from speaking to yourselves I understand that you consider retail to refer to A1 uses. Planning policy should be flexible and allow for other uses within broad classes of development. A number of the sites identified are suited to a mix of development. The policy should be clear and precise. The policy as it stands is open to misinterpretation.
627a	Kotecha V	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>TOT18.1:</p> <p>This site is on the back of retail units with zero access from the front, on a main road, with zero footage. Changing status to retail will not serve any purpose, nor will any retailer rent the site.</p>
829c	Newbury E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		There are plenty of community buildings already, not operating at full capacity, no more.
943ah	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.15:
943t	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.1:

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT18, Town Centre Opportunity Sites						
943u	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.2:
943v	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.3:
943w	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.4:
943z	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.7:
943ab	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.9:
943ac	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.10:
943ad	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.11:
943ae	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.12:
943ag	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.14:
943y	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.6:
943af	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.13:
943aa	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.8:
972x	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.8:
972ab	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.12:
972s	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.3:
972aa	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.11:
972ad	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.14:
972z	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.10:

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT18, Town Centre Opportunity Sites						
972ac	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.13:
972y	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.9:
972ae	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.15:
972w	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.7:
972v	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.6:
972u	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.5:
972q	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.1:
972r	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.2:
972t	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.4:
1031r	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT19, The Civic Building complex						
1060ad	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		One of the few collection of buildings having architectural merit.
622s	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
317ag	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
943ai	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972af	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031s	Townsend G	<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: TOT20, Environmental and transport improvements in Totton Town Centre						
1060ae	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Almost 15 years since major LTP funding allocation was first promised. Transport management improvement scheme long overdue. More especially, in view of present day air pollution levels.
1060h	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Environmental and Transport Improvements in Town Centre, of vital importance. Accords with adopted Core Strategy policy.
622t	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
317ah	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Think it will only make things worse.
319s	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Whilst accepting your premise that the impact of through traffic should be reduced, there is little in the plan to show how this might be achieved. In my view, a considerable amount of traffic passing through (including HGVs) has no business there and should be using the M27,M271 or A35. I do not think that the (mainly) cosmetic measures suggested will actually reduce traffic but better use of planning controls on traffic generating enterprises might help. It would be preferable for the town centre roundabout to be removed altogether and replaced by traffic lights since it impedes the free passage of pedestrians on the north side of Ringwood Road. The land released could be used as public open space for markets and the like.</p> <p>There is nothing in the policy to help cyclists. The highway alterations should therefore incorporate a cycleway along the south side of Commercial Road to link up with the cycle track from Southampton.</p> <p>The most urgent improvement however has been omitted, namely a pelican crossing by the railway station. This must be included.</p> <p>Radical improvements to the town centre layout were recommended in the Urban Design Framework of 2002. Why were these not followed up?</p>
943aj	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972ag	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031t	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT21, Rumbridge Street Local Shopping Area

1060af	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		More balanced planning approach to mix of retail and residential development required.
--------	-----------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT21, Rumbridge Street Local Shopping Area						
622u	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
317ai	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
573k	Rutland C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Change of Use of first floor residential accommodation to office accommodation should be permitted.
943ak	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972ah	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031u	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT22, Nutshalling Close, Calmore Local Shopping Frontage						
1060ag	Cllr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Major 'upgrade' long overdue
622v	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
317aj	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
943al	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972ai	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1031v	Townsend G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT23, Public Open Space Proposals						
899e	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of Barker Mill Estate & Taylor Wimpey UK	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Cocklydown Copse: TBME/TW support the allocation of Cockleydown Copse for public open space use. TBME own this and land adjoining Cockleydown Copse which may assist with future accessibility/deliverability. TBME are therefore happy to discuss such opportunities in partnership with NFDC and the local community. TBME would welcome further clarification from NFDC with respect to paragraph 3.57 and the assertion that this is Council owned land.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT23, Public Open Space Proposals						
1060ah	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Part a: This allocation was previously made long before residential development at Loperwood was considered desirable therefore I do not accept that it compensates for loss of open space now. This area merits endorsement regardless of other considerations (i.e.. speculation on forfeiture of countryside areas in North Totton.)
1060ai	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Part b: This area of remaining natural countryside should be reserved, regardless of whether or not residential development is allowed to encroach on open countryside in North Totton.
822i	New Forest National Park	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		These sites, in conjunction with the open space requirements on the greenfield development sites, would provide accessible natural greenspace as part of the mitigation required for the 1,000 additional dwellings proposed to be developed in Totton in the period 2006-2026.
622w	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Town Council agrees that the public open space proposal for this site is essential.
317al	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
743f	Kellingley P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		This section refers to land at Bartley Park and Cockleydown Copse being made available as informal open space. There is no such provision for the northern end of Totton which TOT2 and TOT3 could provide.
943am	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
972aj	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT23a:
1031w	Townsend G	<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: TOT24, Transport Schemes						
742f	RSPB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>TOT24.13:</p> <p>Policy TOT 24.13 proposes a new footpath between Ealing and Marchwood Road. The route of the new footpath immediately adjoins the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site. The proposed footpath therefore has the potential to negatively affect the European Sites due to increased opportunities for recreational disturbance. 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).</p> <p>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 urge the Council to consider a more appropriate location or route for the proposed footpath.</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 footpath and we welcome the mitigation measures that have been identified in Table 3.3. We are however concerned the measures identified may not be adequate to effectively mitigate the potential impacts. We are particularly concerned that no details have been provided on the nature of the proposed barrier between the footpath and the European Sites and what level of maintenance will be in place to ensure its integrity.</p> <p>The RSPB therefore considers that the potential impacts of the proposed footpath on the international sites will need to be investigated as part of the appropriate assessment of the Site Allocations DPD. However, particularly ahead of the results of the SDMP, we are very concerned that in this location immediately adjoining the European Sites, the impact of the development is likely to be such that it may not be possible to conclude no adverse effect on the integrity of the European Sites.</p>
888p	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>TOT24.8:</p> <p>It is correctly identified that the proposed cycle route will need to cross a watercourse. The Bartley Water is designated as Main River, and it is not clear whether or not a new crossing will be required. Such a crossing would require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, and will be subject to certain design requirements to safeguard the watercourse and flood risk management interests.</p>
888q	Environment Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>TOT24.11:</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT24, Transport Schemes						
						The proposed off road cycleway will cross two minor tributaries of the Bartley Water, designated as 'ordinary watercourses'. The provision of the cycleway may require additional culverting of these watercourses 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 watercourse and flood risk management interests.
899f	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of Barker Mill Estate & Taylor Wimpey UK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.3: TBME/TW support the provision of a new railway station in Hounslow. A railway station in this location will provide further transport choice for the local residential and business communities, and will enhance connectivity to the surrounding area.
899h	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of Barker Mill Estate & Taylor Wimpey UK	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.11: TBME/TW support local cycle route provision /improvements, some of which involve the use of TBME land. These connections and those provided through Durley Farm provide opportunities to improve pedestrian / cycle connectivity across the community to link into southern Totton /Eling / Marchwood areas.
899g	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of Barker Mill Estate & Taylor Wimpey UK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.10: TBME/TW support local cycle route provision/improvements, some of which involve the use of TBME land. These connections and those provided through Durley Farm provide opportunities to improve pedestrian / cycle connectivity across the community to link into southern Totton/Eling/Marchwood areas.
738g	Natural England	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.13: Potential for impact on adjacent Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar sites and the Solent Maritime SAC. Coastal access is important; however this should not be facilitated where it is likely to have a significant effect on European sites. This will require full Appropriate Assessment if proposed as part of the DPD.
1060ar	Clr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.8:
1060au	Clr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.11:
1060av	Clr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.12:
1060at	Clr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.10:

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT24, Transport Schemes						
1060as	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.9:
1060ax	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.14:
1060an	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.4:
1060ak	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.1:
1060al	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.2:
1060am	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.3:
1060aq	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT 24.7:
1060ap	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT 24.6:
1060ao	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT 24.5:
1060aw	CLlr Dart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.13:
692p	Hampshire CC - Envt Dept	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.4: Reference to safeguarding should be deleted.
692o	Hampshire CC - Envt Dept	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.2: Reference to safeguarding should be deleted.
692n	Hampshire CC - Envt Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The County Council supports the approach to transport proposals in Totton as set out in para. 3.59. In particular it is important to note the likelihood that changes may be required at detailed design stage.
622x	Totton and Eling Council	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
317an	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Cycle routes or paths need to be a track for that purpose only, you cannot use an existing road and paint lines on it and call it a cycle path, vehicles and cycles should not be together.
317am	Garrett S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.2:

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT24, Transport Schemes						
319u	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.3 and TOT24.4: Reopening of the line to passengers has been talked about for as long as I can remember. Therefore I support stations at Hounslow and West Totton but these should NOT include extensive car parking facilities. Parkway type stations are inappropriate at these locations.
319v	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Cycle route proposals: Any facilities to improve conditions for cyclists are welcome but cycleways should follow routes where people actually want to go. Therefore add: 1. Along Ringwood Road from A326 to town centre 2. Along Salisbury Road from Calmore roundabout to town centre, replacing the coloured patches currently on this road. There is plenty of room for this if the service roads were used and the pavements widened where necessary. 3. See above: along south side of Commercial Road to provide easier access to the station. 4. By means of a new footbridge over Bartley Water and the railway line from Testbourne Avenue to connect with proposed route TOT24.8 and Bartley Avenue. 5. See above: From Brokenford Lane to Junction Road through new housing proposed here.
319w	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		24.13: There is already a de facto footpath from Goatee Beach to Magazine Lane, Marchwood. It has been used without hindrance for more than 20 years and could be claimed as a right of way by presumed dedication. This would be preferable to extending it to some unidentified spot on Marchwood Road.
319x	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		24.14: Agreed but you will need to overcome drainage problems.
319y	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Additional footpath proposal: Extend footpath from Junction Road to Mill Road alongside railway station to provide easier and quicker access to the station.
319t	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.2: Please ensure that the improved junctions include signalled pedestrian crossings at Ringwood Road and Fletchwood Road.
354j	Latham R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.3:

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT24, Transport Schemes						
						The re-use of the rail link between Totton - Hythe to ease traffic pressure on the A326 in principle seems a good idea but greater detail is required. What would be the effect on the Junction Road level crossing?
354k	Latham R	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.4: The proposal interacts with TE/T44 and need further explanation. Will the existing Totton station remain? I agree Totton deserves a new rail station. The proposal is for a new station on the extreme western edge of the built-up area, possibly to replace a station on the extreme east. T43 is well sited for car access but at present has no public transport link. A more central location for a new station should be considered. Could be a 'public transport hub' west of Junction Road in Maynard Road/Sunny Way/Brokenford Lane Area.
573q	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.8 (TE/T/12): Bartley Park to Brokenford Lane cycle route is supported.
573l	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.1 (TE/T/69):
573m	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.2 (TE/T/42):
573n	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.3 (TE/T/44):
573o	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.4 (TE/T/43):
573p	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.5 (TE/T/2): Comprising a cycle lane connection across the railway is supported.
573r	Rutland C	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.10 (TE/T/16): The Jacobs Gutter Lane to Downs Park Crescent cycle route is supported.
889w	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.11: 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.
889r	Turley Associates Representing Trustees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.11: Agree in part. Disagree in part.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT24, Transport Schemes						
	of the Barker Mill Estate					The principle of the enhanced cycleway route is supported in principle and Plan TOT24 confirms that it will be provided on the northern side of Jacobs Gutter Lane. Criteria (iv) of Policy TOT16 is considered to conflict with MapTOT24.
943ax	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.11:
943an	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.1:
943ao	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.2:
943ap	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.3:
943aq	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.4:
943ar	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.5:
943as	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.6:
943at	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.7:
943au	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.8:
943aw	Ashley S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.10:
943ay	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.12:
943az	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.13:
943ba	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.14:
943av	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.9:
972ar	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.13:
972al	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.3:

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT24, Transport Schemes						
972am	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.4:
972an	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.7:
972ao	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.8:
972ap	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.9:
972aq	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.10:
972as	Marsh H	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.14:
972ak	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT24.1:
1031x	Townsend G	<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: TOT, Other Totton Comments						
899c	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of Barker Mill Estate & Taylor Wimpey UK	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>3.16:</p> <p>Paragraph 3.16 seeks to increase the percentage of affordable housing required on CS11 sites by 10% and reduce them by 10% on CS12 sites, which would be contrary to these adopted Core Strategy policies. The purpose of the Sites and Development Management DPD is understood to be to deliver the strategic objectives set down by the adopted Core Strategy DPD, not to revise Core Strategy policy. To do so would presumably first require a review of the Core Strategy and the independent examination of a revised evidence base to support such a revision. Trustees of Barker Mill Estate and Taylor Wimpey UK (TBME and TW) therefore consider CS11 and CS12 site requirements should remain as adopted. This is felt to be particularly important for Durley Farm that is a current reserve allocation for housing in the adopted Local Plan (2005), one that has seen its affordable housing requirement rise by 15% already following adoption of the Core Strategy DPD (2009).</p> <p>This said, at the detailed design stages the site may well be capable of delivering slightly more than 100 units. The 50% affordable requirement would therefore yield a greater number of affordable homes from this site. For example, the irregular SINC area on site has come about as a result of management practices on site, or lack of, as well as grazing practices. It may therefore be appropriate to rationalise the SINC areas, providing land not currently SINC to become SINC. In addition, the TBME have the ability to enhance and expand SINC lands south of the A326 as additional compensation as necessary.</p> <p>TBME/TW are committed to working in partnership with NFDC and the local community to ensure the delivery of a balanced community on the TOT1 site. TBME/TW believe the provision of 50% of the site for market homes and 50% for affordable homes achieves this balance. The Technical Appendix (please see full representation) also demonstrates that the Core Strategy DPD requirement for 100 units can be suitably delivered on this site, and endorses its inclusion in the Sites and Development Management DPD.</p>
1060ay	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Extreme concern in terms of erosion of remaining open space and surrounding countryside. This precious commodity is fast 'running out', likely to lead to social deprivation and social decline. Whether or not, residential and employment development opportunities identified within the DPD result in a sound planning legacy, seems rather doubtful.</p>
1060aj	CLlr Dart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>GI-TOT:</p> <p>More GI is needed especially given the identified deficit of public open space identified within the 2006 'Bennett Report' reinforced by NFDC planning officers at the Linden Homes public enquiry in 2007.</p>
93b	Stone A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Totton Town Centre:</p> <p>I would support the improvement of the town centre which has many closed shops and buildings and still has a main road running through the centre of it. In my opinion it has no real community or public centre, and is still</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT, Other Totton Comments						
						unappealing to visitors.
143a	Bran P	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development Principles: Calmore and Totton are overrun with housing. Stop building on the few green fields left.
317ak	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Green Infrastructure: Complete waste of money ! Too few jobs in Totton and no direct easy access to Nursling Ind Est. The continuation to build more and more houses in and around Totton contradicts any green policy. Painting white lines on roads and saying they are cycle lanes is just a joke, cars have to travel in them to pass each other. Cycle lanes should be a separate path, not on a pavement and not on a road. Buses don't run direct routes to employment hot spots and don't run at sensible times. I work on Nursling Industrial Estate and have no option but to drive my car to get there safely.
319a	Wallis D and G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development Principles: My general feeling is that the 'brownfield' sites mentioned in the consultation document should be developed in preference to any greenfield sites. Durley Farm and Loperwood Lane/Farm should certainly not be considered until all other available 'brownfield' sites have been utilised. With several sites remaining undeveloped where planning permission has already been given (e.g. Hanger Farm for nearly 30 years)! it is questionable whether there is any real need for greenfield development at all. Having looked at the excellent Development Brief for Eling Wharf it is obvious to me that this is where your priorities should lie. Consideration should be given to increasing the number of housing units there in lieu of office space. The containers and redundant buildings near the Anchor public house have been an eyesore for years and are inappropriate close to a Conservation Area. The sooner these are removed, the better.
319p	Wallis D and G	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Totton Town Centre: Totton suffers from the lack of privately owned local shops such as greengrocers, small convenience stores or a good quality tea shop/cafe. Whilst generally supporting an increase in retail space, preference should be given to trades which are lacking and avoid encouraging any further 'take-aways', estate agents etc of which there is already a surplus. Further, there may be scope for converting the upper floors of retail units to private flats, thus contributing to the housing provision.
362b	Partridge C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Development Principles: I do feel the existing open spaces in Totton which are limited should remain as open spaces for the benefit of the community and not be in filled, any development should be on the periphery of the area.

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT, Other Totton Comments						
889l	Turley Associates Representing Trustees of the Barker Mill Estate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Para 3.6: Paragraph 3.6 confirms that the policies of the DPD seek to provide the site specific proposals to achieve the requirements of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Pages 83 to 87 of the Core Strategy set out the requirements for Totton and the waterside. With regard to employment, paragraph 9.7 states that “there will be opportunities for local businesses to expand, mostly through the intensification of use of existing sites. In addition, up to 5 ha of new employment land is proposed”. As far as employment requirements are concerned, this section of the DPD should also highlight the key requirements of Policy CS18 including the need for 16,000 sq. metres of office floorspace in Totton and the waterside to meet the identified PUSH requirements.</p> <p>Policy CS18 clearly advocates the identification of new employment sites and not only intensification of existing land.</p>
936o	Clapp N	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development Principles: This plan has too high a concentration of social housing in Calmore - much more than is stated on your website, which states 50-40% NOT 60%!!! As Calmore is already an area of deprivation and affordable housing adding more in this area is not appropriate as will create social exclusion and basically replicate a council estate of the 1980's with associated problems. This is unfair on existing residents of the area who will have to put up with this for the years to come. Drainage at this site is also insufficient.</p>
943x	Ashley S	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT18.5:
972at	Marsh H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Transport: Need to attract more retailers to ease the need for traffic into Southampton. The roads into say West Quay on a Sat are a nightmare if Totton could attract suitable retailers to give the public options, it might be an attractive alternative and better for the environment etc</p>
1044e	Best J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<p>Development Principles: The number of houses built at West Totton reaching right up to Calmore with Amey Gardens etc. and the bypass should be it. Please leave Calmore with some green area and keep some of the original areas intact as so little remain. Just a few years ago the schools were under threat and had to make major changes to remain, now they could not cope with a large increase in number as the space has been lost.</p>

ID:	Representor:	Agree	Disagree	No View	Pref. No. (sites only)	Comments
Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT-S, Other Totton Sites						
762d	New Forest Business Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT-01A and TOT-42: These sites should be considered more fully for strategic long term employment use.
2b	Bovis Homes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Land north of Cooks Lane, Calmore: Land north of Cooks Lane should be identified for housing needs in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS15 of the Core Strategy. This would allow the Council to properly plan for its development needs, rather than simply cram these into an important and attractive area, to the detriment of those living adjacent to it. The development of this land is something that could be undertaken with very little detriment to the adjacent built up area. Indeed, the expansion of Calmore in a northerly direction is the obvious place for this to take place.
268c	RPS Planning & Development Ltd Representing Glenbeigh Developments Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT-41: Although the buildings at Shelley's Nurseries are in agricultural use, the site is 'brownfield' in nature. The glasshouses are no longer economically viable for commercial glasshouse production. Whilst falling outside of any defined settlement, the site adjoins a significant area of built development, i.e. a service station. The site is also adjoined by major roads and is within approx. 400m of Junction 2 of the M27. The site is comparatively sustainable, based on a bus service and the potential for cycle routes. It is accepted that the Shelley Nurseries site does not physically adjoin Totton. However, Background Paper 40 is clear that this criteria only applies to residential sites. The site is accessible to Totton both by car and public transport. For example by bus it is possible to reach Totton Town Centre is less than 10 minutes. It is therefore clear that an employment development on the Shelley Nurseries site is able to satisfy the site assessment criteria in full. Accordingly, against the background of an absence of suitable alternatives, it is appropriate to allocate the site for employment purposes.
317e	Garrett S	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Hanger Farm: Why not build on the land next to Morrisons Supermarket (south of) that runs parallel to the A326 ? it has direct access to the A326 west Totton Bypass, which you are already thinking of upgrading to improve the route to Dibden. You cannot improve the old roads around TOT2 & TOT3 due to age and existing properties. Or build on the other side of the A326 off the roundabout again right by Morrisons, traffic would have no need to use the old existing roads around Calmore. Close walking distance from the supermarket.
992e	Luken Beck Ltd Representing Mr Brian Cooper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		TOT-BU-20: Land at Testbourne Road, Totton This site, comprising 3 parcels of land, was put forward for residential development on behalf of the owners as

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

Consultation Document Policy ID and Name: TOT-S, Other Totton Sites

part of NFDC's SHLAA (site TOT-BU-20). The proposed development would generate approximately 17 dwellings of which some 7 would be affordable. The site has not been included in the Sites and Development Management DPD for the given reasons that its development would involve the loss of public open space without compensation and would adversely affect the character of Totton. I suggest that the site should be included in the list of potential sites for residential development in the DPD on the basis that the 3 parcels of land are not public open space but are privately owned. The land was kept open as part of a proposed highway scheme which has since been abandoned. Access to the land by the public is not of right but has not been prevented, by fencing for example, by the owners. Public access could be prevented by the owners but they have not taken that action to date. The development is intended to leave the central open space undeveloped thereby retaining open space, which would be properly made available as public open space and would reduce the impact of the development on the character of the locality. The site is also in a more sustainable location than several of the sites included in the DPD, having convenient access by foot to local facilities, to bus routes and to Totton town centre. The NFDC background paper 40 - Sustainability Appraisal Report indicates that the site has not been carried forward to the Sites and Development management DPD as it would result in the loss of public open space without compensation.
