

Details of Representations Received to the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Reg19) February 2025

Bishops Waltham

This document has been prepared to provide details of the representations received to the Proposed Submission Plan and the Council's response. It draws upon information contained within the submitted documents SD07b [*Regulation 22 Statement of Consultation Part 2 \(November 2024\)*](#) and SD16 [*Regulation 20 representations \(November 2024\)*](#). It is not considered that this document contains information which is substantially different to that set out within those submitted documents, but it has been prepared to assist in navigating and considering the representations received and Council Response.

For each plan policy or associated document, it sets out some key information from the regulation 22 statement regarding the number of representations received, representation numbers, an overall summary of responses made, and a list of the main issues raised by the representations. It then contains all of the representations recorded against that Plan policy or document, along with links to supporting documents. Finally, it sets out the Council's response to the representations made for that Plan policy or document, and any changes the Council now recommends are made to the Plan policy or document, alongside any other relevant information.

This has been updated to include comments that were submitted by Historic England but were not entered onto Citizenspace and therefore they were not included in the original version of this report.

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| Local Plan Reference or document | Policy BW1 The Vineyard/Tangier Lane | |
| Total Number of Representations received | | 6 |
| Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is – | Yes | No |
| Legally Compliant | 4 | 1 |
| Sound | 1 | 4 |
| Complies with Duty to Cooperate | 3 | 2 |
| <p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>The Parish Council highlighted an error in the policy, which referred to a lapsed policy in the adopted Plan. It was also noted that the footpath and cycleway required under criterion iii has not been completed. Southern Water supported the policy approach to waste water infrastructure. Hampshire County Council advised the potential pupil yield generated by a development of this size. The NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB requested that the policy highlight the potential need for additional health infrastructure.</p> <p>One respondent considered there should be further sustainable transport infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of development in Bishop's Waltham. One respondent considered there should be further development in Bishops Waltham, and proposes an extension of BW1 to deliver a further 60 dwellings.</p> | | |
| <p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BQ4-K - Bishop's Waltham Parish Council/2/BW1</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/25/BW1</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-327S-8/2/BW1</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/28/BW1</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/12/BW1</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/23/BW1</p> | | |
| <p>Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether site BW1 should be extended to deliver additional development; and • Whether the policy adequately addresses potential infrastructure requirements. | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Bishop's Waltham Parish Council |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQ4-K - Bishop's Waltham Parish Council |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQ4-K - Bishop's Waltham Parish Council/2/BW1 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>There appears to be an error in this policy where in the BW1 policy, paragraph iii, it refers to policy BW4 however BW4 in this local plan refers to the Rareridge Lane allocation and not Albany Farm which was allocated as BW4 in the current/existing local plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council also have other concerns which we would like to state regarding the policy in paragraph iii. The development has been completed and houses are occupied, however this part of the policy (and subsequent section 106 agreement) has not been implemented.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | In the BW1 policy section part iii the reference to policy BW4 needs to be made clear to what site it is identifying. BW4 in the proposed local plan is a completely different location (Rareridge Lane) to the allocation in the previous local plan BW4 (Albany Farm, otherwise known locally as Bishop's Meadow) |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | <p>BW1 policy part iii:</p> <p>Provide a new/improved footpath/ cycleway along the northern edge of the site as part of a route along the southern edge of Bishop's Waltham to link with Priory Park and the Martin Street Site and the Albany Farm site (Policy BW4 in the existing/previous local plan, also referred to Albany Farm or locally known as Bishop's Meadow)</p> |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or</i> | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Morag Kirby |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/25/BW1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | Whilst there has been good collaboration between the ICB and WCC during the Local Plan process, our request is an amendment to the policy as outlined in the full response which has been submitted via email on 08/10/2024. - Whilst there is supporting text for healthcare infrastructure there is no inclusion within the policy that directly supports the need for sufficient healthcare infrastructure. The policy needs an inclusion to contribute to infrastructure |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies) |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr & Mrs Painter |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-327S-8 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-327S-8/2/BW1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>5. Bishops Waltham 5.1 The development of Bishops Waltham and its proposed allocations are considered in detail on pages 391- 404. Section 2 of this Statement has already expressed concern about the low housing numbers being accommodated in the sustainable market towns in the plan period but it is even more concerning to note that Paragraph 14.10 of the Plan identifies that: • Only about 765 dwellings are expected to be accommodated in the Bishops Waltham in the plan period – around 20% of the allowance for the Market Town and Rural Areas; • Only 13% of the supply will come from new allocations with a huge reliance on sites that have already been completed, outstanding permissions and remaining allocations. • Almost half of the supply comes from sites that have already been built. The inclusion of built out sites in the supply and limited provision for new growth in the 2024 to 2040 period is considered to be lacking in ambition and vision and does not represent positive planning. Policy BW1 5.2 It is noted that The Vineyard/Tangier Lane is included as an allocation in the Plan under Policy BW1. This is an existing built out site and thus it is surprising to see it included in the plan. This is not good practice or positive planning and is not considered a sound approach. 5.3 Normally such a redundant allocation would be expected to be removed from the Plan. However, there is land immediately adjoining the southern part of BW1 to the south west which is available and demonstrably suitable and deliverable. In light of the District's current and potential future housing need, and the availability and suitability of the site, it would be logical to extended the allocation to include this land. A map showing the extended allocation is contained in Appendix 1. 5.4 In order to make BW1 sound the following modifications should be made to the Policy: • The redline extended to include the land to the south, as shown on the map in Appendix 1 • The site size adjusted to 3.23ha • The indicative number of homes adjusted to 180 • The expanded site be phased to come forward before 2030 • The site specific requirements adjusted to focus on the undeveloped portion of the allocation.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |

| | |
|---|--|
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Supporting Document (commenting on policies) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Neil Massie |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/23/BW1 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | 150 dwellings could generate up to 45 additional primary age pupils and 32 secondary age pupils. The site is served by Bishops Waltham Infant School, Bishops Waltham Junior School and Swanmore College. It is possible that a contribution towards the expansion of all phases of education provision may be required. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Phil Gagg |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/12/BW1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | Together the BW policies will have a major impact on Bishop's Waltham. To be sound they should share general sustainable transport requirements to provide sustainable transport infrastructure across Bishop's Waltham, especially cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and public transport routes linking Bishop's Waltham with Winchester, Botley, Station and Fareham more effectively. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | To be sound. add general sustainable transport requirements to provide sustainable transport infrastructure across Bishop's Waltham, especially cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and public transport routes linking Bishop's Waltham with Winchester, Botley, Station and Fareham more effectively. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW1 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Ryan Patrick Lownds |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-327U-A - Southern Water/28/BW1 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>We welcome the inclusion of the criterion below for Policy BW1 The Vineyard: Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider. Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing underground infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. Supporting Text: Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for the area where this site is allocated. In accordance with this, we undertook an assessment of the existing capacity of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for the proposal at this site. The assessment revealed that local sewerage infrastructure in closest proximity to the sites has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Limited capacity is not a constraint to development provided that planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of wastewater infrastructure. Proposals for the number of dwellings at this site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network in order to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement will be provided through the New Infrastructure charge, but Southern Water will need to work with site promoters to understand the development program and to review whether the delivery of network reinforcement aligns with the occupation of the development. Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation. Southern Water has limited powers to prevent connections to the sewerage network, even when capacity is limited. Planning policies and planning conditions, therefore, play an important role in ensuring that development is coordinated with the provision of necessary infrastructure, and does not contribute to pollution of the environment, in line with paragraph 180(e) of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023). Our initial assessments of this site also ascertained that Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site, which needs to be taken into account when designing the layout of any proposed development. An easement</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Supporting Document (Commenting on policies) |

| |
|---|
| WCC Response. |
| Comments noted. |
| WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations: |
| No changes apart from: Proposed Modification to Local Plan policy BW1 (page 396) to clarify the position regarding potential infrastructure requirements. Proposed Modification to Local Plan Policy BW1 (page 395) to delete reference to an incorrect policy number |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----|
| Local Plan Reference or document | Policy BW3 Tollgate Sawmill | |
| Total Number of Representations received | | 8 |
| Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is – | Yes | No |
| Legally Compliant | 6 | 0 |
| Sound | 2 | 4 |
| Complies with Duty to Cooperate | 5 | 1 |
| Summary of Representations Hampshire County Council advised the potential pupil yield generated by a development of this size. One respondent considered there should be further sustainable transport infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of development in Bishop's Waltham. Two respondents questioned whether this site will come forward, given it has been allocated for some time, and proposed alternatives. The South Downs National Park Authority requested that the policy protects the setting of the National Park. | | |
| Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named) ANON-AQTS-32U8-B/Historic England (this representation does not have a full rep number because it was not directly entered into Citizenspace) ANON-AQTS-3BQ4-K - Bishop's Waltham Parish Council/3/BW3 ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/32/BW3 ANON-AQTS-327S-8/3/BW3 ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/15/BW3 ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/36/BW3 ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/16/BW3 BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/30/BW3 | | |
| Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the site will come forward; and The setting of the National Park. | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Guy Robinson |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32U8-B - Historic England |
| Full reference number | |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England re: suggested changes) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Bishop's Waltham Parish Council |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQ4-K - Bishop's Waltham Parish Council |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQ4-K - Bishop's Waltham Parish Council/3/BW3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | The Parish Council strongly support this allocation and its class E use (healthcare facility). The current GP surgery is well beyond capacity and through meetings with the surgery, a new site for a GP surgery is desperately needed. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Bloor Homes Limited (River Reach, Unit 7 Newbury Business Park, London Road, Newbury, Berkshire, RG14 2PS) |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-329Q-8 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/36/BW3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The Tollgate Mill site is an existing local plan allocation that is proposed to be carried forward as it has not been delivered. The plan indicates that it is in existing commercial use. To date there is no indication from the planning applications register of any residential development activity on this site and it is therefore questioned how deliverable this site is.</p> <p>It is important to note that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) (Site WI02), scores better than the Tollgate Sawmill site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proforma, pages 50-52) from a sustainability perspective within the Regulation 19 Integrated Impact Assessment Report, published July 2024 (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1024-1026) and is under single ownership.</p> <p>Additionally, the Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which was part of the original masterplan previously promoted, also outperforms the Tollgate Sawmill site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proforma, pages 50-52) from in terms of sustainability within the Integrated Impact Assessment Report (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035). This Mill Lane site is in single ownership and more likely to be deliverable than the BW3 Tollgate Sawmill site and can provide up to 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>We therefore propose that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) be expanded to incorporate WI06, increasing the total number of units on the site from 40 to around 100 and significantly elevate the number of affordable housing units from 16 to up to 40 on the site.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>The Tollgate Mill site is an existing local plan allocation that is proposed to be carried forward as it has not been delivered. The plan indicates that it is in existing commercial use. To date there is no indication from the planning applications register of any residential development activity on this site and it is therefore questioned how deliverable this site is.</p> <p>It is important to note that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) (Site WI02), scores better than the Tollgate Sawmill site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proforma, pages 50-52) from a sustainability perspective within the Regulation 19 Integrated Impact Assessment Report, published July 2024 (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1024-1026) and is under single ownership.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Additionally, the Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which was part of the original masterplan previously promoted, also outperforms the Tollgate Sawmill site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proforma, pages 50-52) from in terms of sustainability within the Integrated Impact Assessment Report (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035). This Mill Lane site is in single ownership and more likely to be deliverable than the BW3 Tollgate Sawmill site and can provide up to 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>We therefore propose that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) be expanded to incorporate WI06, increasing the total number of units on the site from 40 to around 100 and significantly elevate the number of affordable housing units from 16 to up to 40 on the site.</p> |
| <p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p> | <p>The Tollgate Mill site is an existing local plan allocation that is proposed to be carried forward as it has not been delivered. The plan indicates that it is in existing commercial use. To date there is no indication from the planning applications register of any residential development activity on this site and it is therefore questioned how deliverable this site is.</p> <p>It is important to note that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) (Site WI02), scores better than the Tollgate Sawmill site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proforma, pages 50-52) from a sustainability perspective within the Regulation 19 Integrated Impact Assessment Report, published July 2024 (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proformas, pages 1024-1026) and is under single ownership.</p> <p>Additionally, the Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which was part of the original masterplan previously promoted, also outperforms the Tollgate Sawmill site (refer to Appendix F, Site Assessment Proforma, pages 50-52) from in terms of sustainability within the Integrated Impact Assessment Report (refer to Appendix F, pages 1033-1035). This Mill Lane site is in single ownership and more likely to be deliverable than the BW3 Tollgate Sawmill site and can provide up to 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>We therefore propose that the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham (Policy WK5) be expanded to incorporate WI06, increasing the total number of units on the site from 40 to around 100 and significantly elevate the number of affordable housing units from 16 to up to 40 on the site.</p> |
| <p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p> | |
| <p>If no, please explain</p> | |
| <p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p> | <p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p> |
| <p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation.</i></p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Letter (commenting on policies, policies map and evidence base) Vision document (Land At Mill Lane, Wickham)</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Morag Kirby |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/32/BW3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | The ICB supports the current policy statements. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies) |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr & Mrs Painter |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-327S-8 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-327S-8/3/BW3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Policy BW3 5.5 The Tollgate Sawmill was identified as a new employment allocation with a limited amount of housing in the 2017 Development Management and Site Allocations DPD. This site has not yet been developed and has been brought forward into the emerging Plan. The Bishop Waltham housing sources table in Paragraph 14.10 identifies that the site will contribute 10 units to the supply in the plan period. 5.6 It is questionable whether this site is deliverable. The housing was required to enable the employment uses and the site is currently almost entirely covered in trees and scrub. Its biodiversity baseline is expected to be very high as a result which is likely to making viability even more challenging. It is considered that the site is unlikely to come forward as a result and it should not be relied upon to deliver new housing in Bishop's Waltham in the Plan period. There are alternative sites (such as the extension to BW1) which are suitable and available and which would provide a far more certain and deliverable source of supply.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or</i> | Yes Supporting Document (commenting on policies) |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Neil Massie |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/30/BW3 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | 10 dwellings could generate up to 3 additional primary age pupils and 2 secondary age pupils. The site is served by Bishops Waltham Infant School, Bishops Waltham Junior School and Swanmore College. It is possible that a contribution towards the expansion of all phases of education provision may be required. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Phil Gagg |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/16/BW3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | Together the BW policies will have a major impact on Bishop's Waltham. To be sound they should share general sustainable transport requirements to provide sustainable transport infrastructure across Bishop's Waltham, especially cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and public transport routes linking Bishop's Waltham with Winchester, Botley, Station and Fareham more effectively. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | To be sound, add general sustainable transport requirements to provide sustainable transport infrastructure across Bishop's Waltham, especially cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and public transport routes linking Bishop's Waltham with Winchester, Botley, Station and Fareham more effectively. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW3 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/15/BW3 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | We support the criteria in Policies W10(VII), CC2(VIII), and CC3(II and VIII) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. We request that reference to the setting of the South Downs National Park is included in the above policies, and that similar criteria are included in Policies W6, W9, BW3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01 – as these are all in the setting of the SDNP - to ensure they are effective and consistent with national policy. In addition, we also request that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policies W5, W6, W9, W10, BW3, BW4, KW2, CC2, CC3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | We support the criteria in Policies W10(VII), CC2(VIII), and CC3(II and VIII) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. We request that reference to the setting of the South Downs National Park is included in the above policies, and that similar criteria are included in Policies W6, W9, BW3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01 – as these are all in the setting of the SDNP - to ensure they are effective and consistent with national policy. In addition, we also request that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policies W5, W6, W9, W10, BW3, BW4, KW2, CC2, CC3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | We support the criteria in Policies W10(VII), CC2(VIII), and CC3(II and VIII) about the relationship with, views from, and provision of landscape buffers to, the SDNP. We request that reference to the setting of the South Downs National Park is included in the above policies, and that similar criteria are included in Policies W6, W9, BW3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01 – as these are all in the setting of the SDNP - to ensure they are effective and consistent with national policy. In addition, we also request that the boundary of South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policies W5, W6, W9, W10, BW3, BW4, KW2, CC2, CC3, WK1, WK5, WK6, and OT01. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and/or site within the setting of the South Downs National Park. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Email (Commenting on NE8) Letter (Commenting on policies) Email correspondence (Re policy NE8) |

| |
|---|
| WCC Response. |
| Comments noted. |
| WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations: |
| No changes apart from: Proposed Modification to Local Plan Policy BW3 (page 4005) to highlight the need to protect the setting of the National Park. Proposed Modification to Local Plan policies map to include the boundary of the South Downs National Park in the allocation and inset maps in response to comments by SDNPA. |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| Local Plan Reference or document | Policy BW4 Land North of Rareridge Lane | |
| Total Number of Representations received | | 37 |
| Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is – | Yes | No |
| Legally Compliant | 19 | 16 |
| Sound | 3 | 32 |
| Complies with Duty to Cooperate | 17 | 18 |
| <p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>The responses, primarily focus on sustainability, biodiversity, infrastructure, transport and community consultation. 78% of respondents are worried about biodiversity loss due to the development of woodland, impacting sustainable development goals. Doubts were expressed about achieving a 10% biodiversity net gain. The proposed housing design raises concerns about ecological disruption and drainage problems.</p> <p>There were concerns about local infrastructure pressure, including traffic and inadequate public services, were raised by 44% of participants. 28% of respondents considered the community engagement process as inadequate, suggesting poor public involvement and inadequate communication throughout the consultation.</p> <p>The South Downs National Park Authority referred to their Statement of Common Ground with the City Council.</p> <p>Some respondents identified alternative sites they considered more suitable. Hampshire county Council sought changes to the wording on transport matters, and advised of the likely pupil yield from this development.</p> | | |
| <p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32U8-B/Historic England (this representation does not have a full rep number because it was not directly entered into Citizenspace)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BN6-J/1/BW4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BFM-1/1/BW4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BF4-8/1/BW4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BHV-C/1/BW4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BEN-1/1/BW4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BEK-X/1/BW4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BQ4-K - Bishop's Waltham Parish Council/1/BW4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BRH-8/1/BW4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BPC-1/1/BW4</p> | | |

ANON-AQTS-3BP7-N/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-3B4V-R/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-3B5W-T/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/9/BW4

ANON-AQTS-3BXP-P/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-3BBE-N/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-327S-8/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-327D-S/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32C4-N/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-3B54-Q/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/4/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32DS-N/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32M8-3/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32MC-E/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32ZP-8/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-3BPD-2/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-322H-R/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32ZG-Y/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32Z4-C/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32K1-T/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32KY-2/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32A6-N/1/BW4

ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/3/BW4

ANON-AQTS-32HK-H/1/BW4

BHLF-AQTS-32EY-V/2/BW4

BHLF-AQTS-3289-F/1/BW4

BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/6/BW4

Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation

- Whether the wording regarding any vehicular access via Byron Close is appropriate;
- The potential flooding and ecological impacts, including the loss of trees and wildlife;
- The suitability of proposed access arrangements, including the policy wording about achieving a speed reduction in Hoe Road;
- Potential impact upon South Downs National Park and nearby local nature reserves and SSSI; and

- Impacts upon biodiversity and how Biodiversity Newt Gain will be achieved.
- Whether alternative sites in Bishops Waltham are more suitable.

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Guy Robinson |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32U8-B - Historic England |
| Full reference number | |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England) Email correspondence (between officers and Historic England re: suggested changes) |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
|--------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of respondent (or client) | Adam wright |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BFM-1 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BFM-1/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The document states that the land is 'used for growing trees and undeveloped'. The land is a well developed woodland with a wealth of biodiversity. We have seen slow worms, badgers, muntjac deer, squirrels, amphibians, bullfinches, kestrels, bats and more coming from the woodland. There must be plots of land with much less biodiversity that can be used for a development rather than destroying this thriving habitat. No landscaping will overcome the damage caused here if done.</p> <p>There is also no consideration to the impact of rainwater drainage in the development plans. The land is at a higher elevation than all of the housing along Rareridge Lane / accompanying streets. As such, there is no consideration to what impact there will be when all of the woodland is cut down and there are not enough roots to take the water out of the ground. There will surely be an impact on the houses further south, with subsidence or flooding.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>Please add the wording " The land is a well developed woodland with a wealth of biodiversity. There are common sightings of slow worms, badgers, muntjac deer, squirrels, amphibians, bullfinches, bats and more coming from the woodland. "</p> <p>Also add " The land is at a higher elevation than all of the housing along Rareridge Lane / accompanying streets. As such, there is a potential impact if all of the woodland is cut down and there are not enough roots to take the water out of the ground, which could lead to potential subsidence or flooding of the houses further South on Rareridge Lane."</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | <p>The land is a well developed woodland with a wealth of biodiversity. There are common sightings of slow worms, badgers, muntjac deer, squirrels, amphibians, bullfinches, bats and more coming from the woodland. The land is at a higher elevation than all of the housing along Rareridge Lane / accompanying streets. As such, there is a potential impact if all of the woodland is cut down and there are not enough roots to take the water out of the ground, which could lead to potential subsidence or flooding of the houses further South on Rareridge Lane."</p> |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |

| | |
|---|----|
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |
|---|----|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Andrew Edward Ogden |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32M8-3 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32M8-3/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>I do not believe that the policy is legally compliant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area is identified as being used for growing trees. This has not been the case for many years. It is woodland and has many native trees. As far as I can tell, no independent assessment of the woodland has been made. No details are provided in the plan of the types and maturity of the trees in the area. 2. The efforts made to ensure thorough consultation have been very poor. I was only recently aware of the consultation and many people I speak to who live near the proposed development are not aware of it. <p>The proposal is not sound as it is clear breach of many stated policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policies state that developments close to the South Downs National Park should not impact the part from a light pollution or sound point of view. The proposal says the impact should be minimized but the policy implies no impact (not minimum). It is hard to see how there would be no impact. 2. The policies state that development should be sustainable. It is hard to see how putting 100 houses on the edge of Bishops Waltham will not lead to increased use of cars to travel to shops and work which will lead to an increase in fuel use and carbon emissions and reduced air quality from increased particulates from tyres. 3. The policies indicate that infrastructure and services should not be made worse. The provision of GP services in Bishops Waltham is really poor and constrained by the current location. There is mention that there is consideration of working on this but surely no further development and addition of population should be approved until the problem in health care is resolved. 4. The policies indicate that infrastructure and services should not be made worse. With the closure of the tip in Bishops Waltham people will have to drive further to dispose of waste which will be aggravated by the proposed increase in population. 5. The policies indicate that infrastructure and services should not be made worse. Parking in Bishops Waltham is poor even with new parking at Jubilee Hall. It is difficult to park to buy groceries from The Co-op and the car park in Sainsbury's is small. The result is that more people will shop in other locations such as Hedge End. Again, this will lead to increased carbon and tyre particulate emissions. 6. The policies indicate that infrastructure and services should not be made worse. It unclear whether current and proposed developments will cause a change in staff to pupil ratios in local schools as no data is provided. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Clearly changes in private school VAT and business rates regulations will make this worse. Well run organisations would provide a projection of this but nothing is provided in the plan.</p> <p>7. It is not clear if the development is safe. Currently, many children walk along the narrow pavement from Swanmore at the end of the school day. This development will increase the traffic on Hoe Road and the new road junction will increase risks to road users and pedestrians. No data is provided in the plan showing traffic volume now and after the new development nor current and expected accident rate. It is unclear if reducing the speed to 30mph will significantly reduce the risk and the plan should include an assessment of this by independent road traffic safety experts.</p> <p>The plan does not comply with the duty to co-operate as the consultation has been very poorly advertised. Finally, it is clear that national priorities are changing with the new government. There is a mandate to "fix the NHS", reduce carbon emissions, address biodiversity crises and radically reduce emissions from sewage treatment works to water ways and the sea. The plan goes against all these national priorities.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>1. Until the GP services in Bishops Waltham are resolved, it is hard to see how further population can be added to Bishops Waltham. Well run organisations ensure wall-to-wall planning and this appears to be missing.</p> <p>2. The policies seem well thought through although they need improvement to align with new national government priorities.</p> <p>3. The actual plan is not aligned with policies in areas including services, infrastructure, biodiversity, sustainability, carbon emissions, air and water quality, safety of citizens.</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Andrew Mathys |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BF4-8 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BF4-8/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Firstly, the wording and registration structure to reach this comment box seem to me designed to make it as uneasy and tries to put you off commenting at all in my view.</p> <p>14.22 firstly, with 100 new dwellings this brings perhaps 2 cars per unit plus some motorcycles, which just in itself will change the nature of this part of Bishops Waltham. It will naturally mean more traffic to Swanmore, and change the wider area which I can't see mentioned.</p> <p>One major concern we have is over drainage. There is already an issue on Rareridge Lane during heavy rains, which pours rain down Hoe Road and driveways. With several septic tanks on the road you can imagine the issues we will have and with rainfall increasing due to climate change this will only get worse. You can see for yourself that many houses already have sandbags by the garages. By removing this woodland I strongly believe we will see greater run off along Hoe road and Rareridge Lane which will lead into properties.</p> <p>Drainage and cars are my two main reasons that I feel this site is wrong for development.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Ann Thwaites |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B4V-R |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B4V-R/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>My concerns-</p> <p>1 Impact on existing homes in Byron Close as a 100 home pedestrian route into town and to school, and also emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>2 Poor location of road access for vehicles and pedestrians so close to Rareridge Lane junction with Hoe Road. No footpath.</p> <p>3 This area has become a worthwhile bio diverse land which has developed since this plan was 1 of 5 and since changed Government Reg in 2021.</p> <p>4. It is a valuable buffer between current homes and the SDNP.</p> <p>5. Difficult to understand how the impact of 100 homes on the SDNP can be in line with regulations.</p> <p>6. B.D.G. - i cannot see how the proposal can properly protect and or enhance ecology of the area.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>Alteration to both road and pedestrian accesses</p> <p>Retain this BDG land.</p> <p>Significantly reduce noise/light pollution impact on SDNP and existing homes.</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or</i> | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Bellway Strategic Land Daniel Poole |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3289-F |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-3289-F/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Paragraphs 14.18 to 14.24 acknowledge that the site has some significant constraints, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site is located “immediately to the south of the South Downs National Park”; • the site “has been used for growing trees” and from our site visit it resembles a woodland; • “West Hoe Cemetery lies immediately to the east”; • The development “will need to be sensitively designed and managed in order to minimise any potential adverse impacts on the National Park”; • There are “a number of listed buildings are in the vicinity, including a group of buildings to the south and a cottage to the east. Consideration will need to be given through the design process to minimise harm to the setting of those heritage assets”; • “a pedestrian crossing would be needed on Hoe Road as there is no footpath on the north side of the road”; • “it will need to be demonstrated through the design process how the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, including safe and attractive routes to, from, and within the site have been connected to the Public Rights of Way (PROW) network and to the nearest public transport stop”; • “development of the site is expected to avoid the highest part of the site, leaving the northern area for amenity space, landscape screening and biodiversity net gain”; • the “exact layout of this site is expected to be determined in a landscape led masterplan fully justified through a design process in accordance with policy D1 and supported by appropriate evidence”; • “The proposals will need to include significant landscaping to mitigate the impacts to the adjacent footpath, countryside, the National Park, and nearby listed buildings”. <p>5.50 Overall the Local Plan acknowledges that all of the site’s constraints “are considered likely to reduce the capacity of the site and it is therefore allocated for ‘about 100’1 dwellings as a prudent estimate of what can be achieved.</p> <p>5.51 1 The term “about 100 dwellings” is cited in the wording of the allocation in Policy BW4.</p> <p>5.52 The Rareridge Lane site has an area of approximately 5 hectares, and given the need to secure BNG, a prudent 15 dph assumption would give rise to just 75 dwellings.</p> <p>5.53 However, in our view, factoring in tree cover, a need to provide landscape buffers, open space and BNG it is prudent to assume a reduced site area of 3 hectares and a 15 dph ratio; therefore the true deliverability of</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>the site is closer to 45 dwellings in our view; which gives greater weight to the need to find more sites in Bishop's Waltham.</p> <p>5.54 We are concerned and object to the fact that land north of Rareridge Lane is the only new allocation for Bishop's Waltham, and as highlighted above, it is located in an unsustainable location on the north of the town where impacts on the South Downs National Park will also be greater. Due to the site's woodland covering, it is likely to prove very difficult to achieve biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>5.55 Our primary concern with the proposed allocation of the Land North of Rareridge Lane relates to its poor relationship to the High Street. The walking distance from the centre of the site to the northern end of the High Street is 1.3 kilometres, which is a 15-minute walk.</p> <p>5.56 By comparison, the distance from the centre of our client's site to the southern end of the High Street is just 395 metres, which is a 5-minute walk. In our opinion, our client's site is preferable to the allocated site in terms of its inherent sustainable location.</p> <p>5.57 The extract of the SHELAA mapping provided below shows how the Rareridge Lane site (BW17) sits awkwardly, jutting out towards the South Downs National Park, and located on the hinterlands to the north east of the settlement.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Form (with table)</p> <p>Letter (commenting on policies - includes tables and pictures)</p> <p>Supporting document 1 (Vision Document - Botley Road, Bishops Waltham)</p> <p>Supporting document 2 (pre-application advice from Historic England)</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Bishop's Waltham Parish Council |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQ4-K - Bishop's Waltham Parish Council |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BQ4-K - Bishop's Waltham Parish Council/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>In general this policy is supported by the Parish Council, however we believe there needs to be some minor changes to ensure the policy is sound come the stage of a planning application.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.22 mentions 'potentially' a reduction in the speed limit to 30mph. Our comment would be to clarify the language in the supporting paragraph to match the actual policy in part vii where it states, 'Provide or contribute to the reduced speed limit to 30mph and a new village gateway on Hoe Road to the east of the site'. Ensuring the 30mph limit is extended past the proposed site access has strong local support from residents and the Parish Council, especially where we have seen previous developments not have this in the policy, leading to unchanged speed limits of 40mph at a time whereby we are trying to make it easier and safer for residents to walk into the town center.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.22 also mentions 'General vehicular access onto Byron Close will not be acceptable however pedestrian cycle and emergency services access should be retained.' We are very concerned that this is not reflected in the policy itself. We strongly support the supporting paragraph but believe that this should be reflected in the policy, specifically mentioning that only pedestrian...etc access through Byron Close should be accepted, with no vehicle traffic to use this access.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>To alter the supporting paragraph 14.22 to reflect the policy part vii.</p> <p>To alter the policy part iii to reflect what is said in supporting paragraph 14.22.</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | <p>Paragraph 14.22 line 6 onwards should have the word 'potentially' removed to read:</p> <p>.....To access the site a standard T junction onto Hoe Road would be required and a reduction in the speed limit on Hoe Road to 30 mph.....</p> <p>The policy part iii should read: Provide an appropriate, safe, vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access in accordance with Policy T3 which minimises the impact on existing residential properties and complies with Hampshire County Council technical guidance documents. Byron Close access will be restricted to pedestrian and cycle access only, no vehicle access will be permitted through Byron Close.</p> |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |

| | |
|---|--|
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Colleen Sykes |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32C4-N |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32C4-N/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>There was inadequate information or involvement with the local residents in making this decision, together with inadequate advertisement leading to improper consultation.</p> <p>Incorrect classification of woodland, anyone who has visited the site can see it is of mixed woodland and is rich with biodiversity. A full arbor cultural survey would show this.</p> <p>There is no sign of biodiversity net gain. I fail to see how a new housing development would enhance a species diverse woodland of both flora and fauna. There is little hope of gaining the 10% that is required. A full ecological survey would show the richness of the area.</p> <p>The access is not up to taking the extra traffic as the Rareridge/Oak road is choked with vehicles leaving Hoe road an already well used and narrow route.</p> <p>Why would you look to destroy a wooded area which will have a huge impact on the local environment and clean air?</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Up to date surveys by independent bodies are undertaken and shown compliance with legislation and local plans. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Duane Walker |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32ZP-8 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32ZP-8/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The description of the land being proposed within the allocation proposal BW4 is incorrect and does not accurately describe the land in question. This is a woodland that has matured naturally over many years and has not been used for growing Xmas trees for decades.</p> <p>The site is rich in wildlife and plant species and the will be a significant bio diversity loss as a result of the allocation.</p> <p>The sites levels and the impact on the National Park is under described and the impact is likely to be significant.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | The correct description of the site as a mature woodland rich in wildlife would create a more sound and accurate description within the plan of the site's current use. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | The site is a mature woodland that has been naturally developing over 20 years now with an abundance of wildlife present. |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided</i> | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Emma Houghton |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BRH-8 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BRH-8/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>14.19 The description of the land is completely inaccurate, it is NOT a 'piece of land that has been used for growing trees', it is in fact a young native woodland, containing a number of different and valuable native species of trees, including Ash, Beech, Oak, and birch. The woodland is full of wildlife, which I have listed in previous regulation 18 submission, no mention of the displacement of wildlife is mentioned within the regulation 19 policy. In addition, for the first time in many years, I heard a cuckoo in the woods this May which I believe to be on the red list of birds.</p> <p>14.22 As a resident who would be directly affected by the addition of a new road to give access to the site, I feel that there is insufficient detail of the vehicular access. Hoe Road is a busy 40 mph road and it is the main route between Swanmore and Bishops Waltham. A new road will affectively make it a four way junction with Hoe Road, Rareridge Lane and the new road access. This I believe will be unsafe, both to vehicular and pedestrian traffic and is to all intents and purposes an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>Previous developments in Bishops Waltham have failed to place reasonable safe traffic measures.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | This Woodland should be preserved and not destroyed, there is no modification that would make this a sound decision and the land should not be used for building. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | George Whalley |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-32EY-V |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-32EY-V/2/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response.</p> <p>We object to the proposed allocation of this site which is not justified or consistent with national policy the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) have objected to the site in the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan due to impact on the National Park. Their concerns have not been overcome (as confirmed in the latest Statement of Common Ground (SOCG)10. Furthermore, the Regulation 19 SA site assessment is not justified or legally compliant as the site assessment for BW17 fails to identify the landscape impact on the SDNP.</p> <p>The proposed allocation at Rareridge Lane is not consistent with national policy and will be unable to deliver a 10% net gain in BNG. The proposed development would result in the loss of a portion of the grassland, woodland and scrub. A Feasibility Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment has been undertaken for Land at Mill Chase and Land North of Rareridge Lane as part of a comparative assessment set out in the Mill Chase New Neighbourhood Vision Statement. This assessment demonstrates that a development of 100 dwellings would not be able to deliver a 10% net gain in BNG. To achieve 10% BNG on the Rareridge Lane site the development potential would need to be reduced from 100 to approximately 50 dwellings.</p> <p>An Integrated Impact Assessment Report incorporating SA has been undertaken for the Regulation 19 Local Plan including site assessments. The appraisal for site BW17 is not justified or legally compliant as it fails to identify the landscape impacts on the National Park. The appraisal of the site under objective IIA10: Landscape identifies only a 'minor-negative concern' and concludes that the site has 'medium or higher overall landscape sensitivity'.</p> <p>In terms of site selection and landscape impact, 'Land at Mill Chase' is a preferential 'Land at Rareridge Lane'. Land at Mill Chase is located adjacent to the south-east settlement edge of Bishops Waltham where views into and out of the site are screened by woodland and existing residential development. The Land at Mill Chase Vision Statement should be referred to in respect of landscape impact.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>NPPF paragraph 182 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. Paragraph 182 also states that development in the setting of National Parks should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on designated areas. The SDNPA have confirmed through their representations and latest SOCG that the proposed allocation of 100 homes will have a significant adverse impact on the National Park and these effects cannot be adequately mitigated through a landscape led approach. Therefore, the proposed allocation is contrary to national policy and should be removed from the draft Local Plan or the capacity for development reduced to ensure landscape impacts on the setting of the National Park are appropriately addressed.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Form (referring to letter)</p> <p>Supporting information (commenting on policies and proposed site)</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Helen Gillooly |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BPC-1 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BPC-1/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>1) There is no mention in the policy that existing properties in the area already experience flooding due to surface runoff during extreme rainfall events, which are increasing in occurrence and severity as a result of climate change.</p> <p>2) The policy is not sound with Winchester City Council's Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) 2021. The BW4 site is a regenerated deciduous woodland with at least 9 different native trees present, which have self seeded due to it's proximity to the ancient semi-natural woodland - Runnydown Copse. The BAP states that Winchester City Council are committed to "halting the loss of habitats and species" and "strive to be an exemplar to the management of our own estate, inspiring others to do the same!". Page 7 of BAP highlights that 12% of lowland mixed deciduous woodland was lost from 2006 to 2018 within the Winchester district. The BW4 development will remove another 5 hectares from the district. Winchester City Council's BAP 2021, highlights 22 key species (Page 21) which the council is committed to preserving and maintaining. Of these 22 species, 10x are either directly supported by the BW4 woodland or are found in the immediately adjacent habitats; bats, swifts (nest in houses directly adjacent to the south of the woodland), house sparrows, skylark (nest in northern field adjacent to woodland), great spotted woodpecker, slow worm, common toad, stag beetle, bumblebees (10x species in the area including the nationally rare shrill carder bee, <i>Bombus sylvarum</i>, seen in the adjacent field) and chalk hill blue butterfly (seen in Rareridge Lane gardens and on the Dundridge Local Nature Reserve). Whilst not listed on the Winchester City Council's BAP 2021 species list, woodcock are present within the BW4 woodland. Loss of this woodland and the disturbance caused by the development works, will directly impact these species. Despite the fact that "Waltham" is the old Anglo-saxon word for Woodland Settlement, very little woodland still remains within Bishops Waltham, with the BW4 site being the second largest woodland within the town at 5 hectares, with The Moors (SSSI) being the largest at 5.9 hectares, and the third biggest being Claylands with 2.8 hectares of woodland. The BW4 woodland is incredibly diverse and is a prime example of natural succession and rewilding. Sites with significantly lower biodiversity were considered for development within Bishops Waltham but were discounted, making this policy unsound with Winchester City Council's BAP 2021 strategy. It is also not in keeping with local initiatives such as Greening Bishop's Waltham (www.greeningbishopsaltham.uk), which is an organisation to help Bishops Waltham fight climate change.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | 1) The policy needs to state that existing surface runoff infrastructure needs improving and extremely careful consideration needs to be made to ensure the BW4 development does not increase the surface run off experienced by properties downhill of the proposed development. 2) The BW4 development should not progress to make the policy sound with Winchester City Council's Biodiversity Action Plan 2021. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | James Ironside |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32ZG-Y |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32ZG-Y/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>From the Foreword to the Plan: "The biggest challenge we face is climate change. Our area has an above average carbon footprint.": How does cutting down an area of woodland help with the area's carbon footprint? Furthermore that makes it difficult to achieve a biodiversity net gain as mentioned in the development plan. Its seems more like taking two steps backward and one step forward.</p> <p>From the Foreword to the Plan: "We are seeing the direct impact of climate change locally – with flash flooding,....": This plan replaces natural drainage land with concrete and tarmac, thus affecting properties etc downhill from the site. Why not use a brownfield site to build on?</p> <p>Para 14.19: "The site is currently undeveloped and has been used for growing trees" This statement serves to diminish the importance of the woodland area that this is. It should be written "The site is currently an undeveloped area of natural woodland that supports a great variety of wildlife".</p> <p>This site is immediately adjacent to the South Downs National Park affecting it with light pollution/and visual impact. The plan suggests that the development will be sensitively designed and managed to minimise these impacts: surely there is a better placed site within Winchester area that will mean NO impact to the SDNP in the first place.</p> <p>Doctors Surgery cannot cope with existing numbers of people in the village - why add more? Promises of increasing NHS resources to make up for increased building have historically failed to properly materialise in this country in recent years: I simply do not believe anything will be done in this regard. We already have to wait 2-3 weeks for an appointment - this will only worsen.</p> <p>There is no mention of how the increased pressure on the local school in terms of increased numbers of school children that this development would inevitably bring will be mitigated against.</p> <p>Access to the development looks like a) involving demolition of one or two existing houses b) being sited immediately adjacent to the existing T junction formed by Rareridge Lane - I fail to see how this can be safe.</p> <p>Mention of a bus shelter being built in Hoe Road is amusing as there is no room on the south side of Hoe Road to accommodate such a thing.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Abandon the idea of developing this site |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Jane Ogden-Swift |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BBE-N |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BBE-N/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>I would like to object to the proposed development for a number of reasons.</p> <p>1 Loss of woodland This site has been woodland since 1980. Since the Norway Spruce was harvested in 2003 the land has reverted to a native woodland. There is now a range of well established trees. The Forestry Act appears to prohibit the building of residential property on woodland. How can the local Plan contravene this legislation? It would suggest that the plan is not legally compliant. Given Climate change the preservation of existing woodland should be a priority. How can this plan be considered 'sound'?</p> <p>2. Biodiversity There are a large number of different species; many protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act. The list includes; Bats Slow worms Grass snakes Badgers Deer Hedgehogs A large number of different birds, many of which are listed as Birds of Conservation Concern. The Council claims to prioritise biodiversity and to require a 10% net gain if the site is cleared. How is this achievable. How can this be considered 'sound'.</p> <p>3 The South Downs National Park and adjacent protected lands. The proximity to the South Downs National Park cannot fail to have an adverse effect on the biodiversity and levels of light pollution. How can this be considered sound.</p> <p>4. Traffic Bishops Waltham is a small town of historic importance. The increase of traffic will have an adverse effect on the character of the town. Parking is difficult there is considerable congestion and the local infrastructure does not support the current population. How can this be considered sound.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>5. Road access</p> <p>The proposed access from the site to Hoe Rd is adjacent to the entrance to Rareridge Lane. It is inevitable that the junction will become very congested. This together with the poor lines of sight will endanger pedestrians many of whom will be school children travelling to and from Swanmore secondary school. I question whether this is compliant with existing regulations regarding road developments and wonder how this proposal could be considered sound.</p> <p>6 Consultation</p> <p>Consultation has been poor. There has been inadequate engagement by the parish Council and WCC. Finding the links to the plan and working through the system has not been easy. A large number of people must be disadvantaged either because they do not have the technology or can't cope with complexity. The elderly, many of whom are not familiar with computers have been marginalised and not given the opportunity to access the plan and comment on it. Is this legally compliant?</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Alternatives to building on the site behind Rareridge lane should be explored. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Jenny foulkes |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BHV-C |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BHV-C/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>As a resident of rareridge lane I am very unhappy and surprised to see plans to develop an area of regenerated natural woodland to build 100 new houses. This is NOT a 'Christmas tree plantation' as the Parish Council incorrectly continues to define it. This is established and healthy woodland. Any new build will have huge impact on the natural surrounding environment and 10% DNG is utterly nonsensical - destroying an existing healthy natural environment to 'attempt' to replace it at a later date is ludicrous. Access to the site is incredibly problematic, the extra traffic will overwhelm the area and significantly impact surrounding houses. As a walking route to the local school from all over the town, the extra site traffic during any build will cause environmental impact, air pollution and cause huge safety concerns for local children walking to and from school. These roads simply do not support giant 2-tonne diesel engined heavy machinery going backwards and forwards from a building site every day. Extra traffic once any houses are in place will do the same long term. The local infrastructure does not support more housing, for example, the local doctors surgery is overwhelmed as it stands, without circa 400 new patients. Regardless of intent, this development WILL have a detrimental effect on the associated National Park and the dark skies policy. This is not the right location to build houses, there are plenty of options slightly further from the centre of this historically important and already congested market town.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Referencing the area suggested as 'regenerated natural woodland '. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Referencing the area suggested as 'regenerated natural woodland '. |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Jos Creese |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BP7-N |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BP7-N/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The level of consultation was inadequate – local residents affected by the proposals were neither informed or involved and the only ‘consultation’ with the Parish Council was not publicised and hence hardly anyone was aware or was involved. 2. The site proposed has been incorreced labelled, described as ‘conifer plantation’, and a ‘Christmas Tree Field’ by the Parish Council recently in Reg18 comments. It is not and hasn’t been for many years. It is regenerated native woodland of high importance in the area – arguably one of the most wild-life rich in the parish. It has been wooded since the late 1980s when conifers were planted. 3. The biodiversity net loss from the proposed plans cannot be replaced for such a rich wildlife site. It is not, as some have claimed, a plantation, or ‘low quality woodland’, but a dense, diverse and increasingly mature native woodland, with the girth of some trees now substantial. 4. The proposed access will cause significant congestion on Hoe Road and potentially existing roads as traffic travels towards to other side of Bishop’s Waltham (the main route to Hedge End and Southampton). <p>Additional detailed comments cover</p> <p>The identification of the site for inclusion in the Plan by the Parish Council; The loss of woodland and reference to the Forestry Act; Biodiversity Loss – a range of important species identified and doubts biodiveristy net gain can be achieved. Climate emergency and loss of carbon capture:through loss of trees Impact on the South Downs National Park (SDNP), The Moors SSSI and landscape character Traffic & road impacts , Hoe Road is a narrow road for access, poor sight lines and overall traffic increase Quesiton need for development at all, or if necessary newer parts of Bishops Waltham would be mor ein keeping Object to lack of meaningful consultation and poorly attended Parish Council meeting.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | The position taken in previous Local Plans that this site should not be developed (various quotes) and history of the site drawing upon photos and plans of the site since 1929 and partial clearance of the site in 2013. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restart proper and meaningful consultation with local residents affected 2. Redefine the description of the area as regenerated secondary native woodland 40 years old 3. Fully survey independently the biodiversity loss 4. Consider alternative sites |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Julie Roughton |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BPD-2 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BPD-2/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>We do not believe this is a sound policy and that reasonable alternatives that have been considered for this site or that it complies with the duty to co-operate based on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Responses to questions on the draft plan have not been satisfactorily resolved or answered. Winchester City Council have NOT carried out the proper consultations with members of the public - particularly those directly affected in Byron Close, Bishops Waltham despite the Parish council saying otherwise. The use of social media forums by residents of Bishops Waltham has driven awareness and discussion of these plans after the consultation period have happened and both BWPC and WCC have not made any effort to substantially increase awareness and encourage consultation within the local community at the correct point in the process - which is why there wasn't much feedback at the appropriate stage. In the consultation comments on policy BW4 it states "Planning permission will be granted provided that details accord with the Development Plan" - why are we not able to comment and be consulted on the final plan and have our questions answered prior to this stage? 2. In section 14.22 of the local plan it states "General traffic vehicular access onto Byron Close will not be acceptable however pedestrian/ cycle and emergency services access should be retained". Not only have we not been consulted to the addition of 'emergency services' being given access via Byron Close in this updated plan but this is still not acceptable and previous objections remain. To quote parish councillor Jo Wood again, "the parish council would not agree to any vehicular access through Byron Close because it is already very unsafe. Absolutely not". So without the agreement of the parish council, why are emergency services (who will be driving at speed) an exception to this? Is it proposed to open up this route during construction to allow construction traffic to reach this site via Byron Close? 3. The proposed 'Landscape Led Approach' as summarised in 14.24 doesn't address the loss of bio-diversity, wildlife habitats and the wide range of protected species living in this wooded area. Winchester City Council have already declared a nature emergency (https://www.winchester.gov.uk/news/2023/sep/winchester-city-council-declares-a-nature-emergency) and it is counter intuitive to destroy this local woodland which is already contributing to the reduction of the carbon in our local community. It was identified in policy NE8, clause 7.67 that this has the potential to "impact on the landscape and amenity of the National Park and must be carefully managed and potential adverse effects |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>mitigated” and the local plan does not satisfactorily outline how this will be achieved, leaving it to council appointed, unregulated landscapers who will not be contractually bound to meet this obligation.</p> <p>4. In 14.25 of the local plan, whilst it is agreed that the allocation falls within an area which is served by one or more GP surgeries, both are over-subscribed and the allocation of 100 additional homes will put further stress on these services without a clearly agreed expansion plan decided at this stage. The proposed closure of Winchester Hospital’s Accident & Emergency department has also not been noted or referenced in this local plan or associated documentation which will not only also have an impact on local services but if this proceeds, there will not be an A&E within 1 hours drive.</p> <p>5. The reduction of public transport services provided by the council has not been addressed in the consultation comments notes. An addition of a bus shelter funded by developers as detailed in policy, clause vi (page 403) is not necessary as there are significantly reduced bus services to collect passengers in the first place. Reinstating bus routes such as a direct service to Southampton would resolve these issues and reduce traffic and congestion.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>See comments in previous section above.</p> <p>Communicate with those directly affected and implement applicable processes and contractual bonds in place for third parties who do not meet or deliver on their contractual obligations.</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Karen Trent |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-327D-S |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-327D-S/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response.</p> <p>This proposed site will mean a substantial loss in biodiversity and wildlife. The site BW4 is grossly inaccurately described in section 14.19 as 'underdeveloped and used for planting trees'. This may have been the case 20 years or so ago, but it is now established dense woodland with native species such as silver birch, sallow, oak and sycamore plus healthy ash trees. Has anyone from the BWPC actually visited this site? The woods are home to a vast number of birds and wildlife including badgers, hedgehogs, bats, dragonflies and moths. There is also a substantial hedgerow on the south side of this proposed development, which is home to nesting birds such as Wrens, Mistle thrush and Firecrest (protected under Schedule 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981). All of these species have been visitors to my garden which backs onto the woods.</p> <p>Object of loss of trees, and impact upon climate change and biodiversity.</p> <p>Concern allocation would result in a housing density much higher than surrounding area or other allocations</p> <p>Concern allocation outside the settlement boundary could lead to the 'green light' for even more development in the future, in the settlement gaps between Bishops Waltham, Swanmore and Waltham Chase.</p> <p>Concern Hoe Road access is poor and allocation will result in an increased risk for road users and pedestrians. Wider traffic impacts, public transport is overstated and impact upon parking.</p> <p>Impact upon local infrastructure – the doctors surgery is already under pressure with appointments being very difficult to obtain and the surgery made representation at one local council meeting confirming the need for a 4-fold increase in size to current premises to cope with existing demand.</p> <p>I have concerns over the potential increase in risk of localised flooding due to the removal of the woodland in favour of roadways, buildings etc. I back on to the proposed development site and I have experienced flooding issues on my property in the past 2 years when we have heavy prolonged rain. I feel this problem will only be exacerbated by the development. There have been flash flooding events in Hoe Road and Oak Road as well where water has overwhelmed the existing drainage systems in Rareridge Lane leading to issues further down into Cricklemede. With extreme weather events forecast to increase, the new development will only intensify the risk of flooding.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>The BW4 site would be adjacent to the South Downs National Park on two sides and seems in direct contravention of the WCC Policy NE14 on 'Rural Character'.</p> <p>The South Downs National Park is one of only 21 internationally designated Dark Sky Reserves. It will be a challenge to install a compliant street lighting scheme for this proposed development, without the added issues of light pollution from 100 plus residential security lights, which are unregulated.</p> <p>This patch of woodland also forms a corridor for wildlife. The Wildlife Trust publicises the need for wildlife corridors to connect small nature reserves. This land provides a critical path between the Claylands, Hoe Road, The Moors and Dundridge nature reserves.</p> <p>The approach taken by Bishops Waltham Parish Council does not constitute meaningful consultation – there was one PCC meeting to discuss the plan when it was first put forward to WCC - this was poorly publicised and, therefore, only 2 people attended. None of the residents in or around Rareridge Lane, which will be most affected by this proposed development, have been invited to or notified of any opportunity for meaningful consultation or debate with BWPC and have had to rely on word or mouth, or 'friends of friends' in obtaining information.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Further meaningful consultation by Bishops Waltham Parish Council before BW4 is added to the Local Plan |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | As contained above |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Kathryn Eustace |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32A6-N |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32A6-N/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>14.19 page 401 (SHELLAA BW 17) is incorrect - the site was once used to grow christmas trees but the site was cleared about 20 years ago and left. It has developed into good quality secondary woodland with an abundant and diverse biodiversity that I have seen from two different friends' gardens.</p> <p>14.22 page 402 - access onto Hoe Road - this would be a significant problem with traffic and health & safety issues with an additional approx 100-200 cars wanting access onto Hoe Road, especially in the mornings. This is currently is a quiet country lane. Pavements are narrow and inadequate for children to get to Swanmore school, our local secondary. I think there is only pavement at one side of the road at this point.</p> <p>14.24 page 402 suggests that the northern part of the site would be used for amenity, landscape reasons and biodiversity net gain. You cannot use part of the site for amenity and BNG because they are clearly two very different things. BNG requires a net gain of 10% of biodiversity within the site. This is not possible if you fell most of the woodland and turn it into a housing estate.</p> <p>I do not think this is legally compliant. Surely if a site is incorrectly described is it not legally compliant? My objection to this proposed development site remains.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | 14.19 needs to state that the site is secondary woodland and NOT suggest that it is still used to grow Christmas trees which it hasn't for decades. To call a woodland undeveloped suggests that any woodland could be used for development, and thus totally ignores the site's currently good diverse biodiversity. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | <p>The site is currently woodland that has developed on an old christmas tree plantation. West Hoe Cemetery lies immediately to the east of the site.</p> <p>Page 401 currently states:</p> <p>Existing use:</p> <p>The site is currently undeveloped and has been used for growing trees.</p> |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Kathryn Eustace |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32K1-T |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32K1-T/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>14.19 page 401 (SHELLAA BW 17) the site description is incorrect - BW4 was once used to grow christmas trees but the site was clear felled maybe 25 years ago and then just left. It has developed into a diverse secondary woodland with an abundant wildlife and biodiversity that I've viewed from friends' gardens.</p> <p>14.22 page 402 - access to/from Hoe Road - this would be a traffic big problem, causing health & safety issues with an additional probably 100-150 cars wanting access onto Hoe Road, it is currently is a quiet country road. Pavements are narrow and inadequate for children to get to Swanmore school or into Bishop's Waltham. I think currently there is only a pavement on one side of Hoe Road.</p> <p>14.24 page 402 suggests that the northern part of the site would be kept for amenity, landscape features and biodiversity net gain. There is a clear conflict between biodiversity and amenity. It is highly inappropriate to use part of the site for both amenity AND BNG because of this conflict.</p> <p>BNG requires a net gain of 10% of biodiversity within the site. This is clearly NOT possible if you fell most of the woodland and build houses on it and maintain the current biodiversity and increase it by 10%.</p> <p>I am unsure if it is legally compliant or not but if a site is incorrectly described it is most likely not legally compliant.</p> <p>My objection remains to the change of use from woodland to housing.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | <p>14.19 needs to state that the site is woodland (albeit secondary woodland) and not state that it is used to grow trees because it has not been used for that purpose for a long time.</p> <p>Woodlands should not be described as undeveloped as it suggests that a woodland could be developed. This completely ignores the site's current diverse wildlife value.</p> |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | <p>The site is currently woodland that has been allowed to develop on a old christmas tree plantation.</p> <p>Currently states on page 401:</p> <p>Existing use:</p> <p>The site is currently undeveloped and has been used for growing trees.</p> |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | kevin middleton |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BEN-1 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BEN-1/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>14.22/14.23/Access iii & iv</p> <p>Hoe Road is fairly narrow and the pavement is just about one person wide in places, causing people to step on to the road to pass others walking in the opposite direction. Opportunities for developers to make this a more attractive route to the town centre because will be restricted of this, especially for prams & mobility scooters.</p> <p>It would be most probable that residents would identify the safest route to the town centre as via Byron Close then through Halls Close and on through the church yard, as other alternative routes (e.g. via Ridgemedes) end up on Hoe road.</p> <p>The plan guidance suggests minimising the impact on Byron Close, but this may be unavoidable as residents find their own routes to access the town centre.</p> <p>The potential impact on Byron Close infrastructure & residents would need to be fully understood.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Louise Padelopoulos |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32KY-2 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32KY-2/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The site is being described as a "christmas tree plantation". This may have been the case at some point in the past. However, the site certainly does not reflect this today. From what I can see from satellite images, only part of the land was ever intentionally planted, with the other (east element) have regenerated naturally. This has resulted in a biodiversity rich woodland which is crucial to the overall biodiversity health of our town. We currently have very little woodland left, with much of it being fragmented. It's well documented that connected ecosystems are crucial for biodiversity development. By removing this woodland we would be forcing wildlife out of this area into already over-crowded alternative locations. I see that the plan states that the development will increase biodiversity - however, I cannot see the rationale behind removing such an ecologically rich area only to create a new wildlife area elsewhere - it simply does not make sense. In summary, development of this site would contravene our Government's targets to increase space for nature. In terms of access to the proposed site for both building contractors and in time residents- this is likely to impact negatively on the Rareridge residents in that the roads are not designed to take more than the current flow.</p> <p>In terms of consultation, the residents have had very little information around this consultation and what it could mean for this area.</p> <p>In terms of the location and its proximity to the SDNP - the proposal states that the development should not have any negative impact on the park - however, the development would be extremely visible being built on the slope of a ridge which the SDNP looks down onto.</p> <p>In terms of housing developments as a whole in the town - we have had significant building in and around the town over the last few years. There are still brown-field sites that need to be utilised before we continue to build on our green spaces.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Reject the development on this site. |

| | |
|---|--|
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Marian Creese |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32MC-E |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32MC-E/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Para 14.19</p> <p>Local Plan section 14.19 states ‘the site is currently undeveloped and has been used for growing trees’. This is not the case. It is currently a regenerated natural woodland of over 20 years maturity. The fact that it was used to grow conifers only adds to the likelihood of the soil containing a high richness of microbial community abundance.</p> <p>Bishops Waltham Parish Council (BWPC) did not initially give any information to individual residents of properties adjoining this site of its intention to recommend the site for building. There was very little advertising of local public meetings to discuss this. When this site was initially discussed several years ago as a potential for including in the SHEELAGH it was one of the least favoured as it would extend the village boundary northwards to adjoin the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>BWPC still refers to the site as ‘the christmas tree field’. It has not been used to grow christmas trees for over 20 years. They were removed in 2003. Since then the site has been allowed to regenerate into a natural woodland rich in biodiversity.</p> <p>The reason why this area of land was not included in the South Downs National Park and in fact deliberately omitted has never been explained.</p> <p>Para 14.22 - The extra traffic using the proposed access onto Hoe Road, close to the junction with Rareridge Lane will make this an even more dangerous junction for cars and pedestrians including school children walking to and from the secondary school in Swanmore.</p> <p>Secondary school children from the proposed development will also have to cross Hoe Road. Cars heading for Southampton, Hedge End and particularly Winchester or the M3 for London will need to drive through the town to get to the other side of Bishops Waltham and on to their destination. Winchester Road is already very heavily congested.</p> <p>Para 14.24 - Biodiversity and 10% net gain</p> <p>There is a lot of evidence to support the importance of this woodland as a haven for all types of wildlife which has been spotted and recorded by many people and stated in many objections. A survey of the area was done by woodland consultant Hugh Milner dated 22 December 2022 and his report was sent to Winchester City Council in support of a Tree Preservation Order Request in May 2023. His report was dismissed out of</p> |

hand. Below is a copy of his report which i would like to be considered as part of my objection. Unfortunately I can't copy his appendix 1 into this form but I have a copy of the report (word document) if it would be helpful. Even only developing part of this area would result in a huge loss of diversity which would be difficult to compensate for elsewhere. It is essential that a full survey of the area and neighbouring gardens is undertaken to appreciate this diversity and the extend to which this includes red listed species such as house sparrow and greenfinch and protected species such as badgers, bats, grass snakes, slow worms. This is only a small example of species known to be present in this woodland or the adjacent gardens to the south of it .A full survey of the site and adjacent gardens should be carried out to establish the species present here and the importance of this woodland to Bishops Waltham particularly in the current climate change emergency.

Report by Hugh Milner:

Woodland North of Rareridge Lane, Bishops Waltham

A Silvicultural Report in Support of a Tree Preservation Order Application

I was asked to professionally consider the naturally regenerated mixed native broadleaved woodland, the subject of a planning application to build a hundred houses on the same land.

This New Native Woodland (NNW) of 5.27 hectares (13 acres) has regenerated naturally over the last 20 years following the removal of a former Christmas tree crop of Norway Spruce, *Picea abies*. This fits wonderfully as just the type of woodland being promoted nationally by the Forestry Commission (FC) and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), to address the most serious international concern over climate change.

Additionally, the FC state that natural regeneration is preferable to planting of trees and shrubs derived from a tree nursery. Local genetic integrity is thereby maintained.

This stand-type of a broad range of trees and shrubs makes it resilient in the face of the current escalation in Pests and Diseases invading this country because this established woodland is comprised of at least 14 tree species, six different underwood shrubs, three climbing plants, one garden escapee and eight species of ground flora. This is from an inspection looking in from local gardens and an adjacent field. Thus, there may well be more species present.

The attached Forestry Commission map illustrates the woodland's proximity to the rich habitat of Rareridge Copse, an Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW), which has enhanced the range of natural plant colonisation, including at least three Ancient Woodland Indicator (AWI) plants in such a brief time, in woodland terms. This includes the rare Spurge-laurel, *Daphne laureola*.

Six bird species were observed visiting the woodland.

Lichens and mosses on many tree and shrub stems demonstrate locally clean air.

Recent winds have toppled some trees and others have died through being shaded out in the process of natural selection. Unusually for such a young woodland, this has provided a fair amount of standing and lying deadwood, which is most important for habitat diversity by promoting fungi and insects in the recycling process.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------|-------|---------------|-----|------------------|--------------|-----|---------|-------------|------|---------|----------|-------|-----------------|---------|---------------|-------|----------|--|------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|--|------------|-------|------------|--|--|--|--|-------------|------------|--|-------------|------------|-----|-------------|--|--------|--|-------------|--|--|----------|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--|--|---------|--------|--|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|--|-------|--|--|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|--------|
| | <p>Most ash, common in the northern part of the wood have died from the new Ash Disease, Hymenoscyphus fraxineus. Hopefully, some may survive to produce disease-resistant seeding. Sadly, the disease is untreatable. But the ash which has succumbed does provide valuable standing deadwood for enhanced habitat.</p> <p>At present the woodland is dominated by birch, Betula spp, and grey & goat willow, Salix spp. The latter is a host plant of the purple emperor butterfly, known to be in the local area. Appropriate and sustainable woodland management is strongly recommended via an approved Management Plan. An initial silvicultural thinning could favour a more balanced species range.</p> <p>Under the Forestry Act, there is a legal presumption against change of land use, meaning woodland must remain woodland. In the current climate emergency, this is even more important.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Hugh Milner, Woodland Consultant, 22 Dec 2022.</p> <p>Appendices over: 1. A map of the woodland, showing the proximity to ASNW 2. A list of species noted in the woodland</p> <p>Appendix 1</p> <p>Appendix 2. The following species were noted:</p> <table><tr><td>Trees</td><td>Shrubs</td><td>Climbers</td><td>Ground Flora</td><td>Birds</td></tr><tr><td>Birch</td><td>Spurge-laurel</td><td>Ivy</td><td>Pendulous Sedge.</td><td>Meadow Pipit</td></tr><tr><td>Oak</td><td>Dogwood</td><td>Honeysuckle</td><td>Iris</td><td>Redwing</td></tr><tr><td>Sycamore</td><td>Hazel</td><td>Old Man’s Beard</td><td>Bramble</td><td>Mistle Thrush</td></tr><tr><td>Beech</td><td>Hawthorn</td><td></td><td>Ground Ivy</td><td>Long Tailed Tit</td></tr><tr><td>Lawsons Cypress</td><td>Holly</td><td></td><td>Briar Rose</td><td>Green</td></tr><tr><td>Woodpecker</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Wild Cherry</td><td>Blackthorn</td><td></td><td>Cuckoo Pint</td><td>Gold Crest</td></tr><tr><td>Ash</td><td>Cotoneaster</td><td></td><td>Tutsan</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Goat Willow</td><td></td><td></td><td>Dog Rose</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Grey Willow</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Yew</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Lichens</td></tr><tr><td>Walnut</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Turkey Oak</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Elder</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Norway Spruce</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Mosses</td></tr></table> | Trees | Shrubs | Climbers | Ground Flora | Birds | Birch | Spurge-laurel | Ivy | Pendulous Sedge. | Meadow Pipit | Oak | Dogwood | Honeysuckle | Iris | Redwing | Sycamore | Hazel | Old Man’s Beard | Bramble | Mistle Thrush | Beech | Hawthorn | | Ground Ivy | Long Tailed Tit | Lawsons Cypress | Holly | | Briar Rose | Green | Woodpecker | | | | | Wild Cherry | Blackthorn | | Cuckoo Pint | Gold Crest | Ash | Cotoneaster | | Tutsan | | Goat Willow | | | Dog Rose | | Grey Willow | | | | | Yew | | | | Lichens | Walnut | | | | | Turkey Oak | | | | | Elder | | | | | Norway Spruce | | | | Mosses |
| Trees | Shrubs | Climbers | Ground Flora | Birds | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Birch | Spurge-laurel | Ivy | Pendulous Sedge. | Meadow Pipit | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oak | Dogwood | Honeysuckle | Iris | Redwing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sycamore | Hazel | Old Man’s Beard | Bramble | Mistle Thrush | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Beech | Hawthorn | | Ground Ivy | Long Tailed Tit | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lawsons Cypress | Holly | | Briar Rose | Green | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Woodpecker | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wild Cherry | Blackthorn | | Cuckoo Pint | Gold Crest | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ash | Cotoneaster | | Tutsan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Goat Willow | | | Dog Rose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grey Willow | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yew | | | | Lichens | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Walnut | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkey Oak | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elder | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Norway Spruce | | | | Mosses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Martyn Philip Heathcote |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BEK-X |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BEK-X/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Sirs - As a resident in Rareridge Lane I wish to make some observations in respect of the outline proposal for the land designated as north of Rareridge Lane. I was somewhat perplexed by the description of the proposed development land as "...the site (being) currently undeveloped and has been used for growing trees". Is this in some way a bad thing? Is any site that is used "for growing trees" seen as a location for development? It hardly chimes with the stated intention within the Plan's guidelines to adopt an approach to development of "brownfield first". Moreover, the Plan further states that the "masterplan should... manage vegetation to focus on native species". What consists of the land in question in this case other than "native species" ? At the local Council meeting to discuss (inter alia) this plan the area was, I believe, referred to as the "Christmas tree wood". It most certainly is NOT a Christmas tree wood but, as mentioned previously, consists of "native species". And, similarly, talk of a net gain in biodiversity by developing an alternate site for nature as an offset is, frankly, naive at best and disingenuous at worst.</p> <p>As regards traffic access to the potential site the junction of Hoe Road and Rareridge Lane is already dangerous to negotiate at times. Therefore, to consider adding an additional junction for access at this point is most likely to make the existing situation even more risky.</p> <p>I also note that the NHS Integrated Care Board has advised that the relevant practice (i.e. Bishops Waltham Surgery) falls below the relevant NHS space standards for the number of people on the current patient practice list. How can this situation be improved by the addition of more folk being added to the practice list? Lastly, and from bitter personal experience, I would point out that each time an additional housing development has been effected locally (..in the general Rareridge Lane area) I have suffered an ingress of sewage from the local main wastewater pipe. Does another local development mean further stress being added to an already burdened water supply and waste disposal system?</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |

| | |
|---|--|
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Morag Kirby |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B56-S - NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB/9/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | The ICB supports the current policy statements. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies) |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Mr & Mrs Painter |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-327S-8 |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-327S-8/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Policy BW4 5.7 The Plan proposes to accommodate limited new housing growth post 2030 in Bishops Waltham via a single 100 dwelling site allocation at Land north of Rareridge Lane. This approach, and Policy BW4, is not considered to be sound for the following reasons: • The site represents a major projection into open countryside and would have a form that would be non organic and out of keeping with the existing settlement. Effectively it would be highly visible, backland development rather than a logical organic extension of the existing settlement. • The site adjoins the SDNP and the urban development would be highly visible from the Park. The potential to adversely impact on it, and nearby listed buildings is considered significant . • There will be a significant number of design challenges to overcome and it is unlikely that the site will come forward quickly. The Plan has also phased the site to come forward after 2030. The site will therefore not meet the Government and Council's objective of significantly and quickly increasing delivery of new housing. 5.8 Extension of the Vineyard/Tangier Lane site allocation is considered a more effective and sensitive approach to quickly deliver future housing growth in Bishops Waltham.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? | Yes Supporting Document (commenting on policies) |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Neil Massie |
| Personal reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council |
| Full reference number | BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/6/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | |
| Sound? | |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>see PDF for mark ups and additional info</p> <p>100 dwellings could generate up to 30 additional primary age pupils and 21 secondary age pupils. The site is served by Bishops Waltham Infant School, Bishops Waltham Junior School and Swanmore College. It is possible that a contribution towards the expansion of all phases of education provision may be required. The County Council recommend that Criteria vii) needs to be less specific with the speed limit and the County Council therefore recommend that it should read as: "provide or contribute to the reduced speed limit to 30mph measures that would support a lower speed environment</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation.</i> | Yes Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base) |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Nia Powys |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B54-Q |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B54-Q/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | Yes |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Firstly, Blenheim Strategic Partners welcome the draft allocation of their site within the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan, as depicted by Policy BW4.</p> <p>The site covers an area of 5.13ha and is located directly adjacent to the eastern edge of the settlement of Bishop's Waltham. The land lies within flood zone 1 and is not subject to any historical or environmental designations, with the exception of it being located within a nitrate vulnerable zone. In addition, the land is classified as Grade 4 – Poor Agricultural Land and is not located within a mineral safeguarding area. There are no TPOs or listed buildings on the site or immediately adjacent to it, and the site does not fall within a conservation area. In short, the site presents an excellent opportunity for residential development due to the lack of technical constraints and we are pleased Winchester City Council ('WCC') agree.</p> <p>The site is in a sustainable location. Bishop's Waltham is a sustainable settlement and one of the largest in the district. The site is within walking distance of the town centre (approximately a 15min walk) and within proximity to sustainable transport links. The Market Town status of Bishop's Waltham is reaffirmed within the Winchester Settlement Hierarchy (August 2024) and is recognised as having a range of services and facilities in more sustainable locations as per the Winchester Development Strategy and Site Selection document (July 2024).</p> <p>The site is available and viable, being under the control of an active and willing developer (Blenheim Strategic Partners), willing to progress quickly to planning application in accordance with the allocation. As evidenced by the draft allocation and 2023 SHELAA (assigned reference BW17), the site is deliverable. The site is suitable, as demonstrated by the Development Strategy and Site Selection document (July 2024):</p> <p>"This site is considered suitable for allocation as it is close to the main centre of services and facilities in Bishop's Waltham including the primary school. It will not lead to coalescence of settlements, and it is well located to enhance and promote walking and cycling. Following consideration of responses received during the regulation 18 consultation, the proposed allocation recognises the sensitivity of the location and potential for impact upon the South Downs National Park. The estimated capacity of 100 dwellings is considered to be a reasonable assessment whilst ensuring potential impacts are mitigated through design. A joint site visit has been undertaken with Officers from City Council and Officers from the SDNPA to discuss the parameters for how the site could be developed."</p> |

We acknowledge that a large part of the district north of Bishop's Waltham is constrained due to its proximity to the South Downs National Park. The draft allocation has the potential to form a natural boundary to the settlement and its self-contained nature ensures that it can be developed in isolation with provision of an enhanced natural buffer to the National Park.

We acknowledge SDNP Authorities objection to the draft allocation, who have raised concerns in relation to the negative impact on the setting of the SDNP. In summary, they are concerned that the design does not adequately consider the park's landscape, ecology, and tranquillity. They believe the development would be visually intrusive, disrupt the settlement pattern, and negatively affect nearby public rights of way. Despite some potential for visual screening, they find the proposals unacceptable. WCC officers have consulted with SDNP regarding this and have amended Policy BW4 to provide a better, clearer approach for how development is anticipated to come forward.

Part i. of the draft policy requires development to be informed by a landscape-led masterplan. tor&co have been working closely with WCC and South Downs National Park ('SDNP') on the emerging landscape strategy for the site and will incorporate the following principles:

- retain a 20m belt of existing trees and shrub;
- where planting is absent on the western extent of the northern boundary, a further 20m wide tree and shrub belt (widening to create a small woodland group in the north western corner) would be provided to create a continuous boundary of structural vegetation;
- built development would avoid the highest area of the site, in the north eastern corner. This area would form a new open space;
- a new tree belt on the northwestern boundaries of 10.5m; and
- Additional green infrastructure including landscape buffers along the northern edge of the site and green corridors allowing for views through the development.

Blenheim Strategic Partners acknowledge the importance of securing an appropriate, safe access along with improved active and sustainable travel links in accordance with parts iii, iv, v, vi, and vii of the draft policy. We further support the officer comments within the 'Consultation comments on Policy BW4 – Land north of Rareridge Lane' documents. Hampshire County Council have requested improvements to bus stop facilities and reduced speed limits as part of the allocation, which Blenheim Strategic Partners are happy to accommodate.

Concerns have been raised about the potential impact of development on the last remaining wooded area on the Northeast side of Bishops Waltham, a site rich in biodiversity. In response, officers have revised the allocation policy to require that the site's development be guided by a landscape-led masterplan, which considers the site's unique constraints and features as well as adhering to policy NE1 of the plan. Blenheim Strategic Partners support this response as, particularly on the basis of the emerging landscaping proposals which were discussed earlier.

Further concerns regarding loss of trees, flooding and carbon and the climate emergency have been raised. We reiterate that the presence of trees on site does not prevent this development with the merits of the site

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>outweigh any necessary loss. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (June 2023) prepared by Aecom on behalf of WCC did not require any specific policy in relation to flood risk on this site, with flood risk matters being covered by Policy NE6. It is lastly recognised that the development of this site will result in the loss of some trees and vegetation. However, the remaining policies within the plan seek to locate development in locations where there are more opportunities for sustainable transport and the carbon benefits.</p> <p>A full response to the objections received on the site allocation can be seen within the 'Consultation comments on Policy BW4 – Land north of Rareridge Lane' document, which Blenheim Strategic Partners support.</p> <p>Part ii. of the policy states 'The development is phased for the latter part of the Local Plan period and permission for housing development will not be granted before 2030'</p> <p>BSP objects to this position, for reasons set out under responses to Policy H2. In short, there is no justifiable reasons to delay the delivery of sustainable sites, in the context of the NPPF and particularly given serious questions arising and concerns over the overall housing requirement and land supply position.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | Deletion of any reference to phasing. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Deletion of any reference to phasing. |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | paul bedford |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BN6-J |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BN6-J/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>The supporting text has now been amended to state" General traffic vehicular access onto Byron Close will not be acceptable" (para14.22)</p> <p>The Policy itself is too vague and full of platitudes .This clear statement must be included as Policy not just as supporting text .Otherwise developers will try and argue for some general access of Byron Close which would be totally unacceptable .A position supported by the highway authority. Without this change the policy is unclear and therefore not sound .</p> <p>This should also apply to construction traffic</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | The policy needs to include the statement that General traffic vehicular access (including construction traffic) onto Byron Close will not be acceptable . |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | <p>BW4</p> <p>Access</p> <p>iii ...Provideguidance documents .No general traffic vehicular access will be permitted onto Byron Close (including construction access) .</p> |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation.</i> | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Peter Potts |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32Z4-C |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32Z4-C/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>14.19 page 401 (SHELLAA BW 17) is incorrect - the site was once used to grow christmas trees but the site was cleared c.20 years ago and left and has developed into good quality secondary woodland with an abundant and diverse biodiversity.</p> <p>14.22 page 402 - access onto Hoe Road - this would be a significant problem with traffic and health & safety issues with an additional c.100-200 cars wanting access onto Hoe Road in the mornings which currently is a quiet country lane. Pavements are narrow and inadequate for children to get to Swanmore school.</p> <p>14.24 page 402 suggests that the northern part of the site would be used for amenity, landscape reasons and biodiversity net gain. You can not use part of the site for amenity and BNG because they conflict and BNG requires a net gain of 10% of biodiversity within the site. This is not possible if you fell most of the woodland and turn it into a housing estate.</p> <p>I am not sure if it is legally compliant or not but if a site is incorrectly described is it legally compliant?</p> <p>My objection to this proposed development site remains.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | 14.19 needs to state that the site is secondary woodland and not suggest that it is still used to grow trees which it hasn't for decades. To call a woodland undeveloped suggests that any woodland could be used for development and completely ignores the site's current diverse biodiversity. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | The site is currently a secondary woodland that has been allowed to develop on a christmas tree plantation. West Hoe Cemetery lies immediately to the east of the site. |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Phil Gagg |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/3/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | Together the BW policies will have a major impact on Bishop's Waltham. To be sound they should share general sustainable transport requirements to provide sustainable transport infrastructure across Bishop's Waltham, especially cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and public transport routes linking Bishop's Waltham with Winchester, Botley, Station and Fareham more effectively. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | To be sound, add sustainable transport requirements to provide sustainable transport infrastructure across Bishop's Waltham, especially cycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and public transport routes linking Bishop's Waltham with Winchester, Botley, Station and Fareham more effectively. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | R Roughton |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32HK-H |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32HK-H/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | The consultation comments have only recently been brought to my attention. I do not consider that there has been adequate consultation for the wider BW community. I have added further comments below on specific issues that I consider are not being properly addressed. Hopefully any future planning applications will be publicised more. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | General comments on infrastructure: The earlier development of land to the south-west of the B2177 (what is now Wetherall Close/Foxglove Road) was originally shown as requiring a roundabout to slow traffic and also to permit easier access onto the B2177 from Shore Lane. Traffic has considerably increased in the past few years, often due to road users avoiding M27/M3 roadworks on their way to London & Midlands. Traffic from a new development in this area will only compound the problems. Having seen the chaos ongoing in the Hedge End/Botley area from housing developments being built before proper access and infrastructure is in place, what assurances and constraints are in place to ensure timely delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements before any housing developments are allowed to commence? |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | Objection re Impact on SDNP/Dark Skies by ANON-KSAR-NKG7-8 et al Officer comment proposed change to para 14.19 – proposed wording “will need to be prepared...” is inadequate and does not necessarily impose a duty on a developer to provide the ‘needed’ masterplan. Wording should be changed to read “must be prepared...” (note this is also referred to in bold further down the comments. Officer comment proposed change to para 14.23 – again, proposed wording “...layout of the site is expected to be determined...” is inadequate and does not necessarily impose a duty on a developer to provide the ‘needed’ masterplan. Wording should be changed to read “...layout of the site must be determined...” Again, further down the comment the words “...need to include significant landscaping...” should be amended to read “...must include significant landscaping...” |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Sarah Ironside |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-322H-R |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-322H-R/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>On your documents the first and biggest challenge was climate change and yet you are proposing to cut down woodland. You also mention the occurrence of flash flooding become more frequent but you are planning to take away fields that drain the excess water from the fields.</p> <p>You say you want to protect villages but by over populating them you take away the usability of the village for existing residents, no additional parking in the village would be provided. The doctors are hard enough to get an appointment with at the moment and yet you say the surgeries taking care of Bishops Waltham are not over subscribed. As a lot of people use Wickham will that take into account the increased numbers of people from the Wellborne Estate the other side of Wickham? Also schools, where will the new children go?</p> <p>Living along Hoe Road it is a concern for us about the increased traffic this will bring onto small B-roads. 100 new homes would probably mean that there would be another 200 cars on the road, not to mention the lorries and trucks needed to bring materials onto the site before they are completed. With such a small junction at Rareridge Lane it seems that it would be quite dangerous having so many vehicles pulling out from there.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-329Z-H - South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)/4/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | As set out in the Statement of Common Ground, the SDNPA has 'in principle' concerns about the allocation of the site in relation to the proposed development quantum and how this could be successfully achieved through a landscape-led design. The SDNPA is committed to working with WCC and the site promotor to bring this site forward in a way which avoids or minimises any potential adverse impacts of the SDNP as per NPPF Paragraph 182, subject to the site being found sound at Examination. The SDNPA supports the amended policy wording and supporting text which sets out the need for a landscape-led design for the development. We request that the boundary of the South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policy BW4. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and site within the setting of the South Downs National Park. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | As set out in the Statement of Common Ground, the SDNPA has 'in principle' concerns about the allocation of the site in relation to the proposed development quantum and how this could be successfully achieved through a landscape-led design. The SDNPA is committed to working with WCC and the site promotor to bring this site forward in a way which avoids or minimises any potential adverse impacts of the SDNP as per NPPF Paragraph 182, subject to the site being found sound at Examination. The SDNPA supports the amended policy wording and supporting text which sets out the need for a landscape-led design for the development. We request that the boundary of the South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policy BW4. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and site within the setting of the South Downs National Park. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | As set out in the Statement of Common Ground, the SDNPA has 'in principle' concerns about the allocation of the site in relation to the proposed development quantum and how this could be successfully achieved through a landscape-led design. The SDNPA is committed to working with WCC and the site promotor to bring this site forward in a way which avoids or minimises any potential adverse impacts of the SDNP as per NPPF Paragraph 182, subject to the site being found sound at Examination. The SDNPA supports the amended policy wording and supporting text which sets out the need for a landscape-led design for the development. We request that the boundary of the South Downs National Park is added to the inset maps, site plans and wider context plans for Policy BW4. This will assist applicants and case officers in understanding the relationship of the settlement and site within the setting of the South Downs National Park. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | Yes Email (Commenting on NE8) Letter (Commenting on policies) Email correspondence (Re policy NE8) |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Stephen Berrow |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DS-N |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-32DS-N/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>To describe the site as "used for growing trees" (per Description of Existing Use and Statement 14.19) is misleading and unrepresentative of the site. This description significantly understates the rich bio diversity and range of trees, plants and wildlife contained on the site. There is no active use or growing of trees on the site, which this title suggests, rather it is an undisturbed habitat which has developed over many years to include a large range of species.</p> <p>Considering the current rich biodiversity of the site, destruction of this for building houses is in direct contravention of Strategic Policy NE1 "Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and the Natural Environment in the District" which states, "Development will only be permitted where it demonstrates that it will protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity"</p> <p>A detailed analysis and assessment of the wildlife currently within the site boundaries, including consideration of any protected species, should be undertaken and assessment of that report made against the stated aims under NE1.</p> <p>It must be demonstrated that, considering the number, range, variety and volume of species currently within the site, it is feasible to deliver a "biodiversity net gain" as required per 14.24. Otherwise this site must be considered in direct contravention of the stated aims under NE1 and omitted from the plan. On the basis that it is (i) not Positively Prepared (ie does not meet the areas objectively assessed needs under NE1) (ii) on the same account is not consistent with national policy, and (iii) considering the range of other, more suitable land around the town, with lower biodiversity (eg towards the East of the town along the Winchester Road) is not Justified, considering the reasonable alternatives.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | This site should not be considered within the plan. It is wholly at odds with the stated aims of NE1, given its current bio diversity. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | This site should not be considered within the plan. It is wholly at odds with the stated aims of NE1, given its current bio diversity. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Sue Curtis |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B5W-T |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3B5W-T/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | Yes |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>I note that it is proposed to position the dwellings in the southern part of the site whilst keeping a landscape barrier to the north ie adjoining the SDNP. So this will be 100 houses on say 3 - 3.5 hectares. This is a higher density than Tangier Lane / Vineyard development which is 120 on 7.4 hectares. That means the concentration of hard landscaping/roadways will be at the lower side of the site with the consequent issues of water drainage and run-off downhill towards all properties on Rareridge Lane.</p> <p>I also note that whilst there is considerable discussion of the landscaping required for proximity to the SDNP and some listed properties (not sure where they are) absolutely no comment is made re landscaping and tree boundary protection for properties on Rareridge Lane.</p> <p>The issue of lighting also concerns me. The SDNP is a dark skies area. The idea is that there is minimal lighting at night to protect wildlife. I can't believe that an estate of 100 dwellings will have no street lights and even if they are dimmed or even turned off at night people may still have outside lights on all night and there are no restrictions on the brightness of these.</p> <p>There is regular repetition of the commitment to not give planning permission for this site until 2030. Presumably building contractors access will be via the roadway at Hoe Road / Rareridge Lane junction (that will need some sorting out to be safe) which will be an irritation. Or might they close off Rareridge Lane, either temporarily or permanently, and we all have to come in and out through the Ridgemedede estate - they would have to sort out the on-road parking in that scenario.</p> <p>The issue of lighting does bother me however as it will negatively impact on quality of life. As does the impact on local services - roads, drainage, local services.</p> <p>Existing wildlife habitat - there are foxes, badgers, deer, slowworms owls and many small mammals and insects living in the woodland area which adjoins the houses backing on Rareridge Lane. They will be eliminated by the building of houses particularly on the lower southerly section of the site.</p> <p>Not enough thorough investigation has taken place into the effects of this proposed development site on the wildlife and the local population's amenity, nor on the demand on local services. It is not enough for developers to stick yet another children's playground on the site as local service provision.</p> <p>Bishop's Waltham no longer has decent public transport since the direct bus to Eastleigh and Southampton ceased, nor any cycle lanes or paths, no safe connection for cyclists to the station at Botley which could be</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | solved by the development of the old rail line for this purpose. If the latter requires some compulsory purchase then use the developer's money for it. The library is on reduced days and hours, the household amenity site is threatened with closure, the banks are gone and yet HCC still attempts positions more houses here. |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | The number of dwellings should be reduced to reduce the density, the local infrastructure and services given priority with developer funding. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy/Evidence base document | BW4 |
| Name of respondent (or client) | Susan Barber |
| Personal reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BXP-P |
| Full reference number | ANON-AQTS-3BXP-P/1/BW4 |
| Legally compliant? | No |
| Sound? | No |
| Complies with duty to co-operate? | No |
| Policy/Document comment | <p>Other possible developments sites in SHELLA document were not put forward, why have these not been put forward to the community. Whilst the Parish Council may have a preference for this site surely their first action should be with the community and not for Winchester to offer va fait accompli. This is not consultation..</p> <p>You also need to refer to my previous submission response made on the 2022-12-11 ref ANON-KSAR-NKW4-N. these points have not been addressed, nor as Winchester had the courtesy to try and contact me to do so, there are 8 main points covering :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Excessive Development 2) Housing Density 3) Ecological, Biodiversity & Climate Change. 4) Lack of Consultation (Repeat of above) 5) Amenity 6) Drainage 7) Use of Woodland for Development. 8) Road Safety <p>This format for having your say is over complicated and poor for the general public.</p> |
| What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound? | See comments above, more proper consultation with the public concerned who will be affected. |
| What is your suggested wording or text for the policy? | This is not for me to determine, why is this for me to answer? dp not understand the question. |
| Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored? | |
| If no, please explain | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy? | Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate |
| Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i> | No |

| |
|--|
| WCC Response. |
| Comments noted. |
| WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations: |
| No changes apart from: Proposed Modification to Local Plan policies map is included in the Proposed Modifications to include the boundary of the South Downs National Park in the allocation and inset maps in response to comments by SDNPA. Proposed Modification to criteri on vii Policy BW4 to clarify how traffic impacts will be considered and managed |