

Land at Greenways Lane and Kiln Lane, Buriton (LAA ref. EA005)

Number of comments on policy: 44

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	1	1	8	21	13

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents note that converting fields that currently absorb runoff into impermeable surfaces may reduce water absorption and strain drainage systems, particularly given the history of flooding and high water tables in the area. They raise concerns that the proposed increase in housing could alter the village’s traditional character and intrude on established heritage features, scenic views, and protected green spaces. Additional issues include increased traffic on narrow rural lanes, compromised road safety, and pressure on limited public transport and water supply, alongside an oversaturated housing market. Furthermore, respondents point to potential environmental harm from the loss of farmland and wildlife habitats, increased light pollution, and a risk of further development beyond the initial proposal through gradual relaxation of planning rules.

Key Themes raised:

- Flood Risk and Drainage Concerns
- Impact on Local Character and Heritage
- Traffic, Safety, and Access Issues
- Housing Demand and Market Saturation
- Environmental Impact and Biodiversity
- Infrastructure and Service Capacity Constraints

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support subject to detailed landscape assessment. The **Environment Agency** says there are no constraints identified in their remit.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council note developer funding may be sought to enhance walking and cycling routes to key village facilities. Although no flooding is recorded, groundwater and outfall options need further investigation.

Parish / Town Councils

Buriton Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed development, citing serious flood risks, harm to local character and views, overburdened infrastructure, and threats to sustainability and village identity.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan because it was not possible to establish if surface and groundwater could be appropriately managed.

Policy SDA36 Land at Clements Close, Binsted (previously Policy SD60)

Number of comments on policy: 4

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Four comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Opportunity: The long-standing but undelivered allocation should either be replaced with a deliverable housing site or placed within the SPB to come forward as a windfall opportunity.

Longstanding Concerns: biodiversity, flood risk, transport, limited affordable housing, and difficult vehicle access via Clements Close.

There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit. **Natural England** expresses support for developing a strategic mitigation approach for development within 5km of the Wealden Heaths SPA and a willingness to collaborate with the Council and other authorities as the necessary evidence and specific requirements are established.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

SDNP/24/03248/FUL for 10 dwellings on this site has a Committee resolution to grant subject to s106, so the principle of development on this site is established and considered deliverable.

Policy SDA37 New Barn Stables, The Street, Binsted (previously Policy SD61)

Number of comments on policy: 4

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree:0

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Four comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Opportunity: The long-standing but undelivered allocation should either be replaced with a site capable of providing much-needed National Park housing or placed within the SPB to come forward as a windfall opportunity.

Environment Agency shares the policy requires clarity that, because the site lies within a sewered area, foul drainage must connect to the public sewer rather than rely on non-mains systems that may not receive an environmental permit. **Natural England** expresses support for developing a strategic mitigation approach for development within 5km of the Wealden Heaths SPA and a willingness to work collaboratively with the Council and other authorities to secure the necessary evidence and define the required measures.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This site is allocated for one gypsy and traveller pitch and is believed to still be in the same ownership as when originally allocated so there is a reasonable prospect that the pitch will be delivered during this Plan period.

Policy SDA40 Land South of the A272 at Hinton Marsh, Cheriton (previously Policy SD63)

Number of comments on policy: 6

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree:0

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 5

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Six comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Due to the long-standing allocation having not progressed, it was argued that it should either be replaced with a deliverable housing site or treated as a windfall within the SPB.

Access: Concerns are raised that the requirement for public access to the River Itchen has been removed without evidence that the alternative provision offers equivalent benefit

The **Environment Agency** expresses support for the policy, emphasising protections for the River Itchen and proper foul-water management, while noting that any sewage discharge must comply with Environmental Permitting Regulations and requires a separate permit from planning permission. The **National Trust** supports the continued allocation of Land South of the A272 at Hinton Marsh, noting no changes since 2019 that warrant altering the policy and confirming ongoing engagement with the SDNPA. **Natural England** recommends updating the policy to acknowledge the site's location within the Solent and River Itchen nutrient neutrality catchments and to require developments to demonstrate nutrient neutrality.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

The landowner has confirmed that this land is still available for development.

Explanation of mitigation required under SDN7 is included in supporting text and identifies the nearby Hinton Ampner Estate as a suitable location for this. This Estate, owned by the National Trust, has already provided public access to the River Itchen.

The advice from the Environment Agency is included in the supporting text.

Policy SDA45 Land at Park Lane, Droxford (previously Policy SD65)

Number of comments on policy: 5

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 2

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 2

Summary of issues and key themes raised

There were 5 comments on this site. The following issues were raised:

Deliverability: It is noted that the site has been allocated for many years without coming forward. Suggestion that either the allocation is removed or include it within the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) as a potential windfall site.

Winchester City Council raise concern over the reduced site capacity and query whether sufficient evidence has been provided to show that no solution exists to address sewer capacity issues.

Droxford Parish Council agrees with the proposed amendments and state that safe access to the dwellings would remain a development priority for the Parish Council.

The **Environment Agency** note the reduced site capacity and state their preference is for connection to the public main sewer, which should be included the policy. They also note the site lies within Source Protection Zones 2 & 3.

Natural England note that this allocation falls within the Solent Neutrality Catchment Area.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Droxford is not serviced by any foul main drainage, so there are no sewers into which the site could discharge. A private wastewater solution will therefore be required which restricts the capacity of the site.

There is a current planning application SD25/03644/FUL for 9 homes, which indicates that the site is being actively promoted for development.

Advice from the Environment Agency and Natural England is included in the supporting text. It is not necessary to include in the policy as this is covered by other policies.

Policy SDA52 Land at Petersfield Road, Greatham (previously Policy SD71)

Number of comments on policy: 5

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 1

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Five comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Opportunity: Due to the site having not progressed for many years, it was argued that it should either be replaced with a deliverable allocation or simply included within the settlement boundary to come forward as a windfall opportunity.

NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight highlights future development here would add patients to already over-capacity GP surgeries, creating further strain and potentially leading practices to close their lists to new residents unless mitigation or CIL funding is secured. The **Environment Agency** supports the policy requirement that any development in this Source Protection Zone 3 location must demonstrate it will not cause significant harm to groundwater resources. **Southern Water** advises that the site's limited local sewer capacity requires development to be phased in line with new wastewater infrastructure, with accurate mapping and protection of existing assets near the site boundary essential to avoid flooding risks, ensure adequate capacity, and prevent costly diversion works. **Natural England** expresses support for developing a strategic mitigation approach for development within 5km of the Wealden Heaths SPA and a willingness to collaborate with the Council and other authorities as the necessary evidence and specific requirements are established.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

SDNP/21/04848/FUL was allowed on appeal in June 2023 and conditions have been discharged, indicating that this site is deliverable. Given that this site has an extant consent it would not be reasonable to add a restriction on occupation until the delivery of new wastewater infrastructure. Advice on the location of existing infrastructure has been added to the supporting text.

The comments from the NHS are noted and the provider is encouraged to apply for funding for specific health facilities from SDNPA's Community Infrastructure Levy.

Comments from the other statutory bodies are noted. The matters are covered by other policies, but the advice and a cross-reference is included in the supporting text.

Land at Fern Farm, Greatham (previously Policy SD72)

Number of comments on policy: 3

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Three comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Southern Water shares that their underground infrastructure runs through the site, requiring a 6-metre-plus clear easement that must shape the development layout to ensure unhindered access for maintenance and avoid costly asset diversion. The **Environment Agency** highlights that the site lies partly within Source Protection Zone 3, so the policy should require evidence that the development will not cause significant harm to groundwater resources. **Natural England** would object to allocating SD72 unless robust evidence shows why four traveller pitches should be permitted within the 400 m exclusion zone around the Wealden Heaths SPA, given that residential development here is normally prohibited and the emerging Local Plan policies indicate mitigation is unlikely to be achievable.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This development has been implemented so the allocation does not need to be carried forward into the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

The development was already accounted for within the limit of residential developments allowed within 400m of the Wealden Heaths SPA.

Policy SDA53 Land at Itchen Abbas House, Itchen Abbas (previously Policy SD73)

Number of comments on policy: 6

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 6

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Six comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Water: The site has no on-site watercourse, may face groundwater constraints, and requires further investigation to identify a suitable outfall, though there are no recorded flooding incidents (Hampshire CC).

Access: Concerns are raised due to lack of viable access and the harm a new engineered access would cause. Site therefore considered undeliverable and alternative promoted at Baring Close.

Natural England supports the allocation but recommends explicitly noting its location within the Solent and River Itchen Nutrient Neutrality Catchment Areas and requiring developments to demonstrate nutrient neutrality. The **Environment Agency** stresses that to show no likely significant effect on the River Itchen SSSI/SAC, developers must prioritise mains sewer connection, follow the drainage hierarchy if considering non-mains options, obtain permits where required, and plan foul water management early. **Southern Water** highlights that the nearest public sewer is 1.2 km away, meaning the development's layout and required wastewater infrastructure will need careful planning to address the lack of nearby sewer connections.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Promoted alternative site at Baring Close (LAA ref WI095) was excluded at stage 1 of the LAA because it is not considered to be previously developed land, is outside a settlement and is detached and unrelated to that settlement. Access to the Itchen Abbas House site is considered to be achievable and the policy wording allows for flexibility.

Advice from statutory consultees is included in the supporting text and impacts on the Solent and River Itchen are covered under SDN7.

Policy SDA69 Land at Ketchers Field, Selborne (previously Policy SD84)

Number of comments on policy: 5

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 4

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Five comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Flood Risk: The site has no on-site watercourse, so further work is needed to identify a suitable outfall for flood risk management.

Housing Need: It is recognised that the South Downs National Park should take a fairer share of required housing, warning that restrictive development risks harming the local economy and placing disproportionate pressure on surrounding East Hampshire areas.

Southern Water notes the site has no nearby public sewer network, with the closest catchment 3.4 km away, which will need to be factored into the development layout and required wastewater infrastructure planning. There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit. **Natural England** support the approach while noting that emerging evidence will determine specific mitigation needs and expressing willingness to work with the Council and other authorities to develop this evidence and define the required strategy.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Housing need comment does not relate to this specific site.

Advice from statutory consultees has been added to the supporting text, including that that the site is within 5km of the Wealden Heaths SPA so policy SDN5 will apply.

Policy SDA70 Land at Pulens Lane, Sheet (previously Policy SD85)

Number of comments on policy: 7

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 2

Not stated: 5

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Seven comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Minerals: Recommendations on strengthening minerals policy by requiring a Mineral Resource or Safeguarding Assessment, given the site’s location within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

Flood Risk: Flood risk considerations highlight the need to avoid nearby flood zones, address areas of surface water risk, and explore opportunities for local flood improvements.

Access: Raises significant concerns about the division of the site, inadequate pedestrian and cycle access, and the narrow proposed access road, emphasising the need for a continuous safe route between Sheet and Petersfield and adherence to the Development Brief’s requirement for a fully accessible pedestrian/cycle corridor.

Southern Water advises that because wastewater infrastructure lies close to the site boundary and mapping may be inaccurate, developers must confirm its exact location, ensure access for maintenance and future upgrades, and avoid building over these assets due to the high cost of diversion. The **Environment Agency** notes the site contains Flood Zones 2 and 3, so housing should be confined to Flood Zone 1 with flood-resilient design and a buffer to Zone 3b, and because it lies in Source Protection Zone 3, the policy should also require demonstrating no significant harm to groundwater. **Natural England** support the policy but recommend replacing the phrase “worthy of retention” in SD85.2d with a reference to policy SD11.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Many of the comments relate to the planning applications SDNP/24/03657/FUL and SDNP/24/03715/FUL which have since been approved.

Advice from Southern Water has been added to the supporting text. Reference to groundwater resources protection has been added to criterion 7 and explained in supporting text.

The Plan must be read as a whole so policy SD11 (now SDN8) will apply alongside this criterion.

Criterion 13 has been added to say that it will be demonstrated that the proposal would not have a significant harmful impact on the supply of local minerals. However, given the extant planning permissions now on this site, strengthening the flood risk criteria is not considered appropriate.

Policy SDA76 Land South of Church Road, Steep (previously Policy SD89)

Number of comments on policy: 3

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Three comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Flood Risk: Flood risk is not considered a concern, and discharging to a nearby watercourse appears to be a viable solution.

There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit. **Natural England** shows support with no comments to make.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Comments noted, no action required.

Policy SDA10 Land at Penns Place, Petersfield (previously EA067)

Number of comments on policy: 12

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	2	2	2	1	4

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents suggest that potential allocations (including their quantum and uses) should be reassessed, and that more homes are required in Petersfield to address local needs. In terms of EA067, respondents support a dedicated sports hub and call for an integrated and enhanced active travel network that links footpaths and cycle routes with local destinations. Robust environmental, landscape, and flood risk assessments and measures are also advised, with suggestions to regulate artificial grass pitches and plant trees along site boundaries. Concerns over increased car dependency (due to limited transport options and congested roads) have led to calls for improved offsite transport links and better integration with neighbouring developments. Additionally, respondents stress the need for enhanced cross-government coordination, a clear mineral safeguarding assessment, and attention to potential impacts on local healthcare services.

Key themes raised:

- Site allocation and land use strategy
- Active travel and pedestrian/cycle connectivity
- Environmental, landscape, and flood risk management
- Vehicular traffic, parking, and car dependency

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support the proposed allocation subject to a detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council recommend that a mineral resource or safeguarding assessment is required given the site's location in a mineral safeguarding area. Footpath 502 could be used for cycling and equestrian users, and developer contributions and a diversion may be required to protect and enhance the footpath and its users. Flood risk improvements will need to be considered given surface water flood risk and potential discharge to the watercourse.

Parish / Town Councils

Petersfield Town Council comment that the site lies outside the settlement boundary and is an island surrounded by a sports and recreation allocation in the neighbourhood plan. Housing would be incongruous with the identified sports hub

initiative, disconnected from the existing settlement, and contrary to the neighbourhood plan unless suitable alternative sports provision is made.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy requires a sequential approach to development in areas of flood risk.
- Policy includes specific support for the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan designation of this site as a community facility (Community Policy - Policy CP1 - C10)
- Policy includes specific support for development improving active travel and public transport access and the provision of additional sports facilities as part of a holistic transport and movement plan.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy protects existing trees and boundary landscapes and requires further enhancement.
- Policy includes specific residential design requirements to specifically address its unique location.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA11 Land south of Paddock Way, Petersfield (previously EA071)

Number of comments on policy: 12

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	2	2	0	0	7

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raise concerns about inadequate transport and pedestrian infrastructure, noting that key routes such as Paddock Way and Borough Road are too narrow for anticipated traffic. They call for revised multimodal transport criteria, enhanced water management and drainage measures, and clearer links with the wider road network. Concerns are also raised about active travel infrastructure with a need for wider and better signposted pedestrian and cycle routes that cater to all users. Clarifications are sought on housing typology and intended uses, alongside improved community infrastructure and the capacity of existing services. Additional comments include securing developer contributions for infrastructure enhancements, ensuring adequate vehicular access, and consideration of the adjacent safeguarded waste site.

Key themes raised:

- Neighbourhood character and public realm connectivity
- Water management, drainage and environmental compliance
- Active travel and pedestrian/cycle connectivity
- Community infrastructure and service capacity
- Developer contributions and infrastructure enhancements
- Vehicular access and traffic management
- Housing typology and use clarity

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support the proposed allocation subject to a detailed landscape assessment. The **Environment Agency** comment that development should prioritise connecting foul drainage to the public sewer and only assess alternative measures if necessary. There is a very small area of Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the boundary. Policy criteria should reflect the need for a sequential approach to direct development away from areas of higher flood risk.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council (landowner) comment that the site is no longer within a mineral safeguarding area for brick clay as per updated geological data. However, it lies near a safeguarded waste facility which must be considered. It needs to be demonstrated that the access via Paddock Way is suitable to facilitate the proposed development quantum. No flood risk issues are identified, water discharge to a

nearby watercourse is potentially feasible, and developer contributions may be required to enhance the public rights of way network.

Parish / Town Councils

Petersfield Town Council comment that the site lies outside the settlement boundary and that access is via a narrow residential road. Development would need to: integrate with nearby footpaths and cycle routes; integrate and respect the existing playground and playing field; and ensure playground access is not compromised. The lack of identification of the playground and playing field is a significant omission which requires correction.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy requires a sequential approach, directing built development away from flood zones 2 and 3.
- Policy requires the continued provision of a local green space (Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy NEP2), no smaller than the existing provision (totalling 0.79ha) and including provision of children's play equipment and a playing field.
- Supporting text notes that the site is in the buffer zone of the safeguarded waste transfer site at Petersfield Depot.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy requires pedestrian connections to the surrounding Public Rights of Way network (footpaths 189/44a/1 and 189/42/1).
- Policy requires appropriate buffering for adjacent watercourses and their riparian zones.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA12 Land at Drum Court, The Spain, Petersfield (previously EA182)

Number of comments on policy: 8

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
2	2	1	0	1	2

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Eight comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Housing Need: Petersfield needs a greater housing allocation, especially when smaller settlements like Ropley are receiving more homes despite having far fewer residents and limited local services.

Alternative Sites: The unused brownfield office site within the SPB should be prioritised for housing, but its failure to come forward raises viability concerns, making the previously developed land at Cowslip Drive a more suitable option.

Access: The site proposals must account for existing informal parking on Borough Road, ensure safe and well-designed pedestrian routes including Shipwrights Way and Footpath 509.

There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit. **Natural England** shows support with no further comments. **NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight** highlight future development here would add patients to already over-capacity GP surgeries, potentially forcing them to close their lists to new residents without additional developer or CIL funding.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Health Facilities capacity (NHS Hampshire & Isle of Wight)

Policy SDA13 The Courtyard, Heath Road, Petersfield (previously EA195)

Number of comments on policy: 7

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	2	1	0	0	3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Seven comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Housing Need: Petersfield requires a larger housing allocation, especially given the imbalance with nearby areas like Ropley and the lack of local services such as a nearby supermarket.

Alternate Sites: Concerns over the viability of the current brownfield site suggest that a more coherent and deliverable option would be to develop it alongside the Festival Hall land or prioritise the previously developed site at Cowslip Drive.

Access: The policy needs to clarify access arrangements, given constraints at the existing Heath Road kerb.

Water: Ensure further investigation into a viable drainage outfall, as no on-site watercourse exists.

There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit. **Natural England** shows support with no further comments. **NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight** highlight any development here would add patients to already over-capacity GP surgeries, increasing pressure on services for both new and existing residents.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- The supporting text includes reference to the opportunity for comprehensive development with Allocation Site SDA14 (Festival Hall).

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Health Facilities Provision (NHS Hampshire & IOW)

Policy SDA14 Land at Festival Hall, Petersfield (previously EA225)

Number of comments on policy: 13

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	1	2	1	1	7

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raise concerns that the policy does not fully align with key guidelines, noting the need for flood risk measures, enhanced parking for community amenities, and a more integrated approach to local planning. They question the demand for extra commercial floorspace given current town centre vacancies, and stress that development should retain existing parking, improve vehicle and cycle routes, and enhance pedestrian connectivity. Environmental and engineering issues are also noted, with warnings that earthworks and drainage alterations could affect the pool structure. Calls are made to preserve mature trees and improve planting to boost biodiversity. Feedback further emphasises that key community assets (i.e., the open-air swimming pool and Festival Hall) must be safeguarded, and that sustainable design with renewable energy solutions should be integrated into development.

Key themes raised:

- Infrastructure needs
- Residential and commercial land use balance
- Transport and parking accessibility
- Urban connectivity and public Realm enhancements

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

n/a.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council comment that existing access points may need to be rationalised. They also note some areas of low surface water flood risk and possible groundwater flood risk.

Parish / Town Councils

Petersfield Town Council comment that Festival Hall and its surrounding area is a key part of the town, offering an excellent performance venue, community hall, and open-air swimming pool. The above must be respected and any redevelopment should be holistic, carefully considering the entire site and its character including the setting of listed buildings. The neighbourhood plan envisages high-quality residential and employment uses, a new access off Tor Way, and a (potential) town centre hotel.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy specifically requires the preparation of a comprehensive site-wide masterplan, produced in consultation with the community and all stakeholders including adjacent third-party landowners including Festival Hall, Petersfield Outdoor Swimming Pool and the Courtyard
- Policy requires development to have regard to the Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan designations (CPI-C1 and MU3) and clarification is provided in the supporting text.
- Requirement to provide a holistic transport plan for the whole site including vehicular and pedestrian/cycle access and routes, and cycle and vehicle parking provision.
- Requirement to provide suitable flood mitigation measures associated with surface water flood risk.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- The policy includes specific design requirements noting the particular needs of the outdoor swimming pool and the Festival Hall.
- Additional information regarding the outdoor swimming pool is provided in the supporting text.
- Additional information regarding the provision of cycle parking facilities is provided in the supporting text.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA15 Windward, Reservoir Lane, Petersfield (previously EA187)

Number of comments on policy: 8

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	2	1	0	0	4

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Eight comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Viability Concerns: Doubts about the deliverability of the brownfield site allocation within the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB), as it has not come forward as a windfall site.

Meeting Housing Need: Petersfield (population ~15,500) requires more housing than currently allocated; concern that allocations are disproportionately low compared to smaller settlements.

Access to Local Services: Lack of nearby supermarkets raising concerns about practicality and sustainability.

The **Environment Agency** note the site is within Source Protection Zones 2 and 3.

NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight note pressure on existing GP surgeries.

Petersfield Town Council state development should align with Policy H11 of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- The supporting text clarifies the need for alignment with Petersfield Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy H11.
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Health facilities provision (NHS Hampshire & IOW)

Policy SDA28 Land at Farnham & Station Roads, West Liss (previously EA043)

Number of comments on policy: 12

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	0	3	1	3	5

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents emphasise that the development should protect mature trees, preserve the character of West Liss, and give careful attention to massing, layout and materials in order to minimise adverse visual impacts. They raise existing planning policy and call for clearer criteria, including precise housing figures, alignment with settlement boundaries, and the need to maintain local rural character and the strategic gap between Liss and West Liss. In relation to housing, a more varied mix incorporating affordable, starter and traditional home types is recommended over a singular, high-density approach. Infrastructure concerns focus on dangerous access points, discontinuous footpaths, vehicle access challenges, and parking provisions affected by flooding risks. Environmental issues centred on groundwater protection and potential impacts on bat activity and mature oak trees. Respondents also urge the preservation of working agricultural land by utilising alternative brownfield and infill options.

Key themes raised:

- Landscape and visual impact
- Policy compliance and planning process
- Housing scale, mix, and typology
- Neighbourhood identity and settlement boundaries
- Infrastructure and access
- Environmental and hydrological risks

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** highlight that the site is in Source Protection Zone 3 and, as such, development will need to demonstrate no significant harm to groundwater resources. **Natural England** state that a detailed landscape assessment and bespoke mitigation will be required. This will include SANG due to the proximity of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA.

District / Borough / County Councils

Hampshire County Council comment that the site is in a possible groundwater flood risk area; developer contributions are required to improve Footpath 6; and that it will need to be demonstrated that suitable visibility splays and junction spacing can be achieved. **East Hampshire District Council** supports the proposed allocation but

urges the allocation of more homes - especially affordable homes – in the area to meet housing and local needs.

Parish / Town Councils

Liss Parish Council object due to the site's previous rejection in the neighbourhood plan, overdevelopment of the village, oversupply of care homes in the village, loss of green space and food production, infrastructure constraints, existing dangerous access, and impacts on the protected gap, a mature oak tree, neighbouring properties, and recently documented bat activity. They suggest exploring alternative and better suited sites for affordable housing.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of two potential vehicular access arrangements within the policy
- Inclusion of multiple requirements to connect and extend the public right of way network including shared pedestrian and cycle connections towards the village centre
- Extension of the allocation to include both C2 (residential institutions) and C3 (housing) provision
- Policy requires that built development and parking provision shall not be located within the Neighbourhood Development Plan Protected Gap
- Policy includes that a Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) is required to mitigate any potential impacts on the Wealden Heaths Phase II Special Protection Area
- Policy requires that the development shall deliver green infrastructure which connects to both the Liss Meadows Local Wildlife Site and the former Liss Tree Nursery Tracks Local Wildlife Site which forms part of the allocations.
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Inclusion of two potential vehicular access arrangements within the policy
- Inclusion of multiple requirements to connect and extend the public right of way network including shared pedestrian and cycle connections towards the village centre
- Policy requires that built development and parking provision shall not be located within the Neighbourhood Development Plan Protected Gap

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA31 Land west of Liphook/ Land at Westlands Park, Liphook (previously EA215)

Number of comments on policy: 73

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
8	2	1	10	28	24

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raise that development could negatively impact the environment and landscape by altering cherished vistas, green spaces, and wildlife habitats, and increasing issues such as drainage, noise, traffic, sewerage, and urban sprawl. They highlight that local services and infrastructure are already at capacity, with some respondents raising the need for a local bypass. Further comments relate to the planning process, lack of adherence to National Park purposes, and the need for proper consultation. Respondents view the proposed quantum of 250 homes as potentially excessive in relation to local heritage and rural character. They also object to the allocation of traveller pitches, citing poor location and the number of existing pitches in the area. Respondents suggest that alternative sites, improved flood risk management, accurate mapping, and a focus on long-term sustainability should be considered.

Key themes raised:

- Environmental and landscape impact
- Strain on local public services and infrastructure
- Traffic and transport infrastructure
- Policy compliance and planning process
- Strategic opportunities and community benefits
- Housing density and design quality
- Community character and heritage
- Traveller accommodation provision

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England comment that due to scale of development (50+ dwellings), a bespoke Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) is likely to be required.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council highlight LTN 1/20 and their Technical Guidance Note 10. They comment that: options for traffic calming may be limited on Portsmouth Road; there are some areas of low surface water flood risk; and developer contributions could enhance footpaths. **East Hampshire District Council** broadly support the proposed allocation but seek clarity on uses, transport impacts, and SPA

restrictions. They comment that infrastructure, housing needs, and environmental concerns require cross-boundary coordination.

Parish / Town Councils

Bramshott and Liphook Parish Council object to the proposed allocation citing: no evidence of exceptional circumstances; no evidence of need for housing, care home and traveller pitches; existing permissions and proposals for homes and traveller pitches in the EHDC planning area; impacts on existing infrastructure; and conflicts with the neighbourhood plan.

Milland Parish Council comment that cumulative impacts with proposed development at Chiltley Lane must be considered. They highlight concerns over infrastructure (i.e., highways and healthcare) and the use of Milland as a “rat run”.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy includes requirement to provide a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG).
- Policy includes requirement to provide a comprehensive site-wide masterplan, including: an Access & Movement Strategy; a Sustainable Drainage, Green Infrastructure and Recreational Strategy; a Design Code; a Health Impact Assessment; and a Phasing Strategy.
- Inclusion of significant extension of the active travel network through and within the site, with supporting text noting specific requirements based on the latest standards.
- Policy includes requirement for including pre-application infiltration testing.
- Policy includes provision of an ‘active travel spine’ which provides an alternative route to Liphook Station and Bohunt Academy through the site from the north east of Liphook, and access from the site to Liphook Primary School to the north.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Inclusion of provision for of 2x 11v11 Football Pitches, skate/bike park facilities, outdoor classroom and play areas.
- Inclusion of design requirements related to the successful provision of sustainable energy technologies within homes across the whole site.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health, utilities and community provisions

Policy SDA32 Land at Westlands, Liphook (previously EA216)

Number of comments on policy: 13

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	1	1	1	2	7

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raise that existing transport issues require a local bypass, improved active travel links, and a revised field access to address existing congestion in Liphook Centre. A technical assessment suggests minimal traffic increases from 8 dwellings, while other respondents warned of potential overload to existing infrastructure – i.e., community, education, and healthcare uses and sewage systems. Respondents’ views on landscape and ecology issues range from observations of low ecological value to calls for an enhanced and sustainable setting that preserves village character and the National Park boundary. There is emphasis on a need for coordinated planning that integrates local community perspectives and encourages joint working with authorities. There are also suggestions to extend settlement boundaries, review longstanding covenants, and update housing need assessments. Additional comments include the need for further flood risk investigation, and improved connectivity for a site located on the boundary near key catchment areas and local landmarks.

Key themes raised:

- Transport and traffic implications
- Landscape, ecology and environmental impact
- Strategic planning and stakeholder coordination
- Policy, legal constraints and covenant considerations
- Local infrastructure and service capacity

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support the proposed allocation subject to a detailed landscape assessment. The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and so mitigation will be required.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council comment that traffic calming along Longmoor Road may not be necessary due to the site’s size. The county council may require developer contributions to improve active travel links in Liphook (i.e., Footpath 5). No watercourse is identified on the site and so further investigation into a suitable outfall should be undertaken. **East Hampshire District Council** comment that the site would provide a small quantum of development. If the site is not incorporated into the adjacent strategic site, then they suggest the settlement boundary is amended to

include the properties to the west of the site, providing potential windfall opportunities for future development.

Parish / Town Councils

n/a.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy references Policy SDN5 Wealden Heaths.
- Settlement boundary amendments have been recommended.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy requires delivery of a shared pedestrian and cycle connection into Allocation Site SDA31.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health, utilities and community provisions

Policy SDA38 Land south of Lovell Gardens, Binsted (previously EA161)

Number of comments on policy: 10

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	0	0	2	4	4

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents noted that current infrastructure—comprising water supply, sewage treatment, transport links and local facilities—appears stretched and may not support additional development. They questioned the site’s overall suitability and need, observing that previous measures seem to have met identified social housing requirements while Binsted’s rural context, limited facilities and green belt location raise concerns. Feedback also highlighted potential environmental impacts, including encroachment on green spaces, prime agricultural land and wildlife habitats, and the possible loss of valued scenic views. Issues relating to traffic and accessibility were raised, with extra vehicles likely to increase existing congestion and insufficient bus services and traffic calming measures compounding the challenges. Further comments stressed the risk of cumulative overdevelopment and called for strategic mitigation measures, including improved public route connectivity and reassessment of water supply, utility capacity and flood risk, while one remark noted that any potential integration with the existing settlement did not sufficiently address these concerns.

Key Themes raised:

- Community Infrastructure and Social Services
- Questionable Need and Site Suitability
- Environmental and Countryside Impact
- Traffic, Transport and Accessibility
- Cumulative Overdevelopment
- Disruption to Local Character and Heritage
- Water Supply, Utility and Flood Risk

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support subject to detailed landscape assessment. Further strategic mitigation may be required for development within 5km of Wealden Heaths SPA. The **Ministry of Defence** recommends that detailed criteria to include measures to prevent impact on defence operations due to the site's proximity to RAF Odiham.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council comment access via Lovell Gardens may require formal adoption as a public street due to the increased dwelling numbers. Existing crossover

arrangements and rights of access must be reviewed. Flood risk is minimal, but suitable drainage outfall needs further investigation.

Parish / Town Councils

Binsted Parish Council raise significant infrastructure strain—especially concerning water supply, roads, and GP services. They also highlight overdevelopment concerns given the broader regional pressures, such as the 1,650-home site at Neatham Downs

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy notes the requirements of Policy SDN5 Wealden Heaths
- Policy requires that the site has no impact on the operation or asset capability of RAF Odiham.
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy requires that the development provide characteristic planting on the southern boundary

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health, utilities and community provisions

Policy SDA65 Land at Old Green Farm, Owslebury (previously WI100)

Number of comments on policy: 9

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	1	1	0	0	7

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Nine comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Assessments: Concerns are raised about increased traffic on Whites Hill, potential land contamination, and the need for thorough assessments before development proceeds.

Rights of Way: They also request stronger wording to protect adjoining rights of way, particularly Bridleway No. 9, ensuring no increased motorised use and requiring an enhanced landscape setting.

Access: Significant concerns raised over vehicle access, pedestrian and cycle safety, and active travel connectivity, emphasising the need for safer links, prioritised pedestrian routes, and potential developer contributions to improve nearby PROW connections.

The **Environment Agency** reminds that developers must prioritise connection to the public sewer and, if this is not possible, follow regulatory requirements for alternative foul drainage while ensuring no significant harm to groundwater within the site's Source Protection Zones. **Natural England** shows support subject to detailed landscape assessment.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy and supporting text set out access requirements for both vehicles and pedestrians focused on minimising vehicular impact and creating networks for walking and cycling.

Policy SDA71 Land off Merryfield Road, Sheet (previously EA200)

Number of comments on policy: 11

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	1	2	1	4	3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raise that the site is unsuitable for development and should be retained as open space. They highlight that development would be in breach of restrictive covenants and that planning permission has recently been refused for 9 dwellings. Concerns are raised about the increased traffic on Pulens Lane, the need for further safeguards in a Source Protection Zone, and the risk of felling protected trees that support essential wildlife. Further comments focus on housing density, typology and neighbourhood character, emphasising that proposed dwelling heights and compact arrangements could negatively impact adjoining properties.

Key themes raised:

- Policy, legal constraints, and compliance
- Environmental impact and habitat conservation
- Open space preservation
- Cumulative impact on local infrastructure
- Road safety, traffic impact, and infrastructure improvements

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** highlight that the site is in Source Protection Zone 3 and, as such, development will need to demonstrate no significant harm to groundwater resources.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council comment that no watercourse is identified on site and that further investigation into a suitable outfall should be undertaken.

Parish / Town Councils

Sheet Parish Council object due to safety and congestion concerns relating to Love Lane and Pulens Lane. They request that development contributes to the delivery of a pedestrian bridge crossing over Tilmore Brook to improve access to the Rotherlands Nature Reserve and Taro Leisure Centre. They also raise that traffic calming and safety improvements for the “Sheet end” of Pulens Lane are in the last phase to be implemented.

Steep Parish Council raise concerns about road infrastructure.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Allocation boundary revised

Policy SDA78 Land north of Winchester Road, Stroud (previously EA212)

Number of comments on policy: 35

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	1	2	5	22	5

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raise concerns that additional development may worsen existing road access issues on the A272—characterised by excessive speeds, blind bends, poor sight lines and flooding—and increase congestion around junctions and busy routes. They note that further housing and associated traffic could strain local infrastructure and exacerbate safety challenges, particularly at key access points and near schools and amenities. Respondents also highlight that the heavy clay composition and high groundwater of the land contribute to poor drainage and recurrent flooding, with additional impervious surfaces likely to intensify these problems. Comments on the environment raise loss of valuable habitats, mature woodlands and hedgerows, along with potential reductions in biodiversity and increases in light pollution, while concerns about preserving rural character and agricultural land are expressed. Comments also emphasise that recent housing developments may have already met local needs, that strategic planning and community consultation have been insufficient, and that approving this site could set a precedent for further expansion without adequate safeguards. Adjacent landowner notes that they would not permit vehicular access to the site via Rothercombe Lane which is in the ownership.

Key Themes raised:

- Road Access and Traffic Safety
- Traffic Congestion and Infrastructure Capacity
- Flooding and Drainage Challenges
- Environmental and Ecological Impacts
- Housing Demand and Alternative Solutions
- Impact on Rural Character and Agricultural Land

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England – support subject to detailed landscape assessment

Environment Agency – There are no constraints on this site within the Environment Agency’s remit.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council – access from the A272 will need to demonstrate suitable access in line with the relevant Hampshire Technical Design Guidance relating to visibility splays (TG3). Pedestrian connection to Rothercombe Lane should be provided

NHS Hampshire & IOW – note that infrastructure is over capacity and CIL contributions will be required

Parish / Town Councils

Stroud Parish Council voices concern regarding the location of the site, the complex access issues including pedestrian safety, over development, and the need for local engagement potentially through an updated Parish Plan.

Steep Parish Council voices concern that the proposed development could lead to increased traffic through their parish via narrow, single-track roads—Church Road and Ridge Common Lane—potentially creating unsafe “rat runs” unsuitable for higher vehicle volumes.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy requires an appropriate access onto the A272 for vehicles and pedestrians, including appropriate pedestrian crossing facilities on the A272 and any traffic calming measures deemed appropriate by the highway authority
- Policy requires that tree removal on the southern boundary is limited to providing appropriate site access and ensuring appropriate visibility splays
- Policy requires provision of appropriate drainage

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy requires that the scheme maintains a loose knit layout reflective of existing development within Stroud to the north of the A272.
- Policy requires that the scheme ensures a positive relationship with neighbouring residential properties and retains a positive outlook from the rear of the adjacent care home.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Health Facilities Provision (NHS Hampshire & IOW)

Policy SDA79 Land north of Dodds Lane, Swanmore (previously WI102)

Number of comments on policy: 52

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	1	2	28	20	0

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents highlight that proposed development could harm the local environment by reducing green space and mature vegetation, and impacting protected species. They raise that housing need in Swanmore appears to be met by existing and planned developments, and they question whether the proposed benefits justify further growth, particularly on a greenfield site at the edge of the National Park. Further concerns focus on access, traffic and safety issues on narrow roads like Dodds Lane, and already overstretched local infrastructure and services. Respondents point to a lack of strategic coherence with existing planning policies, potential loss of the village's visual character and rural amenity, and doubt that the proposed mitigation measures will adequately offset highlighted negative impacts. Additional observations include the need for further consultation, improved pedestrian connectivity, and better management of drainage and flood risks.

Key themes raised:

- Environmental and ecological impact
- Housing need and 'exceptional benefits' test
- Access and highway safety
- Strain on local infrastructure and services
- Preservation of village character and visual amenity

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support the proposed allocation subject to a detailed landscape assessment.

The **Environment Agency** comment that development should prioritise connecting foul drainage to the public sewer and only assess alternative measures if necessary. They would encourage early consideration of how foul water will be managed for this site.

District / Borough / County Council

Hampshire County Council comment that the site is well located for active travel movements to local facilities, and that sufficient visibility and traffic calming will be required and welcomed, respectively. Developer contributions will be welcomed to improve pedestrian access to and from the site (including improvements to Footpaths 11 and 19). They also comment that no watercourse is identified on site, so investigation into a suitable outfall should be undertaken.

Winchester City Council support the proposed allocation but raise that it could deliver more homes, and question why 'exceptional benefits' are needed or justified for 'boundary sites'.

Parish / Town Councils

Swanmore Parish Council object to the proposed allocation for the following reasons: there are no exceptional benefits; infrastructure is overstretched; risk of settlement sprawl; risk of further development in the future; detrimental impacts on biodiversity, wildlife, and views; safety concerns regarding Dodds Lane and proposed access; and impact on amenity of neighbouring properties.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy requires access to include appropriate pedestrian crossing and traffic calming measures on Dodds Lane to ensure pedestrian access to the pavement on the western side of Dodds Lane.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy includes a developable area to clarify that development should only be located on the western area of the site.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health, utilities and community provisions

Policy SDA80 Land north of Hewlett Close, Twyford (previously WI056)

Number of comments on policy: 7

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	2	1	1	0	3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Seven comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Support is given because the site’s discreet location with limited visual impact and was previously favoured by residents, while representations also argue that a modestly larger allocation could have enabled better infrastructure and access improvements. They further highlight Twyford’s strong employment, services and transport links, alongside requests for minor policy changes to allow flexibility and remove unjustified requirements.

Access and Services: Support can be offered if significant concerns over unsafe access, inadequate open-space provision, poor pedestrian links, and the cumulative traffic impact of neighbouring redevelopment are resolved. Asks for clarity on the footpath and possible developer contributions to improve local routes.

Drainage: Recommends further work to identify a suitable drainage outfall since no watercourse exists on site.

The **Environment Agency’s** response emphasises that foul drainage should connect to the mains wherever possible, that any alternative systems require environmental permitting, and that early planning is needed to ensure no harm to groundwater given the site’s location in Source Protection Zone 3. **Natural England** shows support subject to a detailed landscape assessment.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Developable area and green space requirements adjusted to protect and enhance the setting of existing trees.
- Policy requires provision of pedestrian links to the public footpath to the west of the site leading to Northfields Play Area, on Coles Close.

Land at Whites Hill Farm, Owslebury (LAA ref. WI101)

Number of comments on policy: 7

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	0	1	0	0	6

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Seven comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Rights of Way: The representations support the site's draft allocation, requesting stronger wording to protect adjoining rights of way.

Employment: proposing an increase in employment floorspace from 1,500 to 2,000 sq m, which they argue can be accommodated within the existing developed area.

Allocation Boundary: They also seek reinstatement of the wider allocation boundary shown in the LAA to allow greater flexibility, while emphasising that development should remain focused in the southern portion of the site to protect landscape character.

Access: Concerns are raised over narrow, unsuitable access roads, increased vehicle movements, and the need for safer active-travel.

Drainage: Highlights that the site requires further investigation of drainage outfall options.

The **Environment Agency** reminds that developers should prioritise connection to the public sewer, consider alternative foul-drainage options only if necessary, ensure any discharges meet permitting requirements, and demonstrate that development within Source Protection Zones 2 and 3 will not harm groundwater resources. **Natural England** shows support, subject to detailed landscape assessment.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan because it was not possible to establish a suitable access arrangement.