

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
00004	Bishops Waltham Parish Council	00004/00001/026	
SDA needs to take account of diversion of investment , customers, employment and bus focus from nearby settlements such as Bishops Waltham and Wickham.			
00013	Denmead Parish Council	00013/00001/026	
We do not wish to comment on hedge ends situation.			
00015	Durley Parish Council	00015/00001/005	
Should be no development in Durley countryside. Areas south of the main road and more suitable, close to railway station, bus links and shops.			
00015	Durley Parish Council	00015/00002/033	
Should be no building in Durley countryside. areas south of the main road are more suitable, close to railway station, bus links and shops.			
00016	Hambledon Parish Council	00016/00001/040	
The South- East Plan identified Hedge End SDA as looking to Southampton for employment, transport and facilities. Hedge End has no natural identified links to Winchester and should not have. Local travel to Southampton employment and facilities will minimise travel/ commuting congestion, minimise Climate Change caused by pollution emissions, and improve residents' quality of life. Hedge End local gaps, (Botley, Durley, Cudridge, etc), should be protected to avoid adverse impact on the rural nature of those Parishes.			
00025	New Alresford Town Council	00025/00001/038	
Timely provision of infrastructure.			
00030	Owslebury Parish Council	00030/00001/010	
Question whether framework in place for this and other adjacent developments.			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
00075	Eastleigh Borough Council	00075/00001/007	
<p>Welcome recognition of need for close joint working. Doubt whether longer term spatial impact of SDA appropriately addressed. Need to consider role settlement will perform in wider area once completed.</p>			
00082	East Hampshire District Council	00082/00001/005	
<p>The Hedge End SDA will play an important part in improving the economic performance of the PUSH area and its future development is therefore sub-regional as well as District- wide interest. It is essential that the SDA fulfils its purpose and is developed in full during the period 2026 if the strategy for Southern Hampshire is not to be jeopardised. In view of the likely long lead in time before development commences together with the involvement of two local authorities, speedy progress on the Area Action Plan would appear to be essential.</p>			
00127	Mr P Turner	00127/00001/035	
<p>The area of bocage landscape in the area of Botley, Botley Green and Durley should be protected from the impacts of development.</p>			
00134	Mr Peter Franckeiss	00134/00001/036	
<p>Effective public transport.</p>			
00511	Mr Keith Story	00511/00002/034	
<p>The SDA's must be able to meet the needs of their population for schools, shops, transport etc.</p>			
01083	Ms Elizabeth Robinson	01083/00002/026	
<p>As noted above Winchester needs to take this huge growth on board when deciding where to locate its additional concrete jungles.</p>			
01265	Ms N A Holladay	01265/00002/036	
<p>The overriding issue is the dramatic growth of the urban areas. The numbers are horrifying and unless Winchester fights hard to sustain its own character the whole of the region will become a depressing urban sprawl typified by urban crawl and pollution. Again, this questionnaire should be seeking a view from residents as to whether they agree to the provisions of SEERA before asking all the other questions.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
01630	Mrs Eleanor Watts	01630/00002/030	
Best use of the land should be made. If this beautiful rural area is to be lost to development, then the development must make the most use of the land and be of the highest standard.			
01923	Captain John Ellis	01923/00001/040	
Build accommodation within the economic development area so as to reduce load on infrastructure (transport, roads etc). Develop west of waterlooville as a priority.			
01935	Mrs June Chilton	01935/00001/029	
More facilities for small and medium businesses.			
01939	Mrs Jean Buckle	01939/00001/032	
Provision and upkeep of roads and footways.			
01943	Mrs Phyllis Evans	01943/00001/028	
I don't feel there are any other issues missing from this list. Mainly it makes me sad to think space has to be found for these developments in this area. What are we leaving for grand children, a mass of concrete and little boxes? Where are all the occupant's coming from The truth of England?			
01951	Mr Robin Sharp	01951/00001/031	
No			
01958	Commander Robin Whiteside	01958/00001/033	
The hedge end SDA should not be in Winchester District at all, or preferably, should not be developed at all.			
01960	Mr Ian Merritt	01960/00001/035	
Impact on M27 Residents will not support WCC businesses due to distance from Winchester Loss of picturesque countryside on Durley claylands landscapes. Loss of established golf course/hotel. Impact on rural communities and locality to South Downs National Park.			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
01961	Mr Daniel Wilden	01961/00001/037	
Use of local materials. Require a mix of house builders including small local builders and self-build opportunities to prevent monotony. Insist on CHP. Allotments and community gardens.			
01965	Mrs Joyce Simmons	01965/00001/031	
Massive development should not be built in the rural landscape of Durley/Botley or in the Botley Park Golf Course, which is nationally renowned. The beautiful countryside around Netherhill and Ford Lake should not be degraded into an urban fringe. There must be an environmental impact assessment and feasibility study on transport, water resources and drainage before this matter goes any further			
01973	Mr Ewan Simmonds	01973/00001/037	
Assuming that all issues are given due consideration establishing the right balance between them may be a necessary requirement.			
01984	Mr Peter Gardner	01984/00001/038	
Build more at Hedge End (if you must) and less at Winchester.			
01988	Mr Clive Jacob	01988/00001/033	
Sensitivity in achieving the right mix of housing and green open spaces.			
01994	Miss J Nicholson	01994/00001/034	
Please ensure that you develop a LOCAL electricity grid - see Woking as an example of what can be done to reduce energy consumption, even with existing buildings.			
01996	Dr And Mrs John Axford	01996/00001/030	
Challenge the imposed targets for new dwellings- have alternative strategies been assessed			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
01997	Mrs Chris Slattery	01997/00001/037	
<p>Partly because of their respective locations and important service functions, both Bishops Waltham and Wickham will be directly affected by the sub-regional strategy and the scale of new development it proposes. A critical question for both of these settlements is what role do they wish to have a support/respond to the PUSH area, there is an option for these settlements to expand beyond their present key hub status. Expansion at Knowle also forms part of this potential option and could benefit from its relationship with the Fareham SDA and enable Knowle to gain improved sustainability through more direct access to a wider range of local services and facilities. At west of Waterlooville there may be scope to expand beyond currently permitted area for 2,000 homes and the already identified "reserve site" extension for a further 1,000 dwellings. At Whiteley, there is a lack of certain key facilities (e.g. primary and secondary schools needed). There may be an opportunity for Whiteley to contribute to the PUSH target and, in addition, a concentration of growth here could improve the settlement's self-sufficiency and overall sustainability. This may offer the opportunity to use facilities and services at Waterlooville, which is better served than the settlements in the southern part of Winchester District.</p>			
01999	Mrs Barbara Garfath	01999/00001/034	
<p>Ensure adequate parking at Hedge End station.</p>			
02000	Mr Henry Garfath	02000/00001/038	
<p>Adequate access to and parking facilities at public transport locations. Including housing provision with schools, hospitals etc to ensure affordable housing and minimising transport requirements for key workers.</p>			
02003	Mr Ptol Slattery	02003/00001/041	
<p>Hedge end needs links to Southampton employment and retail, not commuting to Winchester. Commuting north would increase congestion/pollution, would aggravate/increase Winchester's already very high carbon footprint per capita. Need links to Southampton local facilities/jobs/retail.</p>			
02005	Mrs Marion Keen	02005/00001/034	
<p>Avoid building too many large blocks of flats, ground - level housing in identifiable groups, preferably around green spaces, provide a better environment for healthy neighbourhoods to develop.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02008	Mr Caesar Slattery	02008/00001/041	
Hedge End looks to Southampton jobs and retail. Encourage this to minimise commuting and climate change.			
02022	Mr Michael Carter	02022/00001/031	
Wickham has a very compact footprint. Countryside impinges directly from all sides. This has been recognised by extending the proposed South Downs National Park right up to and including part of Wickham. It is a pleasant place to live because of its intrinsic green space. To maintain its unique character Wickham must be separated from the proposed new town about one mile to the south. It is essential that a strategic/local gap should be put in place between Wickham and the southern edge of the District. Partly because of their respective locations and important service functions, both Bishops Waltham and Wickham will be directly affected by the sub-regional strategy and the scale of new development it proposes. Expansion at Knowle also forms part of this potential option and could benefit from its relationship with the Fareham SDA and enable Knowle to gain improved sustainability through more direct access to a wider range of local services and facilities. At west of Waterlooville there may be scope to expand beyond the currently permitted area for 2,000 homes and the already identified reserve site extension for a further 1,000 dwellings. At Whiteley, there is a lack of certain key facilities (e.g. secondary school and through access road). There may be an opportunity for Whiteley to contribute to the PUSH target and, in addition, a concentration of growth here could improve the settlement's self-sufficiency and overall sustainability.			
02023	Mr Micheal Sadler-Forster	02023/00001/025	
This emphasis on Hedge End SDA is understandable but WCC must take the same concern about the 10,000 homes in North Fareham: the boundary of which is likely to be less than 1 mile from Winchester and Knowle. Is it realised that Knowle is in the parish of Wickham. Strategic gaps are vital.			
02033	Mr And Mrs Dennis And Yvonne Mills	02033/00002/027	
See customer's previous contribution (Re Hedge End)			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02038	Mr Philip Mason	02038/00001/035	
Development at Hedge End will put huge pressure on services, buildings and community in the market towns of Bishops Waltham and Wickham- re joining up of Southampton/ Hedge End/ Bishops Waltham and Wickham will ruin this beautiful area of S. Hampshire.			
02049	Mrs Wendy Thorpe	02049/00001/029	
The traffic effect of thousands of cars using rat runs through country roads to avoid the motorways where they are busy or blocked by accidents or when junctions to motorways are too busy to enter the motorway easily.			
02050	Mr Martin Tiller	02050/00002/015	
Use of Marginal /blighted land near existing developments within the area before encroaching on rural areas.			
02068	Mr Peter Milbourne	02068/00001/027	
A brake should be put on the development around Hedge End.			
02070	Mr And Mrs Roger Hockin	02070/00001/036	
Realistically, development of onsite renewable energy is just a dream Its just not economic. More "barrack blocks" like those in Oaktree Road would be totally unacceptable.			
02084	Mrs Melanie Walker	02084/00001/028	
All infrastructure must be in place before any building takes place.			
02092	Mr Fergus Christie	02092/00001/036	
Connect Hedge End to Southampton jobs and facilities to minimise commuting.			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02096	White Young Green Planning	02096/00001/021	
<p>Acknowledgement of the issue surrounding the Hedge End SDA within the Issues Options paper is to be welcomed despite the fact that it still requires confirmation from the Secretary of State in her response to the Examination Panel Report. The wider area of search and the initial PUSH development area both include land within Winchester District and whilst the final extent of any built development is not known it is likely that the SDA will include land within the District and have a significant effect upon the southern most part of the Winchester area and the settlement of Durley in particular. In terms of the issues identified in 13a-e all are obviously important but the relationship of the SDA to existing public transport routes, particularly Hedge End railway station, is considered to be the key factor which was highlighted by the South East Plan Panel but is not reflected in the peculiar approach of PUSH in their initial feasibility report, which actively reduces the ability to effect modal shift by distancing the proposed built development from the station. Winchester City Council should seek to influence the Action Area Plan for the SDA to rectify this short coming.</p>			
02098	Macdonald Hotels	02098/00001/006	White Young Gre
<p>Acknowledgement of the issue surrounding the Hedge End SDA within the Issues Options paper is to be welcomed despite the fact that it still requires conformation from the Secretary of State in her response to the Examination Panel Report. The wider area of search and the initial PUSH development area both include land within Winchester District and whilst the final extent of any built development is not known it is likely that the SDA will include land within the District and have a significant effect upon the southern most part of the Winchester area and the settlement of Durley in particular. In terms of the issues identified in 13a-e all are obviously important but the relationship of the SDA to existing public transport routes, particularlry Hedge End railway station, is considered to be the key factor which was highlighted by the South East Plan Panel but is not reflected in the peculiar approach of PUSH in their initial feasibility report, which actively reduces the ability to effect model shift by distancing the proposed built development from the station. Winchester City Council should seek to influence the Action Area Plan for the SDA to rectify this short coming.</p>			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02099	Mrs D M Hare	02099/00001/025	White Young Gre
Must consider relationship of SDA to existing public transport routes and Hedge End railway station WCC should seek to influence the AAP on this issue.			
02100	Burton Property	02100/00001/025	White Young Gre
Must consider relationship of SDA to existing public transport routes and Hedge End railway station WCC should seek to influence the AAP on this issue.			
02119	C D May	02119/00003/032	
Secondary school provision is essential to minimise the effect on transport and family life.			
02126	Taylor Wimpey	02126/00001/018	Boyer Planning
We do not consider that there are any additional issues which should be taken into account when producing the Action Area Plan. However, we would like to stress the importance of Issue 5 and note that given the proximity of the proposed Hedge End SDA to the key hubs within the PUSH area, it will be necessary for the Council to also consider the existing and future needs of the key hubs and how the SDA can assist in addressing wider needs of the District.			
02146	Mr R Parker	02146/00002/033	
The construction of dedicated cycle routes completely independent of other highway traffic is fundamental to a sustainable transport system and needs to be implanted into the culture of development.			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02172	Clients Of Southern Planning Practice	02172/00001/001	Southern Plannin
<p>1. Object to proposal for land in Winchester to form a major part of Hedge End SDA. a) Lack of consultation: No one locally feels that they have been consulted on this proposal - either the size or its boundaries. b) Lack of research: The proximity of the Hamble SAC/SPA and the scale of the development will require both appropriate assessment and EIA. These should be done at this stage in plan making before confirmation. c) Lack of infrastructure: The roads have the poorest connection to M27 and strategic road network. d) Contrary to general objectives of plan to minimise impacts on environmental and communities. To minimise need for expensive infrastructure. To locate development to help remedy shortfalls/problems elsewhere (urban regeneration) e) Very poorly located to existing employment and to railway stations. Propose the following: 1. Resist any development of Hedge End SDA taking place in Winchester District. 2. Ash PUSH to make up SDA numbers elsewhere e.g. Eastleigh: as part of Hedge End SDA Eastleigh: as urban extensions Fareham: as urban extensions Winchester: as urban extensions Southern Test: as urban extensions I have seen the draft comments of Durley residents and fully endorse them.</p>			
02193	Mrs Dagmar Slater	02193/00001/041	
<p>To ensure that any major development is sited close to existing large conurbations, rather than creating new large centres on the basis that required infrastructure should already exist in these areas and thus save taxpayers money. To consider questions such as quality of life/work balance for those expected to live in these areas.</p>			
02229	Gleeson Homes	02229/00001/039	Turley Associates
<p>The lead-in time for the delivery of necessary infrastructure is important to ensure this keeps pace with associated development impacts. The sites lead-in time must also be taken into account in discounting the rate at which dwellings will be completed within the district as a whole over the plan period. PPS3 - Housing requires that Winchester CC clearly demonstrates that there is a deliverable supply of homes within the plan period. The Core Strategy should therefore be sufficiently flexible to react to any housing deficiencies arising from delays within the SDA/PUSH areas of the district.</p>			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02243	Mr Stuart Jones	02243/00001/032	
<p>Strongly agree that WCC maintains its position that the Hedge End SDA should adjoin Hedge End station. The small green gap proposed will be insufficient to separate the SDA from Hedge End, while being enough to put people off the longer walk or journey to the station. Therefore the SDA development should be concentrated around the station and predominantly in the Eastleigh Borough district. This is in support of policy H3: Housing developments should generally be in locations that are, or can be, well served by a choice of transport modes, with higher densities in and near locations well served by public transport.</p>			
02374	Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)	02374/00001/037	
<p>The South- East Plan identified that Hedge End SDA is designed to look to Southampton as a sub-district of Southampton , and Hedge End has no natural identified links to Winchester and should not have. Local travel to Southampton employment facilities will minimise travel/commuting congestion, minimise Climate Change caused by pollution emissions, and improve residents' quality of life. Hedge End local gaps, with the rural nature of Parishes to the North (Botley, Durley, Cudridge, etc) should be protected to avoid adverse impact on the rural nature of those parishes.</p>			
02385	Mrs Elisabeth Hopson	02385/00001/037	
<p>Yes - Learn from the mistakes of Whitley, Infrastructure comes FIRST as and when or maybe.</p>			
02410	Mr Joseph Meider	02410/00001/023	
<p>Living in Bishops Waltham we use the roads going via Durley/ Botley for two reasons: (a) to visit the Hedge End shopping area or (b) to enter the motorway or to get to Southampton. These two minor roads via Durley and Botley are already too busy and secondly, not suitable for the volume of traffic using them, including many large lorries.</p>			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02414	Mr David Simmons	02414/00001/036	
<p>There is probably no evidence that the Hedge End SDA relates in any way to the needs and aspirations of Winchester District. If we are to be so foolish as to allow it then all the "sustainability criteria" apply. In assessing the likely effects on their Durley tax payers (and indeed the poor residents of Botley). WCC officers might like to frequently visit the Eastleigh Dowds Farm Development as a little test-tube experiment of what is in store. One third developed and already part occupied, it will generate construction traffic through to 2010-11. Its 4-storey high canyons admit little sunlight, funnel wind and the ever present and intrusive traffic noise and create a general feeling of oppression. Walk around and see if you agree that this accords with Winchester's vision for improving our quality of life over the next 20 years. You do have the option to withdraw fro the PUSH Joint committee.</p>			
02421	Ms Catherine Macintosh	02421/00001/016	
<p>As stated earlier, Winchester Dist. should be more pro-active in setting up CHP power schemes.</p>			
02422	Mr Mike Robertson	02422/00001/031	
<p>1. Local employment opportunities (either in or immediately outside the SDA) 2. Split between affordable and other housing in the SDA.</p>			
02428	Mrs Christine Gardner	02428/00001/022	
<p>Avoid any more building in Winchester area.</p>			
02430	Mr Roger Challis	02430/00001/034	
<p>Increased employment within walking distances of homes.</p>			
02448	Miss Lois Gravely	02448/00001/021	
<p>I am not qualified to comment.</p>			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02461	Mr Steve Robinson	02461/00001/030	
<p>Above is the statement "Because of its character and strong functional links with the urban areas beyond our boundary, this part of the district is very different from the more central and northern parts." This is inaccurate. The southern part of Winchester district is much more similar in character and aspiration to the central and northern parts of Winchester than it is to Hedge End, and frankly I would expect the council to have a better grasp of that fact than the statement above suggests. I regard Hedge End as a sprawling soulless mess, a fine example of zero imagination minimum cost development and a planning shame. It is the Lordshill of its day and, like Lordshill, will doubtless only become more down at heel and vaguely threatening with age. I expect Winchester council to resist any spread of Hedge End into our district in the strongest possible terms, and should any extension into Winchester be necessary it should be strictly limited and planned with an overriding priority of character and quality - not volume and cheapness. You will gather the idea fills me, and I'm certain the great majority of southern Winchester residents, with dread. We are not Hedge End, nor will we ever accept its imposition upon us.</p>			
02478	Mrs Sue Digby	02478/00001/035	
<p>Needs sufficient greenspace to prevent another Totton being created.</p>			
02480	Mr Michael Westwell	02480/00001/035	
<p>Effects on healthcare provision</p>			
02504	Mr Peter Stevens	02504/00001/040	
<p>Improvement of existing main roads is vital to try and ensure that existing minor and rural roads (e.g. to Bishops Waltham) are not used as intensive rat runs and short cuts to avoid congestion on main roads and motorways. The M27 is already at capacity, and traffic use along other minor roads is growing very rapidly as it is.</p>			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02506	Mr Barney Ball	02506/00001/035	
<p>Areas like this should be encouraged to use local facilities, schools instead of commuting to schools outside of the area causing huge transport problems. Traffic in this area is considerably worsened by the influx of local people who consider there local schools not to be good enough for their children and so therefore driving to schools outside. You cannot build a sustainable future with this being allowed. This problem could be cut if ONLY affordable local housing was built instead of large, expensive housing for middle class commuting public.</p>			
02516	Mr Matthew Barker	02516/00001/035	
<p>There is virtually no public transport in the rural areas. The buses are few and far between, there are no trains and the roads are fast and narrow. Cycle tracks would be very welcome. Renewable energy is all very well, but we do not have enough water here and that is a major concern.</p>			
02549	Mr Andy Crowe	02549/00001/037	
<p>Unlike the car industry, the building industry is quite backward in its approach to new technology. It therefore needs a huge kick to improve the quality of housing and reduce CO2 emissions. This probably needs government regulation but you need to use your planning powers to their full.</p>			
02557	Mr Geoff Olden	02557/00001/030	
<p>Is the SDA necessary and well sited</p>			
02565	Mr Alfred Witham	02565/00001/033	
<p>I might be more important to transfer the whole SDA to Eastleigh as it has only limited impact on most of the Winchester District.</p>			
02568	Mr Michael Chaplin	02568/00001/034	
<p>Transport, Education and Sporting facilities.</p>			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02570	Ms Jacqueline Fulton	02570/00001/019	
<p>Effect of planned development on the village of Durley. The imposition of large numbers of houses in the south of the village and the increased traffic through the village resulting from the expansion of Bishops Waltham Will devastate this community. The traffic from BW to the motorway will come through the village rural road. This has no pavements, is very narrow and twisty and has a school and large riding stables. There are serious safety concerns as well as concerns for the quality of life for residents.</p>			
02574	Miss Denise Oatham	02574/00001/030	
<p>There are real safety and transport issues for these proposed developments which will have a hugely adverse environmental and safety impact particularly for those needing to access Southampton for jobs.</p>			
02576	Mr Anthony Thorpe	02576/00001/032	
<p>Yes - the effect of increased traffic between Hedge End, Botley and Bishops Waltham. It will become increasingly difficult for bishops's Waltham people to access the M27 and M3 motorways if there is the significant traffic increase which the development of Hedge End will bring.</p>			
02588	Mrs Jean Dorey	02588/00001/035	
<p>A new centre with local facilities (e.g. small shops) will be required north of Hedge End. The open spaces and boundaries between Hedge End and Durley; Botley and Bishops Waltham should be preserved.</p>			
02592	Mr Rob Gazzard	02592/00001/014	
<p>The forestry commissions direct you to two documents linking to PUSH within Winchester: "Forestry Commission Woodlands in Southern Hampshire Guidance and evidence for PPG17 - Open spaces, sport and recreation in Forestry" and TEP document to the PUSH board "A green infrastructure strategy for urban South Hampshire."</p>			
02594	Mr Martin Hughes	02594/00001/028	
<p>This area has already taken on an aspect of significant 'sprawl'. The retention of usable (for agricultural/domestic or recreational purposes) green space between developments is absolutely vital.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02604	Mr Douglas Emmett	02604/00001/018	
To protect and preserve existing greenspace and recreational land within the development plans.			
02612	Mr Edward Jackson	02612/00001/036	
Need to minimise commuting by providing employment opportunities in step with housing.			
02614	Mr Rob Houston	02614/00001/023	
I believe that the SDA is fundamentally flawed and the respective councils have ignored brownfield redevelopment and this needs to be actively considered, as this would reduce/remove the need for large scale infrastructure development and would keep large sections of unspoilt countryside for people to enjoy rather than continuing the senseless urban sprawl.			
02627	Mr David Page	02627/00001/024	
I do not see how Issue 1 above is compatible with building 6000 new house; by definition, the two are diametrically opposed.			
02629	Mr Michael Blackstaff	02629/00001/022	
Maintain existing green corridors between the SDA and settlements to the north.			
02630	Mr Robert Shepherd	02630/00001/027	
Renewable and energy sustainable ideals are good, but analyses need to be done on the true cost of such, and the use of fossil fuels and chemicals etc that are required to produce the green fuels and materials.			
02638	Mr Ian Newton	02638/00001/029	
Ensure development is urban designed with architectural solutions and not the same 'noddy boxes' that are put forward by most house builders.			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02641	Mr Ralph Bolton	02641/00001/021	
<p>Please be very aware that I do not want to be in PUSH - I live in Bishops Waltham, and the best PUSH option is to take the town out. All PUSH is doing is creating dorminty settlement for car bourne commuting, probably out of the area. As acknowledged in sustainability appraisal, the employment draaws of London and Basingstoke draws commuters out of the area - all PUSH is doing is providing more houses for this to happen. A sustainable approach of creating employment withn the Winchester District, and house and transport to link would be entirely sensible. Please rethink, and if WCC is only following orders (as the representatives at local meeting hide behind, take the issue up on behalf of your residents with SEERA - they're a quango with no elected representation: WCC is</p>			
02658	Mrs Sarah Duck	02658/00001/033	
<p>Developing further housing in an area of new housing and large retail/business opportunities is a logical move forwards in creating the needed housing requirements. Developing a modern area such as Hedge End will not affect the local area in a negative way.</p>			
02661	Miss Amanda Mumford	02661/00001/028	
<p>A study of the affect of the extra traffic will have on the surrounding rural roads.</p>			
02663	Mr Nigel Dollery	02663/00001/036	
<p>I doubt the provision of sustainable transport.</p>			
02665	Mr Martin Burton	02665/00001/027	
<p>Again the answer is constrained, only the first one is relevant, maintain the existing environment. More houses means more congestion, and more loss of land to roads, supporting services, etc. It doesn't stop, we will keep chasing our tails over the next 20 years build more and more infrastructure!</p>			
02666	Mr Peter Richardson	02666/00001/028	
<p>I agree that the main development should be centred around the two major cities of Southampton and Portsmouth wher the urban environment already exists and is a focus for city life - work, retail, entertainment, services etc. I am really concerned about an additional 6,000 homes at Hedge End as this will transform that environment and blue the distinction with Southampton. 6,000 homes as just a suburb without a heart would be tragic.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02669	Mrs Joanna Wedeman	02669/00001/024	
<p>The massive development of Hedge End over the last 20 years, in addition to the growth of nearby Fair Oak and Horton Heath has already put a massive strain on the local roads. The M27 junction at Hedge End is already overstretched and building another new development of this size in the area would be crazy. The village of Durley is one of few rural communities remaining in the area and this would be compromised by such a vast development. The market town of Botley would also be hugely affected and unfortunately once these all become another suburb of the sprawl of Hedge End there will be no going back. Surely a development with a new junction 6 on the motorway would be more sensible, or further development in the Whiteley/Segemsworth region which has large business parks and welcomes more house and services.</p>			
02713	Mrs Rebecca O'Loughnane	02713/00001/027	
<p>Road systems.....access to M27</p>			
02717	Miss Carol Stebbing	02717/00001/022	
<p>The impact of additional housing on the main roads as well as rural roads. Hedge End has obvious links with the M27 and despite work to improve the roads, more housing will inevitably lead to additional traffic both aiming for the M27 and the M3. Queues are bad during rush hour already, which largely lasts from 7am to 9am and 4pm to 6pm travelling to and from the motorways and into the main economic areas.</p>			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02740	North Hedge End Consortium	02740/00001/017	Terence O Rourk

As the Hedge end SDA is to be such a significant development, whilst the expected build out rates are quite ambitious, it is disappointing to see that little has been done relative to capturing information to shape SDA policy. If the development is to be delivered within the target timescale it is important that work on bringing forward the necessary joined policy document commences immediately and comes forward quickly, giving developers comfort and sufficient information to allow them to finalise site assembly and then begin master planning the site. Identification of the broad site within the RSS Panel is only the beginning of the process. It is also hoped that at the next stage of the LDF process more information will be provided on how Winchester and Eastleigh Councils will deliver the SDA. Where there is reference to the settlement hierarchy within the Issues and Options, it is important that any wording used does not prejudice the delivery of the Hedge End SDA. It is not a local hub or market town, but still needs to provide a range of uses and be allowed to grow. With regard to 13e, there is inconsistency between the wording of the question and Issue 5. One is to do with services and facilities whilst the other could be taken to be connected with 'impacts on settlements' such as character and appearance. This is confusing and could result in inaccurate results and thus clarity is required. It appears that the issue would benefit from separated out into two distinct areas, one the services issue and the other the character point. Appreciating the confusion, with regard to Hedge End it is important to consider the impacts of the SDA with not only the existing Hedge End but also the wider service catchments. It is not, and cannot, be about complete and immediate delivery of services. In addition to the points mentioned there is a need to reflect on housing mix and type, employment provision, landscape quality, retail provision, social and leisure facilities, public transport links and green spaces as highlighted within the RSS Panel Report.

02753	Mrs Lorrie Smith	02753/00001/029	
No idea because I don't live in the Hedge End area and cannot therefore comment, but I have ticked all boxes as very important, because it's important to deal with those 5 issues. How will you go about it			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02764	Mr Graham Mulholland	02764/00001/034	
<p>The area being considered is totally unsuitable for any such development and is totally at odds with any local or central government policy. There has been no consideration that the area is unsuitable from every sustainable planning point of view and does not provide any rational solution to the social and economic needs of the area.</p>			
02775	Mrs Rosemarie Lee	02775/00001/032	
<p>The impact on surrounding villages such as Durley of the increased traffic flow. Snakemoor Lane is already too heavily used for safety and the maintenance of its road surface.</p>			
02779	Ms Linda Yeodal	02779/00001/035	
<p>Greenspace should include a large amount of wild space.</p>			
02783	Mrs Dorothy Quiney	02783/00001/026	
<p>Protect the rural village of Durley and not permit any development to encroach onto any area within its environs. Introduce traffic measures to deter any increased use of Durley Street as a rat run to access the rural route over the downs to Winchester. The use of this road other than for local traffic is already unsustainable.</p>			
02784	Mrs Victoria Louise Ruth Moore	02784/00001/010	
<p>The problem is that we have natural green areas at the moment which have wildlife and created green areas do not match these. Whole communities are feeling cheated and despondent as the places they purchase because they liked the environment is being stolen from them at an alarming rate and people who have chosen a village and green environment to live in is having this taken away.</p>			
02824	Mr Mike Davies	02824/00001/022	
<p>The need to understand and minimise the ecological impact of development.</p>			

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02833	Mrs Gillian Mulley	02833/00001/029	
<p>1. Ensure that the existing fields and woodland in the green strip around the SDA are preserved in their current form (not made into leisure facilities etc) 2. Ensure that existing village communities (like Durley) are not overwhelmed by large numbers of new houses being built within their boundaries. Durley is a rural village with a strong sense of history and community. The residents of these houses will feel part of the SDA community and look towards Southampton. They will have no links with the existing village. 3. Define clear boundaries to the SDA and strengthen the status of the agricultural land and woodland with, say, two or three miles of the SDA so that it isn't all bought up by land speculators who are hoping the SDA will expand further into Winchester district in the future. If the status of the agricultural land and woodland is not strengthened all the land in Durley and surrounding areas will become marginalised.</p>			
02923	North Whiteley Consortium	02923/00001/033	Terence O'Rourk
<p>In addition to the points mentioned there is a need to reflect on housing mix and type, densities, employment provision, landscape quality, retail provision, social and leisure facilities, public transport links and green spaces, as highlighted within the RSS Panel Report.</p>			
02925	Mrs Gaynor Parker	02925/00001/036	
<p>The density of housing is already too high.</p>			
02926	The Whiteley Co-ownership	02926/00001/033	Terence O'Rourk
<p>In addition to the points mentioned there is a need to reflect on housing mix and type, employment provision, landscape quality, social and leisure facilities, public transport links and green spaces, as highlighted within the RSS Panel Report.</p>			
02931	Mr John A Hurrell	02931/00001/032	
<p>ensure that overall housing densities minimise the amount of land required for the level of development.</p>			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02932	Mr Jonathan Simmons	02932/00001/040	
<p>The entire concept of this "strategic development area" flies in the face of the "needs and aspirations of Winchester District". I wish to object 100% to this ridiculous plan, since the site has been so poorly chosen that there are in fact no satisfactory or realistic solutions to the above issues. It is madness and this is making the local people furious. I predict that those responsible will be held to account for irreversibly ruining the area for future generations.</p>			
02934	Mrs Eloise Appleby	02934/00001/024	
<p>There is absolutely no character or sense of place to Hedge End as it is now, and there ought to be a commitment in the AAP to making it a much more special place than the urban sprawl that it currently is, and perhaps righting some of the wrongs that have been and are currently being committed. It needs something to give it pride. The sustainable travel will be an interesting challenge, given that Hedge End currently majors as an out of town shopping destination.</p>			
02939	Mr Lucian Warwick-Haller	02939/00001/027	
<p>Issues 4 and 5 are very general and could be used as a cover for any form of development; it would be necessary to examine individual projects to be able to comment on appropriateness. You can ensure the provision of greenspace simply by leaving the country alone</p>			
02944	Mr Andrew Bennett	02944/00001/037	
<p>You have already ruined Hedge End. The huge blocks of flats that have recently appeared seem totally inappropriate.</p>			
02997	Mrs Nikki Oliver	02997/00001/024	
<p>It should be acknowledged that this is an unsustainable location for new housing from the outset.</p>			
03010	Mr Peter Middleton	03010/00001/032	
<p>No new development shall be permitted until an adequate road infrastructure provided to link developments to the principle road network.</p>			

Question 13f. Are there any other issues missing from the list that need to be included to make sure that the Hedge End SDA takes full account of the needs and aspirations of Winchester District?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
03029	Mr Robert Toleman	03029/00001/015	
Hedge End or anywhere else, Yes listening to and planning for improvements of the existing facilities and environment for the benefit of the present population. Lovely words "improve and sustainability" use them wisely for the residents who pay for your livelihood.			
03058	Mr Andrew Rigg	03058/00001/017	
Requires excellent master planning and high quality design.			
03071	Mr John Hayter	03071/00001/042	
Impact on Bishops Waltham and Wickham in terms of diverting customers, employment and bus services.			
03080	Winchester Housing Board	03080/00001/009	
Support percentage and tenure split. Need also to consider specialist requirements.			
03135	Hampshire And Isle Of White Wildlife Trust	03135/00001/013	
PUSH are in the process of producing a green infrastructure strategy for the PUSH area. It is essential that Winchester deliver the proposals in this strategy where they relate to the Hedge End SDA. Hedge End SDA provides opportunities for biodiversity enhancements which should also be considered. Water resource capacity will need to be addressed also.			
03146	Mrs V B Clifton	03146/00001/001	
Object to Hedge End SDA and request Winchester City withdraw from PUSH. There are other urban areas that could be developed without detrimental impact on the countryside, including Whiteley.			

Q13f

The following list made the following comments:

Object to proposed development at Hedge End SDA due to :-

- **scale of development – lose of identify of existing communities**
- **impact on roads and increased congestion, lack of access to motorway**
- **impact on attractive countryside – loss of wildlife, loss of areas for walking, riding, cycling, loss of golf course etc**
- **reduction in quality farming land – need to retain for food production**
- **lack of infrastructure – drainage, flooding and surface water run-off**
- **poor access to rail station and lack of trains**
- **lack of employment opportunities**
- **any development must have minimal impact on existing infrastructure and new infrastructure must be provided prior to any development**
- **lack of capacity of water supply and water disposal**
- **this is a rural area and the countryside should be preserved**
- **need to explore alternative locations at Winchester and Whiteley**
- **need to redraw PUSH boundary to exclude rural communities**
- **impact on rural community**
- **need to remove SDA from Winchester District or dispense altogether and increase development elsewhere at north of Winchester, Waterlooville, Whiteley and Knowle, West End/Horton Heath, Portsmouth / Eastleigh railway line and M27, and along M3 near Chandlers Ford/Otterbourne, Allington Lane, West End**
- **Object to everything in the PUSH area being urbanised**
- **lack of schools**
- **Need to retain green separation between new urban areas in PUSH abd established rural areas**
- **Need to explore brownfield sites before destroying countryside**
- **Increase in crime and antisocial behaviour**
- **M27 corridor is already overloaded – add the additional 6000 requirement to the eco town proposal at Micheldever**
- **consider organic development around existing centres**

Each response has been counted as an individual comment.

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01299	Mr And Mrs Kemp	01299/00004/001
01299	Mr And Mrs Kemp	01299/00005/001
02024	Mrs B Turner	02024/00001/001
02025	Mrs A Lineham	02025/00001/001
02026	Mr And Mrs L And B Verrico	02026/00001/001

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
02027	Miss W Bignell	02027/00001/001
02028	Mr And Mrs Colin And Jacqueline Bowsher	02028/00001/001
02029	Mr And Mrs Peter And Tracey Greaves	02029/00001/001
02030	Mr Geoffrey Trapnell	02030/00001/001
02031	Mrs N Glenn	02031/00001/001
02033	Mr And Mrs Dennis And Yvonne Mills	02033/00001/001
02035	Mr And Mrs John And Roselyne Slimm	02035/00001/001
02036	Mr Steve Delmege	02036/00001/001
02037	Miss Holly Wood	02037/00001/001
02040	Mr Mark Linehan	02040/00001/001
02041	Mr And Mrs G Mulholland	02041/00001/001
02042	Miss C R Clifton	02042/00001/001
02043	Mr And Mrs Paul And Joy Bignell	02043/00001/001
02044	Mr R H Clifton	02044/00001/001
02045	Mrs V Edwards	02045/00001/001
02046	Mr Trevor Richardson	02046/00001/001
02048	Mr John Hamon	02048/00001/001
02050	Mr Martin Tiller	02050/00001/001
02051	Miss Sarah Ventures	02051/00001/001
02053	Mrs B B Finch	02053/00001/001
02054	Miss B Curl	02054/00001/001
02056	Mr S Street	02056/00001/001
02057	Mrs Liz Poole	02057/00001/001
02058	Mr And Mrs James And Karen Robins	02058/00001/001
02059	Mrs Teresa Hamon	02059/00001/001
02060	Mr And Mrs N Houghton	02060/00001/001
02061	Mr J Hack	02061/00001/001
02062	Mr R C Whiteside	02062/00001/001
02063	Mrs Hazel Richardson	02063/00001/001

Summaries of responses to Core Strategy Issues and Options (October 2008)

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
02064	Ms A Metcher	02064/00001/001
02245	Mr Marcus Heys	02245/00002/001
02414	Mr David Simmons	02414/00002/001
02551	Mr And Mrs Gill And Andy Mulley	02551/00001/001
02559	Mrs Maurita Macey	02559/00001/001
02560	Mr Nigel Granger	02560/00001/001
02563	Mr And Mrs Simmonds	02563/00001/001
02628	Mr Roger Hann	02628/00001/045
02669	Mrs Joanna Wedeman	02669/00002/001
02919	Mrs Catherine Pollitt	02919/00002/001
02939	Mr Lucian Warwick- Haller	02939/00002/001
02942	Mr Graham Campbell	02942/00001/036
03084	Mr & Mrs Robert And Joanne Allen	03084/00001/001
03085	Mr And Mrs M Howe	03085/00001/001
03086	Mr Peter Howarth	03086/00001/001
03087	Mr S D Mote	03087/00001/001
03088	Ms Nicky Lilley	03088/00001/001
03089	Mr & Mrs David & Anne Martin	03089/00001/001
03090	Mr And Mrs Alan And Tanya Hounsham	03090/00001/001
03091	Mr Eugene Mc Cann	03091/00001/001
03092	Mrs Anne Compton	03092/00001/001
03093	Mr Charles M Harding	03093/00001/001
03094	Mrs Nina Kelly	03094/00001/001
03095	Mrs Dawn Brenchley	03095/00001/001
03096	Ms Jennifer Berry	03096/00001/001
03098	Mr Derek Oswald	03098/00001/001