

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
00004	Bishops Waltham Parish Council	00004/00001/009	
Bishops Waltham and Wickham should not be in the PUSH area.			
00013	Denmead Parish Council	00013/00001/010	
The middle division could be more accurately renamed "Alresford and the northern parishes"			
00015	Durley Parish Council	00015/00001/002	
Winchester town; market towns and larger villages; rural areas and smaller villages.			
00015	Durley Parish Council	00015/00002/010	
Winchester Town; market towns and larger villages; rural areas and smaller villages.			
00016	Hambledon Parish Council	00016/00001/011	
- Winchester Town, Market Towns and the rural area. - 'PUSH' Partnership of Urban South Hampshire. - South Downs National Park (to be designated) and AONB areas. The Southern Parishes are not naturally part of the PUSH area except perhaps Whiteley. The others, including Denmead, form the rural hinterland, and should not be considered urban for planning purposes. They should be excluded from the PUSH area. Any development in these villages would have a negative impact on the Designated South Downs National Park immediately to the North.			
00043	Wonston Parish Council	00043/00001/010	
The rural areas should be treated as a separate entity. There is, without doubt, a more significant difference between life in a market town and life in a village or farming community than there is between life in Winchester City and life in a market town. This is particularly so with the respect to the first three "broad considerations" on pg22 of the document.			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
00089	Hampshire County Council	00089/00001/006	
<p>HCC would like to see reference to a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) undertaken/ commissioned by the Council. It is considered that the provision of this information will assist in demonstrating the deliverability of the Core Strategy and the level of reliance the Council will be placing on Brownfield Land, and in turn, the Council's likely future requirement for Greenfield development over the plan period.</p>			
00113	Alresford Society	00113/00001/011	
<p>This division ignores a number of significant factors: The proposed National Park that isolates some of the District. Also the equivalent "PUSH" area centred on Basingstoke and Deane that will create pressures in the North-East of the District unfortunately split between East Hants, Basingstoke and Winchester.</p>			
00270	Ms Meriel Walton	00270/00001/012	
<p>Limited development of all settlements. Results in over focus of expansion of towns and under focus on villages.</p>			
00270	Ms Meriel Walton	00270/00002/012	
<p>Limited development of all settlements.</p>			
00276	Mr R I L Howland	00276/00002/011	
<p>The South East Plan's emphasis on existing urban areas is misguided and undemocratic. A flexible approach is needed. The old Barton Stacey camp is a good site. The fact that it straddles a boundary of two authorities is irrelevant,.</p>			
00280	Mrs Cheryl Berry	00280/00002/011	
<p>1. Winchester Town and market towns and rural areas (grouped together) 2. PUSH area 3. South Downs national park</p>			
00320	Ms R Wetherill	00320/00002/012	
<p>I'd like to know why a major sustainable market town based on Micheldever is not on the agenda This will allow consideration of how the objective to protect Winchester is best served.</p>			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
00415	Ms Laura Clarke	00415/00002/008	
<p>Whether or not this is an appropriate will be measured by the effectiveness of the decisions made in respect of them. If the process is reduced to a decision about numbers then the division doesn't matter - it's about the most appropriate developments in the most appropriate place, not how that place has been labelled.</p>			
00556	Mr A Gossling	00556/00002/010	
<p>The 3 areas should be: 1. Winchester town and market towns and rural areas 2. PUSH area 3. South Downs and AONB National park</p>			
00783	Mr And Mrs CW And JR Eames	00783/00003/005	
<p>More specific to Winchester City, Alresford, Bishops Waltham, Wickham and surrounding villages for which overwhelming generalisations will not necessarily be appropriate.</p>			
00784	Mr D J Barfield	00784/00002/008	
<p>It is ridiculous to plan to build on Greenfield when an unknown quantity of Brownfield sites such as barracks, prisons will become available over the next decade or so.</p>			
00852	Ms Norma C Goodwin	00852/00002/008	
<p>I agree this is an appropriate way to sub-divide the district.</p>			
01024	Mrs S Dix	01024/00001/018	
<p>Fewer houses to be built in the next 20 years. Which would lead to more green land being left as it is instead of cramming houses on every possible bit of land.</p>			
01083	Ms Elizabeth Robinson	01083/00002/011	
<p>I live in Waltham Chase and do not want this area to be included in PUSH. How many people in this area want to be more urban If we wanted to live in a town we would do. I think its fine to split between Winchester town and the market towns/ rural area. I object most strongly to being dumped into 'urban south Hampshire' as no doubt we will end up with even more houses and accompanying problems but none of the amenities that should benefit urban areas.</p>			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
01125	Mr Denise Caws	01125/00001/011	
<p>The division means that there are a few settlements, such as Wickham, that are categorised as both 'Key Hubs' within 'market towns and the rural area' AND 'southern fringe within PUSH boundary'. Development for these places can be considered under both classifications. They are therefore doubly vulnerable. How can settlement be both within the 'market town and rural area' and the urban area of the 'PUSH'?</p>			
01243	Ms Serita Campbell	01243/00002/003	
<p>It is not appropriate to convert the green areas surrounding small villages such as Wickham, Soberton, Swanmore, Shirrell heath, as will be detrimental to the areas and will lose the village identities. It is more appropriate to build on areas that are already built on, such as industrial sites.</p>			
01265	Ms N A Holladay	01265/00002/011	
<p>Winchester Town Rural areas and villages Business enterprise zones Retail centres Urban centres</p>			
01297	Ms Ann Sadler Forster	01297/00002/009	
<p>There are many differences within e.g.: market towns to make keeping them together artificial also the way they are labelled. i.e. Denmead should be included as a market town, surely it depends on population and existing services and whether the population see themselves as town and village.</p>			
01316	Mr And Mrs Paul And Valerie Shuttleworth	01316/00002/010	
<p>The historic centres of Bishops Waltham and Wickham should be part of the second group (market towns and rural area) and Whiteley and Knowle, as new developments, should belong to the third group.</p>			
01460	Mr Michael John Bennett	01460/00002/009	
<p>I cannot see an Option 1 or 2 in the question above. There is a serious question about the status of Wickham versus Denmead.</p>			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
01501	Revd David Simpson	01501/00005/011	
<p>It is the invidious extension of urban areas that I object to. It seems that the interests of local residents on the southern perimeter of the district are on Winchester's peripheral vision. It seems that since the North Fareham SDA relates to land that falls within the area of Fareham Borough Council the residents of Knowle Village are disenfranchised - we have no democratic rights in the Borough and the boundary is an arbitrary one. In view of this, Winchester owes it to residents in the southern part of the district to argue a robust case for the protection of our rural environment.</p>			
01923	Captain John Ellis	01923/00001/009	
<p>Division is inappropriate and misleading as a total solution needs to be found. Solutions for one area/sub-division may cause increased problems for another. A total and balanced solution is needed - this may well involve all of Hampshire (And adjacent counties)</p>			
01926	Mrs Fiona Turner	01926/00001/009	
<p>PUSH is an inappropriate name for the southern part A the district it conjures up memories of "Silent City"</p>			
01931	Mr Micheal Cunliffe	01931/00002/009	
<p>Market Towns (key hubs and local hubs) should be separated from 'Rural Area'. This will enable separate policies to be applied to different needs.</p>			
01937	Mrs Lesley Hallett	01937/00001/009	
<p>North/ South split. Otherwise confusion as to a parish in 2 or 3 or both.</p>			
01941	Dr Richard Hallett	01941/00001/009	
<p>Should be Northern and Southern sectors. As above several planes fit into 2 sectors.</p>			
01946	Mrs Margaret Raffle	01946/00001/010	
<p>Denmead should be within the Meon Valley - Rural Area</p>			
01948	Mr Neil Lander-Brinkley	01948/00001/009	
<p>But the middle market towns is more accurately named - Alresford and the northern parishes</p>			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
01956	Mrs Barbara Holyome	01956/00002/011	
But with the caveat that the PUSH area will impact on rural southern parishes/towns that are adjacent to this area and possibly beyond towards "middle" Hants including Winchester itself			
01958	Commander Robin Whiteside	01958/00001/009	
The "Partnership for Urban South Hampshire" should not extend into Winchester District which is basically rural. Urbanisation of the south will not create "great places to live" or allow it to remain "an attractive and sustainable place".			
01960	Mr Ian Merritt	01960/00001/009	
Winchester town Market towns and larger villages Rural areas and small villages Do not "sell out" the southern parishes within the push area, they should be included and treated equally under the Winchester city boundary.			
01961	Mr Daniel Wilden	01961/00001/011	
Can you not call it Winchester city or even Winchester urban area?			
01962	Mr John Harrison	01962/00001/009	
Cannot read writing.			
01964	Mr John Beveridge	01964/00001/002	
A further subdivision could be made of the market towns and the rural area as their needs and characteristics are significantly different.			
01965	Mrs Joyce Simmons	01965/00001/006	
PUSH should only apply to existing urban areas, allowing for improvement and regeneration as needed, seeking to improve civic pride by removal of graffiti and litter, planting of trees and providing access to countryside/ green space for recreation.			
01968	Mr Barry Collins	01968/00001/010	
Consideration should be given to the impact of the proposed National park and the AONB in order to retain the rural characteristics of the area.			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
01969	Mr David Owen	01969/00001/011	
<p>This implies that the whole of the PUSH area can be regarded as urban and that development in the other two areas can be safeguarded by reference to their rural nature. This dangerous strategy will mean that the southern area loses any safeguards against overdevelopment. Each area should have a vision of an appropriate mix of urban development any safeguards.</p>			
01981	Mr Julian English	01981/00001/005	
<p>Should be as revised above. (Shown on 'form')</p>			
01983	Mr John Blake	01983/00001/009	
<p>This pre-supposes that the present District is the correct one. Winchester town and the immediately surrounding area could be better served if the more remote parts of the District (push parts) were lived off.</p>			
01984	Mr Peter Gardner	01984/00001/010	
<p>Concentrate building in south Hampshire, not Winchester, which has been over-developed already.</p>			
01992	Mr David Brown	01992/00001/010	
<p>The division stated is appropriate but the addition of possible new eco towns should be added to the suggestions.</p>			
01997	Mrs Chris Slattery	01997/00001/011	
<p>Winchester town and Market towns and the rural area. South Downs National Park (to be designated) PUSH area, excluding Wickham, Bishops Waltham and Colden Common. Unsure of the implications for keeping the District asa whole. How are the numbers allocated for designated sites late in being developed West of Waterlloville·?</p>			
01999	Mrs Barbara Garfath	01999/00001/011	
<p>The market towns should be one category and the rural area should be another category (4 areas total)</p>			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02000	Mr Henry Garfath	02000/00001/011	
<p>The District is so homogenous that any attempt to divide it into the artificial compartments suggested prevents proper strategic planning. In particular creating a "Winchester Town" also allows the District's own variation on the Midlothian Question, ie it creates a subdivision which is disenfranchised since its own elected members are always in a minority. Question 4 (that follows) appears to identify the rationale for doing just this. However in reality such a NIMBY policy is short- sighted, since destroying the existing character of Winchester City would also have a negative impact on the rest of the District.</p>			
02002	Mrs Sarah Marsh	02002/00001/010	
<p>Because Winchester Town Councillors are out-voted more than a fair share falls on the City.</p>			
02003	Mr Ptol Slattery	02003/00001/011	
<p>South Downs national park and aonb and heritage areas are irreplaceable assests, and seperate areas we need to preserve and enhance.</p>			
02006	Mr Raymond Marsh	02006/00001/011	
<p>Because Winchester town councillors are out-voted, the housing development falls unfairly on the town rather than outlying areas.</p>			
02008	Mr Caesar Slattery	02008/00001/011	
<p>1. Winchester and market towns and rural. 2. PUSH area 3. South downs national park and AONB's Include key hubs and local hubs in Winchester not PUSH. Leave only Whiteley, Waterlooville, Southampton and Portsmouth in PUSH as their residents want growth but rest do not.</p>			
02009	Mr Ian Embrey	02009/00001/011	
<p>Divide as follows: - Winchester toen, market towns and rural areas. - "PUSH" area of major conurbations, excluding market towns. - South Downs Park and Areas of Natural Beauty (AONB) Or: - Retain numbers as a whole for entire district as in WDLPR 2001-2011. This would give greater flexibility.</p>			
02010	Mrs Sylvia Moss	02010/00001/011	
<p>Divide the districts: 1. Winchester Town, Market towns, rural areas 2. PUSH area but excluding market towns, 3. Areas of Natural Beauty.</p>			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02015	Mr Derek Rutherford	01927/00001/008	
The implication that the whole of the so-called PUSH area is to be urbanised in due time goes against everything that those of us living in rural parts of that region believe in.			
02019	Mrs Jennifer Hollis	02019/00001/010	
Areas should be divided into: - Urban (cities and towns) - Villages - Rural			
02021	Mr Andrew Rogerson	02021/00001/009	
The "PUSH" area should be limited to include the highly urbanised areas (Southampton, Portsmouth, Fareham) where infrastructure, access and transport links to employment centres have been developed.			
02022	Mr Michael Carter	02022/00001/011	
The district is rural right to its southern boundary and therefore consists only two categories: Winchester Town. The market towns and the rural areas. The core strategy issues and options paper stresses the rural nature of Winchester District in many places. It is rural right to its southern edge. No part of the district is urban, apart from the city. Urban South Hampshire is a paper concept and should be rejected by Winchester District - councillors and officers.			
02023	Mr Micheal Sadler-Forster	02023/00001/010	
Suggest two categories only: - Winchester town - Market towns			
02039	Mr Adrian Baskerville	02039/00001/010	
But all due account should be taken of the protection and presentation of villages and towns worthy of conservation, given tradition and character.			
02047	Dr Nigel Atherton	02047/00001/011	
Needs should be assessed and addressed fairly across the District. The "PUSH" initiative is not supported as it is imbalanced.			
02049	Mrs Wendy Thorpe	02049/00001/010	
Every area should be included. Past development should be taken into account.			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02050	Mr Martin Tiller	02050/00002/009	
Remove the area delineated by PUSH and place it into the market towns and rural area sector.			
02069	Mrs Pamela Timms	02069/00001/009	
But we need to keep our smaller communities as this is why people move there in the first place (if they had wanted to live in big cities that is where they would have gone.			
02070	Mr And Mrs Roger Hockin	02070/00001/010	
Bishops Waltham should not be a Key Hub and also be in the "PUSH" area. Development here is not sustainable due to in/out transport needs. The same applies to a lesser extent to Wickham.			
02084	Mrs Melanie Walker	02084/00001/003	
Too much emphasis based on Wickham/ Waltham Chase/ Bishops Waltham. Too much growth in too small an area, especially with 10,000 in Fareham and 10,000 in Hedge End.			
02092	Mr Fergus Christie	02092/00001/011	
Winchester, market towns and rural areas. South down national park			
02093	Mrs Jane Graham	02093/00001/009	
Does the District need districting			
02112	On Behalf Of Commercial Clients	02112/00001/007	Southern Plannin
The economic interdependence of the whole area must be recognised. This proposed division of the District is one based on living, rather than working, and on residents rather than firms and public bodies (i.e., not the employers and economic drivers). The economic strategy needs to be integrated with those of Southern Hampshire and treated as a whole, separately from the housing strategy.			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
---------------------------	-------------	--------------------------	--------------

02115	Mapledean Developments Ltd	02115/00002/002	Southern Plannin
-------	----------------------------	-----------------	------------------

The way in which the District has been subdivided, particularly in separating out the PUSH area from the rest of the District largely reflects the South East Plan. As the housing numbers for the PUSH area are separately addressed in the South East Plan, it is logical to follow this sub- division in this Plan. However, the consideration of twice of some of the settlements first under The Market Towns and Rural Areas and then again under the PUSH area, but with different issues arising each time, is considered potentially misleading and confusing. It would be better to deal with all the PUSH area in one section and exclude this area from consideration under The Market Towns and Rural Areas.

02117	Persimmon Homes	02117/00001/002	Southern Plannin
-------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------

The way in which the district has been sub-divided, particularly in separating out the PUSH area from the rest of the district largely reflects the South East plan. As the housing numbers for the PUSH area are separately addressed in the South East plan, it is logical to follow this same sub division in this plan. However, the consideration twice of some of the settlements, first under the market towns and the rural area and then again under the PUSH area, but with different issues arising each time, is considered potentially misleading and confusing. It would be preferable to deal with all of the PUSH area in one section and exclude this area from consideration under the market towns and rural areas.

02127	Bewley Homes Plc	02127/00001/009	Charles Planning
-------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

The sub-division of the district in the Core Strategy is suitable given the different development targets which the South East Plan Panel report has recommended for the area of the District with PUSH and the rest of District Area. However, it is important that the Core Strategy acknowledges the clear inter-linkages between these areas.

02168	Mr And Mrs John And Elena Goodwin	02168/00004/011	
-------	-----------------------------------	-----------------	--

I'm aware of the complications of this issue, but surely killing the rural areas is not going to benefit many.

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02170	Mrs Caroline Jezeph	02170/00001/009	
1. The division lacks clarity in terms of identifying the rural area and market towns inside the PUSH area. 2. The division fails to identify smaller settlements			
02171	Miss Charlotte O'Neill	02171/00001/009	
1: The division lacks clarity in terms of identifying the rural area and market towns inside the PUSH area. 2: The division fails to identify smaller settlements.			
02174	Tichbourne Estate	02174/00001/010	Dreweatt Neate
1. Winchester City and its accessible hinterland. 2. The southern part of the district falls within the partnership for urban south Hampshire. 3. The remainder of the district, Winchesters accessible rural hinterland should include the satellite settlements of New Alresford, Colden Common, Otterbourne, Sutton Scotney, Kings Worthy, South Wonston and Littleton.			
02181	Mr Keith Williams	02181/00001/009	
Subdivision results in the daft anomaly that parts of the District end up in two areas- to with Bishops Waltham being also in the wholly inappropriate PUSH area as well as the "market towns and the rural area" BW is in no way any part of an urban area nor should it ever be so			
02193	Mrs Dagmar Slater	02193/00001/011	
M27 or M3 corridor, Winchester town, other major conurbations in south Hampshire (e.g. Southampton, Fareham etc.) The market towns and rural area (as a last option)			
02195	Eagle Star Estates Ltd	02195/00001/002	Barton Wilmore
The core strategy is premature pending publication of the South East Plan and Eco town processes and should be withdrawn until the SEP is adopted and its location strategy and housing requirements are finalised. The Core Strategy is inflexible, fails to identify and consider all the available issues, options and alternatives and take into account latest government guidance on housing delivery and eco-towns. Over reliance on Barton farm. Other options should not be dismissed at this stage on the basis that they are not in conformity with the RSS. Also object to the options for market towns and rural area- consider a new settlement at Micheldever offers the most appropriate solution to delivering sustainable communities within Winchester District, including the delivery of affordable housing, community and physical infrastructure.			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02229	Gleeson Homes	02229/00001/010	Turley Associates
<p>In Spatial planning terms, there should be a clear distinction between "market towns" and the "rural area". Spatial planning objectives for the rural area will differ greatly from those aimed at the market towns. The merging of the two is confusing and will create uncertainty for those planning on developments and those commenting and making decisions on them. The rural area should appear in its own right for clarity and transparency and should be below market towns.</p>			
02237	Martineau Trustees	02237/00001/009	Dreweatt Neate
<p>Winchester's accessible rural hinterland should include the satellite settlements of New Alresford, Colden Common, Otterbourne, Sutton Scotney, Kings Worthy, South Wonston and Littleton.</p>			
02238	Holmes And Sons	02238/00001/010	Dreweatt Neate
<p>1. Winchester City and its accessible hinterland. 2. The southern part of the District falls within the partnership for urban South Hampshire. 3. The remainder of the district - Winchester's accessible rural hinterland should include the satellite settlements of New Alresford, Colden Common, Otterbourne, Sutton Scotney, Kings Worthy, South Wonston, Littleton and Sparsholt.</p>			
02239	Trustees Of E M Toogood Settlement	02239/00001/010	Dreweatt Neate
<p>1. Winchester City and its accessible hinterland. 2. The Southern part of the district falls within the partnership for urban South Hampshire. 3. The remainder of the district - Winchester's accessible rural hinterland should include the satellite settlements of New Alresford, Colden Common, Otterbourne, Sutton Scotney, Kings Worthy, South Wonston and Littleton.</p>			
02240	White Young Green Planning	02240/00001/003	
<p>Allowing housing development within rural villages and towns is crucial to facilitating the provision of additional housing for all size of settlements. Many employment uses in the countryside have become unviable/ unsustainable. The development of brownfield sites in towns and villages offers an available source of land for housing.</p>			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02243	Mr Stuart Jones	02243/00001/010	
<p>The overlap of the market towns and rural area with the southern part of the district within PUSH is confusing. Is Bishops Waltham in both areas It's now defined as a market town and also in the southern area. Which policies affect BW Those of both areas or only one What about rural areas in the PUSH area These overlaps need to be clarified. If the market towns and the rural area relates only to the area outside PUSH and Winchester town, why not rename it: 'The northern part of the district.'</p>			
02245	Mr Marcus Heys	02245/00001/009	
<p>PUSH should not exist. Onus should be put on those councils where housing is required i.e. Southampton, Eastleigh, Portsmouth, Winchester etc. Housing destined for the PUSH area that is also covers parts of the Winchester district is excluded from any of Winchester's Housing requirements e.g. Durley (N/NE Hedge End SDA)</p>			
02270	Mr James Cameron	02270/00002/005	
<p>Winchester Town, areas integrated with the Southern Urban Area, rural townships, remaining rural areas.</p>			
02274	Mr Peter McManus	02274/00001/011	
<p>Areas should be divided as follows: 1. Winchester Town, market towns and rural areas. 2. 'PUSH' area. 3. South Downs National Park and AONB areas. OR: Retain numbers as a whole for the entire District as in WDLPR 2001-2011.</p>			
02374	Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)	02374/00001/010	
<p>Winchester town, Market towns and the rural area. "PUSH" South Downs National Park and AONB areas. Southern Parishes residents in Market Towns to the north of Hedge End SDA e.g. Bishops Waltham, Wickham and Colden Common, would logically be part of the 'rest of Winchester' District. Except Whiteley who may logically prefer to remain within the "PUSH" area.</p>			
02376	Ms Janet Mckenzie	02376/00001/009	
<p>This question asks us tom choose between option 1 and 2 but does not outline those options</p>			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02377	Mr Colin Penfold	02377/00001/009	
Assuming that option 2 is no (ever considered proofreading the questionnaire): PUSH should not go as far as Bishops Waltham, Swanmore or even Wickham. These are rural areas, not town areas. A town must have a railway line.			
02379	Mrs Jennifer Williams	02379/00001/009	
I think these 3 should be taken as one whole			
02380	Mr Ian Berry	02380/00001/011	
1. Winchester town, other market towns and rural areas (all grouped together) 2. PUSH area 3. South Downs national park			
02385	Mrs Elisabeth Hopson	02385/00001/011	
Why would you divide the district anyway What controls have you in place that insures that no one "area" takes the brunt of new building How is equality and fairness to be demonstrated in this exercise			
02387	Mrs Angela Harding	02387/00001/008	
How can you tick Yes or No when you are only given the option of ticking option 1 or 2			
02392	Mr Brian Denton	02392/00001/008	
We need a new town at Micheldever.			
02395	Mrs Carol Bradshaw	02395/00001/008	
uinclear what option 1 and 2 are			
02399	Mr Chris Southgate	02399/00001/010	
Winchester City Northern district South East district around Fareham Southern district around Eastleigh etc			
02410	Mr Joseph Meider	02410/00001/010	
The reason I answered no being as explained in my answer to the previous question where I stated that we are already over populated. The roads here are constantly over subscribed and thus difficult to travel on. My particular street is becoming more and more difficult to negotiate onto the main road, we need traffic lights. As said we are becoming a large town rather than a village. Why should we be forced into this situation, do we have to move after living here for 30 years			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02414	Mr David Simmons	02414/00001/009	
By including WCC Southern parishes under PUSH you are supporting the partnership for urbanising South Hampshire. Durley is part of the rural area.			
02415	Ms Kelsie Learney	02415/00001/010	
Need to consider the town as being a much wider area- a sphere of influence rather than having fixed boundaries and give some flexibility over the boundaries between urban/ rural/ PUSH/ not PUSH.			
02416	Mr David Thompson	02416/00001/011	
You have not made it clear what options 1 and 2 refer to. I have assumed that option 2 means yes to the suggested way of sub- dividing the district.			
02419	Mr Loic Lomine	02419/00001/009	
I do not understand: Question 3a asks me to choose between "option 1 and 2" but they are not outlined.			
02420	Mrs Susan Hall	02420/00001/009	
I am firmly against the plan to build 12,240 dwellings in the next 20 years. How could the Council have agreed to such a proposal			
02427	Mr Michael Emett	02427/00001/004	
The district should be divided into the PUSH area and 'Rest of District', consistent with the SEP. The latter could then be sub-divided into Winchester town and the rural area in order to highlight and emphasise the clear settlement hierarchy. As currently proposed the market towns and rural areas straddles both SEP sub-regions and overlaps with the PUSH area, giving rise to potential confusion.			
02434	Mr Alan Dunk	02434/00001/009	
Based on existing parishes, the above just condemns the Southern parishes into a massive build. The load must be shared across the county. If not local people will be forced to move out to the more rapidly expanding areas breaking down the community.			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02435	Mr William Stroud	02435/00001/011	
Let Winchester be treated the same as the other large conurbations in the area. Why should it have special treatment Why are market towns grouped with the rural area I live in an attractive market town and can say that market towns are much more likely to be dormitory urban areas inhabited by the well-off than part of the agricultural community.			
02440	Mr Gerard Hawkes	02440/00001/011	
Disagree with (push)			
02454	Mr David Phillips	02454/00001/011	
I am disturbed that Denmead has been included in the PUSH designated zone. Denmead is definately rural and should be included as such.			
02456	Mr Stuart Hopkins	02456/00001/009	
There should be the creation of a completely new town which can be carefully placed so that the current environment is safeguarded. Messing about with placing add ons to existing villages and a town such as Winchester will damage our environment, the creation of a new town will enable modern futyristic business to flourish and at the same time create community.			
02461	Mr Steve Robinson	02461/00001/005	
I am not sufficiently familiar with PUSH (nor, I'm sure, are many respondants) to be able to agree that the division is appropriate - I suspect from a resident's point of view we in the rural parts of the South of the district do not feel out areas should be treated differently from any other rural part of Winchester.			
02464	Ms Jennifer Bennett	02464/00001/009	
It would help if you could define your own terms better so that people outside the council can understand what it is you are proposing.			
02465	Ms Denise Corlett	02465/00001/010	
No development should be taking place in rural areas, develop brown sites.			
02466	Mr Harry Booth	02466/00001/010	
Keep to built up areas.			
02468	Mr Stephen Webb	02468/00001/011	
Build economic housing in the north of England - the work will follow.			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02470	Mr Edward Du Boulay	02470/00001/011	
<p>The proposed divisions target currently underdeveloped areas. The obvious consequence of this approach is that in 20 years time there will be little rural land left undeveloped. The division between the city and countryside will be blurred in a mess of urban sprawl. An alternative proposition would be that large areas of open countryside (such as south Hampshire) need to be preserved, with focus playing on the existing city suburbs. South Hampshire plays a crucial role as the buffer between Winchester and Portsmouth, and developing it will just create a homogenised metropolis.</p>			
02480	Mr Michael Westwell	02480/00001/010	
<p>Question 3a is not clear - what are the two options</p>			
02482	Mr Milton Jolin	02482/00001/010	
<p>Fully identify brownfields sites that can be initially used for development before considering expanding small rural communities and using open countryside to build large volumes of housing. This is nothing stating in this document about the large amount of privately owned properties lying empty or derelict which could be utilised.</p>			
02487	Mrs Jane Turner	02487/00001/009	
<p>I do not agree that Wickham should be included in both PUSH which relates to urban South Hampshire and is also classified as a market town and rural area. Wickham should be excluded from PUSH.</p>			
02488	Ms Gillian Dean	02488/00001/009	
<p>Am not happy about becoming part of an Urban District.</p>			
02493	Mr Rupert Johnson	02493/00001/009	
<p>The district should be treated as a single entity with additional housing spread equally across the whole district. This will help us to ensure that there is a better housing/ resource balance as opposed to focusing development in the PUSH area, where it is unlikely the extra resources required will be supplied.</p>			
02495	Mr John Dixie	02495/00001/011	
<p>I don't think the District should be divided but planning should be done for an unified District.</p>			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02502	Mr Geoffrey Johnson	02502/00001/010	
Divide into industrial and rural areas and keep the industrial expansion out of rural towns.			
02504	Mr Peter Stevens	02504/00001/011	
There seems to be no consideration of the possibilities of new towns (such as Micheldever) but only to further intensive development of existing settlements.			
02505	Ms Janette Lloyd	02505/00001/003	
Need to consider Micheldever New Town proposals as means of delivering new development . Reduce the amount of commuting into the city by relocating HCC to the PUSH area served by the M27.			
02511	Cllr Malcolm Wright	02511/00001/010	
Winchester City, market towns and the rural areas within the district make up the character of the whole area.			
02511	Cllr Malcolm Wright	02511/00002/009	
Winchester city, market towns and the rural areas within the district make up the character of the whole area.			
02515	Mr Chris Gillham	02515/00001/010	
Need to reflect more 'extra' District influences.			
02515	Mr Chris Gillham	02515/00002/010	
Need to reflect more 'extra' District influences.			
02526	Mr David Jenkins	02526/00001/011	
I guess this is appropriate although I can't help the feeling that you are leading me into a 'fait accomplis' later in the questionnaire because of the way these questions are phrased.			
02529	Mr David Carr	02529/00001/010	
Brownfield areas across the district.			
02538	Mr Joshua Layish	02538/00001/011	
The District should be divided into seperate areas based on the relative importance of their architectural heritage and landscape quality.			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02550	Mrs Alison Matthews	02550/00001/011	
Villages are a major feature of the "rural area" and should not be lumped together with market towns, suggest a seperate category.			
02557	Mr Geoff Olden	02557/00001/010	
Keep any development close to the M27 and M3 corridors			
02558	Mr Kevin Andreoli	02558/00001/009	
Winchester City. Northern Area. Southern Area.			
02567	Mrs Sandy O'Leary	02567/00001/011	
The market towns and rural areas should be two separate categories.			
02568	Mr Michael Chaplin	02568/00001/007	
Winchester Town. Northern part of the District. Southern Part.			
02573	Mr John Crew	02573/00001/009	
Not exactly sure about this, but to build up and around the existing market towns is totally foll-hardy; there are far too many people and vehicles in these heavily congested areas as it is			
02576	Mr Anthony Thorpe	02576/00001/010	
It depends on where the lines are drawn - there is an overlap between these areas, which produces inconsistencies in the approaches to them.			
02581	Mr Nicholas Lalor	02581/00001/009	
The Northern boundary of the PUSH region should be sent further South so that it doesn't conflict with market towns such as Wickham and Bishops Waltham.			
02583	Mrs Nicola Kelly	02583/00001/009	
Feel this description is vague and unclear. The link of market towns and rural area, and the third area make the divisions confusing. What happens if your market town is in the PUSH?			
02584	Mr Paul Howden	02584/00001/009	
More emphasis on existing villages/towns and their existing facilities including employment. Winchester as a separate entity appears appropriate.			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02588	Mrs Jean Dorey	02588/00001/010	
I don't understand what the 3rd bullet point consists of.			
02589	Mr Andrew Boarder	02589/00001/009	
Some towns lie within two of these categories.			
02595	Mr Brian Eyley	02595/00001/009	
The southern part of the district should be excluded from the PUSH boundaries. It is entirely inappropriate to allow major development in the Wickham area whether under PUSH or the WCC LDF. Wickham and the adjacent area is a rural area, not an urban area and should remain so.			
02599	Mr Ian Wolverson	02599/00001/009	
Why divide and make block plans, why not allow small scale natural development!			
02606	Mrs Claire Chapman	02606/00001/009	
It does not seem right to include some market town/rural areas (e.g. Wickham, Bisops Waltham) within the partnership for URBAN South Hampshire:these are not urban areas Although their needs will be affected by their proximity to the PUSH area, they should be treated as completely different from other market towns and rural areas.			
02611	Mr James Robins	02611/00001/010	
The treatment of rural areas is inappropriate. The division into these three areas means that rural areas in the southern part of the district are likely to be treated differently from rural areas in the north. The southern rural areas will fall into the PUSH region and are, as a result, unlikely to be given adequate consideration for protection from development. It would be preferable to divide the District into: - Winchester Town - Market Towns - Other developed areas of land - Rural areas. This will allow a more consistent treatment of rural areas, wherever they are situated in the district.			
02614	Mr Rob Houston	02614/00001/010	
If the aim is to reduce the carbon footprint and provide facilities and amenities without having to use a car, surely large towns and cities should be earmarked as key areas of consideration for the dense urban dwellings that the council and govern seemed determined to foist upon us.			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02623	Mr Jon Taylor	02623/00001/011	
Other developments are not considered in the division. Wickham should not be a key hub: it is vulnerable from development at the southern boundary and needs protection of its green borders.			
02627	Mr David Page	02627/00001/010	
Whilst in principle I agree with the concept of dividing the district, I would question the rationale behind the determination of the area that constitutes PUSH; this boundary extends too far north into many rural areas, which are not urban by any reasonable definition of the word. The risk here is yet further encroachment upon already pressurised countryside and farmland.			
02630	Mr Robert Shepherd	02630/00001/010	
Identify Brownfield areas, and improve already developed sites before allowing any green area developments.			
02633	Mr Richard Hill	02633/00001/009	
Placing the burden on existing urban districts is acceptable provided that the local services are adequately enhanced; such as, schools, doctors, public transport, sewage, water supply, police forces, fire brigade cover etc.			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02635	Mr Chris Benham	02635/00001/002	
<p>The Issues and Options Core Strategy (IOCS) acknowledges that the Panel Report into the draft South East Plan (August 2007) requires land to be provided within the district for some 12, 240 dwellings over the period 2006-2026. To help guide decision- making on where this housing should be located the IOCS proposes to divide the district into three areas: Winchester; The Market Towns and the rural area; The southern part of the district that lies within the area Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) This approach fails to recognise the difference in the level of statutory landscape designation that exists within the district. A significant area to the east of Winchester Town and comprises part of the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and/or the proposed South Downs National Park. Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas states that 'Nationally designated areas comprising National Parks... and Areas of Outstanding Natural beauty, have been confirmed by Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should therefore be given great weight in planning policies and the development control decisions in these areas.' (para 21) Given the existing and proposed level of protection that applies to this area, it is considered necessary and appropriate to differentiate land within the AONB/ National Park from the remainder of 'the market towns and rural area'. The Core Strategy should therefore subdivide this 'spatial area' into two, following the boundary of the AONB/National Park.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Core Strategy should conclude that as a result of the limited development potential in the AONB/ proposed National Park that part of the 'Market towns and rural area' beyond these designations will need to accept a greater proportion of new housing growth to meet the requirements of the South East Plans.</p>			
02637	Mr Ewan Withers	02637/00001/011	
<p>Market towns and the rural area needs sub-division based on population and population density. It's really important to differentiate between a town of several thousand inhabitants and a village of a couple of hundred.</p>			
02641	Mr Ralph Bolton	02641/00001/009	
<p>I live in Bishops Waltham, a rural market town. I don't want to be in a urban environment, and certainly not in a partnership for creating one. Who's daft idea was it anyway We live in the hinterland of Winchester with equal influence of Southampton and Portsmouth. I really don't want to be a commuting settlement for London which, effectively, is being proposed.</p>			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02646	Mrs Samantha Baldwin	02646/00001/011	
Option 1 is too generalised. You need to sub divide the "market towns and rural areas" as they all differ considerably.			
02647	Mr Victor Hatch	02647/00001/010	
Some identified Market Towns are also in the PUSH area, and it should not be forgotten that a significant amount of Winchester CC's provision for additional housing is centred areas, away from the historic city.			
02649	Mr Chris Owen	02649/00001/010	
North of the city to be a valid division.			
02653	Mr Chris Hutchings	02653/00001/007	
Treat as one region - don't micro manage.			
02656	Mr Andrew Mclay	02656/00001/010	
Build where the housing is wanted and there is employment.			
02665	Mr Martin Burton	02665/00001/011	
The premise is wrong. The requirement to build 12,240 houses has been imposed by central government and we (the population of Hampshire) have not been consulted on whether we agree or disagree with these imposed figures. We have not been allowed to build up our own vision, Winchester District is merely trying to impose central government doctrine, and pretend that it is having a "democratic" consultation on the process. You cannot have a democratic consultation when you refuse to allow debate on the imposition of 12,240 houses by central government.			
02668	Mrs Wendy Pace	02668/00001/008	
Maximise the development of Brownfield sites to reduce the requirement to develop new areas.			
02669	Mrs Joanna Wedeman	02669/00001/009	
As far as I understand it, under the current plans Borley Green and Durley come under the PUSH category (as does Bishops Waltham) and yet although they may be within this area they are either a market town or rural area and should be considered such in any planning. It would be devastating to the area to spoil yet more of our villages and towns, turning them into yet more sprawling masses.			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02677	Mr Martin Orford	02677/00001/011	
<p>Bishops Waltham and Wickham should not be included in the PUSH as they are historically separate from the conurbations of Southampton and Portsmouth. Transport links with these conurbations are poor as is the condition of the roads, and the market towns have more in common with rural mid- Hampshire. The South Downs National Park boundary should also be re-drawn to preserve the green gap between Wickham and Bishops Waltham and the PUSH area.</p>			
02678	Mrs Victoria Watson	02678/00001/009	
<p>Use areas that are not already populated so reducing the stress on existing roads and services.</p>			
02680	Mr William Hoskins	02680/00001/012	
<p>Bishops Waltham is within two of these areas. It is a rural market town of great charm that will be completely destroyed if a large number of houses are built here. Secondly, it just comes into the area covered by PUSH. We should be either one or the other - not both.</p>			
02685	Mr Malcolm Thornton	02685/00001/004	
<p>Your guidance for the division here is poorly described. How can anyone agree or disagree without sufficient information. where the hell is this PUSH district? Where precisely are the Market Towns?</p>			
02686	Mr Donald Taylor	02686/00001/009	
<p>New housing should be built, together with all new infrastructure, in open areas away from market towns, who are already struggling to meet with the existing numbers of both people and traffic.</p>			
02690	Mr Colin Thorne	02690/00001/009	
<p>The District should not include any part of the PUSH. The southern part of the District should be included in the list of Market towns and rural areas only.</p>			
02695	Mrs Amanda Hutchings	02695/00001/010	
<p>Any division is somewhat arbitrary. Why not treat the District as a whole</p>			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02702	Mr Paul Quarrington	02702/00001/010	
<p>Areas such as Wickham must not be put into both categories of "Key Hub" within "market towns and the rural area" and "Southern Fringe within the Push Boundary". It should be one or the other, not both. Making Wickham a small village with a strong identity in a rural area, doubly vulnerable to being ruined by over-development.</p>			
02704	Mr Richard Carpenter	02704/00001/011	
<p>It is clear that with 12,240 dwellings to produce the only way that this can be done without destroying the nature and character of numerous existing towns and villages is to construct a new town. This may well require the sacrifice of some existing Green Belt land and by choosing a location that would have reasonable access to a rail network 1st and a motorway network 2nd and providing one infrastructure to service the new town all the benefits of a modern town can be designed into the plan. This will avoid the need to reinforce the roads and infrastructure of the many towns and villages that the current plan requires which as you know will not happen (despite promises) till many years after the houses are constructed.</p>			
02710	Mrs Margaret Hounsham	02710/00001/011	
<p>The PUSH area encroaches close to the south side of Bishops Waltham on rural, not urban land and is inappropriate for a town soon to become gateway to a national park.</p>			
02714	Mr James Fulton	02714/00001/005	
<p>Over stretching resources in the PUSH area. Specifically BW.</p>			
02716	Mr Adrian Wood	02716/00001/010	
<p>Do not consider the southern part of the district to be urban.</p>			
02729	Mrs Maggie Smith	02729/00001/003	
<p>Wickham falls into two categories: market town and rural area as well as PUSH. More consideration should be given to the consequences especially as Wickham will have a large SDA on its doorstep.</p>			
02761	Mr John Lambert	02761/00001/011	
<p>Bishops Waltham is a rural town with limited provisions for local employment. Over many years industrial brown field sites have been to housing developments and as a result workers have had to commute for employment. What about our carbon footprint</p>			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02764	Mr Graham Mulholland	02764/00001/009	
<p>The idea that a sustainable development plan can be provided by way of a partnership, i.e. PUSH is a complete madness. The specific needs and structure of each area should be considered upon their relevant merits and requirements. Fareham, Eastleigh and Winchester have nothing in common.</p>			
02779	Ms Linda Yeodal	02779/00001/010	
<p>New housing provision must reflect the needs and wishes of local inhabitants. We currently need a small number of sheltered homes for the elderly, not a massive, profiteering housing development that will completely overwhelm the current community and destroy our way of life.</p>			
02783	Mrs Dorothy Quiney	02783/00001/010	
<p>Rural market towns should be removed from the PUSH area.</p>			
02784	Mrs Victoria Louise Ruth Moore	02784/00001/002	
<p>It should be divided to show derelict industrial estates (Brownfield sites) for development first.</p>			
02786	Mr Anthony Cailles	02786/00001/010	
<p>It would be acceptable if the PUSH area was based on the urban areas of south Hampshire, but at present it also includes some of the southern market towns (e.g. Wickham, Bishops Waltham and rural areas). The PUSH boundary needs to be redefined.</p>			
02800	Mr Malcolm Rowland	02800/00001/011	
<p>Limit building to 150 affordable dwellings and concentrate larger builds to areas that have the infrastructure to cope with this amount of dwellings.</p>			
02833	Mrs Gillian Mulley	02833/00001/011	
<p>I do not think that Durley should be in the PUSH area. It looks towards Bishops Waltham (not Southampton) and belongs within the 'market towns and the rural area' category.</p>			
02872	Mr Peter Henley	02872/00001/005	
<p>Spread the load more evenly over the county involved areas, rather than the small country towns like Bishops Waltham and Wickham which will otherwise lose their character entirely.</p>			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02874	Mr Michael Hollis	02874/00002/011	
Designation of Wickham as a "market town" is incorrect. Wickham is a village.			
02887	Mrs Judy Marsh	02887/00001/006	
Reluctantly I agree.			
02895	Mrs Wendy Ingamells	02895/00002/010	
Yes. It would be better to have an evenly spread growth in every village and town so that no community is destroyed by being swamped with huge increases in housing / population which will only lead to increased traffic jams, pollution, crime and health / education waiting lists getting longer.			
02904	Mrs Ruth Croger	02904/00001/010	
It is unreasonable for a town like Bishops Waltham to be a Key Hub and included in the PUSH for possible major development. Its area boundaries should not overlap.			
02908	Mr Frank Harrison	02908/00001/004	
Bishops Waltham cannot accept having an extra 1000 houses. The village can hardly cope with the various needs at present - hardly any car parking available on the streets and car parks - one has to wander around until a park is available. The pressure of the 1000 houses would make the car traffic impossible - it may be possible to cope with an extra 200 houses.			
02912	Winchester Friends Of The Earth	02912/00002/006	
Need to develop a development strategy that looks at corridors to maximise public transport opportunities to reduce car usage rather than urban concentration that encourages commuting on M3/A34. Redevelop car park sites has a number of benefits in placing people near activities, raising revenue, and removing the car park as a traffic generator. Provision of park and ride is misguided as it increases traffic and carbon emissions, and compromises conventional bus services.			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02923	North Whiteley Consortium	02923/00001/009	Terence O'Rourk
<p>Although it is an appropriate way to divide the District, given the approach set out in the RSS Panel Report, the Issues and Options papers presumes that the reader has a degree of knowledge of PUSH and its area of influence. Further, the scale of Map 1 is too high and diagrammatic, preventing understanding of the detailed extent of the PUSH area. There is a need to rectify this. If this can not be achieved it may be that simply dividing the area into Winchester, the towns and rural areas would be easier for the general public to understand.</p>			
02926	The Whiteley Co-ownership	02926/00001/010	Terence O'Rourk
<p>The scale used on Map 1 is too high and the information too diagrammatic, preventing understanding of the detailed extent of the PUSH area. There is a need to rectify this.</p>			
02929	Mrs Yvonne Case	02929/00001/009	
<p>1. Winchester 2. The market towns and rural area.</p>			
02932	Mr Jonathan Simmons	02932/00001/011	
<p>The southern part of Winchester District should not lie in PUSH region, since it is a rural area and the residents wish it to remain so. "Urban South Hampshire" is not something that we want to be part of.</p>			
02934	Mrs Eloise Appleby	02934/00001/011	
<p>It is not true that the character of the whole of the PUSH area is unified or looks exclusively south for its services etc - given that PUSH reaches up to Colden Common, and that Winchester has the bulk of cultural amenities, the cathedral, events such as the ice rink etc, it may just be that people in the PUSH area head different directions for different activities. Definitely need to be flexible when making judgements about the parts of PUSH that are not subject to major development.</p>			
02936	Mr Randolph Mulley	02936/00001/010	
<p>I suggest these three: - Winchester town - Market towns - The rural areas</p>			

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
02942	Mr Graham Campbell	02942/00001/010	
I live in the village of Durley and do not like the creeping description that includes me in an urban area this is the creeping talk that is allowing talk of the NNE development here.			
02944	Mr Andrew Bennett	02944/00001/011	
You really have surpassed yourself with the meaningless jargon spouted above: you say you wish to consult the public and yet design a form that most members of the public will be unable to decipher. My reading of your proposal is to protect Winchester by inflicting huge numbers of flats into the 'so called' PUSH district. How dare you waste our council tax money on this rubbish			
02968	Miss Joy Spiler	02968/00001/011	
Rarely visit Winchester Use public transport.			
02985	Mr Charles Pearson	02985/00001/002	
Oppose inclusion of BW and other rural parts of southern district within the urbanised PUSH area. BW and Wickham should be allowed to develop naturally and become more self sufficient, particukarky in regard to employment and travel.			
02991	Redrow Homes (Southern) Limited	02991/00001/009	Woolf Bond Plan
Accept, in principle, the spatial strategy set out on page 23 of the consultation document, provided it embraces the need to focus development on those sustainable locations identified in earlier (including LPR) work, together with ensuring the provision of deliverable housing allocations, in accordance with PPS 3 (para. 54).			
02993	Tesco Stores Limited	02993/00001/002	DPP
However the borough is divided, the local development framework should acknowledge that sufficient services should be available to meet the needs of this growing community.			
03016	Mrs Danielle F Giles	03016/00001/010	
Feel "PUSH" area is to big and surely comes largely within second sub-division (Market Towns and rural area).			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
03029	Mr Robert Toleman	03029/00001/004	
<p>Words, words, "special" strategy. I do not believe the rate payers up whom the planners depend for their livelihood, wish for 12,240 additional dwellings- which can not be accommodated, if the quality of life for existing residents is to be improved.</p>			
03054	Mr Peter Motchman	03054/00001/002	
<p>The core strategy needs to explore more fully the strengths and weaknesses of these areas to be able to absorb more growth - given the focus of the SEP on urban areas the core strategy should conclude that the majority of the 5500 requirement should be in an around Winchester town.</p>			
03057	Community Action Hampshire	03057/00001/009	
<p>Separate the rural areas from the market towns.</p>			
03071	Mr John Hayter	03071/00001/011	
<p>The Spatial Areas should be consistent with the sustainability hierarchy and the South East Plan's definition of 'market towns'.</p>			
03082	City Of Winchester Trust	03082/00001/011	
<p>Agree subject to assessment of impact of policies in one are on other parts for the district.</p>			
03102	N R Trickett (Developments) Ltd	03102/00001/001	Mr Peter Motchm
<p>As the most sustainable settlement in the District, the majority of the 5,500 dwelling needed outside PUSH should be in and around Winchester Town, leaving only limited additional development requirements in the market towns and rural areas.</p>			
03105	Save Barton Farm Group	03105/00001/011	
<p>Either: Three areas to divide Winchester District: 1. Winchester Town, market towns and rural areas. 2. 'PUSH' area. 3. South Downs National Park and AONB areas Or: Retain numbers as a whole for the entire District as in WDLPR 2001-2011.</p>			

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

Question 3b. If you ticked no; are there any other ways in which the District could be divided which would help plan the District for the next 20 years?

Customer Reference	Name	Comment Reference	Agent
03136	The Dever Society	03136/00001/009	
<p>The rural areas should be treated as a separate subdivision, as the planning issues they face are very different to those facing market towns. It is not possible to have common policies appropriate to both types of area.</p>			
03199	Sport England (South East Region)	03199/00001/007	
<p>Support the spatial split for the district and request that the following are included in the preferred options: Protection and promotion of open space, sport and recreational facilities. Promotion of population participation rates in sport and recreation. Built environment to include opportunities for sport and recreation- need to build in area action plans and master plans for larger sites.</p>			
03202	Mr M Charrett	03202/00001/004	
<p>The District does not need to be divided. The only solution to meet housing requirements over the next 20 years is to distribute development to all towns and villages throughout the District. A better solution would be to re-examine regional targets, taking full account of development land likely to become available near to, but beyond, the District boundary e.g. MoD land at Bullington [Test Valley] and Bordon [East Hants]. Sustainable housing targets should be allocated to all small towns and villages throughout the District. This approach would revitalise villages, boost local services and lead to public transport improvements and reductions in out-commuting.</p>			
03225	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	03225/00001/009	Woolf Bond Plan
<p>Support the principle of providing for growth, within the 'South Hampshire' part of the District, at Bishops Waltham, Wickham, Whiteley and Denmead - clearly established as four of the seven 'most sustainable' locations in the district. Accept, in principle, the spatial strategy set out on P23 of the consultation document, provided it embraces the need to focus development on those sustainable locations identified in earlier work, together with ensuring the provision of deliverable housing allocations, in accordance with PPS3 (para 54)</p>			

Q3b

The following list made this comment:

'Development for Wickham could be considered under 'market towns the rural area' and the PUSH category. It is therefore doubly vulnerable'

Each response has been counted as an individual comment.

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
00949	Mr And Mrs Debbie Holley And Family	00949/00002/002
00951	Mr And Mrs Philip And Wendy Greenish	00951/00002/002
00954	Mr And Mrs P D And L Spake	00954/00003/002
00956	Mrs M Wheeler	00956/00002/002
00978	Mr G J Wilkins	00978/00002/002
00990	Mr And Mrs E Jakob	00990/00002/002
00994	Mrs Evelyn Warwick	00994/00002/002
00995	Mr N R Turner	00995/00003/002
00999	Mrs B Davis	00999/00002/002
01003	Mr And Mrs B P And E S Winter	01003/00002/002
01004	Mr And Mrs Leslie And Rita Coker	01004/00002/002
01008	Mr And Mrs Anthony And Helen Drury	01008/00002/002
01009	Dr Robert C Sexton	01009/00002/002
01014	Mr And Mrs M D Henderson	01014/00002/002
01015	Mr Keith F Barnard	01015/00002/002
01017	Mr Richard Y C Sharp	01017/00002/002
01020	Mr Anthony Clark	01020/00002/002
01023	Mr C S Hodge	01023/00002/002
01026	Ms Lisa Morey	01026/00002/002
01027	Mrs M Whiffin	01027/00001/002
01028	Ms Fiona Allen	01028/00002/002
01031	Mr And Mrs John And Patricia Hartley	01031/00002/002
01032	Mrs D Brown	01032/00001/002

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

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01036	Mr And Mrs Brian And Sheila Harfield	01036/00002/002
01037	Mr D Gamblin	01037/00002/002
01042	Ms Linda Mary Tomlin	01042/00002/002
01043	Mr And Mrs Charles And Deborah Smith	01043/00002/002
01045	Mrs J Hirst	01045/00002/002
01046	Mr And Mrs Andrew And Tamsin Goodman	01046/00002/002
01050	Mr And Mrs K Melsome	01050/00002/002
01054	Mr Brian Oswald	01054/00002/002
01055	Ms Heather Oswald	01055/00002/002
01056	Ms Patricia Fray	01056/00002/002
01064	Mr And Mrs Colin And Jennifer York	01064/00002/002
01067	Mr And Mrs Simon And Lisa Rustell	01067/00002/002
01068	Mr And Mrs Ian And Rosemary Riches	01068/00002/002
01070	Mrs Joan Botten	01070/00002/002
01081	Mr Michael Green	01081/00002/002
01082	Mr And Mrs S H And P M Cooper	01082/00002/002
01084	Mr Modesty Hunter	01084/00002/002
01085	Mr Kevin Tappin	01085/00001/002
01085	Mr Kevin Tappin	01085/00002/002
01086	Ms Ruth Edwards	01086/00002/002
01091	Mr James Haywood	01091/00002/002
01092	Mr Graham Haywood	01092/00002/002
01094	Ms Rosemary Crane	01094/00002/002
01096	Ms Melanie Boylett	01096/00002/002
01099	Ms Lauren Burton	01099/00002/002
01101	Mr Basil Bultitude	01101/00002/002
01104	Mrs Rosemary Hilton	01104/00002/002
01106	Mr E M Smith	01106/00002/002

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

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01110	Mrs C Bond	01110/00002/002
01111	Mr And Mrs Neil And Lorraine Masson	01111/00002/002
01113	Mrs D E Hammond	01113/00002/002
01114	Ms Margaret Van Den Broek	01114/00002/002
01115	Mr E Barringer	01115/00002/002
01119	Mr And Mrs C B And J L Estell	01119/00002/002
01126	Mrs C Blackman	01126/00002/002
01128	Mr And Mrs J Crick	01128/00002/002
01130	Mrs Elizabeth Hardinge	01130/00002/002
01136	Mr And Mrs Vollentine	01136/00001/002
01138	Mrs R Chambers	01138/00002/002
01139	Mr A Chambers	01139/00002/002
01142	Mrs E Pack	01142/00002/002
01143	Mrs Christine Beardshaw	01143/00002/002
01144	Mr And Mrs S And I P Tasker	01144/00001/002
01152	Mr And Mrs Russell And Catherine Chisnall	01152/00002/002
01154	Mr And Mrs Edmund Charles And Shirley Waring	01154/00002/002
01158	Mr And Mrs Thorne	01158/00002/002
01159	Mrs And Mrs M Toole	01159/00001/002
01165	Mr And Mrs Ross	01165/00002/002
01173	Mrs L H G Bonnor	01173/00002/002
01174	Ms Sandra Foulkes	01174/00002/002
01176	Mr And Mrs Laws	01176/00001/002
01179	Mr M J Willers	01179/00002/002
01180	Ms Carole Unser	01180/00002/002
01183	Mr And Mrs Michael And Judith Oakes	01183/00002/002
01184	Mrs Jean E McKay	01184/00002/002
01185	Mr M J Coombs	01185/00002/002
01188	Mr And Mrs R Harwood	01188/00002/002

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01191	Mr Matthew Bailey	01191/00002/002
01193	Mr And Mrs Tollerfield	01193/00002/002
01196	Mr B Wingate	01196/00002/002
01198	Mr P Locke	01198/00002/002
01202	Ms Dorothy Johnson	01202/00002/002
01204	Mr And Mrs G J Aiken	01204/00002/002
01206	Mrs M R Dear	01206/00002/002
01208	Mr And Mrs Knight	01208/00002/002
01209	Mr And Mrs Mike And Anne Gosney	01209/00002/002
01210	Mrs B Benson	01210/00002/002
01212	Mr And Mrs Gulliford	01212/00001/002
01217	Mrs G Butters	01217/00002/002
01223	Mr And Mrs Kevin Coker	01223/00002/002
01228	Mr And Mrs D J Gray	01228/00002/002
01230	Mr Anthony Richard Johnson	01230/00002/002
01235	Mr And Mrs H K White	01235/00002/002
01239	Mr Andrew Burton	01239/00002/002
01240	Mr Dennis Pilcher	01240/00002/002
01242	Mr And Mrs Laing	01242/00002/002
01245	Mr William Hobbs	01245/00002/002
01247	Mr Kenneth Edwards	01247/00002/002
01248	Mr P J Noble	01248/00002/002
01249	Mr D M Vear	01249/00002/002
01250	Mrs S Gillanders	01250/00002/002
01253	Ms Wendy Burton	01253/00002/002
01257	Mr And Mrs P J Duddridge	01257/00002/002
01261	Ms Sheila Elizabeth Campbell	01261/00002/002
01264	Ms P McIntosh	01264/00002/002
01268	Mr William Bryn Foulkes	01268/00002/002
01272	Mr H W Lockey	01272/00002/002
01274	Dr Mark Du Boulay	01274/00002/002

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

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01278	Mr And Mrs Colin And Janet McIntosh	01278/00002/002
01279	Ms Alana Burton	01279/00002/002
01285	Mrs Barbara McCallion	01285/00002/002
01290	Mr And Mrs Roy And Susan Perry	01290/00002/002
01294	Mr Terry Caister	01294/00002/002
01295	Mr And Mrs Coker	01295/00002/002
01299	Mr And Mrs Kemp	01299/00002/002
01301	Mr And Mrs George And Sylvia Mercer	01301/00002/002
01303	Mr And Mrs Theuma	01303/00002/002
01304	Mr And Mrs O'Neill	01304/00002/002
01305	Mr And Mrs Ray And Bez Richards	01305/00002/002
01308	Mrs M E Manuel	01308/00002/002
01309	Mr Keith Robinson	01309/00002/002
01311	Mrs Toni Smith	01311/00002/002
01313	Mr And Mrs Bert And Joan Parkins	01313/00002/002
01314	Mr And Mrs L S Towlson	01314/00002/002
01315	Mr Richard Warwick	01315/00002/002
01317	Mr Paul Healy	01317/00002/002
01320	Mrs Rosalind McAllister	01320/00002/002
01321	Mr G Barrett	01321/00002/002
01322	Mr And Mrs Raymond And Joyce Offen	01322/00002/002
01323	Mr Duncan Phelps	01323/00002/002
01329	Mr John Bain	01329/00002/002
01330	Ms Jennifer Bradley	01330/00002/002
01332	Ms Carol Batterson	01332/00002/002
01333	Mrs Angela Avonda	01333/00002/002
01335	Ms C Chapman	01335/00002/002
01336	Mrs P June Harper	01336/00002/002

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

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01337	Mr And Mrs George And Ann Condie	01337/00002/002
01338	Mrs Vivien Harper	01338/00002/002
01339	Ms Mary J Burgess	01339/00002/002
01340	Mr Robert Goble	01340/00002/002
01341	Mr V B Hunter	01341/00002/002
01349	Mr And Mrs D Burgess	01349/00002/002
01351	Mr And Mrs R Powell	01351/00002/002
01353	Dr J Goodey	01353/00002/002
01355	Mrs E S Goodey	01355/00002/002
01358	Mrs A T Cobb	01358/00002/002
01359	Mr P G Taylor	01359/00002/002
01360	Mrs J Brackenbury	01360/00002/002
01366	Mr Michael Kerley	01366/00002/002
01368	Mr B J Turvey	01368/00002/002
01371	Mr And Mrs Arthur And Diana Shadwell	01371/00001/002
01372	Mrs Peggy L Anderson	01372/00002/002
01373	Ms Judith Masterson	01373/00002/002
01374	Mrs S Byles	01374/00001/002
01375	Mr And Mrs Ray And Susan Austin	01375/00002/002
01376	Mr And Mrs Bentley	01376/00002/002
01377	Mrs Joyce V Johnston	01377/00002/002
01378	Mr And Mrs Anthony And Gillian Balcombe	01378/00002/002
01379	Mr Beryl Olwen Alexander	01379/00002/002
01382	Mrs Betty Bellis	01382/00002/002
01383	Ms Pat Matthews	01383/00002/002
01387	Mr P F Donohue	01387/00002/002
01391	Mr Matt Browning	01391/00002/002
01393	Mrs G Tuffs	01393/00002/002
01395	Mr And Mrs P Bennett	01395/00002/002

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01396	Mr And Mrs Keith And Gillian Towlson	01396/00002/002
01401	Mr J Marshall	01401/00002/002
01402	Mr And Mrs Robert And Margaret Goodrich	01402/00002/002
01405	Mr And Mrs J Leach	01405/00002/002
01406	Mrs T J Beale	01406/00002/002
01408	Mr And Mrs G G And J R Sessions	01408/00002/002
01410	Mr And Mrs Michael And Victoria Betts	01410/00002/002
01416	Mr Patrick Hole	01416/00002/002
01419	Ms Iris Bartlett	01419/00002/002
01420	Ms Jennifer Steeples	01420/00002/002
01425	Mrs B E Quantrill	01425/00002/002
01427	Mr And Mrs Malcolm And Karen Lipscombe	01427/00002/002
01431	Mr And Mrs B Hearn	01431/00002/002
01433	Mr And Mrs Brian And Margaret Edgworth	01433/00002/002
01436	Mr And Mrs C K Couch	01436/00002/002
01438	Mr And Mrs S Wood	01438/00002/002
01441	Mr R C Smith	01441/00002/002
01443	Mr Anthony White	01443/00002/002
01444	Mr Reg Betts	01444/00002/002
01449	Mr A Clark	01449/00002/002
01450	Mrs Doris Goodall	01450/00002/002
01453	Mrs Joan D Smith	01453/00002/002
01455	Mr Joyce M Tuffill	01455/00002/002
01456	Ms Dorothy Lilian Kendrick	01456/00002/002
01457	Mr F R Edwards	01457/00002/002
01458	Mr D Copeland	01458/00002/002
01459	Mr Robert Brown	01459/00002/002
01464	Mr Mark Ashton	01464/00002/002

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

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01466	Ms Sue North	01466/00002/002
01468	Mr And Mrs David And Greta Weston	01468/00002/002
01474	Mr David E Blake	01474/00002/002
01475	Mr Stephen P Drake	01475/00002/002
01476	Mr Brian Davies	01476/00002/002
01477	Ms Denise Davies	01477/00002/002
01478	Mr Oliver Davies	01478/00002/002
01479	Ms Helen Manuel	01479/00002/002
01482	Mrs Jennifer Bass	01482/00001/002
01483	Mr Gerald Banks	01483/00001/002
01484	Mr Ian Goddard	01484/00001/002
01486	Mr Graham Smith	01486/00001/002
01487	Mrs Janet Langford	01487/00001/002
01489	Mr And Mrs Norman And Christine Beckett	01489/00001/002
01492	Mrs Angela Fay Wilson	01492/00001/002
01494	Mrs Tania Hall	01494/00002/002
01501	Revd David Simpson	01501/00002/002
01502	Mr And Mrs Angus And Margaret McGilp	01502/00001/002
01508	Mr Douglas Aylward	01508/00002/002
01509	Mr Peter Frankpitt	01509/00001/002
01511	Ms J A Restall	01511/00002/002
01514	Mr Robert Goulson	01514/00002/002
01516	Mrs Jane Goulson	01516/00002/002
01517	Mr And Mrs Derek And Barbara Watson	01517/00002/002
01518	Mr And Mrs Maurice And Myrtle Cooper	01518/00002/002
01521	Mr J Comerford	01521/00001/002
01524	Mr Godfrey Harper	01524/00002/002
01525	Mr And Mrs Pierre And Tina Allison	01525/00001/002

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

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01528	Mr Brian Hall	01528/00002/002
01529	Mr Derek Charles Somerville	01529/00001/002
01531	Mrs Janet Bingham	01531/00001/002
01532	Mrs Lisa Foster	01532/00002/002
01533	Dr Morgan O'Connell	01533/00002/002
01536	Mrs Carrie Mandley	01536/00002/002
01537	Mrs Barbara Webb	01537/00002/002
01538	Mr Jack Stickland	01538/00002/002
01545	Mr And Mrs Louis And Susan Nash	01545/00001/002
01547	Mrs Olive Trotman	01547/00001/002
01548	Mrs Daksha Mistry	01548/00001/002
01549	Mr And Mrs Barry And Christine Samways	01549/00001/002
01551	Mrs Daphne Kingsland	01551/00001/002
01552	Mr Sean McCallion	01552/00002/002
01555	Mr And Mrs John And Margaret Wheeler	01555/00001/002
01556	Miss Maxine Wheeler	01556/00001/002
01559	Mr Iain McAllister	01559/00002/002
01563	Mrs Susan Hemsworth	01563/00001/002
01564	Mrs R Cane	01564/00001/002
01565	Mr And Mrs Maclean	01565/00002/002
01566	Mr William John Baldwin	01566/00002/002
01569	Mr Frank Knight	01569/00001/002
01570	Captain Rn. Gerrard Andrewes	01570/00002/002
01571	Mrs June Gibbons	01571/00001/002
01572	Mr Damon Daysh	01572/00001/002
01573	Miss Jane England	01573/00002/002
01575	Mr Edward Piercy-Jones	01575/00001/002
01576	Mrs Jean Ockenden	01576/00001/002
01578	Mr Henry Butters	01578/00001/002

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01582	Lt Cdr And Mrs Michael And Barbara Berry	01582/00001/002
01584	Mr Keith Davies	01584/00001/002
01586	Ms Lisa Hymers	01586/00001/002
01590	Mrs Melba Boulwood	01590/00001/002
01593	Mrs Karen Percival	01593/00001/002
01595	Mr Neale V Fray	01595/00001/002
01597	Mrs Betty Mitchell	01597/00002/002
01598	Mr And Mrs Wayne And Sally Beck	01598/00001/002
01600	Mr And Mrs Peter And Joy Curry	01600/00001/002
01602	Mrs Anne Mitchell	01602/00001/002
01603	Mrs Constance Gordon	01603/00001/002
01606	Mr Barry Evers	01606/00001/002
01615	Mrs Susan Hoare	01615/00001/002
01624	Mr Roger Partridge	01624/00001/002
01628	Mrs Doreen Ettling	01628/00001/002
01630	Mrs Eleanor Watts	01630/00001/002
01633	Mrs Christine Wilkins	01633/00001/002
01635	Mrs Dorothy Usher	01635/00001/002
01636	Mr Phillip Perry	01636/00001/002
01637	Mr Arthur Cleeve	01637/00001/002
01643	Mr Robert John Wheeler	01643/00001/002
01644	Mrs Pamela Ray	01644/00001/002
01648	Mr Gerald Andrew Day	01648/00001/002
01650	Mr And Mrs Barry And Beverley Jones	01650/00001/002
01651	Mr Winnie Metcalf	01651/00001/002
01653	Mr Adam Weald	01653/00001/002
01655	Mr And Mrs Michael And Miranda Hughes	01655/00001/002
01660	Mrs June Astridge	01660/00001/002
01662	Mr And Mrs Frank And Jean Cox	01662/00001/002

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

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01664	Mr And Mrs Malcolm And Norma Short	01664/00001/002
01666	Mrs Lindsay Glasspool	01666/00001/002
01667	Mr Steven Shott	01667/00001/002
01675	Mrs Susan Doherty	01675/00001/002
01676	Mrs Marjorie Butterfield	01676/00001/002
01682	Mr And Mrs Anton And Susan Hanney	01682/00001/002
01685	Mr Ian Wright	01685/00002/002
01687	Mr And Mrs William And Penelope Agnew	01687/00001/002
01692	Mrs Anne Driver	01692/00001/002
01693	Mrs Pauline Betts	01693/00002/002
01694	Mrs Isabel Short	01694/00001/002
01695	Mrs Margaret White	01695/00002/002
01697	Mr Stanley Quantrill	01697/00002/002
01698	Mr Graham Russell	01698/00002/002
01703	Mr And Mrs Michael And Claire Barnes	01703/00001/002
01705	Mrs Lucy Marson	01705/00001/002
01706	Mr Cedric Hunt	01706/00001/002
01707	Mr Anthony Driver	01707/00001/002
01710	Mr R W Merritt	01710/00001/002
01714	Mr Graham Pike	01714/00001/002
01719	Mrs Susan Roger-Jones	01719/00001/002
01720	Mr Robin Dudley	01720/00002/002
01725	Ms Claire Steeples	01725/00001/002
01730	Mr And Mrs Graham Knight	01730/00001/002
01731	Mr Graham Laut	01731/00001/002
01734	Lady Dorothy Tidbury	01734/00001/002
01735	Miss Katherine Richards	01735/00001/002
01737	Mr Peter Fooks	01737/00001/002
01738	Mr Derek Hunt	01738/00001/002

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

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01739	Mrs Lisa Ashley	01739/00001/002
01740	Mrs Christine White	01740/00001/002
01744	Mr And Mrs Michael And Rosemary O'Leary	01744/00001/002
01748	Mr And Mrs Charles And Daphne Gale	01748/00001/002
01749	Mr Eugene O'Connor	01749/00001/002
01751	Ms Jane Shearsmith	01751/00001/002
01754	Mr David Pitt	01754/00001/002
01755	Mr Brian Dell	01755/00001/002
01756	Mr Brian Morgan	01756/00001/002
01757	Mr Stanley Money	01757/00001/002
01758	Mr And Mrs William And Mary Puttock	01758/00001/002
01759	Mr Brian Orvis	01759/00001/002
01761	Dr Charlotte Groves	01761/00001/002
01770	Miss Elizabeth Austin	01770/00001/002
01772	Mr James Freemantle	01772/00001/002
01775	Mr Neil Botten	01775/00001/002
01777	Mr And Mrs Jack And Joan Eddles	01777/00001/002
01778	Mrs Angela Clear	01778/00001/002
01780	Mr Martin Rogers	01780/00001/002
01781	Mr And Mrs Roy And Karen Jeffrey	01781/00001/002
01783	Mr Bruce Howard Crook	01783/00001/002
01785	Mr David Buckle	01785/00001/002
01787	Mrs Dorothy Pope	01787/00001/002
01789	Ms Lynda Cussons	01789/00001/002
01790	Mr And Mrs John And Gloria Roux	01790/00001/002
01792	Mr And Mrs Ian And Diane McKay	01792/00001/002
01795	Mr And Mrs Paul And Joan Hymers	01795/00001/002

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

Customer Reference	Customer Name	Comment Reference
01796	Mr And Mrs Robert And Marlene Randell	01796/00001/002
01798	Mrs Joyce Daysh	01798/00001/002
01801	Mr Werner Zacker	01801/00001/002
01802	Mr Christopher May	01802/00001/002
01803	Mr Stephen Kay	01803/00001/002
01805	Mrs Bev Wetherill	01805/00001/002
01806	Mr Colin Pratt	01806/00001/002
01807	Mrs Hazel Fleming	01807/00001/002
01808	Mrs Fran Hall	01808/00001/002
01809	Mrs Alberta Simmons	01809/00001/002
01812	Mr And Mrs Paul And Ann De Ste-Croix	01812/00001/002
01822	Mrs J Cleife	01822/00002/002
01912	Dr And Mrs Steven And Fiona Reeves	01912/00001/002
01913	Sir John Forbes	01913/00001/002
01914	Mrs Joan Stubbington	01914/00001/002
01917	Mrs Dawn Toomey	01917/00001/002
01919	Dr Mark Hunter	01919/00002/002
02281	Mr And Miss Steve And Rachel Hodgkinson And Christopher	02281/00001/008
02282	Miss Annette Blackman	02282/00001/008
02284	Mr Barry Hirst	02284/00001/008
02286	Mrs Sandra Hallt	02286/00001/008
02287	Mr Brian Brotherton	02287/00001/008