

Appendix 4: Alresford Site Allocations Consultation Responses Report 2014 Updated 25/6

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
1	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Not properly consulted on the plans, A31 access for the sun lane site is limited, that a travellers site is undesirable for residents or proposed new business. Other sites should be considered before sun lane.
2	Windermere Gardens Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported of the development. Logical choice but was worried about access to the fast A31 bypass, recommending additional access via the B3047 to Sun Lane. They considered siting the travellers in the commercial part the best option.
3	Nursery Road Arlesford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported of the development. Concerned about increased volumes of traffic in Nursery Road. Recommended HGV restrictions during construction and for the future.
4	Edward Terrace Sun Lane Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported the development. Worried the plan did not feature detailed access. Wanted traffic restrictions on sun lane and thought the travellers site inappropriate due to previous experience. Would not want to see any vehicle access to sun lane.
5	Appledown close Arlesford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported the development; no comments given.
6	Tichborne Down Arlesford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed the development. Problems of traffic along Sun Lane. They wanted more information on the plans.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
7	Russet Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This response was opposed to the development. Not best positioning, too much traffic on small road. Lack of need for a travellers site. They also foresaw additional pressure on schools and nurseries.
8	Windermere Gardens Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed the development. Traffic pressure, school capacity, lack of need to move industrial units off the Dean, junction problems with the A31, insufficient need for the travellers site, and infrastructure pressure from development.
9	Buttermere Gardens Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Support the development but required justification for the travellers site, better access to the Sun Lane site. Liked the open space proposals.
10	Windermere Gardens Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Cited access (derived from comments on the previous local plan), parking requirements, potential flooding and lack of pedestrian access.
11	The Dean Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This response came from a business owner in the Dean. They gave no clear opinion but stipulated that any transfer must consider parking facilities, pedestrian access to the town centre and security.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
12	Appledown Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Cited the lack of need or wish for businesses to relocate off The Dean, too much of Sun Lane being given to commercial development, poor consideration for the nursing facility, the unsuitability for a travellers site and impacts on infrastructure. Alternative proposals suggested include retaining employment at The Dean locate older persons accommodation and the limited office space required at the northern end of Sun Lane.
13	Charlotte Place Southampton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. This response was made on Behalf of Client Alfred Homes. Recommended the Arlebury park site. It cited the high sensitivity of part of the sun lane site, and lack of access to the A31. Submitted with a highly detailed Access Appraisal which highlighted the unsuitability of an A31 access road and other options for the Sun Lane site.
14	Salisbury Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Lack of sustainability appraisal for the site, a lack of phasing for the development, and poor communication in the consultation process.
15	Nursery Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported the development. Stipulations: Access should not be through sun lane due to additional traffic pressure.
16	Nursery Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This response was in support of the option with several stipulations: A better access plan for the A31, close work on the development of the public space, and a focus on sustainability.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
17	Langtons Court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Overpressure created by 320 homes on Sun Lane, flooding from the new paved surfaces, congestion on Sun Lane and its use as a potential rat run. It supported the green space at the core.
18	Tichborne Down Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Danger created by congestion, the impact of an industrial site and the issues related to a traveller site.
19		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Issues related to a travellers site.
20		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Issues related to a travellers site.
21		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported the Development. Cited sensible placement and a holistic approach.
22	Tichborne Down Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Problems of surface flooding at bottom of sun lane. Roads are currently a rat run which will get worse with more traffic. Issues with travellers site. Weighted against a small number of the Alresford Community. New housing must be deconcentrated to multiple sites. Access must combine A31 and a northern route (B3047). A road must be constructed for site traffic before commencement. More consideration must be taken for wildlife i.e. skylarks.
23	De Lucy Avenue Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported the development. Industry moved from the Dean reducing lorries, but issues with travellers site.
24	Nursery Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally Supported the development. Worried about the creation of a rat-run on sun lane, concerns around flooding.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
25	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Cited unsustainable level of the development on Sun Lane, difficulty of new access via the A31, increased congestion, issues relating to the traveller site.
26	Shepherds Down Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither supported or opposed the development. Emphasised need for safe routes to the town centre, questioned the location and provision or shelter/nursery units. Unwise to locate the traveller site next to the commercial allocation., recommended reappraisal of sites 278, 2408 and 1927. Concerns regarding road access (unsuitability of both Sun Lane and Tichborn Down to accommodate an increase in the volume of traffic) and the need for adequate infrastructure. Pearson Field will require a visual barrier.
27	Langtons Court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither supported or opposed the development. 320 houses must be spread over multiple sites because of landscape and traffic grounds. Recommended alternate sites; 278 is most sensitive, same for 2553/1927; only adjacent to river is most sensitive, rest is
28	Orchard Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly opposed the development. Sun lane is not the best site to develop as it is naturally valuable and outside the town boundary. Problems with access to A31, will cause congestion due inadequate current state of Sun Lane. Flooding Issues.
29	Appledown Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Cites issues with Traveller Site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
30	Orchard Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development, which is being done too fast. New A31 access will be expensive and difficult. Existing employment sites in the town as somewhat vacant so why more provided? Issues with the traveller site.
31	Tichborne Down Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Major concerns over flooding at the bottom of sun lane. If a new industrial site goes ahead, there must be a clearer plan for the roads serving it; there should be access from Bishops Sutton with a sliproad onto the A34.
32	Tichborne Down Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported the development. Several caveats; issues with the traveller site, need for a better access plan especially the width of sun lane.
33	Charing Cross Road London	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported the development. Agent On behalf of Huxley (UK), landowner in the Dean.
34		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed the development. The major site needs to be broken up, there need to be a better designation of public space. Issues with the traveller site. Lack of justification for a commercial site, and therefore new A31 access.
35	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed the development. Problems of traffic congestion from new development.
36	Windermere Gdns. Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly opposed to development. Too bigger development and issues with the traveller site.
37		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Cites issues with Traveller Site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
38	Ash Walk Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. New development is out of context of historical development. Issues with travellers. Flooding due to enhanced development.
39		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Critiques elements of the plan; gives no negative overall comments. Dean is established so no need to move, and new site on sun lane is functionally disconnected from the core of Alresford. Inagree in principle with housing on part of the Sun Lane site, however transport must be much improved for the new housing development. The only practicable access onto Sun Lane would be via a new link road on to the Bishop Sutton road. Need to assess all options for a care home - Langton Court is one alternative, with good access to the town centre. Need to keep the crest of Sun Lane land free from development. Wuestions the need for a trevellers site.
40	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Too much extra housing will cause loss of identity of the town. A31 access will create a rat-run. Increased pressure on parking if no assessment made. Infrastructure problems with internet, water supply and sewerage.
41	Sun Hill Crescent Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported the development. Caveats: Access to site must be central proposals. Issues with traveller site allocation. Must recognise green gap between villages of Alresford and Bishops Sutton.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
42	Links Cottages Tichborne Down Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to development. Alternative brownfield sites should be developed first. Emphasises creation of a rat run, no need to relocate Perins considering construction of new parts. Issues with the traveller site.
43		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to development. New sites must have good road links. Arlebury park is more appropriate due to better links. No justification for the travellers site..
44		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to development. Site does not give enough back to the community, gives all profits to developer.
45	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to development. Site is not sustainable and no evidence a proper study has been carried out around the traveller provision.
46		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to development. Needs to be a coherent plan for the new Sun Lane site. Jobs must exist to fill any commercial space. If move employment from The Dean, should also move business from Prospect Road, and use this land for housing, as and when necessary. Currently plans for Sun Lane create a separate community not properly integrated in the plan. Traffic problems on Sun Lane. Sufficient available land that could accommodate development in a more organic way
47	Arlebury Park Barns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to development. Too many houses considered for Sun Lane. More space should be given to green space. Proportionality required with the traveller site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
48		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither supports or opposes the development. Recommends better infrastructure planning. Better Access on Sun Lane and Nursery Road, and better public transport. Houses must be of an adequate size for their occupants.
49	Derwent Gardens Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supported the development. Supported Traveller site.
50		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not enough information given about the process. Do not object to housing provision. However is no need for affordable housing as people can afford to live there. Concerns raised include: too big for current infrastructure. Issues with traveller site. Road access should be via the north side. Sun Lane is not the appropriate site for employment as it is on the opposite side of town to other businesses and links to Reading/Basingstoke.
51	Arlebury Park House, The Avenue, Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Sees Sun lane as an appropriate site for development, but wants to see more detailed plans for the A31 junction.
52	Cobbs Farm Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to development. Bishops Sutton must be consulted as part of the development. A site at Bramdean Common could be used to industry as it is mostly empty. Issues with traveller location, need to be somewhere more secluded. Safety and viability concerns regarding slip road onto A31

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
53	Cobbs Farm Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Critiques elements but seems to generally support proposals. The proposed housing must be affordable. Access to the A31 essential for new commercial site but difficult to implement. Suggest site at Bramdean Common for light industrial use. Issues with travellers site.
54	Maple Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	On balance is opposed to the development. No evidence to show what the capacity of Alresford to expand is. No justification in the background documents to explain why this is the best option. There needs to be a more detailed plan, including policies to control development. The plan does not mention longer term issues. Need to consider the financial cost of new access on other 'planning gains' Commercial is being made peripheral despite the fact that a market town should have mixed uses. Travellers site should be incorporated into the fabric of the town. Concerns about A31 bypass access; other options need to be explored. There is not a need for 15ha of open space - who will maintain it? The burial site is far from the town's churches, raising issues of car
55	Appledown Lane Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with traveller site. A31 access poses funding and siting questions.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
56	Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Very limited access to Sun Lane, worried about new A31 access being undeliverable by a developer and encouraging through traffic. Without the bypass access, further commercial development will take place at the Dean and Prospect Road. Some housing could be put the Sun Lane site, if agreed by the Highways Agency. Issues with the traveller site.
57	Cobbs Cottages Bishops Sutton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. Agree it is the best way for providing houses, but have concerns about employment land. Concerned with A31 access route as it will cut through the noise screen encouraging noise pollution. A junction is inappropriate due to the speed of the A31 and lack of a dual carriageway.
58	Churchyard Cottages	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development but road access is critical. To A31 preferably via 4 way junction at whitehill lane, alternatively a new road up via the railway. Other access should restrict large vehicles. Alternatively take a road to the North to B3047, or make Sun Lane a no through road at Sun Hill School. If none of these options are viable, then should either spread the development on the other proposed sites or not take forward the other 'needs' as they are wishes, not needs.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
59	Sun Hill Crescent Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Relocate the industrial site to Ropley, saving money on new access from A31. A full ecological survey should be done of the Sun Hill site. Issues with the traveller Site.
60	Robertson Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Industrial site will cause traffic issues, with lorries travelling through. Local services may not be able to take all the development. If Sun Lane is blocked traffic will divert down Jacklyns lane causing major problems. Questions why a travellers' site it required
61	Beech Wood Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Removal of industrial premises from the Dean will benefit Alresford.
62	Orchard Close Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Sun lane must be isolated as it cannot take the additional traffic flow. Needs to be a limited junction off the A31, a new road to Sun Lane via Bishops Sutton and Whitehill must close as a through road, and should be one way at western end. The current burial ground has capacity for 6 years.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
63	Derwent Gdns. Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally Opposed to the development. Concerned over how access will be constructed for A31. Suggests a new access road to the north connected to the B3047. Development traffic will have to take difficult routes through Alresford. Need to have strict planning restrictions and suitable road layout in place prior to the commencement of the developments. Agree with traveller provision if it is a maximum of 2 caravans.
64	Benenden Green New Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Issues with the traveller site in terms of provision and location. A new A31 road link would create congestion. Relocating the Dean will not reduce lorries due to through traffic unrelated to the site. Employment should remain at The Dean, and expand there if necessary.
65	Sun Hill Crescent Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. Needs to be significantly more detailed plans. Needs A31 access to work. White Hill lane should be kept intact for traffic and sun lane must have through road access to the school. Does not want access to the burial ground from Sun Lane. Houses must be affordable
66	Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally Opposes the development. Concerned with the roads and how they will cope with extra traffic.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
67	Orchard Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to development. Concerned that the commercial site will not be attractive to businesses, that there is no proposal for better linkages across the railway. Identifies a need for care facilities near to the town centre to allow some downsizing by local residents, and give local shops business, keeping Alresford affluent.
68	Appledown Close Alredford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Issues with the traveller site, should be distant from residential settings. Whitehill lane should be widened to take account of need for traffic, as is a Northern Link to the B3047.
69	Derwent Gdns. Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If housing has to be built then agree with housing proposals as dedicated access would avoid traffic problems on Sun Hill and Nursery Lane. Assume burial ground will not be sited opposite the schools. Visual blight of commercial site could be resolved with appropriate screening and having 'business' units, rather than 'industrial' units. Issues with the travellers site.
70	Orr's Meadow Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Objects strongly to the inclusion of the Traveller Site.
71	Sun Lane Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Issues related to a travellers site, concerns regarding the drainage in the bottom of Sun Lane, and the cost of a new junction with the A31/viability of having commercial units there.
72	Sun Hill Crescent Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site, road access along Sun Lane and parking issues.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
73	Meryton Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Caveats: Must be affordable housing, properly sized homes and energy efficiency.
74		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site being next to the commercial development.
75	Sun Lane Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Roads around Sun Lane are not capable of taking extra traffic, and HGVs from the new commercial site. A31 junction is in the most expensive part of the bypass to build on. Commercial site will create noise pollution, as will junction. Need to protect the wildlife on the site New Old Peoples development for the Dean does not benefit local people. Concern regarding the burial ground being on the crest of a hill. Suggested alternative is to develop the fields to the north of The Avenue. Develop bottom half of Sun Hill for solar. Do not want a travellers site.
76		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site.
77		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site.
78		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site.
79		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site.
80		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site.
81		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Must be more than one access to the site, as one is impractical and presents a problem for the emergency services.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
82	School Lane Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. WCC need to do a thorough assessment of the sustainable distribution of housing around the town. Need for greater clarity on access to the site during construction and afterwards. Increased traffic will create congestion. A31 junction is inappropriate and impossible to implement. Insufficient evidence to show the requirement for a travellers site. Must be a prop
83	School Lane Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site, need for much better access to the site, Nursery road often congested and cannot take additional vehicles. Considerable difference in height between A31 and proposed development.
84		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	concerns include need for better traffic access to the site, as sun hill is a dangerous road; should consider infill before planning more housing outside of the settlement boundary. Unsure the stated amount of employment land is required.
85	Tichborne Down Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Development will put large additional pressure on car parking. Tichborne and Sun lane must be protected. Issues with the traveller site.
86		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site. Hope the open space will form a large part of the development

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
87	Sun Hill Crescent Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. Alternatives to the main site should be studied more closely, as it create a new town on the edge not just an expansion. The area must have better access but the A31 is not viable. The proposed employment site is significantly larger than actually required - no review of the retention or relocation of New Farm Road industrial area has been included. The local needs of travellers must be identified.
88	Langtons Court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the developmentA31 access does not fulfil all needs, as how will new residents get access to town centre easily. Suggests a northern road connected to the B3047. The new site is too dense compared to the previous proposals. Do not accept putting all residential development to on the northern part of the site. Environmental considerations have been given to residents on the west of Sun Lane, but not to those at Langton Court (need open space between this and the new housing).
89	Tichborne Down Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Development must not exacerbate flooding. The commercial site is too concentrated. A new access road must be completed before development to deal with HGVs. The environmental qualities of Sun Hill must be appraised, for example the impact on skylarks.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
90		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Severely limited road capacity in the area. Development is too close to the A31; and the junction will be difficult to achieve and will encourage through traffic. Development will exacerbate flooding. Issues with the traveller site. Suggests the A31 exit if built is placed 800m east to reduce noise or the development is moved to different sites; especially the Avenue.
91	Langtons Court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sun Lane will not provide satisfactory vehicle access as it is singular and will pass through an industrial estate. Use of current roads will cause congestion as they are too small. The development is too large for a single site; development should be spread across SHLAA sites 277, 2552, 278, 2538 and 2408, maintaining the character of the town. Issues with drainage/flooding at Langtons Court and Nursery Road. Has submitted an alternative layout of site 277, for consideration if the site has to be developed.
92	Chestnut Walk Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Problems of flooding will be increased by the development. Issues with the traveller site. There should be more space between current and proposed development along sun lane. The burial ground is a good idea.
93		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issues with the traveller site.
94	Ashburn Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Agrees with moving industrial sites from the dean and the new housing. Issues with the traveller site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
95	East St. Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Movement from the Dean to Sun Lane for commercial sites will improve the character of Alresford. Opposed to any large chain supermarkets in the new development.
96	Churchyard Cottages Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development with caveats to access. A31 access must be bidirectional and Sun Lane must be blocked to prevent a shortcut into Alresford centre. There must be an access route to the north connected to the B3047. Any New access must be completed

Identity Address

Yes

No

Houses

Traffic

Bypass Access

Flooding

Traveller site

Commercial

Site

Summary

97



Supports the development with several caveats, including: Access is a major issue and must be at the core of any future proposal; more thought must be given to avoiding a single 'escape' for vehicular traffic from the development. Access to the B3047 would be a good access route. Open space - based on over rigid open space standards set for urban areas. The provision of informal open space in new housing development will count towards the overall provision. Concern of future development if the gap between Alresford and Bishops Sutton is not maintained. The eastern boundary (also a parish boundary) should be protected in some way e.g. a dedicated deep woodland buffer. Relocation of commercial businesses to the bottom of Pearsons Down need to be assessed as area has recently flooded. Is a possibility that WCC have underestimated the windfall potential of the town. Concern regarding future pressure on car parking in the town

98 Salisbury Road Alresford



Opposes the development. Alresford lacks commuter and public transport services meaning any new residents will need to travel by car, and the town is already congested. Issues with the traveller site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
99	School Lane Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Concerned about A31 access and the pressure on local roads created by the development. The employment site will further contribute to traffic pressure and is optimistic. Issues with the traveller site. HGVs should be reduced
100	School Lane Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Concerned about A31 access and the pressure on local roads created by the development. The employment site will further contribute to traffic pressure and is optimistic. Issues with the traveller site. HGVs should be reduced, not increased on country roads. Suggest spreading housing around the area. Put industrial areas next to major access points (consider the A31 Junction)
101	Sun Hill Crescent Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Issues with the traveller site. The proposed development is too large and will cause disturbance and loss of amenity. There will be additional congestion as access is along narrow roads.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
102	Langtons Court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Access roads are currently too small. The plan should not use up greenfield sites and should be spread more evenly around the town to preserve the character of the town. Should develop at a high density on available sites within the town boundary. For Site 277, have submitted and alternative plan including Langton Court type development along the eastern side of Sun lane. The field at the top of sun lane should be left clear next to the school. Have provided a suggested access to the A31.
103	Langtons Court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. The site is too large and overly dense restricting access for emergency vehicles and other services. This should be dispersed to reduce the impact. Inadequate consultation has taken place.
104	Langtons court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Understands the need for additional housing, but objects to the development strategy. Access for new residents would be poor as it would either be through the narrow Sun and Nursery Lanes or through an industrial estate, and even with an access onto Sun Lane it would create too much congestion. Suggests reducing the number of houses by 50%
105		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Support the development with a series of caveats. Access must not impinge on the school. The travellers site must be limited to 5 pitches.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
106	Sun Hill Crescent Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Access must be built before any new development on Sun Lane. The commercial site should be near the Ropley Roundabout. New access must not be created to the A31
107	Nursery Road New Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Development should be spread across the town as access to 277 is highly restricted on current infrastructure. Construction traffic must not pass on residential streets.
108	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. The infrastructure is inappropriate to the size of development proposed. A31 access should be bidirectional. Issues with the traveller site.
109	Sun Lane Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Concerned with the commercial units causing noise pollution and being incorrectly sited, traffic overload through Nursery Road. Weak evidence for further employment as several units are currently empty in the town. Concerns regarding flooding at site 277. Questions the Gypsy and Traveller requirement for Alresford. The plan does not address parking issues. Suggests a smaller residential development on the least sensitive north eastern corner of Sun Hill, with no vehicular access.
110		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly opposed to the development. Infrastructure cannot support new development. Access should not be built on the A31. Issues with the traveller site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
111	Nursery Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Development must be low carbon. Smaller houses should be built with larger gardens. Traffic plan for Sun Lane must be clearer.
112	Hobbs Close Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. The development is too large and puts pressure on existing infrastructure. Issue of flooding at White Hill Lane and Sun Lane. Issues with the traveller site. Concerns regarding the impact on Bishops Sutton.
113	Tichborne Down Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. No need has been identified for a travellers site. Infrastructure cannot support the development, especially Sun Lane. There will be more pressure on the school.
114		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Lack of highways capacity to sustain ease of access to or from the site. A31 access requires more detail. No need has been identified for a travellers site. Development should be spread around, not in a single 'mega' site.
115	Hobbs Close Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. The development is too large and puts pressure on existing infrastructure. Issues with the traveller site. Concerns regarding the impact on Bishops Sutton.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
116	Orchard Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Sun lane forms a good boundary to the town and additional development would ruin the beauty of the area. Existing infrastructure cannot cope with the additional population and traffic, especially HGVs from construction traffic. Flooding will occur. Issues with the travellers site.
117		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site.
118	Petersfield Road Ropley	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither supports or opposes the development. The new development will put pressure on infrastructure such as drainage, schools and medical facilities. No identified need for a travellers site. Suggests brownfield sites should be used instead of land outside the permitted development area (infill).
119	Petersfield Road Ropley	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Infrastructure insufficient for new site, especially roads. Flooding will be exacerbated by the new development. The Four Marks area has permitted more housing than required, so the area is meeting housing targets and these houses are not required. Suggested alternatives include brownfield sites being considered first, all current sites with planning permission being made to be built, housing should be situated in more industrial areas next to transport hubs.
120		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the Development. Issues with the traveller site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
121	Mill Hill Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Maintains local character and suggests creating a natural burial site.
122	Oak Hill Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Lack of infrastructure both physical and services for new development.
123		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. The balance between housing and recreation space is a positive move for the town. However housing should be spread around the town to maintain the character of the village. Lack of detailed access plan considering the narrow/poor access currently provided to the site. Commercial site must be hidden from view. Criticisms of WCC/NATC not engaging with local residents in a positive manner.
124		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. Issues with the traveller site. Concerned about the increased pressure on road infrastructure by all the new development.
125		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Too much development in a single site with no clear plan for dealing with congestion.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
126	School Lane Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly opposed to the development. New site is outside town boundaries and closes green gap with Bishops Sutton. The site has poor access and a new Access to the A31 is essential. Social housing should be provided at the Dean. Issues with the travellers. Suggests spreading development around the town. Infrastructure should be in place before development takes place.
127	Headley Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Issues with the traveller site. Commercial site must incorporate a buffer to residential property.
128		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Development will place too much pressure on local amenities. The commercial site will increase traffic and create visual blight. Consultation was poorly conducted.
129	Tichborne Down Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Supports the objective of allowing the town to continue to develop as a working town, however has concerns over the development of site 277. These include the impact on local services such as Perins school, pressure on car parking and the issues related to HGV access to the Salad depot.
130		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neither supports or opposes the development. Concerned over traffic pressure in Nursery Road. Access should be provided on new routes. New development may exacerbate flooding.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
131	Church Lane Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Concerns include new development is too large, will increase parking pressure in Alresford, more HGVs due to construction and commercial site, issues with the traveller site and the need to maintain a gap between Bishops Sutton and New Alresford.
132	Beech Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to development. Concerned with traffic pressure from new development on Nursery Road and general increase in congestion from new development. Suggest open space is placed on western side of the Sun Lane site, acting as a buffer (enclosed a plan of suggested layout).
133	Appledown Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Concerned over traffic pressure in Sun Lane and Nursery Road. Little need for an industrial site and access to A31 would be difficult. The A31 is an accident black spot. Traveller requirements should not be the same as for Winchester.
134	Windermere Gardens Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development strategy. Should be split across the town. Industrial site does not need moving. New junction will damage the area and the A31. A buffer zone of open space should be established around Langtons Court and along Sun Lane to minimise the impact of new development on existing residents. Concerns raised over the location of the travellers site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
135	Stable Cottages Tichborne Down Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Issues with the travellers site. Development will cause increase in traffic and danger. Bus routes have been removed. Exacerbates risk of flooding. The proposals will change the character of the town.
136	The Avenue Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Views to the north need to be protected.
137	The Avenue Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. New areas must be carefully worked into existing urban fabric, there should be a new link to the B3047.
138	Sun Lane Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Concerned with the commercial units causing noise pollution and being incorrectly sited, traffic overload through Nursery Road. Weak evidence for further employment as several units are currently empty in the town. Concerns regarding flooding at site 277. Questions the Gypsy and Traveller requirement for Alresford. The plan does not address parking issues. Suggests a smaller residential development on the least sensitive north eastern corner of Sun Hill, with no vehicular access.
139	Benenden Green Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. New A31 access should be built. Development should be careful with good space standards. Detailed traffic plan must be developed. A single travellers pitch to the north of the bypass has low impact.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
140	Windermere Gardens Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development strategy. Should be split across the town. Industrial site does not need moving. New junction will damage the area and the A31. A buffer zone of open space should be established around Langtons Court and along Sun Lane to minimise the impact of new development on existing residents. Concerns raised over the location of the travellers site - put by A31 roundabout.
141	Langtons Court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Support the strategy to provide more housing in the town, but not on one site - suggest a dispersed approach. Lack of a detailed access plan from the A31. The new commercial site will create visual blight and viability needs to be considered. Disagree with the location and size of the traveller site. Needs to be a buffer zone between old and new development. The development would require flood preventing landscaping.
142	Nursery Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development strategy, but only if development is unavoidable. Must be provisions for increased traffic and no access from any part of Sun Lane. Support plan if guarantee the traveller site is never increased in size. Police presence must be increased.
143		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Support the inclusion of a traveller site as Alresford has a long history as a stop off for travellers. Suggests 2 or 3 smaller sites would be a better idea

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
144	Appldown Close Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. Need to reuse existing empty employment units at Prospect Road before building new units. Should be two entrances (A31 and B3047) to new estate. Has submitted revised plan for site 277.
145		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes or supports the development. Concerned over local business and issues with the travellers site
146	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Do not agree with scale of development proposed. Issues with the traveller site/location next to businesses. Need for a new A31 junction not just use of Whitehill as a rat run. Need to consider loss of agricultural land and question if infrastructure can cope with the additional development.
147	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. A31 access must be clarified. The design quality of the development must be carefully considered - need a design review panel.
148	Grange Road New Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. A31 access must be clarified, possibly with a north connection to the B3047. Old Park Road industrial site remains empty and has good access to the by-pass.
149	Grange Road New Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Suggests reusing Park Road industrial site. Bishops Sutton and Alresford must be considered together.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
150	Links Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issues with the traveller site placement and commercial near to school. There should more open space in the development near to school. Suggests extending open space down west side of the field, and place the commercial and traveller allocations to run vertically along the eastern side of the site.
151	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Remove the traveller site. A31 access must be better considered due to differential speeds. Need to reduce the amount of traffic using Whitehill Lane.
152	Arlebury park Barns New Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Redeveloping The Dean for elderly housing is a good idea.
153	School Hill Soberton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Opposes the development. Development closes the green gap between the settlements and results in the loss of agricultural land. The site has insufficient access and no development should happen without new access. Development should be spread across the town. The commercial site is unrealistic. Business will not want to move next to the traveller site. The site is not on a recognised traveller route, and it is unacceptable to place it next to residential properties and a school.
154	Links Cottages Tichborne Down	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Opposes the development. Cites a lack of evidence for commercial site demands. Critical of the consultation which took place

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
155	Sun Lane Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. A31 access would bring more congestion and HGVs. Issues with the travellers site. There is only a need for housing. Development will exacerbate flooding.
156	Orchard Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports moving industrial away from The Dean and building housing for older people. Issues with the traveller site.
157	Mill Hill Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Concerned that there should be a new A31 access route but with a reinforcement of HGV restrictions on some routes.
158	Orchard Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Development is too dense and will cause traffic problems. Questions need for a burial ground.
159		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Issues with the traveller site.
160		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Issues with the traveller site.
161		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Object to the traveller site.
162		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Issues with the traveller site.
163		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Issues with the traveller site.
164		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Too much development for the site - will result in an increase in traffic and parking issues. Doubts businesses will be able to afford to move from the Dean.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
165	Covey Way Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Appears to generally support the development. Asks if 420 homes are needed, where are the 100 going to be placed as can only see 320 on the plan and for more specifics on the A31 junction.
166		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strongly opposes the development. Concerned that a single site is too large, does not see local employment for the new commercial site, issues with the traveller site and development exacerbating flooding at Tichborne Down.
167	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Access must be given from more than just the A31, and this junction will be difficult to implement.
168		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Concerns that Alresford's infrastructure and services will not be able to cope. Issues with the travellers site, including why Alresford has to have 20% of the Winchester District total allocation.
169		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Concerns that Alresford's infrastructure and services will not be able to cope. Issues with the travellers site
170		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. Unsure whether there is any need to relocate commercial sites to Sun Lane - how will you ensure jobs go to local people?

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
171	Nursery Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development with some caveats; An A31 junction must be built to deal with traffic and HGVs. A north connection to the B3047 must also be provided. This is primarily to prevent congestion on Nursery and Sun Hill Lane.
172	Beech Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Highlights the congestion problems in Sun and Nursery Lane with new development. Also questions the use of the A31 Junction. Suggests displacement of Recreation ground for construction. And make better use of Stratton Bates Park in Grange Road.
173		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Concerned with pressure on infrastructure from such a large development, and effect on Nursery and Sun Hill roads. Suggests building on the Avenue town recreation grounds and moving them to Sun Lane site. If a new industrial estate is required suggests the corner of Kings Worthy Road
174	Langtons Court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Raises concerns about the short consultation period and the change in the proposals made by NATC. Concerned with traffic access. Suggests a new A31 Link and a new northbound to the B4037. Blocking Sun Lane will prevent more congestion in neighbouring streets. New housing will damage the scenic beauty of the area, and there has not been a thorough environmental assessment done. Has submitted an alternative layout for the Sun Lane site and a partial Biological Survey.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
175		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Issues with the traveller site.
176		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. The open space should focus on biodiversity.
177	Windermere Gardens New Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Plan depends on road construction, both A31 junction and link to B3047. The industrial site is too large considering oversupply in town. Issues with placing the travellers site next to the commercial area. There are many dangers for locating older people at Dean e.g. the river.
178	Winchester Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. But development must account for local character, and be well thought out and designed. There must be better infrastructure for the town. Local shops must be protected.
179		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Concerned over increased pressure on Sun Lane. Believes the consultation process has been too fast.
180		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Issues with the traveller site.
181		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Looking for clarification on the plans for the sun lane development, looking for assurances of the A31 Junction and on provision of parking for the town.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
182	Sun Hill Crescent New Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally opposes the development. Concerned over the traffic on Sun Lane which can get bad at certain times. Issues with the traveller site. Seeks reassurance that the open space will be protected from future development. Need to ensure high quality design. Concerned about school places.
183	Appldown Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Density of proposed development is too high, should be no more than 100 homes which should be affordable. Should not lose agricultural land. There should not be a bypass access route and moving the commercial site makes little sense. Issues with traveller site.
184		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly opposes the development. A31 junction must be built to accommodate growth, the council must make more effort to contact Bishop Sutton Parish Council. Issues with the traveller site.
185		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development, excepting issues with the traveller site.
186	Nursery Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Concerned with a more specific traffic plan and the pressure on the locality from additional development. Nursery Road must be protected. Issues with the traveller site. Suggests moving Perins School to the site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
187	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. There needs to be more detail on access to the site, the A31 junction is difficult as is use of local roads. Wishes for justification for the 200 person employment. Issues with the traveller site. HGVs must have access restricted. Suggests spreading the housing around Alresford
188	Ullswater Grove Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. No development can be built until there is new access to the site. The commercial site should not be moved as it degrades the Sun Lane environment. Suggests building a trading complex at the Ropley roundabout.
189	Nursery Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. New access via A31/B4037 must be created to deal with the traffic pressure. Nursery Road should be blocked to reduce usage as a rat run.
190	Lime Road New Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The top half of the site should be used as a nature reserve. There should be a new junction with the A31 with bi-directional access. The commercial site should be renovated at Old Park Road rather than a new one on Sun Hill Lane. Concerns regarding infrastructure provision. Disagrees with the sports pitches proposed as part of the open space - more emphasis should be placed on natural open spaces.
191	Appledown Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. There should be no more than 100-150 houses and they should be affordable. The development would put too much pressure on local infrastructure. Issues with the traveller site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
192	Windermere Gardens Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Highlights the lack of road infrastructure to deal with development. Some other sites around Alresford may be appropriate. Suggests creation of a north B3047 link. Commercial site in Sun Hill is unsuitable. Issues with the traveller site. Arlebury park should be reappraised.
193	Scrubbs Lane Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. The single development places too much pressure on Alresford - it should be spread around to maintain the character of the town. Issues with the traveller site.
194	Sun Lane Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Development should be spread around Alresford to prevent too much damage to Greenfield site. Access should be provided to B3047. Commercial is unnecessary as there is capacity at other sites. Issues with the traveller site. Development will exacerbate flooding.						
195		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	On balance oppose the development. Are concerned with access to the new site, traffic plans for Nursery Road. Appropriateness of the travellers site.
196	Beech Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Cites lack of capacity to deal with more traffic, especially in Nursery Road, and impact on local services.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
197	Langtons Court Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Raises concerns over the short consultation period and lack of information available to comment on. Single site will exacerbate traffic problems, especially due to poor access to site. Suggests moving the housing south to preserve an area of open space between it and existing housing. A buffer is required on the east side of the field between the new development and existing houses
198	Nursery Road Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Is concerned over traffic congestion on Nursery Road and Jacklyns Road with new development.
199	Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. The green gap between Bishops Sutton and Alresford will be closed. A31 access will have a major impact on East Alresford transport wise and visually. Issues related to the need for a traveller site. Unsure where the new residents will work. Concerns on the provision of infrastructure. Suggests spreading the housing around the town.
200	Ullswater Grove Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. The new development is too large and concentrated and will damage the identity of Alresford. The commercial site should not be next to residential.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
201	Orchard Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strongly objects to the development. The gap between Alresford and Bishops Sutton is being closed up. Is agricultural land. Lack of access to the A31 makes the site unviable. There must be a reappraisal of the environmental impact. Local infrastructure does not have the capacity for the development. Issues with the travellers site. The surface water run-off from the new paved areas will lead to additional flooding.
202	Jacklyns Lane Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. Access via the B3047 should be considered. Sun Hill is inappropriate for sheltered housing as it is distance from the town centre. There should be new public service provision, and new parking arrangements for the school.
203		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Junction and traffic issues must be more clearly planned for. Have consistently advocated a strategy which provides for a new road from Sun Hill to the Bishops Sutton road, which has not been evaluated/discussed. No justification for a travellers' site. There is more space to develop within the town and therefore Sun Lane does not need to be as dense. Construction should be limited between 8am and 5pm and not on weekends.
204		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. Seeks a clearer access plan for the Sun Lane site, and wishes to know the definition of a small traveller site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
205	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Generally opposes the development. Is concerned that the development will place too much demand on infrastructure and services, such as schools. No evidence for a traveller site. Does not believe the new commercial site is necessary, as units on the Dean and Prospect Road remain empty.
206		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the Strategy - supports greenfield development over pdl which does not meet the requirements of NPPF. Cites lack of clarity over the windfall estimates for The Dean. Suggests that SHLAA should be broken up in several smaller sites as more in keeping with historical development. Proposes the Arlebury Park site be reconsidered.
207		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. However, wishes to see more benefits of development for the older population, such as better transport. Flooding must be considered along nursery road.
208	Beech Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Alresford cannot cope with a bigger population, citing traffic and parking concerns. New population should be in a new settlement.
209	Nursery Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. The new development must not have access to Sun Lane as this would create congestion and a busy road. Suggest alternative route via B3047. Agree with the redevelopment of The Dean to provide new employment.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
210	Derwent Gardens Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Plans must make access strategy more clear, as current plans create too much pressure on Sun and Nursery lanes. B3047 link should be reconsidered as a more effective option than the new bypass junction. Is highly concerned over the effects of a new bypass link on commercial and domestic traffic within Alresford.
211	School Lane Bishops Sutton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree with the relocation of industrial sites on the Dean and the Open space allocations at Sun Lane. However, consider sun lane development too large in one piece; it will cause greater traffic and parking problems and place greater demands on infrastructure/facilities. Issues with the traveller site.
212	Broad Street Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports the development. First priority should be to establish the new transport links to the site.
213	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Alresford has insufficient traffic and parking capacity for new development. Issues with the traveller site. New development may cause greater flooding on Nursery Lane. Development would be more appropriate in a city.
214	Buttermere Gardens Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. Is concerned over the dimensions, scale and process involved in a new A31 access road. Such as whether it will be entry and exit capable.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
215	Windermere Gardens Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Believes that the sheltered housing development should be reappraised; concerned that it will create an overpopulation of older residents. Healthcare and education must be improved to cope with new development. Issues with the traveller site. Commercial site should not be adjacent to residential homes. Sun Lane and Tichborne down must have restricted access for commercial traffic.
216	Sun Hill Junion School	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally supports the development. Concerned over potential traffic pressure from a new site; this will create more congestion near the school. There must be a clearer traffic strategy to deal with the new development.
217		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Believes the consultation was too short for NATC public consultation. The new development is too dense, and the commercial site will force the construction of a junction on a bypass designed to preserve Alresford. There are alternative sites dispersed across the town which could take new development. A junction with the A31 will be disruptive for residents. There must be access to the B3047 for the new development. New development will exacerbate flooding on nursery lane.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
218	Ash Walk Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally Supports the development. The Sun Lane development must have good sized, well designed homes. Land from the green space should be used to make the development less dense. The new traffic plan should make Sun Hill a one way street with traffic to the school using Jacklyns Road. There should be parking provision for the open space.
219		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Issues with the traveller site. Concerned over the 40% of affordable housing. Concerned over local school capacity to take development.
220		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Issues with the traveller site.
221	Sun Lane Crescent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Concerned that companies will not wish the relocate from the Dean to Sun Lane. Issues with the traveller site. Too many houses are planned - the alternative may be to build a new town.
222		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Sun Lane site is too dense and should be distributed around the town. The current traffic plan cannot cope with the number of cars generated by new development; the plan to just allow pedestrians and cyclists is unrealistic.
223	Ullswater Grove Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally opposes the development. Sun Lane is a good site for additional housing. Is concerned about the impact of the development on healthcare services. There should be less housing. Moving commercial siting from The Dean is a good idea.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
224	Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Is concerned over the stress placed on educational facilities by new development, and traffic planned for Sun Lane as current proposals present a danger to pedestrians.
225	Bighton Lane Gundleton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposed to the development. Brownfield land should be prioritised ahead of a greenfield development. Issues with the traveller site as it is not part of the travelling communities routes around the country.
226	Bell House Headley Close Alresford Hants SO24 9XE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. More development should happen on the Winchester side of Alresford as it has pre-existing transport links.
227	Scrubbs Lane Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Development should be dispersed around Alresford. Issues with the traveller site. Requests a guarantee that expansion of Alresford will not close the strategic gap with Bishops Sutton.
228	Nursery Road Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. New traffic routes must be established for the site, sun lane and nursery road unacceptable as they are too narrow. New infrastructure must be complete before construction begins.
229	Terwag 3, Tichborne Down Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Opposes the development. Issues with the commercial site as it is redeveloping greenfield land. Does not see a need for more public space provision. Does not believe a junction with the A31 will work, and will increase traffic pressure.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
230	Water Lane Bishops Sutton Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has concerns over the closing of the strategic gap between Alresford and Bishop Sutton. And loss of agricultural land. Issues with the traveller site. Believes the 420 new homes will place too much strain on local roads and parking. There is a risk that forcing businesses to move from the Dean will trigger them leaving Alresford altogether. Development should be scattered around not in a single, large site (suggest some housing could be built between the west of the town and the roundabout where A31 and B3047 meet). Alresford is unsuited to this level of development.
231	Appledown Close Alresford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Support the development. However, wish to make sure that the access plan does not put undue pressure on roads with HGVs. Agree the industrial site should be moved from the Dean. Issues with the Traveller site.
232		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Building 320 homes at Sun Lane would cause logistical problems; building a link road to Bishops Sutton Road will not be enough. The strategy would un-balance the town and undermined it's character. Concerns regarding provision of school places and pressure on local doctors' surgery. The plan is vague, unclear and too easy.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass	Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
233		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does not consider the proposed development strategy is the best way of providing for the needs of the town over the next 20 years, however it may be the best option that can be achieved unless land owners can be persuaded to facilitate the needs of the local community. Considers the most important elements to achieve are ensuring suitable, robust and timely infrastructure is put in place without compromising existing developments and adding to traffic, parking and safety problems. Concerns regarding access to the proposed housing at Sun Lane as the existing road structure to the west of thse site is not considered suitable by local residents. The distance from churches to the burial ground will also increase traffic movements on these roads. Concerns that the open space will attract anti-social behaviour, resulting in the allotments being vulnerable to vandalism. Allotments include sheds etc - will be highly visable. Travellers site - site is isolated and a long walk from town facilities. The effect on Alresford of building 500 more dwellings will be catastrophic.
234	Orchard Close Alresford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Respondent on balance sees the current designation as unacceptable, citing the need to keep new traffic away from Titchbourne Down, and access should be from Alresford or Bishops Sutton and not from the bypass, and questions the size of the commercial site. Issues with the traveller site.

Identity	Address	Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	Summary
235		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Respondent was concerned over the travellers site.
236		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The respondent was opposed to the plan in its current form, citing the potential damage of such a large scale development on Alresford's character. They were also concerned over the lack of detailed plans for Tichborne down and the potential visual pollution caused by the commercial site. Finally, they perceived a lack of engagement on the part of the planning dept. over the plans.
		Yes	No	Houses	Traffic	Bypass Access	Flooding	Traveller site	Commercial Site	
Totals		64	172	73	117	87	24	131	60	
% of all respondents		27%	73%	31%	50%	37%	10%	55%	25%	