

**Revised Pre-submission  
Eastleigh Borough Local Plan  
2011 - 2029**

**Regulation 19 consultation  
February – March 2014:**

**Key issues raised by representations**



*This page is intentionally blank*

## Introduction

1. A total of 987 representations were received from 358 respondents during the consultation on the Revised Pre-submission Local Plan which took place between 10 February and 24 March 2014. This statement first explains the key issues raised in terms of the Local Plan proposals that attracted the largest numbers of representations. It then reviews these in more detail in relation to each chapter of the Local Plan. A schedule of summaries of the representations is attached at Appendix A.

## Key issues:

### Housing

2. The issues attracting the most representations relate to housing, in particular:
  - i. **Number of dwellings** – The calculation of housing need has attracted representations from both those who consider the housing requirement to be too low (generally developers promoting other sites) and those who consider the housing requirement to be too high (generally individuals and organised groups who are concerned about the scale of development being promoted and particular site allocations). How the Council has approached this calculation is set out in Background Paper H1, Housing, updated and re-published in July 2014
  - ii. **Location of dwellings** – developers, planning consultants and local residents dispute the **strategy** for the distribution of new development across the borough. There are challenges in respect of the strategic options considered, and there are also objections to most of the proposed housing allocations in the Local Plan, in particular the proposal for 1,400 dwellings at Boorley Green (policy BO1) and the strategy for locating development in the Botley/ Boorley Green/ Hedge End area (policies BO1, BO2 and HE1). There are also objections to the proposed major allocations at Horton Heath (policy WE1) and land south of Chestnut Avenue, Eastleigh (policy E1). Many of the developers and planning consultants propose alternative sites (listed as '**omission sites**' in the Schedule of Summary Representations at Appendix A – see pages 21 – 23 of this statement). 23 sites are put forward as potential sites for residential development. These include the 'Allington Lane' site being promoted by many of those objecting to the Boorley Green allocation and the strategy for locating development in the Boorley Green/ Botley/ Hedge End area. This site was identified as a potential major development area by a former structure plan in the 1990s. Appendix B to this document sets out a brief history of the Allington Lane site to help explain this further. The Council's Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA – Background paper G4) includes all the sites the Council considered in formulating strategic options for development. The Sustainability Appraisal Report (Background Paper G2) explains these strategic options and the way in which the Council arrived at its preferred locations for development.

**Notes:**

- a. A planning application was submitted for the development at Boorley Green in September 2012. The Council resolved to grant outline planning permission in February 2013 and the permission was finally issued in November 2013. Work is now in progress on reserved matters. Objectors to this development proposal have sought permission for a judicial review of this decision, but have so far failed – the High Court turned down the application, and the Court of Appeal have refused permission to appeal. A further appeal against the Court of Appeal decision is currently in progress.
- b. Planning permission has also been granted for a 250 dwelling development south of Pylands Lane (policy BU3) along with the Sunday's Hill bypass (policy BU4), and the Council has also resolved to permit up to 330 dwellings north of Fair Oak (policy FO1) subject to agreements. Permission has also been granted for other residential developments proposed in the Local Plan in Bishopstoke and Netley, and pre-application discussions are in progress on others including the land west of Horton Heath (policy WE1) and the sites at Bursledon (policies BU1 and BU2). Work has also begun on initial data gathering and background studies at Eastleigh, south of Chestnut Avenue (policy E1)
- c. Some of the 'omission sites' are now the subject of planning applications and appeals.

## Employment

3. Representations refer to:
  - **Eastleigh River Side** – there is some concern that the plan may be over-reliant on Eastleigh River Side; however other objectors think that employment development should still be focused there.
  - **Chalcroft Business Park** – objectors to the proposals for development west of Horton Heath are concerned about related proposals for intensification of employment development at Chalcroft (policy WE6)
  - **Insufficient employment allocations:** a few objectors consider that not enough land is allocated for employment and that insufficient provision is made for the needs of particular sectors of the economy, e.g. high tech, distribution and logistics or small scale local business requirements.

## Infrastructure

4. **Capacity of existing transport infrastructure:** The existing and planned infrastructure required to accommodate the proposed scale of development is also a significant issue for many respondents in objecting to specific sites for development, as well as the overall strategy. Concerns relate primarily to transport infrastructure, especially roads. There is a widespread view that existing traffic levels across the borough are already unacceptable, and that increased development will inevitably lead to further congestion, even taking into account planned additional infrastructure including the Botley bypass. Concerns are also expressed that the Local Plan fails to take into account the impact of its proposals on adjoining authorities.

5. **Deliverability of transport mitigation proposals:** Hampshire County Council has raised concerns about the deliverability of transport mitigation proposals in relation to anticipated reductions in developer contributions arising from the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy. Changes now proposed to the Local Plan have been agreed with HCC and will resolve all HCC's concerns other than for Botley bypass – see HCC's supplementary statement submitted 11 July 2014 (respondent 804).
6. **Botley bypass:** HCC has outstanding objections to the Local Plan's policies in respect of Botley bypass. These arise from their roles as both highway authority and landowner. As highway authority they consider that there is no justification in transport terms for the construction of the bypass during the plan period. As landowner, HCC object to the requirement that in developing land in their ownership north of Botley (policy BO2) they should construct part of the bypass. They also object to requirements for development elsewhere in this vicinity to contribute to the bypass (e.g. policies HE1 and WE1). Winchester City Council, who would be responsible for the eastern part of the bypass, have followed HCC's lead in objecting to the bypass, although they are reviewing an extant Local Plan policy for it through current work on their Local Plan Part 2.
7. While there is support for the bypass proposal within the local community (including from Botley Parish Council – respondent 101), a number of respondents have objected to it because they see it as enabling the development at Boorley Green and Hedge End to which they are opposed. Others object because these developments have not continued to be made contingent on the bypass as they were in the first draft of the Local Plan (this requirement was removed in response to representations from HCC). A number of respondents including HCC raise the issue of the deliverability of this proposal.
8. **Community infrastructure:** A number of respondents are also concerned about community infrastructure in particular schools and health facilities. A number of local schools are perceived to be at capacity, with parents experiencing difficulties in securing places for their children. There are also concerns about the accessibility and availability of GP services.
9. **Utilities:** In addition some residents express concerns about the adequacy of public utilities in particular sewers and water supply.

### **Environment, countryside and biodiversity**

10. In relation to most of the Local Plan's green field housing site proposals, objectors are concerned about loss of countryside and impacts on landscape, biodiversity and other related issues including views from existing dwellings public footpaths and general environmental quality. This is particularly the case where proposed developments closely adjoin established residential areas, e.g. at Boorley Green and at Horton Heath.

11. Natural England and other wildlife organisations have also raised concerns about a number of proposals that they consider may have the potential to have indirect impacts on sites subject to European nature conservation designations, or that border or include sites of local nature conservation importance (locally designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation – SINCs). The proposed changes to the Local Plan and July 2014 updates to the Habitats Regulations assessment and the sustainability appraisal resolve a number of these concerns.
12. In connection with proposed site allocations objectors refer to flooding and other constraints such as inadequate sewerage infrastructure.

### **Process**

13. Objectors to the policy BO1 Boorley Green proposal have raised concerns about the Council's decision to grant planning permission for this development last year, which is seen as premature pending completion of the local plan process (see para. 1(ii)a above). There is a feeling that the views of the local community have been disregarded. There is also a notion that because the BO1 development involves the loss of a golf course and the Council is promoting the development of a new golf course at the Ageas Bowl<sup>1</sup> in which it has a controlling interest, there is a 'conflict of interest'.
14. There were also a number of representations about the process of preparing the Local Plan, with concerns including a perceived lack of meaningful public consultation, methods of consultation and a perception that the Council had failed to meet the duty to co-operate. The Council's Statement of Consultations (Subn.3) and Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate (Subn.5) explain how the Council has carried out the consultation processes and how it has cooperated with neighbouring authorities and other duty to cooperate bodies.

## **Issues raised in relation to each chapter of the Local Plan**

### **Chapter 2, Eastleigh Borough and Chapter 3, Vision and objectives**

15. No issues of major significance were raised in connection with these parts of the Local Plan.

### **Chapter 4, Strategy for new development**

16. A small number of respondents raise concerns about the way the Council has established its preferred strategy for the location of new development, in particular those pursuing alternative locations for development.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Ageas Bowl, formerly the Rose Bowl, is the Hampshire County Cricket Ground. It is a facility of regional importance currently being upgraded to host national and international matches. The upgrade involves the construction of a 5-star hotel and related facilities that include the golf course. The Council has a controlling interest in this site and has invested heavily in this development which is seen as likely to provide a considerable boost to the local economy.

Representations on strategic policies S2 and S3 are mentioned at paragraph 2 above.

17. A larger number of respondents challenge the Council's proposed housing numbers and the basis on which these have been calculated. (See paragraph 2 above). Policy S3 provides a focus for those opposed to the strategic site proposals, in particular Boorley Green and the strategy for allocating land in the Boorley Green/ Botley/ Hedge End area (policies BO1, BO2 and HE1). Representations promoting alternative sites and locations primarily for residential development are grouped under this policy (omission sites – see Appendix A, pages 21 – 23).
18. In relation to the employment policy S4, there are mixed views about Eastleigh River Side. It was formerly regarded as being of sub-regional significance as a large site that provided opportunities for both regeneration and green field development. However, the anticipated costs of the new link road on which it relies (the Chickenhall Lane link road) have significantly constrained the potential for this development to come forward. Some respondents consider that the Local Plan still relies on it too much, while others reach the opposite conclusion. Background Paper EC1a Appendix 5 provides a history of this site and a review of current constraints and opportunities within it. More generally there are concerns that the Local Plan does not make sufficient provision for new employment development in general or in particular sectors such as science parks and distribution and logistics.
19. There are no significant issues relating to strategic policies S5 (green infrastructure) or S6 (community facilities). In relation to strategic policy S7, concerns raised are summarised at paragraphs 4 – 7 above. There is support from Southampton Airport for measures designed to enhance rail access to the airport from the east of the sub-region and beyond (rail travellers from this area currently have to go into Southampton and then back out to the airport).
20. There are no significant issues relating to strategic policy S8 (footpaths and cycleways). In relation to strategic policy S9 (countryside and countryside gaps) there are representations from many who are promoting alternative development sites. They include some who query the principle of designating countryside gaps and restrictions on development within them.
21. Minor issues are raised in connection with strategic policies S10, the coast and S11, nature conservation. Those relating to S11 are addressed through proposed minor changes to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Background Paper G110). There are no major concerns about strategic policy S12, heritage.

## **Chapter 5, Development management**

22. In relation to policies for the management of development, the key issues raised relate to any policies that involve potential increases to the cost of development, including quality design and provision of green infrastructure

(policies DM1 and DM32), sustainable construction (policy DM2), transport infrastructure (policy DM23), affordable housing (policy DM28) and internal space standards for residential development (policy DM29). There are also concerns about how these requirements relate to the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Two respondents also query restrictions on retail development in the countryside (policy DM22).

## **Chapter 6, Parish by parish**

23. The majority of representations relating to the site-specific allocations and policies set out in this part of the Local Plan are objections from local residents to the proposed housing allocations as follows

### **Section 6.1, Allbrook**

24. There are objections to policies AL1, AL2 and AL3 on the basis of impacts on the countryside, landscape and biodiversity, residential amenities, the local roads, ground conditions including flooding, the need for off-site community facilities and improvements to sewerage infrastructure.

### **Section 6.2, Bishopstoke**

25. There were objections to earlier versions of the Local Plan to the developments proposed in policies Bi1 and Bi2 but applications received for both of these have now been permitted and initial phases of the Bi1 development are now nearing completion.

### **Section 6.3, Botley**

26. The key issues in Botley are the development proposals at Boorley Green and Botley (policies BO1 and BO2) and the Botley bypass, all of which are referenced earlier in this statement (see paragraphs 2 and 6 above). As noted above, site allocation BO1 has now been granted outline planning consent.

### **Section 6.4, Bursledon**

27. There are objections to policies BU1, BU2 and BU3 on the basis of impacts on the countryside, landscape and biodiversity, the River Hamble (in respect of BU2), residential amenities, the local roads and flooding. As noted above site allocation BU3 (land north of Pylands Lane) has now been granted planning consent, along with road proposal BU4 (Sunday's Hill bypass) which will be provided by the development.

### **Section 6.5, Chandler's Ford**

28. There are objections to policy CF4, an allocation for employment development of a green field site on Bournemouth Road. The local parish council wish the site to be allocated for use as a cemetery.

### **Section 6.6, Eastleigh**

29. There are objections to the allocation of land south of Chestnut Avenue (Stoneham) as a strategic residential development site (policy E1) primarily on the basis of landscape impact – the area forms part of an historic park – and loss of green space. There are also concerns about traffic impacts. One respondent considers that the site should be allocated for employment. Some

concerns are expressed about policy E9, Eastleigh River Side querying its deliverability. One landowner also seeks more flexibility to allow residential development. In relation to policy E12, Southampton Airport seeks to develop a hotel on a small site fronting Wide Lane.

**Section 6.7, Fair Oak**

30. There are a few objections to policy FO1 which allocates land north of Hardings Lane for residential development. The Council has now resolved to grant this proposal outline planning permission. In respect of policy FO2, land north of Mortimers Lane, there is a current planning application that involves extending the site to the north, more than doubling it in size. There are objections to the plan in respect of this proposal, both from those promoting it and those objecting to it. Note: land west of Horton Heath allocated for development by policy WE1 (section 6.11) lies partly in Fair Oak parish and has attracted a number of representations – see paragraph 34 below.

**Section 6.8, Hamble-le-Rice**

31. Prospective developers of a site near the railway station (planning application recently refused) have commented on policy HA1, the proposal to provide a car park at the railway station. Some detailed comments about policy HA2, the proposed hotel at the Mercury Marina, should largely be resolved by minor changes currently proposed.

**Section 6.9, Hedge End**

32. There are objections to policies HE1 and HE2 on the basis of impacts on the countryside, landscape and biodiversity, residential amenities and the local roads. On HE1, many of the objections are from respondents who are objecting to the overall strategy of allocating development at Boorley Green, Botley and Hedge End. On HE2 and HE4 (residential and employment development on a small area south of Hedge End next to the motorway), developers seek extensions of the site for both residential and employment development. The Council has recently resolved to permit residential development on the northern part of site HE2, subject to agreements.

**Section 6.10, Hound**

33. There are no representations relating to development in Hound.

**Section 6.11, West End**

34. There are objections to policy WE1 which proposes a substantial area of mixed development to the west of Horton Heath on the basis of impacts on the countryside, landscape and biodiversity, residential amenities and the local roads. These include concerns about the proposed location of the new secondary school and the expansion of employment uses at and adjoining the Chalcroft Business Park. There are some concerns about the impact of potential additional traffic from the employment proposals in particular on links to the M27 at junction 7. Two respondents express concerns about the proposed relocation of the Hedge End household waste recycling centre to a woodland site next to the motorway near the Ageas Bowl (policy WE10).

## **Assessments and appraisals**

35. General concerns raised in relation to the appraisals and assessments reflect the representations made on the policies and proposals of the Local Plan as follows:

### **Transport assessment**

36. There are concerns that:
- The transport assessment of alternative strategic development options was not carried out on an equitable basis.
  - The transport assessment of the preferred option does not fully reflect existing traffic conditions (e.g. At Boorley Green) or take into account impacts on neighbouring areas, in particular settlements on the northern routes to Winchester (Colden Common and Twyford) and Southampton.
  - The traffic impacts likely to arise from the proposed secondary school at Horton Heath (policy WE1) will be unacceptable.

Note: Hampshire County Council as highway authority has indicated that its representations regarding the deliverability of transport mitigation proposals set out in the transport assessment would be satisfied by changes now proposed to strategic policy S7 and related text and other amendments to text relating to proposed transport interventions, as set out in the Schedule of Proposed Changes. These are referenced in the Schedule of Summary Representations at Appendix A of this statement.

### **Sustainability appraisal**

37. The main concerns raised are:
- The housing requirement is not justified;
  - The SA fails to provide a robust assessment of alternative options, leading to fundamental concerns with the strategy set out in the plan;
  - Concerns about the way countryside gaps are treated
  - Objections to acceptance of the Boorley Green site as a commitment and a perceived failure to appraise its impacts fully;
  - Failure to refer to the Allington Lane site as an option;
  - Failure to consider impacts outside the borough.

### **Habitats Regulations assessment**

38. The main concerns raised are that the HRA has not adequately assessed:
- Impacts on the Solent European Marine Sites in the upper Hamble;
  - Cumulative impacts on the New Forest.
- Changes have been made to the Habitats Regulations assessment as now submitted to address these concerns.

**Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (February 2014) – Regulation 19 consultation**

**Schedule of Summary Representations**

**July 2014**



*This page is intentionally blank*

## REVISED PRE-SUBMISSION EASTLEIGH BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2011 – 2029 (FEBRUARY 2014)

### SCHEDULE OF SUMMARY REPRESENTATIONS

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>WHOLE PLAN</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 4643/12; 4723/3; 4928/14; 5014/9; 5098/7; 5123/9; 5187/8	Whole Plan	<p>Objections to process undertaken in relation to BO1 and implications for the Plan as a whole:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline permission given for proposed site allocation BO1 before examination of the Local Plan is premature/illegal and suggests EBC have not been impartial in the decision making process</li> <li>• Housing allocations are entirely prejudiced by the presumption 1400 dwellings are to be allocated at BO1</li> <li>• Significant objection to BO1 from the public – undemocratic process</li> <li>• Previous assessments highlighted Allington Lane as a preferred option</li> <li>• Redevelopment of the mature golf course at Boorley Green appears to create a conflict of interest with the Council's investment in a new hotel and golf course at the Ageas Bowl</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 655/56; 3258/19; 4346/7; 4515/10; 4723/3; 5003/6; 5014/9; 5098/7; 5135/26; 5187/8; 5536/9; 5779/3; 6394/8; 6477/6; 6564/2; 6654/2; 6677/1; 6671/1	Whole Plan	<p>Concern raised about the democratic process and regard given to existing residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultations inadequate</li> <li>• Views, values and feelings of the local community not properly/genuinely considered</li> </ul> <p>Objections submitted in earlier phases have been over-ruled/aren't being carried forward for consideration by the inspector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Borough should honour the views of local people in such an important matter</li> <li>• Objects to constant re-evaluation of the Plan and lack of significant changes</li> <li>• Methods used to communicate regarding consultation and changes to the Plan are ineffective and inadequate. Consultation should have taken place with owners of directly affected properties. Denied that Council has placed 'planning permission' style notices in the local area</li> <li>• The consultation arrangements for the local plan are ineffective and rely too heavily on internet and e-mail.</li> <li>• The process is time consuming with lots of data in supporting documents. This may lead to the impression that few people object to the proposals, which is</li> </ul>	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<p>not the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process that we are being asked to follow, the documentation and comments on the legality of the plan and the process by which it has been arrived at is unfair on the local population. The people affected by the plan are lay people with no in-depth knowledge of planning law.</li> <li>Sites proposed to be allocated in the Local Plan subject to consultation with the public concurrent with outline planning applications - the result in an unclear and unfair consultation process for residents.</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 4735/9; 5003/6; 5098/7	Whole Plan	Plan contradicts EBC corporate priorities	None
<b>Object:</b> 15/1; 2232/3; 4944/15; 6537/17	Whole Plan	<p>Duty to cooperate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence: There is insufficient evidence in the Local Plan of how the duty to co-operate has been discharged and how proper consideration of neighbouring Local Plans of Fareham, Winchester, Hampshire and PUSH has been considered.</li> <li>PUSH has not updated any of its reports on housing or employment, so the Council has relied on data that is out-of-date.</li> <li>Housing numbers: Shortfalls in housing numbers in New Forest, Fareham and possibly Test Valley.</li> <li>Housing requirement should be more than 10,140 new dwellings. Interim approach adopted by the Council of adopting the plan and addressing strategic questions via a PUSH Strategy update is not acceptable as the Council would be under no compunction to review its Plan. No evidence that the Council has cooperated with PUSH in setting its housing or employment land provision figures..</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 3258/19; 4735/9	Whole Plan	<p>Transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient assessment, policies and strategy to address existing traffic congestion or future traffic increases as a result of development.</li> <li>There has been no consideration of the traffic-related impacts in Curdrige and Durley parishes.</li> <li>Lack of attempt to address transport infrastructure issues of the south Hampshire area.</li> <li>The plan does not consider transport provision in a sustainable manner, given the requirement for 10,000 dwellings</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 4944/15	Whole Plan	The local plan must fully adopt and implement the main points of the HRA-Lite Non-Technical Summary which accompanied the Habitats Review of the South Hampshire Spatial Strategy Update (September 2012). These are detailed at	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		section 6.3.1 (Mitigation Measures) of that report.	
<b>Object:</b> 101/122	Whole Plan	Deliverability: The document is not effective because there remain unresolved questions on its deliverability concerning the proposed Botley by-pass, essential new community facilities, employment and transportation. The benefits of the selected strategy with regard to new transport infrastructure are only described as potential which may not reassure local residents and other interested parties.	None
<b>Object:</b> 3258/19	Whole Plan	PUSH and Solent LEP policies need to be approved under the NPPF prior to assessment of the Local Plan as these policies are frequently referenced. The current Local Plan is based on isolation from co-located communities	None
<b>Object:</b> 6251/28	Whole Plan	It is unclear how environmental or amenity value of the allocated sites have been assessed, in particular how the biodiversity, landscape and recreational value (including the value of any public rights of way) of the allocated sites been ascertained compared with alternative options. In the absence of a demonstration that Plan is consistent with NPPF para 110, we advise that the plan is unsound. In addition with respect to protected species, it is not clear that the sites are deliverable. Refers to para 98 and 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005. Likely this can be simply resolved by demonstrating that it is highly unlikely that priority habitats or protected species are likely to preclude the delivery of the key strategic sites.	Changes to SLAA proformas to include more detail of nature conservation sites agreed with NE – see SLAA June 2014. These resolve this representation
<b>Object:</b> 6393/5	Whole Plan	The plan is already committed to early review. Where is the point in having a plan for 2014-2029, when its will be changed again before the ink is hardly dry. Plan constantly changed for the benefit of developers to the detriment of residents.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6564/2	Whole Plan	Does not achieve sustainable development as stated in the NPPF	None
<b>Object:</b> 697/16; 6721/2	Whole Plan	Proposals Map: 1) Land at Otterbourne Hill is subject to an extant and live outline planning permission for Class C2/C3 use, (App. No. O/10/67643). Planning permission was granted for 35 No. shared care units and a 20 No. bedroom nursing wing by virtue of Decision Notice issued on 14 March 2012. The emerging Borough Local Plan Proposals Map does not reflect the existence of this planning permission on the basis that the land is shown to fall within open countryside. The Proposals Map should be specifically amended to identify land at Otterbourne Hill within the defined 'urban edge', where planning permission has been granted for mixed care home/health care accommodation and public open space. Location plan attached. 2) It is noted on the proposals maps that a number of sites identified as having a local nature conservation designation also have been listed as an existing recreational and open space facility. For designated sites where the primary purpose is for their nature conservation values they should be assessed to	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		determine the robustness of these sites prior to being identified as a recreational and open space facility. Without such an assessment recreational could have a detrimental impact to the nature conservation value of these sites.	
<b>Support:</b> 6465/9	Whole Plan	Policies AL1, AL2, AL3, Bi1, Bi2, BO1, BO2, BU1, BU2, BU3, CF1, CF2, E1, E3, E5, FO1, FO2, FO4, HE1, HE2, HO1, HO2, WE1, WE2, WE3, WE4, WE5 support the delivery of the necessary infrastructure to meet demand and are therefore consistent with NPPF paragraphs 17, 21 and 157.	n/a
<b>Support:</b> 5572/4	Whole Plan	The Marine Management Organisation has reviewed the Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029) and has no specific comments to make. However the marine planning remit of this organisation should be borne in mind in relation to this consultation.	None
<b>Support:</b> 106/1	Whole Plan	At Hound PC's Planning Committee meeting held on 17 March 2014, it was resolved to raise no objection to the above referenced document.	n/a
<b>Chapter 1; Introduction</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 5161/20	1.5	Objects to the lack of a clear meaning to the strategic priority of realising a healthy community.	None
<b>Object:</b> 5161/24; 6246/1	1.8	Concern that important parts of the evidence base (PUSH background papers and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) have not been publicised.	None
<b>Chapter 2; Eastleigh Borough</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 5965/10	2.17	Objects that hydrology and drainage characteristics are based on inadequate information and require confirmation from Hampshire County Council/Southern Water.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6591/26	Issue G10	Support for G10 in principle but objects that the limited options for expanding the waste water treatment facility at Chickenhall Lane have not been highlighted as an issue for development.	None
<b>Support:</b> 6465/10	Issue G10	Support for issue G10 as consistent with paragraphs 17, 21 and 157 of the NPPF.	None
<b>Support:</b> 3162/21	Issue P10	Support for promoting other forms of transport to reduce congestion on major roads.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6700/1	Issue C1	Support for expressing the housing requirement as a minimum, but issue C1 should be amended to reflect the need to increase the proposed housing requirement.	None
<b>Support:</b> 5563/77	2.6	Support for recognition of the important maritime, rail and air heritage of the borough.	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 5188/15	Figure 3	Objects to the omission of the historic park at Stoneham from the map of constraints.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6700/2	2.62	The description of the existing settlement hierarchy should be qualified by recognition that significant development at Horton Heath will enhance its position in the hierarchy and make it a more sustainable location.	None
<b>Object:</b> 2210/7; 6537/18; 6562/11	Table 1	Objects to the hierarchy as misrepresentative: level 3 should be subdivided (2210/7); Netley Abbey and Old Netley should be combined and placed in level 3 (6537/18); Boorley Green should not be in level 4 (6562/11).	None
<b>Chapter 3; Vision and objectives</b>			
		No representations.	
<b>Chapter 4; Strategy for new development</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 1440/17; 6685/4	4.6	The statement that there will be no significant additional development in the Hamble peninsula is an inappropriate blanket restriction and excludes potentially acceptable sites.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6537/19	4.6	The strategy for the Local Plan should include land to the north of Woolston Road, Netley. Contrary to paragraph 4.6, it is not accepted that there are transport constraints affecting the development of this site or in the wider area, nor would the integrity of this gap be damaged through allocating this site for residential development.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6509/5; 655/53; 2232/1	S1	<b>Plan is inconsistent with principles of sustainable development</b> The plan advocates development that will lead to substantial greenhouse gas emissions; the plan does not meet objectively assessed local needs. <b>The definition of sustainable development is unjustified</b> Expanded definition (relative to the NPPF) is skewed towards environmental objectives at the expense of social objectives, such as meeting the housing needs of the housing market area.	None
<b>Support:</b> 6591/27	S1	Support for the criteria relating to climate change, impacts on the water environment and enhancing local environmental quality.	None
<b>Object:</b> 82/8; 1440/13; 2210/8; 2232/2; 4888/13; 4913/10; 5048/28; 6530/7; 6537/20; 6562/8; 6564/4; 6666/2; 6671/4; 6676/1; 6685/1; 6700/3; 6701/7;	S2	<b>Assessment of housing need is insufficient</b> Analysis is largely demographic and fails to consider local needs (affordability, homelessness, overcrowding) or economic needs/market signals, which may warrant a larger housing requirement; proposed no. of dwellings is arbitrary, based on an out-of-date SHMA and does not meet objectively assessed needs (e.g. PUSH SHMA 2014); proposal does not take into account a backlog of	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
6702/7; 6703/7; 6705/7; 6706/7; 6709/3		805/780 units from previous local plan period; higher targets are warranted using either demographic or economic-led scenarios; proposals limit in-migration and will not meet the required level of growth in labour force; failure to comply with NPPF (meeting objectively assessed needs) has not been justified on sustainability grounds; the plan will not provide sites for a 15 year period, contrary to the NPPF; instead of a 5% buffer, a 20% buffer should be applied to the housing requirement; no evidence that housing requirement will meet unmet needs from adjoining authority areas; neither the transport assessment nor the sustainability appraisal consider different levels of proposed development; further explanation of proposed requirement is needed.	
<b>Object:</b> 3244/33; 3725/18; 3848/92; 3884/13; 4038/14; 5801/11; 5161/25; 4726/24; 6509/4; 6658/4; 6669/3	S2	<b>Assessment of housing needs is excessive</b> Results do not recognise the diminishing number of people on the local housing register; projected increases in residential population suggest that 10,140 new homes is too many; housing figures from the South East Plan/PUSH South Hampshire Strategy should be disregarded; more weight should be given to zero net migration figures; housing numbers have been exaggerated to rationalise Council's interest in development; only 5,000 new dwellings are needed for internal growth, which should be the maximum permitted growth; economic uncertainties count against encouraging further in-migration.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4624/16	S2	The provision of new floorspace should be explained in terms of the PUSH Employment Floorspace Policy Framework (Nov 2008).	None
<b>Object:</b> 2257/18	S2	Support for principle of relating housing requirement to locally-derived evidence; and for an early review of the plan to determine an appropriate share of the PUSH SHMA 2014 housing requirement through the duty to co-operate.	None
<b>Object:</b> 82/9; 6236/3; 6537/21; 6662/2; 6666/3; 6701/10; 6702/10; 6703/10; 6704/10; 6705/10; 6706/10;	S3, general	The approach to delivering housing is not justified, effective or prepared on a positive basis; objectively assessed needs would not be met; the plan is over-reliant on large sites, which will take a long time to deliver; the location of development has not been informed by a full assessment of impact on neighbouring areas.	None
<b>Object:</b> 82/9; 5048/29; 6701/10; 6702/10; 6703/10; 6704/10; 6705/10; 6706/10; 6709/2;	S3, part i	The supply from urban areas is not deliverable because some sites are in employment use and the figure involves double counting; it is irrational to rely on the maximum potential of SLAA sites; SLAA site potentials are unjustified and optimistic; it is unreasonable to assume that all permissions/resolutions to permit will come forward and that potential sites will deliver in full.	None
<b>Object:</b> 2574/14; 2577/22; 3365/4; 3377/6; 3386/9; 3452/4; 3569/19; 3683/14;	S3, part ii	<b>Boorley Green (BO1) should be excluded</b> The proposed allocation does not form part of the most appropriate strategy when considered against alternatives; it is not in the spirit of the Council's Corporate	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
3725/19; 3858/2; 4098/7; 4191/17; 4226/11; 4332/7; 4402/12; 4622/19; 4623/42; 4648/11; 4668/10; 4676/12; 4678/12; 4704/15; 4706/12; 4718/9; 4722/7; 4723/4; 4735/12; 4736/14; 4744/9; 4748/8; 4794/10; 4811/14; 4902/4; 4906/18; 4928/15; 5079/25; 5137/13; 5146/9; 5159/7; 5402/3; 5441/12; 5501/5; 5502/7; 5634/5; 5639/7; 5697/4; 5811/2; 5837/4; 5878/7; 5958/3; 6033/4; 6273/3; 6536/4; 6611/2; 6628/2; 6640/2; 6650/2; 6651/2; 6655/1; 6658/5; 6666/3; 6676/2; 6689/2; 6698/2; 6699/2; 6707/2; 6710/1		Priorities; it is not in accordance with the Sustainability Appraisal/the Council's previous assessments; it is not based on supportable evidence; too much development would be concentrated in the Botley area, especially considering the small scale of local needs; the views of local people have not been considered; development would lead to a loss of local identity; concerns that the site is undeliverable due to inadequate infrastructure and related constraints; historic villages and countryside should be protected from development; development is unacceptable in terms of its likely traffic and environmental impacts, the related loss of local facilities/amenities and the loss of valuable site characteristics; the proposal manifests a conflict of interest with development at the Ageas Bowl (suggested desire to eliminate competition for new hotel and golf course facilities); it is inconsistent with key elements of the NPPF; consultation has been flawed and ineffective; would be better to plan development close to strategic transport infrastructure, and the facilities and services of Eastleigh; development in Whiteley and Fareham would lead to cumulative adverse impacts.	
<b>Object:</b> 5188/14; 6279/6; 6666/3	S3, part ii	<b>Stoneham/Chestnut Avenue (E1) should be excluded</b> Site will not be delivered in full over the plan period; the proposed allocation does not form part of the most appropriate strategy (land should be reserved for biodiversity and food production; impacts on the gap between Eastleigh and Southampton, on the provision of sport/recreation facilities and on transport infrastructure have not been sufficiently considered); new housing should only be for local needs; the site is inappropriate for major development due to impacts on special landscape characteristics; development would be contrary to the principle of protecting and enhancing the historic environment; the proposed allocation fails to meet NPPF requirements.	None
<b>Object:</b> 5536/8; 6484/17; 6509/6; 6676/2	S3, part ii	<b>Horton Heath (WE1) should be excluded</b> The anticipated rate of house building at WE1 is too high; the proposed allocation does not form part of the most appropriate strategy when considered against alternatives (land at Allington Lane/Eastleigh town centre should be (re)developed in preference); there are better sites for a new secondary school.	None
<b>Object:</b> 149/4; 179/8; 508/8; 522/9; 626/7; 2405/13;	S3, part ii	<b>Areas in the east of the borough should be excluded</b> Policies BO1, HE1 and/or BO2 should be excluded from the local plan (see also	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
2572/9; 2604/13; 3223/3; 3244/34; 3365/4; 3556/23; 3639/6; 3655/5; 3665/9; 3704/4; 3728/4; 3808/16; 3848/93; 3884/12; 3917/20; 3974/11; 4027/6; 4037/16; 4038/9; 4164/11; 4186/10; 4310/2; 4346/6; 4352/11; 4487/4; 4515/9; 4588/7; 4622/19; 4726/23; 4727/8; 4738/5; 4759/5; 4780/11; 4801/16; 4802/15; 4863/16; 4873/3; 4911/11; 4914/2; 4915/2; 4916/2; 4927/12; 4944/13; 4948/12; 5003/5; 5014/8; 5098/5; 5116/2; 5122/9; 5123/11; 5126/16; 5178/9; 5187/7; 5442/12; 5536/8; 5647/10; 5657/8; 5795/6; 5801/10; 5804/3; 5813/3; 5821/4; 5850/3; 5855/3; 5904/3; 5909/3; 5930/2; 6017/4; 6236/3; 6638/2; 6641/2; 6652/1; 6662/2; 6670/2; 6682/1; 6684/2; 6693/1; 6697/2; 6698/2		above for policy BO1); the anticipated rate of housing development at BO1 and HE1 has been over-estimated; the Botley by-pass would be required to address the transport-related impacts but is not a commitment during the plan period; development in Botley and Hedge End in combination will have unacceptable environmental and heritage impacts; the impacts of development on services, facilities and infrastructure in Botley parish have been underestimated; development will not improve the local environment and is therefore contrary to the NPPF; development should be focused on the centre/west of the borough.	
<b>Object:</b> 100/6	S3, part ii	<b>Numerical inconsistencies between part ii and Table 2</b> Development totals for Fair Oak and Horton Heath do not agree with the totals shown in Table 2.	None
<b>Object:</b> 655/52; 804/129; 1440/19; 2210/9; 4038/9; 4736/14; 4756/3; 4888/14; 4913/11; 5048/29; 5092/13; 5165/21; 6530/8; 6537/21; 6562/9; 6665/1; 6666/3; 6671/2; 6675/1; 6676/2;	S3, part iii	<b>Settlements identified for greenfield development</b> Horton Heath should be mentioned in part iii) as it is a sustainable location for additional small-scale development; sites BU1, BU2 and/or BU3 (Bursledon) should not be allocated for housing development; brownfield sites at Windhover Roundabout and Eastleigh town centre should be developed in preference to greenfield sites; agricultural land adjacent to settlements should not be developed; objections to the scale of proposed development affecting Bursledon on grounds	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
6685/2; 6700/5; 6709/2; 6715/3;		of increased traffic congestion and adverse environmental and landscape impacts.	
<b>Support:</b> 4557/24; 6700/5; 6537/21	S3, part iii	Support for S3 on the basis of the commitment to development at Boorley Green and enlargement of site WE1 at Horton Heath to accommodate 950 dwellings; support for identifying sites within the local plan and not in a separate DPD/neighbourhood plan/	None
<b>OMISSION SITES</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 82/9; 149/4; 179/8; 508/8; 522/9; 626/7; 2572/9; 2574/14; 2604/13; 3223/3; 3244/34; 3365/4; 3377/6; 3386/9; 3447/8; 3452/4; 3556/23; 3569/19; 3639/6; 3655/5; 3665/9; 3683/14; 3725/19; 3728/4; 3808/16; 3848/93; 3858/2; 3884/12; 3917/20; 3974/11; 4037/16; 4038/9; 4098/7; 4101/12; 4164/11; 4186/10; 4191/17; 4332/7; 4352/11; 4402/12; 4487/4; 4515/9; 4622/19; 4648/11; 4668/10; 4704/15; 4706/12; 4718/9; 4722/7; 4723/4; 4726/23; 4727/8; 4735/12; 4736/14; 4738/5; 4744/9; 4748/8; 4780/11; 4794/10; 4801/16; 4802/15; 4811/14; 4873/3; 4895/5; 4902/4; 4906/18; 4911/11; 4914/2; 4915/2; 4916/2; 4927/12; 4928/15; 4944/13; 4948/12; 5014/8; 5079/25; 5098/5; 5116/2; 5122/9; 5126/16; 5137/13; 5146/9; 5159/7; 5178/9; 5441/12; 5442/12; 5501/5; 5502/7;	S3, part ii	<b>Omission site: Allington Lane should be included</b> Land at Allington Lane would be a sustainable location and could be developed over the plan period; it could provide for development beyond 2029; it should be allocated in preference to BO1/sites in the Botley area (BO1, HE1 and BO2) for reasons of sustainability	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
5536/8; 5634/5; 5639/7; 5647/10; 5657/8; 5795/6; 5801/10; 5804/3; 5811/2; 5813/3; 5821/4; 5855/3; 5878/7; 5904/3; 5909/3; 5958/3; 5965/9; 6017/4; 6033/4; 6273/3; 6509/6; 6536/4; 6611/2; 6638/2; 6640/2; 6641/2; 6650/2; 6651/2; 6652/1; 6658/5; 6670/2; 6682/1; 6684/2; 6689/2; 6693/1; 6697/2; 6699/2; 6707/2; 6710/1			
<b>Object:</b> 3569/19; 3665/9; 3683/14; 4191/17; 4668/10; 4727/8; 4895/5; 4902/4; 4906/18; 4911/11; 5014/8; 5501/5; 5502/7; 5657/8; 6536/4; 6611/2; 6701/10; 6702/10; 6703/10; 6704/10; 6705/10; 6706/10; 6693/1	S3, part ii	<b>Omission site: Land North of Hedge End should be included</b> land north of Hedge End would be a sustainable location and could be developed over the plan period; it should be allocated in preference to BO1/ sites in the Botley area (BO1, HE1 and BO2) for reasons of sustainability; it should be allocated to meet sustainable development objectives.	None
<b>Object:</b> 82/9; 6027/4; 6640/2; 6707/2; 6698/2;	S3, part ii	<b>Omission site: Land North of West End should be included</b> Land north of West End would be a sustainable location and could be developed over the plan period; it should be allocated in preference to BO1/sites in the Botley area (BO1, HE1 and BO2) for reasons of sustainability. <b>Numerical inconsistencies between part ii and Table 2</b> Development totals for Fair Oak and Horton Heath do not agree with the totals shown in Table 2.	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/129	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to the omission of land south of Kings Copse Avenue, Hedge End	None
<b>Object:</b> 2210/9	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land at Middle Farm, Fair Oak	None
<b>Object:</b> 1440/19	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land at Hamble Station	None
<b>Object:</b> 4756/3	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land at Blind Lane, Horton Heath	None
<b>Object:</b> 4888/14	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land south of Mallards Road, Bursledon	None
<b>Object:</b> 4913/11	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land west of Allington Lane/south of Bishopstoke	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 5048/29	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land at Hamble Lane, Bursledon [now granted consent on appeal; ref: APP/W1715/A/13/2207851]	None
<b>Object:</b> 5092/13	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land east of Sovereign Drive, Hedge End/Botley	None
<b>Object:</b> 6530/8	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land west of Hamble Lane, Bursledon	None
<b>Object:</b> 6537/21	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land north of Woolston Road, Netley	None
<b>Object:</b> 6562/9	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land south of Maddoxford Lane	None
<b>Object:</b> 6665/1	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land at Garden of Oakbank, Bishopstoke	None
<b>Object:</b> 6666/3	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land off Bubb Lane	None
<b>Object:</b> 6671/2	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land east of Allington Lane and adjacent to St Swithun Wells Church	None
<b>Object:</b> 6675/1	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land at The Drove, West End	None
<b>Object:</b> 6676/2	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land west of Bursledon	None
<b>Object:</b> 6709/2	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> Objects to omission of land south of Fair Oak Road and west of Devine Gardens	None
<b>Object:</b> 6715/3	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> Objects to omission of land at Home Farm	None
<b>Object:</b> 6685/2	S3, part iii	<b>Omission site:</b> objects to omission of land at Berry Farm, Bursledon	None
<b>Object:</b> 6700/5	S3, part iii	Should also refer to small green field sites bordering Horton Heath (unspecified).	None.
<b>Object:</b> 6700/7	Table 2	It is not clear how the figures set out for Fair Oak and Horton Heath have been arrived at, given the disparity between these entries and the strategic allocation for Horton Heath (950 dwellings; policy WE1). In addition, the figures do not allow for potential small-scale greenfield allocations on the edge of Horton Heath (see Bellway's representation for policy S3).	None in response to representation. Table and text in 4.12 needs to be updated 2014 data.
<b>Object:</b> 6685/3	Table 2	Table 2 and Chapter 6.10 (Hound) omit land at Berry Farm, Bursledon. The land at Berry Farm should be included as a housing allocation.	None
<b>Object:</b> 1895/6; 1906/2; 5161/17; 6236/4; 6509/12;	S4	<p><b>The location of new employment development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locations have not been informed by an impact assessment on areas outside the borough, including the South Downs National Park;</li> <li>• Development should be concentrated at Eastleigh River Side/the old Ford factory site and not at Chalcroft Business Park;</li> <li>• The plan should not rely on development at Eastleigh River Side; policy should reference Southampton city centre as a focus for office development and require consultation with Southampton City Council on related applications.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence base</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Polices are not set in the context of the borough and its neighbours; threats to economic prosperity are not identified;</li> </ul>	Accept in part. See proposed change to paragraph 5.74.

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wider consequences of abandoning Eastleigh River Side are not considered;</li> <li>Allocations are inadequate for future employment growth;</li> <li>Some issues (self-containment, commuting and higher paid jobs) are not legitimate planning issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other limitations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan fails to provide for all economic sectors (e.g. no science parks or large sites for logistics);</li> <li>Plan does not help to create new permanent jobs, but only temporary (construction) jobs;</li> <li>Local business requirements (small units available at low rents) should be met.</li> </ul>	
<b>Support:</b> 1906/2; 4557/25	S4	<p>Support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reference to the PUSH economic strategy;</li> <li>focusing office development in town and district centres;</li> <li>the co-location of employment and housing development and in particular for new employment development at Chalcroft Business Park.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 6676/3	S5	Policy should refer to the country park that could be provided with development west of Bursledon (see objections to strategic policy S3).	None
<b>Object:</b> 3162/25	4.32	This paragraph and others in the local plan make reference to TfSHIOW, a group that has been replaced by the Solent local transport body reporting to the LEP. Reference should be made to the Solent LEP in the context of its preparation of a transport strategy for the Solent region, which will need to be aligned with the local plan.	None. Assertion is incorrect.
<b>Support:</b> 3162/22	4.37	There are benefits to improving rail links between the airport and the east of the region. The airport has data to emphasise this.	n/a
<b>Support:</b> 1906/3	4.39	Support statement regarding park and ride proposal for Southampton.	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 1906/4	S7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over wider impacts of new road links (Sundays Hill bypass and St John's Road Link) - support improvements to network including Windover roundabout.</li> <li>Support public transport priority route from Hedge End/ West End to Southampton including a re-opened Botley Road corridor. Development sites at Hedge End and Botley are not sustainable without this corridor. Significant investment needed in this corridor to link to the SCC network</li> <li>Improvements to pedestrian and cycle links should be considered alongside these schemes.</li> </ul>	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wording suggested</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 1895/7; 6648/1	S7	Inadequate consideration of freight transport in particular rail freight. This is contrary to government policy.	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/130	S7	Changes to the regime for developer contributions by the introduction of CIL will mean that insufficient funding will be available to implement the proposals listed in this policy. While HCC will work with the Borough Council to bring these forward, they should be identified as conceptual proposals that require further assessment. Plan should state that further transport assessment is required to determine the implications of these works for neighbouring authorities. Wording amendments suggested to paras. 4.39 and 4.40.	Accepted. See proposed changes to the Local Plan paragraphs 4.40, 5.108, 5.165, 6.2.18, 6.3.29, 6.6.11, new para. 6.7.33A, and 6.9.42
<b>Object:</b> 101/125; 5135/22	S7	<p>Objections regarding Botley bypass:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building of the Botley by-pass is necessary to support proposed developments at Boorley Green, Hedge End and Botley but the by-pass itself is no longer a requirement of the local plan. The increase in traffic will have a major impact on these settlements.</li> <li>There is a lack of clarity as to the funding of this critical road link which is likely to impact on the plan's effectiveness.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 100/7; 697/10; 3179/31; 4332/16; 4735/10; 5123/12; 6677/3	S7	<p>Objections regarding existing traffic issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fails to address existing issue of congestion - no certainty provided that improvements to already congested roads will take place prior to development (697/10);</li> <li>Lacking a formulated strategy for tackling transport issues including existing transport congestion. Proposals are 'tinkering' with existing infrastructure at best.</li> <li>There are no firm proposals for strategic road or rail improvement to service the area. (4735/10, 5123/12)</li> <li>Serious consideration should be given to construction of a junction 6 on the M27 would solve problems of access to Chalcroft and Hedge End, and relieve existing congestion (4332/16)</li> <li>Bishopstoke Road already unable to cope with peak traffic demands with B3037 at a standstill between Eastleigh and Fair Oak. Development will aggravate this (100/7).</li> <li>No significant road improvements proposed in Chandlers Ford where traffic is exceptionally heavy and will be exacerbated by development in Test Valley (3179/31)</li> <li>No consideration of development impact on Allbrook – roads are already dangerous for pedestrians and existing road infrastructure is already of poor</li> </ul>	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		quality which additional traffic will worsen (6677/3).	
<b>Object:</b> 6575/7	S7	The Local Plan, with regard to proposed allocation E1, fails to address issues of access to the town centre, regeneration of Eastleigh Riverside and road traffic including HGVs adequately.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6509/10	S7	A no through barrier should be erected on Burnett's Lane at the junction with the new link road, to prevent through traffic.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6246/3	S7	The high-level nature of the model used in the transport assessment means that it is not a suitable tool for assessing mitigation measures. Where necessary, promoters of major development will need to identify and fund mitigation measures. It is recommended that wording be added to the Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6236/5	S7	Transport assessment has not fully taken into account impact on villages of Colden Common and Twyford. Further improvements to vehicular routes to these villages may be required.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6676/4	S7	Policy should include park & ride proposals as set out in Southampton City Council's Core strategy, in line with the duty to cooperate. Such a facility could be brought forward as part of a comprehensive scheme on land west of Bursledon (see objections to strategic policy S3).	None
<b>Support:</b> 6657/5	S7	Southampton Airport supports this policy. Improving rail links to the airport from the east would enable sustainable growth in the catchment area that co-exists between Southampton and Gatwick airports and would encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 6657/8	S7	Southampton Airport is dismayed to find that no mention is made of the need to complete the original M27 junction signal and off-slip improvements. In relation to this, the plan is unclear about which developments need to be prioritised (such as new transport infrastructure) so that others can take place. It is also noted that despite previous representations, the Transport for South Hampshire Long Term Strategic Implementation Plan is not mentioned. This document would help to facilitate a joint approach to justifying schemes.	None Note: TfSH Long Term Strategic Implementation Plan is now re-titled Transport Delivery Plan, and is mentioned in the Local Plan.
<b>Support:</b> 4557/26	S7	This policy is supported, with particular reference to section (ii) relating to the proposed new link road between Burnett's Lane and Bubb Lane.	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 6236/6; 6662/1	S8	Seeks designation of B3354 and B3335 as cycle routes for commuting from the Borough of Eastleigh to Winchester via Twyford, with commitment by EBC to seek contributions to its implementation.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6701/11; 6702/11; 6703/11; 6704/11; 6705/11; 6706/11	S8	Whilst improvements to the route between Boorley Green and Hedge End railway station are welcomed, this policy should recognise the significant improvements that could be delivered if land either side of this route was brought forward for	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		development.	
<b>Object:</b> 101/123	S8	The proposal to enhance footpath and cycle links to Boorley Green has not been shown to be deliverable.	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/131	S8	Policy should refer to the involvement of Hampshire County Council as highway authority in implementing these footpath and cycleway improvements.	Accepted. See proposed change to paragraph 4.42.
<b>Support:</b> 4624/18	S8	Valley Park Parish Council supports the proposals for a link between Lakeside Country Park and the proposed Forest Park and Chilworth (criteria i and ix).	n/a
<b>Support:</b> 1906/5	S8	Development of the range of cycle routes proposed is supported, in particular the strategic cycle route corridors between Southampton and Chandler's Ford via Hut Hill, and Southampton and Eastleigh via Stoneham Lane, which link with the Southampton City Council cycle strategy and development of strategic cycle corridors.	n/a
<b>Support:</b> 2257/19	S8	Supports proposal to provide links between Lakeside country park and proposed Forest Park.	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 5048/30; 6530/9; 6676/5	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gaps: Land west of Bursledon, houses could be provided west of Hamble Lane and still retain a gap between Bursledon and Southampton	None
<b>Object:</b> 6551/3	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gap: Residential curtilages of Holmesland House, The Old Coach-house and adjoining dwellings. Inconsistent approach with other dwellings on Holmesland Lane	None
<b>Object:</b> 6537/22	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gaps: North of Woolston Road, Netley. Development would not impact on role and function of the defined gap	None
<b>Object:</b> 6562/10	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gaps: Botley, Boorley Green and south of Maddoxford Lane – protecting land of limited value	None
<b>Object:</b> 6701/12; 6702/12; 6703/12; 6704/12; 6705/12; 6706/12	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gap: Land north of Hedge End	None
<b>Object:</b> 5701/17	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gap: East of Stoneham Lane – does not contribute to the functions of the gap as set out in policy S9	None
<b>Object:</b> 6657/3	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gap: The land known as the Pig Farm (marked as allotment gardens on the policies map, east of Wide Lane) should not be identified as part of the gap (policy S9) but should be included in the urban edge, to enable the development of a hotel which would support the local economy. The urban edge should also include the long stay car parks, aircraft stands 13/14, the fuel farm and the car park in the south-western corner of the airfield.	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 5092/14	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gap: Land east of Sovereign Drive, Hedge End – development would not adversely affect the integrity of the gap between Hedge End and Botley	None
<b>Object:</b> 5057/7	S9	Objects to the definition of the urban edge for Botley as this affects land at Woodhill School and future development opportunities. A modest extension of the settlement boundary (see accompanying Plan 1) is sought to enable redevelopment of the school building for more appropriate use and the development of new school buildings and facilities in close proximity.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4888/15	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gap: South of Mallards Road, Bursledon – sustainable location suitable for small greenfield housing site.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4913/14	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gap: Between Bishopstoke and Fair Oak – settlements are already attached and share facilities and services	None
<b>Object:</b> 4756/4	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gap: Land west of Blind Lane, south of Horton Heath	None
<b>Object:</b> 6709/1	S9	Objects to the following locations identified as countryside gap: Land south of Bishopstoke and west of Devine Gardens – does not separate settlements	None
<b>Object:</b> 3926/1	S9	Object to identification of part of garden of “Fenbrook”, 3, Woodlands Drive, Netley Abbey SO315PS as strategic gap. Urban edge should be redefined to include whole property and garden as elsewhere in the settlement.	None
<b>Object:</b> 1440/18	S9	Object to Council’s view that there should be no significant development in the Hamble peninsula and the countryside gap designation between Hamble and Netley.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4888/15; 6666/4	S9	Objects to the principle of countryside gaps policy: Restricting the Council’s ability to meet housing needs	None
<b>Object:</b> 6530/9; 6562/10; 6701/12; 6702/12; 6703/12; 6704/12; 6705/12; 6706/12	S9	Objects to the principle of the countryside gaps policy: No definition of countryside gaps and not defined by size or landscape quality	None
<b>Object:</b> 5048/30; 6530/9; 6701/12; 6702/12; 6703/12; 6704/12; 6705/12; 6706/12	S9	Objects to the principle of the countryside gaps policy: Does not reflect NPPF/NPPG policy and guidance	None
<b>Object:</b> 5092/14	S9	Objects to the principle of the countryside gaps policy: Contrary to PUSH definition of gaps which requires no more land than is necessary to prevent coalescence of settlements	None
<b>Object:</b> 6701/12; 6702/12; 6703/12; 6704/12; 6705/12; 6706/12	S9	Objects to the principle of the countryside gaps policy: - Retention of some gaps but not others in the borough is irrational	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 4913/14; 5048/30	S9	Objects to the principle of the countryside gaps policy: Sufficient protection of the countryside should be/is contained in the rest of the policy	None
<b>Object:</b> 1895/8; 4913/14	S9	Objects to the principle of the countryside gaps policy: Conflicts with policies for sustainability and economy	None
<b>Object:</b> 1895/8; 4888/15	S9	Objects to the principle of the countryside gaps policy: Much land identified as gap is in sustainable locations for development	None
<b>Object:</b> 6722/7	S9	Objects to the principle of the countryside gaps policy: Several forms of development are appropriate in the countryside	None
<b>Object:</b> 1895/8; 4557/27; 4913/14	S9	Objects to the principle of the countryside gaps policy: Restrictive policy protection is equivalent to greenbelt and not justified	None
<b>Object:</b> 2195	S9	The Council has not maintained the green gap between Horton Heath and West End. A countryside gap should be defined between Horton Heath and West End.	None
<b>Object:</b> 1895/8	S9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy for gaps conflicts with policies for sustainability and the economy and is not justified.</li> <li>• Much land within gaps is in sustainable locations, in particular around Eastleigh which is close to motorways, rail and Southampton Airport. Excluding it from development will lead to increases in travel and duplication of facilities and infrastructure.</li> <li>• Policy for protection of gaps is equivalent to green belt and is not justified. Employment could contribute to separation of communities as well as undeveloped gaps.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/132	S9	Support principle of gaps but policy should specify the development permissible in them, as it does for countryside rather than relying on a negative clause. Alternative wording suggested.	None
<b>Object:</b> 5161/19	S9	Strategic gaps downgraded to just 'gaps'. Stoneham site devalued despite its 1990 council protection. No reasons given that were unforeseen in 1990 so change is crass exploitation.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6671/5; 6722/7	S9	Within the countryside, several forms of development are appropriate and there is not a general presumption against new development especially when material considerations are taken into account as part of the decision making process. Suggested Changes: The policy should be amended to remove the "presumption against new development" phrase.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6636/1	S9	Objects to omission of change of use of agricultural land to residential gardens from the list of acceptable development in the countryside.	None
<b>Support:</b> 6509/9	S9	Countryside and green areas currently marked on the plan should be kept and guaranteed to be kept in its natural state with minimal changes.	n/a
<b>Support:</b> 2257/20; 4624/17	S9	Supports the identification of the Eastleigh – Southampton countryside gap.	n/a

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 697/11	S10	Policy fails to state that that the Borough Council will seek to maintain the River Hamble and Southampton Water also for its nature conservation importance. Whilst the policy does recognise the need to balance recreational sailing and marine related enterprises with the nature conservation interests, the emphasis of the policy is about the economics of these industries. As this policy is about the Coast and not a policy on recreation the emphasis of policy S10 should equally be about achieving net gains for the nature conservation value of the coast as well as on the economics. Wish to see this policy reworded to ensure equal emphasis. Encouraging recreational access to it goes against the work that the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project is trying to achieve. Whilst it is recognised that this policy is caveated by saying “where this can be achieved without detriment to the biodiversity ....interests” we believe that this will not be able to achieve on this highly sensitive coastline. The Wildlife Trust would therefore wish to see the mention of encouraging access excluded from this policy.	None.
<b>Object:</b> 6530/10	S10	Policy is unnecessary as its provisions are addressed by other Local Plan policies. Definition of coast is too broad and suggests excessive protection contrary to NPPF. Reference to S9 should be deleted – areas do not relate to coast.	None
<b>Object:</b> 697/12	S11	Policy references the council's local measures to mitigate recreational disturbance, however, unable to comment on the effectiveness of this, as we cannot see any document where the mitigation proposals are set out for Eastleigh. There does not appear to be anything available on the list of background evidence papers, or published on the council's web site. The Trust would ask if a copy of your mitigation proposals could be made available to us to consider.	None as a response to this representation. However, policy S11 and para. 4.63 are proposed to be updated in respect of the progress of the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project and the Council's involvement.
<b>Object:</b> 133/1	S11	Concerned that Policy S11 does (not?) set out a robust policy approach to the protection of the Special Protection Areas (SPAs) within and close to the Borough's boundary: specifically the Solent SPAs and New Forest SPA. Solent SPAs: does not clearly reflect the interim approach being implemented by PUSH authorities. Supporting text to Policy S11 makes a welcome commitment to developing a joint mitigation strategy with other PUSH local authorities. However, it also refers to a “local Southampton Water and Hamble Estuary Disturbance Mitigation Project” which we presume is in place as an interim measure. However, it is unclear what measures are included in the local project, and whether it is in line with the agreed Solent-wide Interim Planning Framework.	Accept in part. See updated Habitats Regulations Assessment pages 145-149.

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		New Forest SPA: policy makes no reference to measures in place to protect the New Forest SPA from the effects of new housing in Eastleigh, despite the Borough falling wholly within the 20km 'zone of influence' <sup>1</sup> . We acknowledge that the strategic approach to the protection of the New Forest from increased recreational pressure is still in its early stages of development. However, we strongly disagree with the conclusion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment which states that "while visitors from Eastleigh District do visit the New Forest, their contribution is sufficiently small (approximately 2.6%) as to be effectively inconsequential even 'in combination' with other projects and plans. " If this illogical approach to the 'in combination' assessment of recreational pressure were taken by each of the local authorities that are responsible for contributing to recreational pressure on the New Forest SPA, then the 1.05 million additional visits/annum would all go unmitigated. This is clearly unacceptable, and not compliant with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.	
<b>Object:</b> 6701/13; 6702/13; 6703/13; 6704/13; 6705/13; 6706/13	S11	Without the development of land north of Hedge End, new routes cannot be delivered between Boorley Green and the Hedge End railway station. Deliverability is a key requirement of the NPPF. This is a further reason to allocate land north of Hedge End.	None
<b>Support:</b> 6591/16	S11	Supports policy, including commitment to protect, conserve and enhance all biodiversity, not just those that are designated, and the strategic approach to the protection of European sites from the effects of development	n/a
<b>Support:</b> 2257/21; 6591/16	S11	Supports intention to work with PUSH and others to implement PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy (including Forest Park)	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 101/116	S12	The development at Boorley Green should not proceed without the Botley by-pass being put in place [in accordance with part iii) of S12]. It is critically important to avoiding adverse traffic impacts on the Conservation Area that there should be a firm commitment to the construction of the Botley by-pass, however this has not been fully and properly resolved.	None
<b>Chapter 5; Development Management</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 2125/5	DM1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part vi) refers to a net increase in green infrastructure. This is unnecessary and acts as an impediment to sustainable growth.</li> <li>Part xi) refers to public art. This is unnecessary and acts as an impediment to sustainable growth.</li> <li>Both of these requirements adversely affect the viability and quality of residential development.</li> </ul>	None. Viability testing of the Local Plan indicates the policies are viable.
<b>Support:</b> 6509/11	DM1	Housing styles should be in keeping with their location and surroundings. Street	n/a

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		lighting should be minimal to respect the night skies in rural environs.	
<b>Object:</b> 6701/1; 6702/1; 6703/1; 6704/1; 6705/1; 6706/1	DM2	Objects to the timetable relating to increasing sustainability standards and to the separate carbon reduction standards. This approach is no longer justified given the Government's approach to utilise the building regulations. This policy should be deleted.	None.
<b>Object:</b> 2232/4 6671/1; 6691/1; 5048/31; 5108/29; 5124/27	DM2	Policy DM2 does not provide sufficient flexibility in relation to the forthcoming changes in national policy arising from the Housing Standards Review, and will not ensure that development is achievable and viable. The policy should be re-worded to refer to the new national approach to Energy, Water, Access, Security and Space standards. Otherwise, the local plan must seek to justify pursuing an alternative approach and would need to include reference to viability testing in an amended DM2. The statement that "all residential development should achieve..." is not considered a flexible approach and is not considered sound. Text from Policy CP11 in the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 should be replicated in Policy DM2.	None.
<b>Object:</b> 2125/6	DM2	The provisions of DM2 are contrary to paragraph 19 of the NPPF and the intentions of the Government to abolish the Code for Sustainable Homes and move to a Building Regulations control of these matters. BREEAM is an unwieldy bureaucratic system and incurs unnecessary costs and delays for development. There is no evidence to support requirements a) to h) of the policy.	None
<b>Object:</b> 2232/4	DM2	Recommend that the passivhaus standard is not adopted and that parts b), c) and d) of this policy are deleted. The cost of implementing part g) has not been assessed as part of the CIL viability assessment and is consequently unjustified.	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/133 (HCC)	DM2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy DM2(ii) requirement for passivhaus certification for non-residential development will incur additional assessor fees and build costs that will not be achievable on HCC's limited budgets for community infrastructure and will prejudice the delivery of such infrastructure in Eastleigh Borough.</li> <li>• Unclear how policy DM2g applies to the different stages of the planning process or how post-occupancy evaluation will be carried out. Existing BRE POE methods are acknowledged but are inappropriate for community infrastructure. Bristol approach commended and alternative wording suggested.</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.13 requirement for a 1% of build cost contribution to the Council's Carbon Fund for every BREEAM percentage point below excellent is unsound because build costs and BREEAM percentage points are not fairly related in scale and kind. For reasons of financial viability it may not be possible to achieve BREEAM excellent and this requirement could prejudice</li> </ul>	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		the delivery of HCC community infrastructure projects. Requirement should be deleted.	
<b>Object:</b> 5169/8	DM2	Proposes an addition to the end of Policy DM2 as follows: 'In seeking to apply these standards, the Council will take into account: a) the financial viability of the proposal; and b) the contribution that the proposal would make towards mixed, balanced and sustainable communities.' The Council must also acknowledge the Government's Housing Standards Review and the Ministerial Statement of 13 March 2014. A footnote to the policy is also proposed whereby development proposals would be assessed in accordance with the latest Government policy.	None
<b>Support:</b> 6591/24	DM2	Supports principle of policy but for completeness asks that water efficiency is specifically mentioned as they are aware that some levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes can be achieved without any water credits. Water efficiency measures are essential in the South East. Also whilst water efficiency is important in its own right, the links to foul water disposal and protection of designated sites is also key. The less water that is used, the less that has to be disposed of; therefore helping to free capacity at constrained works.	None.
<b>Object:</b> 6591/28	5.11	For clarity and consistency reference in paragraph 5.11 to 'Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems' should be changed to 'Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS).	Accepted. See proposed changes to paragraph 5.11
<b>Object:</b> 804/134	DM4	Policy should refer to sources of flooding in the borough other than fluvial and coastal and clarify how this would be dealt with in determining planning applications. Further new policy wording suggested.	Accepted. See proposed change to policy DM4
<b>Support:</b> 6591/23	DM4	Supports policy.	None
<b>Object:</b> 2125/7; 6714/2	DM5	The overall thrust of the policy is supported, but it is not possible to conclude that some culverting of existing watercourses would not be necessary to achieve the Council's objectives. A minor re-wording of the policy is proposed to reflect this.	None. Reference to culverting was requested by the Environment Agency.
<b>Support:</b> 6591/22	DM5	Supports policy	None
<b>Object:</b> 3258/20	DM7	Noise (see attached letter for further detail): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• out of date</li> <li>• incomplete for night time</li> <li>• no content to redress noise impact on existing areas</li> <li>• no noise action plan</li> </ul>	Accepted. See proposed change to paragraph 5.42
<b>Support:</b> 6591/21	DM7	Strongly supports this policy and accompanying text.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6591/20	5.46	Supports recognition that waste water treatment issues need to be addressed but would suggest that reference to 'local off-site sewerage infrastructure' is widened to include the constraints faced at waste water treatments works as well.	Accepted. See proposed change to paragraph 5.46 to include reference to

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
			need to address constraints at waste water treatment works.
<b>Object:</b> 4516/1	DM8	Seeks assurance regarding the relationship between land use and 400kv powerlines, in particular developer responsibilities should their sites include such powerlines. Local Plan should include a requirement to reach agreement with power distributors regarding location of and links to electrical power infrastructure in accordance with the current Statement of Charging Methodology agreed with the industry regulator (OFGEM)	Accepted in principle. See propose change to paragraph 5.45.
<b>Support:</b> 6465/11	DM8	Policy DM8 and supporting text (paragraphs 5.46 and 5.47) supports the delivery of the necessary infrastructure to meet new demand and so is consistent with paragraphs 17, 21 and 157. The policy and supporting text are also in line with the national planning practice guidance where it states that adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development.	No change
<b>Object:</b> 6251/27	DM9	We advise that to be effective in being in line with the NPPF, policy DM9 is amended to read: “measures <del>are can</del> be taken to mitigate, or if this is not possible, compensate for the adverse effects, such that the development will result in at least no net loss to biodiversity.	Accepted – see proposed change to policy DM9(iii)
<b>Object:</b> 804/135	DM18	Policy should refer to the implications of development on the highway network.	Accepted in principle. See proposed change to policy DM23.
<b>Object:</b> 804/136	DM19	Policy should refer to the implications of development on the highway network.	Accepted in principle. See proposed change to policy DM23.
<b>Object:</b> 5209/1	DM22	Policy DM22 is contrary to paragraph 28 of the NPPF as it does not permit any new development associated with an existing retail use located in the countryside. Whilst a 'town centre first' policy is accepted, paragraph 23 of the NPPF also requires a policy for the consideration of proposals for main town centre uses which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres. The Revised Pre-submission Local Plan is contrary to national policy in its negative approach to established rural businesses. The alternative wording for policy DM22 that was proposed by Gregory Gray Associates in a previous representation (2 December 2013) should be considered.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6711/1	DM22	Objects to policy DM22 because it does not comply with the NPPF. Sequential tests and impact assessments should determine whether a retail proposal should be permitted. There may also be additional reasons for allowing retail	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		development. This policy should therefore be worded to create more flexibility. It is not appropriate to impose blanket bans on development.	
<b>Object:</b> 804/137	DM23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy and supporting text should clarify how its CIL will affect transport contributions.</li> <li>SRTM will not always be the best tool for undertaking transport assessment of development proposals – amend para. 5.107 accordingly.</li> <li>Current proposed levels of CIL will not fund the transport infrastructure required – para. 5.108 should acknowledge this.</li> </ul>	Accepted. See proposed changes to the Local Plan paragraphs 4.40, 5.107, 5.108, 5.165, 6.2.18, 6.3.29, 6.6.11, new para. 6.7.33A, and 6.9.42
<b>Object:</b> 804/138	DM24	Reference to Hampshire County parking standards should be removed as these are now being withdrawn.	Accepted – see proposed changes to policy DM24, paragraph 5.109 and Appendix A para. A13
<b>Object:</b> 1440/14; 2232/5; 4038/13; 6537/23	DM28	<p>Policy requirements unsound because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Underpinned by flawed viability assessment</li> <li>Level is not reflective of values, scales, rates, lending criteria and the current housing market in Eastleigh</li> <li>Requirements of other policies in the plan, e.g. code for sustainable homes requirements, not taken into account (policy will be out of date when code is revoked)</li> <li>Concern about affordable housing requirements for schemes of 5 units</li> <li>Community likely to be unsupportive of this level of affordable housing</li> <li>Delivery will limit availability of finance for other infrastructure</li> <li>Not justified by CIL viability – rates not deliverable with other infrastructure requirements</li> <li>The SE Plan no longer has governmental recognition as a planning criteria and the inclusion of a calculation based on the SE Plan data causes an unjustified upward bias on the housing numbers.</li> <li>Population according to ONS data in Botley is static and not in decline.</li> </ul>	None.
<b>Object:</b> 5161/22	DM28	Object to the principle of building affordable housing only as a proportion of and alongside market housing. It is no more affordable than market housing and is a contrived method to gain income for the council.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4756/2	DM28	Objects to policy DM28 as the policy is not in line with the reasonably related approach of the NPPF. The Council's policy is currently unreasonable as it requires either on-site provision or contributions towards affordable housing based on the existing housing provision on-site. The inclusion of the phrase "affordable housing will be required where there is a NET INCREASE of...dwellings would address this objection.	None

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 2125/8; 2232/6; 6676/6; 6701/2; 6714/3; 6702/2; 6703/2; 6704/2; 6705/2; 6706/2	DM29	Objections because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not supported by evidence</li> <li>• Cost of delivering minimum standards has not been accounted for in CIL viability assessment</li> <li>• Have the space standards been factored into the SLAA housing yields? Government approach will be to address this via building regulations. No justification for local standards</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 6624/1	DM31	The designation of Bottom Copse, Woodhouse Lane, Botley on the Policies Map (South) is questioned. This land is believed to be in the ownership of the Newman family and is not in use as public open space. Policy DM31 does not therefore apply to Bottom Copse.	None.
<b>Object:</b> 2232/7	DM32	This policy is unjustified because the cost of providing recreation and open space facilities does not appear to have been accounted for in the CIL viability evidence. It is however accepted that for larger schemes, the £20,000 cost allowance per dwelling should account for the cost of this policy for these larger developments.	None
<b>Object:</b> 697/15	DM34	The Wildlife Trust would wish to see this policy include a mention that any new moorings, replacement and relocation of existing moorings may require a Habitat Regulations Assessment.	Accepted. See addition to supporting text for policy DM34 - proposed new paragraph 5.150A
<b>Support:</b> 788/8	DM35	Support for policy DM35, which reflects paragraph 70 of the NPPF in guarding against the loss of valued facilities and the retention of facilities and services for the benefit of the community.	n/a
<b>Support:</b> 6591/19	DM36	Supports policy.	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 6537/24	DM37	The requirements of policy DM37 must comply with the guidance of the NPPF and Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations. It has not been demonstrated that the requirements are reasonable, necessary and proportionate to the development being proposed. It is recommended that the policy is amended to provide reference to the CIL regulations (in particular Regulation 122).	None
<b>Chapter 6, Parish by parish:</b>			
<b>Section 6.1; Allbrook</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 5025/5; 5918/1; 6643/1;	<b>AL1</b>	<b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Result in the loss of countryside</li> <li>• Impact on trees</li> </ul>	None

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harm to wildlife habitats</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate vehicular access</li> <li>• The policy should allow some flexibility in relation to criteria i) regarding</li> </ul> <p><b>Density</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site could accommodate more than 25 dwellings</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential amenities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harm to character of area and harm to residential amenities by reason of noise and lack of privacy. In addition, the layout for the proposed development shows the social housing grouped together which is inappropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Ground conditions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential subsidence issues</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to include a requirement for financial contributions towards off-site community facilities</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Object:</b> 5918/2; 6451/2; 6608/1; 6639/1; 6656/1; 6653/1; 6677/2; 5169/7;</p>	<p><b>AL2</b> 6.1.10</p>	<p><b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detrimental impact on wildlife, flora and fauna on the site</li> <li>• the impacts of development on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• unacceptable increase in traffic congestion in local area and consequential harm to quality of life</li> <li>• concern at whether highway assessment carried out on behalf of developers is impartial</li> <li>• the traffic impact of proposed development at AL3 needs to be taken into account</li> <li>• major improvements to traffic management would need to happen before this development can be a positive addition to the village.</li> <li>• additional vehicle movements will put a strain on traffic flow on Pitmore Road and Allbrook Hill</li> <li>• the development could give rise to over 100 more vehicles on Pitmore Road on a daily basis</li> <li>• increase in traffic impact on congestion and safety</li> <li>• will new roads be adopted ?</li> <li>• who will be responsible for lighting ?</li> <li>• the numbers of houses allocated for the site have been increased from 30 to 50 - too many for the local roads</li> </ul>	<p>None</p>

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• roads are already heavily congested and there are limited public transport options</li> <li>• the cumulative impact of this and other housing developments on local roads is unacceptable</li> <li>• <b>Density</b> – reduce numbers to 30 houses if development goes ahead.</li> <li>• <b>Design</b> – criteria ii) should include detailed design requirements appropriate to the traditional Victorian building styles; criteria iii) should be amended to clarify that any new community facilities will be provided off-site; criteria v) should be amended to specify the composition of the open space as follows: an informal grassy area (for games/picnics); a pond for biodiversity/drainage; a wildflower meadow with footpath links; access by car to be restricted ?; What type of housing is planned within the site?: If social/affordable housing is planned, how will the upkeep of these houses and surrounding areas be enforced?; a contemporary design for the development would be out-of-keeping with the existing development.</li> <li>• <b>Ongoing maintenance</b> - criteria iv) should be amended to ensure the on-going maintenance of the surrounding ancient hedges; with regard to criteria vi), the adjoining SINC fields could be incorporated using a management agreement, so that the whole area could be managed by EBC Countryside Service and become a local nature reserve; queries regarding responsibility over shared spaces; who will be responsible for shared areas? Any new recreational facilities (football/netball court) or additional lighting would be an additional maintenance cost for local taxpayers</li> <li>• <b>Residential amenities</b> – the character of the village will be changed considerably; loss of amenity - wildlife, flora and fauna; the development is too large for the locality; a netball/football court would be inappropriate and would lead to unsocial behaviour; floodlighting/additional lighting would cause detriment to local residents.</li> <li>• <b>Infrastructure</b> - impact on school catchment areas (Thornton already oversubscribed); unacceptable impact on local infrastructure including schools, medical facilities and shops. Objector states that Southern Water has objected on the basis that there is no capacity in the sewerage system to accommodate the development proposed; need to include a requirement for financial contributions towards off-site community facilities.</li> <li>• <b>Consultation</b> – there has been inadequate consultation on the increase from 30 to 50 dwellings; by referring to the overall site area and the open space – the description of the site in the plan is misleading and gives the impression</li> </ul>	

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<p>it's bigger than it is. Contrary to the description at iv), there is no watercourse running through the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ground conditions/flooding</b> – what measures have been planned in relation to the flooding that occurs at the bottom of the site ? reduction in the permeable surface water run-off area and will cause more problems to what is already a flood risk area</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Object:</b> 6677/4; 6635/1; 6635/2; 6643/2; 6644/1; 6647/1; 6625/1; 6626/1; 6615/1; 6621/1; 6608/2; 5918/3; 6465/8;</p>	<p><b>AL3</b></p>	<p><b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adverse impacts of development on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation and green land</li> <li>• harm to wildlife and their habitats</li> <li>• loss of habitat for flora and fauna and impacts on water quality</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no consideration has been given to the traffic-related impacts in the Pitmore Road/Allbrook Hill area</li> <li>• the proposed off-street car parking would be insufficient to ameliorate the traffic congestion arising from parking on Allbrook Hill, and in any event the parked cars act as a natural traffic calming measure.</li> <li>• unacceptable increase in traffic</li> <li>• access to site has a dangerous entrance</li> <li>• traffic congestion from commuting and travel to amenities, and from car parking on Allbrook Hill</li> <li>• access to the site will have poor visibility (will cause danger to vehicles and pedestrians)</li> <li>• concerns about traffic entering and exiting Pitmore Road, near a bend in the road</li> <li>• in combination with proposals at AL2 there will be even more traffic</li> <li>• there are vehicles parked on the kerbs on both sides of Pitmore Road - a restriction needs to be put in place</li> <li>• increased pressure on parking, forcing more vehicles to park on Pitmore Road</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Density</b> - the policy should be worded to allow flexibility on the number of dwellings and parking spaces required.</li> <li>• <b>Design</b> - harm to character of Allbrook; there is the potential for the loss of privacy and daylight for existing dwellings; policy should include detailed design requirements; the reference to a new footpath and cycleway should be deleted because of the security implications for existing properties;</li> </ul>	<p>None</p>

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Alternative sites</b> – revert AL3 to a proposal to use the Borough Council acquired land solely to return the single terrace of properties to their original condition</li> <li>• <b>Residential amenities</b> – adverse impact on the need for new community infrastructure (schools, medical facilities, shops); the proposals for development in Allbrook will not maintain the local character and no information has been provided to the contrary; harm to character of Allbrook; harm to residential amenities; loss of amenity and semi-rural character of Allbrook Parish; loss of amenity for local residents and detrimental to the character of the area; there would increases to noise and dust pollution, particularly during construction</li> <li>• <b>Consultation</b> - insufficient consultation - only 2 signs at the site, assumes internet access, no local paper; there is little point establishing and publishing a plan if the council sees fit to change that plan as/when it chooses - the plan becomes worthless. Also concerned about the lack of consultation; insufficient public consultation and notice; local residents have not been informed of the Local Plan – it is being rushed through.</li> <li>• <b>Ground conditions</b> – adverse impacts on localised flooding/flooding in general; it is also noted that Southern Water has objected due to insufficient capacity on the current sewage network increase in flooding from surface water run-off;</li> <li>• <b>Infrastructure</b> – the policy should be amended to propose the development of community facilities (village hall, play area) on the area proposed for public open space; policy should require financial contributions to community facilities; add the following criteria as per other allocated sites “a connection is provided to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity as advised by Southern Water”</li> <li>• <b>House prices</b> – local property values would be adversely affected</li> <li>• <b>Viability</b> - the Council has failed to show that this policy is viable and the cumulative impact of the plan has not been considered</li> <li>• <b>Misc</b> - the Council also has a conflict of interest in developing this site due to its ownership of 10 and 10a Pitmore Road;</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 6.2; Bishopstoke</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 100/4	6.2.6	It should be recognised that there are insufficient employment opportunities in Bishopstoke, meaning that people will have to travel to neighbouring areas for work.	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 100/1	Bi1	A new condition should be added to obtain contributions towards play areas for all age groups/fitness levels. Also objects to the lack of sustainable transport options for accessing this site.	None
<b>Object:</b> 100/2; 6251/29	Bi2	<p><b>Omissions to the policy criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new condition should be added to obtain contributions towards play areas for all age groups/fitness levels; a new condition should be added to buffer and seek enhancement opportunities for the adjoining priority habitat area; a new condition should be added to offset any degradation to the right of way crossing the site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the lack of sustainable transport options for accessing this site.</li> </ul>	Accepted in part. See proposed changes to policy Bi2.
<b>Object:</b> 804/139; 3989/1	Bi3	Objects to the suitability of road junction improvements in terms of traffic safety and congestion. Also concerns about the deliverability of the improvements (source of funding is unclear).	None
<b>Section 6.3; Botley</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 3365/5; 6668/2	6.3.2	The population of the village is not in significant decline, and it does not need major development to stabilise it – the 300 dwellings proposed north-east of Winchester Street will alleviate this. There is no way the population will decline such is the demand and we see many new young families moving into our area all the time, this statement is factually incorrect, biased and presumptuous!	None
<b>Object:</b> 4332/8; 6564/7; 6668/2	6.3.5	The pedestrian, cycle and bridleway links to Manor Farm Country Park are already adequate and do not need any improvement.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6668/2	6.3.8	The out of town stores offer a different service to those stores in the village so this statement in para. 6.3.8 is misleading	None
<b>Object:</b> 4332/9	6.3.8	Most people in Boorley Green do not want a "local centre" as is being suggested. They seem very happy to walk/cycle into Botley or Hedge End.	None
<b>Object:</b> 2877/19; 4332/10; 6668/2	6.3.9	Paragraph is misleading - Boorley Green does not have a regular bus service to Eastleigh as described - the only bus from Boorley Green goes to Southampton, approximately every hour and takes nearly an hour to get there.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6668/2	6.3.10	Statements about the Botley bypass in para. 6.3.10 is misleading. The plan does not propose the bypass in the plan period.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4332/11	6.3.10	Planning a development of 2,500 houses around Boorley Green, as far away as possible geographically from Eastleigh and Southampton, will contribute to an increase in vehicle movements, congestion, air pollution and the destruction of quiet country lanes that give pleasure to walkers, cyclists and horse riders alike.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6564/6; 6668/2	6.3.10	The solution to reduce air pollution would be to move the HGV testing centre and	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		enforce no parking from Kings Corner to the Maypole Road roundabout.	
<b>Object:</b> 4332/12	6.3.11	It is good that there is little parking at Botley railway station as this encourages people to walk, cycle or bus to the station.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4332/13	6.3.12	I don't believe waiting 2 weeks for a GP appointment is adequate. Boorley Green residents, as shown by the local survey, seem to be very happy with their "few local services".	None
<b>Object:</b> 4332/14	6.3.14	The issues identified in Botley parish should be achieved without the necessity of the proposed 2,500 houses. These huge developments will only exacerbate these issues. 300 houses in policy BO2 is quite enough.	None
<b>Object:</b> 2877/20	6.3.14	It is false to suggest that there is a lack of pedestrian and cycle access to Manor Farm Country Park. A public right of way exists for pedestrians and cyclists between Botley and the country park.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4332/15	6.3.15	No mention is made that the golf course area has high quality farmland, public footpaths crossing it and wildlife. The NPPF says that poorer quality land should be used first.	None
<b>Object:</b> 101/118; 149/5; 179/7; 294/6; 364/3; 508/7; 522/8; 626/8; 763/2; 2404/9; 2405/12; 2472/3; 2571/6; 2572/8; 2574/13; 2577/21; 2604/12; 2877/18; 2879/7; 3223/2; 3244/31; 3377/5; 3386/8; 3447/7; 3452/3; 3515/7; 3556/22; 3569/18; 3655/6; 3664/6; 3665/7; 3683/13; 3704/5; 3725/16; 3728/5; 3808/14; 3848/91; 3858/1; 3884/9; 3917/18; 3974/12; 3992/6; 4027/4; 4034/6; 4038/10; 4042/7; 4069/1; 4074/1; 4098/6; 4101/11; 4164/12; 4186/9; 4191/16; 4226/10; 4310/1; 4332/6; 4346/4; 4352/12; 4402/11; 4487/5; 4515/8; 4543/4; 4588/6; 4607/6;	BO1	<p>Objections to BO1 for the following reasons:</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remote location for development of this scale with poor connections to the rest of the borough (see transport section below) and doesn't support regeneration of Eastleigh town centre</li> <li>• Disproportionate development and overdevelopment of a rural area: 60% of borough's green field development in Botley area and 800% increase in population of Boorley Green</li> <li>• Development is not required to meet local need (BO2 would be sufficient on its own) – oversupply for the area</li> <li>• Alternative sites dismissed without reasonable justification</li> <li>• The development will not improve the local environment and does not achieve sustainable development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Consistency with other policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not consistent with EBC corporate priorities</li> <li>• Not consistent with the emerging Local Plan vision and objectives and policies S1, S4, S8 [Error; see S9], DM1, DM2, DM4, DM5, DM6, DM7, DM9, DM11, DM12, DM15, DM17, DM23, DM31, DM37</li> <li>• Against NPPF policy which requires land of lesser environmental value to be preferred for development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence</b></p>	None

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<p>4622/18; 4623/43; 4643/10; 4648/12; 4668/9; 4676/11; 4678/11; 4680/2; 4686/7; 4704/12; 4718/8; 4726/21; 4727/6; 4735/11; 4736/13; 4744/8; 4748/7; 4759/3; 4777/6; 4780/10; 4786/7; 4794/9; 4801/13; 4802/12; 4811/13; 4839/13; 4865/12; 4887/2; 4895/4; 4902/5; 4906/17; 4911/8; 4914/3; 4915/3; 4916/3; 4928/12; 4932/6; 4944/11; 4948/11; 4964/3; 4971/6; 5004/9; 5009/8; 5010/6; 5014/7; 5048/32; 5079/24; 5098/6; 5099/6; 5105/30; 5116/3; 5123/10; 5126/14; 5131/10; 5135/23; 5136/10; 5137/11; 5146/8; 5159/6; 5170/9; 5171/4; 5172/6; 5178/10; 5187/6; 5402/2; 5441/9; 5442/9; 5501/4; 5502/6; 5536/7; 5634/4; 5657/9; 5676/4; 5692/5; 5694/7; 5697/3; 5711/6; 5762/3; 5779/2; 5795/4; 5801/9; 5804/2; 5810/4; 5811/2; 5813/2; 5821/5; 5837/5; 5850/2; 5855/4; 5878/6; 5906/2; 5909/4; 5958/2; 5930/41; 6017/5; 6027/3; 6033/3; 6273/2; 6353/2; 6534/5; 6536/3; 6564/3; 5965/7; 6395/3; 6399/4; 6611/11; 6613/1; 6616/1; 6617/1; 6619/1; 6620/1;</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision not based on robust and credible evidence as shown by the sustainability report.</li> <li>• Evidence is incorrect and misrepresents the issues</li> <li>• SA favours alternative location (Allington Lane)</li> <li>• No evidence Boorley Green location is justified or suitable</li> </ul> <p><b>Countryside, biodiversity, landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green field site, loss of green spaces</li> <li>• Loss of gaps between settlements e.g. Boorley Green and Hedge End, and Boorley Green and Durley</li> <li>• Impact on ecology and biodiversity (SSSI, SPA, SAC etc.)</li> <li>• Permanent loss of high quality grade 1 agricultural land</li> <li>• Site is located on high ground and will have landscape impacts</li> </ul> <p><b>Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverse impacts on drainage with flooding from run-off</li> <li>• Air pollution from traffic</li> </ul> <p><b>Community and heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of popular mature golf course facility</li> <li>• Current facilities such as schools and healthcare are already at capacity and oversubscribed</li> <li>• Proposed new school at Burnetts Lane has poor access from BO1</li> <li>• Permanent change to the character, identity and heritage of Botley and Boorley Green villages</li> <li>• Local residents do not want the community facilities used to justify the proposal</li> </ul> <p><b>Services and utilities infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewerage already over capacity</li> <li>• Site constraints: high water table, and major gas and oil pipelines cross the site</li> <li>• Adverse impacts on drainage with flooding from run-off. Considerable works to avoid this would be required</li> <li>• Adverse impacts on water resources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport impacts underestimated and proposed transport infrastructure improvements are insufficient</li> <li>• Remote location far from Eastleigh and associated employment in the town centre and at Eastleigh Riverside, shops and transport options and thus</li> </ul>	

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<p>6628/1; 6629/1; 6631/1; 6632/1; 6633/1; 6638/1; 6640/1; 6641/1; 6642/1; 6645/1; 6646/1; 6649/1; 6650/1; 6651/1; 6654/1; 6658/1; 6668/2; 6668/4; 6670/1; 6675/2; 6682/1; 6684/1; 6686/2; 6687/1; 6688/1; 6689/1; 6692/1; 6695/1; 6696/1; 6697/1; 6698/1; 6699/1; 6707/1</p>		<p>reliant on car travel. Development would be car centric</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads are already congested at peak periods and development would exacerbate existing traffic congestion problems and associated air quality impacts</li> <li>• Impacts on strategic road network - congestion at junctions 7 and 8</li> <li>• Impacts on local roads: rat runs, Maddoxford Lane not suitable or capable of handling large volumes of traffic, congestion at Maypole roundabout already at peak times. Single lane roads not appropriate. Bottleneck of traffic in Botley.</li> <li>• Botley bypass: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The delivery of development at Boorley Green was initially and critically dependent on construction of the Botley by-pass, this has now been dropped. Development not now justified to build Botley bypass.</li> <li>- Without the Botley by-pass, development at Boorley Green would lead to significant additional traffic impacts on Botley village centre.</li> <li>- Lack of clarity on funding</li> <li>- HCC have accepted there is no transport-related requirement for the Bypass.</li> <li>- Reference to the Botley bypass should be removed from the policy</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Combined with large proposals at Whiteley and Fareham will have transport impacts in the area</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few employment opportunities in the area. Development should be located nearer employment.</li> </ul> <p><b>In combination impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reasons the SDA were rejected have not gone away - impacts in combination BO2 and HE1 allocations</li> </ul> <p><b>Ageas Bowl</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has a conflict of interests between the Botley Park Golf Course development and their investment of public money in the Ageas Bowl for hotel and golf course</li> </ul> <p><b>Local Plan process and consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed allocation is inappropriately treated as a commitment within the plan, even though there is an on-going legal challenge to the decision to grant planning permission.</li> <li>• Rapid approval of the planning application is not justified and planning permission should be withdrawn and the democratic process of Examination</li> </ul>	

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<p>in Public should be allowed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire (Boorley Green vs. Allington Lane) to determine location of major development is not sound.</li> <li>• Lack of effective consultation with the community</li> <li>• Consideration not given to the needs and wishes of local communities</li> <li>• Objections from residents not taken on board</li> <li>• Consultation did not involve neighbouring parishes</li> </ul> <p><b>Covenant</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a covenant affecting the site that requires it to remain in leisure use or revert to agriculture</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Object:</b> 149/5; 294/6; 364/3; 522/8; 626/8; 763/2; 2472/3; 2571/6; 2574/13; 2577/21; 2604/12; 2877/18; 2879/7; 3223/2; 3386/8; 3447/7; 3452/3; 3515/7; 3556/22; 3569/18; 3655/6; 3665/7; 3683/13; 3728/5; 3808/14; 3848/91; 3974/12; 3992/6; 4038/10; 4042/7; 4074/1; 4098/6; 4164/12; 4186/9; 4226/10; 4332/6; 4346/4; 4352/12; 4487/5; 4515/8; 4543/4; 4622/18; 4623/43; 4643/10; 4668/9; 4680/2; 4704/12; 4706/11; 4718/8; 4722/6; 4726/21; 4727/6; 4744/8; 4786/7; 4794/9; 4839/13; 4865/12; 4895/4; 4902/5; 4906/17; 4911/8; 4914/3; 4915/3; 4916/3; 4932/6; 4944/11; 4948/11; 5004/9; 5009/8; 5010/6; 5014/7; 5079/24; 5099/6; 5116/3; 5131/10; 5159/6; 5171/4; 5172/6; 5178/10; 5402/2; 5441/9; 5442/9;</p>	<p>BO1 Objection (alternative location)</p>	<p>Allington Lane was dismissed without due consideration and is a more appropriate and sustainable site. The site is closer to Eastleigh town centre and employment areas and has better transport links. Allington Lane was favoured in the Hampshire County Structure Plan.</p>	<p>None</p>

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
5634/4; 5657/9; 5692/5; 5697/3; 5711/6; 5762/3; 5795/4; 5799/2; 5801/9; 5810/4; 5878/6; 5909/4; 5958/2; 6017/5; 6273/2; 6353/2; 6395/3; 6564/3; 6611/11; 6617/1; 6628/1; 6629/1; 6641/1; 6642/1; 6649/1; 6668/4; 6682/1; 6684/1; 6692/1; 6699/1; 6707/1			
<b>Object:</b> 2577/21; 3447/7; 3569/18; 3665/7; 3683/13; 4727/6; 4622/18; 4623/43; 4668/9; 4895/4; 4902/5; 5657/9; 6611/11	BO1 Objection (alternative location)	Another reasonable and more appropriate alternative location is land north of Hedge End.	None
<b>Object:</b> 2472/3	BO1 Objection (alternative location)	Another reasonable and more appropriate alternative north of West End	None
<b>Object:</b> 1440/16	BO1	Considers the allocation is not deliverable in the plan period because of the judicial review	None
<b>Object:</b> 5108/31	6.3.17	Paragraph 6.3.17 should be updated to reflect the conclusion that a HRA is not required in association with the proposed development, on the basis of a previous HRA screening determination (see planning application: O/12/71514). Detailed changes to this paragraph are proposed.	None
<b>Object:</b> 101/115; 149/6; 179/10; 626/10; 763/3; 2472/5; 3884/10; 3992/7; 4801/15; 4802/14; 4911/10; 5131/11; 5146/10; 5441/11; 5442/11; 5657/10; 5801/8; 5855/5; 6675/3	BO2	<p><b>Strategy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Together with BO1 and HE1 the proposed level of new development in Botley is inappropriate, disproportionate and unsustainable.</li> <li>• Not based on credible or robust evidence</li> </ul> <p><b>Countryside, biodiversity and landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irrecoverable damage to the environment- loss of grade 1 and 2 farmland, impacts on nature conservation designations</li> <li>• Loss of gap between settlements</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient road infrastructure – existing problems with traffic congestion and associated air pollution and development would leader to greater traffic</li> </ul>	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<p>problems and adversely affect road safety. Proposed improvements are largely cosmetic. No indications of phasing or funding of the Botley bypass</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combined impacts with proposals in Whiteley and Fareham</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient local employment</li> <li>• Remote from employment, Eastleigh and Southampton</li> </ul> <p><b>Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would increase the existing problems with flooding and sewerage infrastructure which is already overloaded and subject to capacity constraints</li> </ul> <p><b>Community</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local schools and healthcare are at capacity</li> <li>• Development will add to urban sprawl</li> <li>• Destroy local communities, damaging the historic and unique parish of Botley, loss of recreation opportunities</li> <li>• No evidence of effective consultation with local residents and views of local residents have been ignored</li> </ul> <p><b>Other policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development is contrary to other policies in the Plan, e.g. DM15, DM23, DM31, and wider Council objectives</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 149/6; 626/10; 763/3; 2472/5; 3884/10; 3992/7; 5131/11; 5657/10; 5801/8	BO2 Objection (alternative location)	Allington Lane is a more suitable site.	<b>Object:</b> 149/6, 626/10, 763/3, 2472/5, 3884/10, 3992/7, 5131/11, 5657/10, 5801/8
<b>Object:</b> 5657/10	BO2 Objection (alternative location)	North of Hedge End is a more suitable site	<b>Object:</b> 5657/10
<b>Object:</b> 2472/5	BO2 Objection (alternative location)	North of West End is a more suitable site	<b>Object:</b> 2472/5
<b>Object:</b> 4564/14	BO2 Objection	Objects to possible relocation of allotments. Local residents should decide what is an equivalent or better site.	<b>Object:</b> 4564/14
<b>Object:</b> 804/140	BO2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should allow for more flexibility in housing numbers to cover the potential that could arise, e.g. from moving the power lines.</li> <li>• Object to the requirement for access to the site via the Botley bypass. Need</li> </ul>	<b>Object:</b> 804/140

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<p>for Botley bypass has not been proven. Use of the bypass as an access for development would conflict with its role as a bypass and prevent effective place-making and layout of the site. It would also introduce air quality issues for the new development. Prepared to safeguard a route through the site for a bypass in the longer term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should require retention of vehicular access to Newhouse Farm. Policy should enable the inclusion of small scale office development (use class B1a) within the site – would complement the residential development and would not have a detrimental effect on local centres or conflict with the PUSH “city centres first” principle.</li> <li>• Object to the requirements for 1.2ha of allotments and for a new cemetery neither of which is fairly related to the development. Alternative policy wording suggested.</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 6251/30	BO2	The allocation contains a rural public right of way. The value of this likely to be degraded by the development through urbanisation and this does not appear to have been recognised despite its location suggesting a high level of use. There is currently no development specification to offset any such degradation by increasing the quantity or quality of the public right of way network locally, so as to be consistent with policy DM1 vi, (wording suggested)	Accepted. See proposed change to policy BO2 and addition to supporting text of DM1, paragraph 5.7.
<b>Object:</b> 6251/31	BO3 Objection	Unclear whether this road will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats - careful consideration should be given regarding how the impacts can be mitigated such that impacts are minimised, and residual impacts fully compensated. It is also unclear what the route of the road will be beyond the borough boundary. Until all the relevant local authorities have agreed the route, this policy may be considered undeliverable and hence be unsound. In addition, this road severs Priority Biodiversity Links and as such the additional mitigation should be specified to compensate for this. Lastly the road will sever and degrade two public rights of way.	Accept in part. See update of Sustainability Appraisal and proposed change to the supporting text of policy DM1, paragraph 5.7.
<b>Object:</b> 804/141; 5965/8; 6658/2; 6659/1	BO3	Unrealistic, unjustified and misleading – policy and references elsewhere should be removed or kept as safeguarded link only. HCC is willing to reserve as safeguarded route. Hampshire County Council and Winchester City Council have stated their position that there is no transport justification, or evidence that the proposal is viable or deliverable and is unlikely to come forward/not needed in the plan period.	None
<b>Object:</b> 101/114; 4038/11; 4726/25; 5136/11; 6658/2	BO3	Lack of clarity over funding. S106 contributions from the proposed developments will not be enough to fund the Bypass.	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 6663/1	BO3	Local Plan text relating to policy BO3 (para. 6.3.24) suggests that the North Whiteley development will affect traffic through Botley. There is no requirement for the bypass arising from the North Whiteley development. North Whiteley transport assessment is not complete but transport modelling has been completed which indicates that this development will have an immaterial impact on Botley village. HCC as highway authority and the Highways Agency support these conclusions. EBC's transport assessment demonstrates that the bypass will increase traffic across the local network in peak periods. The reference to North Whiteley should be deleted from para. 6.3.24.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4038/11; 5136/11	BO3	The By-Pass is not wanted by residents if it means 2,500 more homes will be built in Botley & Boorley Green. This was confirmed by a local Residents' survey carried out in December 2011.	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/141	BO3	Requirement to use Botley bypass as an access for the development proposed in site allocation BO2 does not respond to master-planning and urban design concerns raised by HCC as landowner	None
<b>Object:</b> 697/13	BO3	This policy should show the whole of the proposed route rather than just the section in Eastleigh. Without knowing the full route proposed we are unable to assess if this is the most appropriate route in terms of its impacts on nature conservation. Concerns that this proposal may not be deliverable over the Local Plan period	None
<b>Object:</b> 1895/9	BO3	Supports principle- It would benefit those living and working in Hedge End and Whiteley, and would also open up the area around Botley Station for development and relieve congestion from Botley centre. Objections to the Botley Bypass from HCC and Winchester City Council suggest a failure of these authorities and Eastleigh BC to cooperate.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4668/11	BO3	If the Council are determined to use the route along Woodhouse Lane to Maypole Roundabout residents will have significant problems existing safely from their properties. If the by-pass is to go down Woodhouse Lane it should be some yards North of the existing road so that there is scope to enable cars to pull out from existing properties safely.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4704/14	BO3	Objects to BO3 on the following grounds: Add to, and move, existing air pollution problems in the Botley area; Add to congestion at Maypole roundabout; Loss of passing trade for Botley businesses.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4726/25	BO3	Objects to BO3 on grounds that it is no longer a pre-requisite of development elsewhere in the area e.g. Boorley Green.	None
<b>Object:</b> 840/142	BO4	<b>Viability</b> – cannot be delivered unless funding is secured – the policy should make this clear.	Accepted. See proposed change to para. 6.3.29.

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Section 6.4; Bursledon</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 655/57; 5048/33; 6530/11; 6690/1; 6690/2;	BU1	<p><b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site encroaches into countryside</li> <li>• valuable tree cover and a watercourse will be lost</li> <li>• there are natural heritage interests to the north</li> <li>• the wildlife corridor from the river bank up to the Windmill Conservation Area and between the proposed new developments between the A27 and the M27 will be destroyed or fragmented</li> <li>• objection to the inclusion of criterion vii on the grounds that it is not necessary as there is already provision for 15m buffer</li> <li>• because the neighbouring nature conservation site is in private third party ownership, it is unreasonable to ask for contributions as future residents would not have access, and both the developer and Council have no control over the management of the site</li> <li>• the site currently forms part of a local gap</li> <li>• development here would erode the setting of the Bursledon Windmill Conservation Area and has the potential for adverse impact on sites subject to European nature conservation designations</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• would increase traffic congestion at Windhover roundabout</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Density</b> – support for the policy but it could accommodate more than 25 dwellings</li> <li>• <b>Design</b> – communities will be separated in Bursledon;</li> <li>• <b>Residential amenities</b> - there are access and noise-related difficulties; poor relationship to key facilities;</li> <li>• <b>Ground conditions</b> – the ground levels will present difficulties; the site may be contaminated;</li> </ul> <p><b>Misc</b> - there is no commitment to delivery - this site should be deleted from the plan; this is a windfall site that it is not deliverable or developable as required by the NPPF and it is therefore inappropriate to allocate this site for housing in the plan; the proposal does not accord with Policy S1, sustainability principles or Policy DM7 (pollution);</p>	None
<b>Support:</b> 6690	BU1	Support the inclusion of this site as an allocation.	None

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<p><b>Object:</b> 655/58; 697/14; 4863/15; 6350/12;</p>	<p>BU2</p>	<p><b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the site forms part of the green backdrop for Bursledon, is prominent in local views including from the River Hamble</li> <li>• trees will be lost</li> <li>• high quality agricultural land will be lost</li> <li>• the site is too close to the River Hamble and therefore conflicts with spirit of Policy S10</li> <li>• development has the potential to adversely affect sites subject to European nature conservation designations the proposal is therefore at odds with other policies of the Local Plan (S5, DM1, DM9, DM10 and DM15)</li> <li>• the wildlife corridor from the river bank up to the Windmill Conservation Area and between the proposed new developments between the A27 and the M27 will be destroyed or fragmented</li> <li>• the site falls within the zone of influence for Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project - the Wildlife Trust wishes to see this recognised within the policy, not just in the supporting text</li> <li>• landscape impact of development (site serves an important gap function);</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increased traffic congestion on A27</li> <li>• accessibility is extremely poor and access will be hard to achieve;</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Residential amenities</b> –</li> <li>• <b>Flooding</b> - the site is at risk of flooding</li> <li>• <b>Site conditions</b> – site is not close to local services;</li> <li>• <b>Alternative sites</b> - there is a preferable, more sustainable site that could be allocated for housing development meeting the needs of the area west of Hamble Lane; the employment and traveller activity on this site raises questions about site availability;</li> <li>• <b>Misc</b> – the site is close to the railway station but remote from shops and other local facilities.</li> </ul>	<p>None</p>
<p><b>Object:</b> 5048/34; 5124/28; 5619/3; 6251/32;</p>	<p>BU3</p>	<p><b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• landscape impact of development (site serves an important gap function)</li> <li>• site abuts nature conservation interests;</li> <li>• the proposal will result in the loss of ancient woodland – this is not consistent with the NPPF (Policy 118 which suggests planning permission should be refused where the result would be loss of irreplaceable habitats unless</li> </ul>	<p>None</p>

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<p>development in that location would outweigh the loss (6251/32)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is lack of clarity on the scope for replacing any lost woodland with that of an equivalent area and biodiversity function (6251/32)</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection to criterion i of as it should be acknowledged that the proposal does not necessitate the Sunday's Hill Bypass. The need for a bypass is in fact generated by other developments in the vicinity of Botley, Hedge End and Boorley Green</li> <li>accessibility is extremely poor and access will be hard to achieve;</li> <li>a new road (Policy BU4) is neither viable nor necessary;</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Alternative sites</b> - the employment and traveller activity on this site raises questions about site availability;</li> <li><b>Infrastructure</b> - site is not close to local services;</li> <li><b>Viability</b> - there is no demonstrable commitment to housing delivery and the policy should be deleted</li> <li><b>Misc</b> - land should be allocated to provide for the replacement of the existing facilities. The assistance of the Council in identifying such a site is requested.</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 5124/29	6.4.26	Paragraph 6.4.26 should be updated to reflect the conclusion that a HRA is not required in association with the proposed development, on the basis of a previous HRA screening determination.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4038/12; 6564/5;	BU4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sundays Hill is not currently a bottle neck</li> <li>No justification as there is no current congestion at this location</li> </ul>	None
<b>Support:</b> 5108/32	BU4	Support for BU4 and confirmation that the proposed Sunday's Hill Bypass will accord with the requirements of this policy.	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 5108/33; 5124/31	6.4.30	Paragraph 6.4.30 should be updated to reflect the conclusion that a HRA is not required in association with the proposed development, on the basis of a previous HRA screening determination. Detailed changes to this paragraph are proposed.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6250/1	BU7	The policy does not consider the plot size of the property - each extension should be considered on its own merits. Alternative wording suggested.	None
<b>Section 6.5; Chandler's Ford</b>			
<b>Support:</b> 2257/24	6.5.7	It is anticipated that the proposed development in Test Valley is unlikely to have a significant adverse effect in the context of existing traffic flows and movements arising from other sources.	n/a

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 2125/9	CF1	There is doubt as to whether this site is available or deliverable for the proposed 85 dwellings.	None
<b>Object:</b> 2125/10	CF2	It is unnecessary to specify that access should be off Hursley Road and the opening up of the culvert is an unnecessary requirement as the stream will remain culverted up-stream and down-stream.	None
<b>Support:</b> 6591/18	CF2	Support for; the approach to flood risk in the policy in terms of the layout of the dwellings; criterion iv which requires the opening up of the culverted section of the Monks Brook which runs across the site.	n/a
<b>Support:</b> 6591/17	CF3	Supports intention of this policy to ensure development takes account of flood risk within the site and be supported by a flood risk assessment and flood mitigation proposals	n/a
<b>Support:</b> 2257/23	CF4	Support for contributions towards new cycleway on Bournemouth Road linking Chilworth and Chandlers Ford as this aligns with the Councils Cycle Strategy and Network SPD. It will be important to ensure cumulative highway implications including offsite parking of development in this area are taken into account.	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 619/14; 3179/32; 4624/20;	CF4	<p><b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the local gap will be lost</li> <li>the site should be set aside for outdoor activities .</li> <li>it would be preferable not to develop the site at all.</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New employment uses in this area will introduce a greater need for parking and will cause congestion.</li> <li>The policy should be amended to require proposed uses to provide sufficient parking.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to the shortage of burial space this land should be used as burial space suitable for woodland burials. Allocating the land for this purpose would also retain its function as part of the strategic gap between Chandler's Ford and Southampton.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Section 6.6; Eastleigh</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 619/3; 804/143; 1895/10; 1906/6; 2182/2; 3179/30; 4557/23; 4624/19; 5161/23; 5188/13; 5684/3; 5975/3; 5980/4; 6251/33; 6432/2; 6622/1; 6623/1;	E1	<p><b>Adverse impacts on the environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>major development (including mineral extraction) is likely to be inappropriate due to the loss of and damage to a historic landscape; proposal is contrary to vision, objectives and policies S12 and DM10 of the local plan;</li> <li>development would lead to a loss of gap and green space;</li> </ul>	Accept in part – see proposed change to paragraph 6.6.17 (reference to open space removed) in response Natural England (6251/33)

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
6627/1; 6672/1; 6701/3; 6702/3; 6703/3; 6704/3; 6705/3; 6706/3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development would have adverse impacts on wildlife;</li> <li>• development would have adverse impacts on local air and water quality;</li> <li>• policy should be more flexible to allow a lower density of/fewer dwellings to avoid adverse impacts;</li> <li>• the SA has not treated this site in a comparable manner to other options for the local plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local infrastructure is not sufficient</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• concerns that water supply and drainage infrastructure are insufficient;</li> <li>• not satisfied that the proposal will avoid adverse impacts on the local highway network/M27 junction 5;</li> <li>• the impacts of climate change on flood risk have not been considered;</li> <li>• development is likely to increase local flood risk;</li> <li>• higher quality pedestrian, cycle and public transport links are required between the site and Southampton/Southampton Airport.</li> </ul> <p><b>Amenity impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• concern about the large scale of development and its impact on Stoneham Golf Club/Course;</li> <li>• access must be provided for anglers fishing at Avenue Pond;</li> <li>• concern about the impact of development on noise and water quality for fishing and the value of Avenue Pond as a result;</li> <li>• concern that development would result in a loss of public open space (6251/33); concern about feasibility of access from Chestnut Avenue (suggests flexibility in policy wording).</li> </ul> <p><b>Deliverability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• section 106 contributions are not justified (do not always reasonably relate to the proposed development);</li> <li>• unclear whether 1,100 new dwellings can be developed due to landscape sensitivities and open space contributions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site should be allocated for employment use</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site is highly accessible and could be developed for a science park or corporate offices; it would be an adequate replacement for land at Eastleigh River Side.</li> </ul>	No other changes are proposed.
<b>Support:</b> 2257/22	E1	Support for reference to Forest Park proposals; support for continued joint working and masterplanning to ensure that cross-boundary infrastructure requirements are addressed.	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Object:</b> 6701/4; 6702/4; 6703/4; 6704/4; 6705/4; 6706/4	E2	Site should be retained for employment use but the policy is insufficient to ensure this outcome	None
<b>Support:</b> 6509/8	E2	Disused sites such as E2 should be regenerated	None
<b>Object:</b> 6618/1	E4	Increased traffic and parking congestion on Toynbee Road will affect safety at the primary school	None
<b>Object:</b> 6667/1	E6	Restrictions on the change of A1 retail and D2 assembly and leisure floorspace do not constitute a flexible approach to the future role of town centres and the need to be resilient to future economic change (alternative wording suggested).	Accept – see proposed change to policy E6 (ii)(b)
<b>Object:</b> 804/144; 1895/11; 2238/1; 3162/23; 6575/8	E9	<p><b>Policy E9 is unrealistic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is unlikely to deliver the high-value uses that are envisaged; the local plan should recognise its potential for lower-value or rail-related uses; policy E9 fails to show how Eastleigh River Side can fulfil its economic potential within current financial constraints</li> </ul> <p><b>Air quality, congestion and amenity issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy should clarify that development will not be permitted if it is likely to have adverse impacts on transport or air quality; development should not have a negative impact on local air quality/the Air Quality Management Area; criterion g) should be amended to protect the amenity of residents on Southampton Road</li> </ul> <p><b>Barton Park (part i)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater flexibility is required for residential development at Barton Park, to assist with the construction of a new link road (development criterion c)</li> </ul> <p><b>The provision of a new link road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan should be clear that a new link road is not economically viable in the plan period; the requirement to plan a route for a new link road (development criterion c) is unjustified and should be deleted</li> </ul>	Accept in part – see proposed change to policy E9 (g)
<b>Object:</b> 3162/23	6.6.47	Clarity is required that multiple access points will be acceptable for future economic development at Eastleigh River Side	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/145; 6575/9	E10	Policy criteria for E10 should require no adverse impacts on the existing road network or to air quality	None
<b>Object:</b> 100/5; 804/146; 6484/16	E11	Upgrades to the B3037 (including the Twyford Road roundabout) will not reduce congestion and could have adverse impacts on other parts of the network. The proposed junction improvements may also be undeliverable (funding needs to be clarified).	Accept in part – see proposed change to paragraph 6.6.55.
<b>Object:</b> 3162/24; 3162/20; 6657/2	E12	<p><b>Omission of proposals for hotel development</b></p> <p>The local plan should support the potential for a new hotel on land known as the</p>	None

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		Pig Farm. This land should be allocated under policy E12. <b>The provision of a new link road</b> The requirement to plan for a new link road will restrict the airport's strategic development and should be removed.	
<b>Object:</b> 6657/7	6.6.59	The existing text does not reflect the local and regional economic importance of the airport. Amendments are suggested.	Accept in part. See proposed change to paragraph 6.6.59.
<b>Object:</b> 804/147	E13	Policy E13 should be deleted unless land is required to mitigate the impacts of development at Chestnut Avenue (policy E1) on local playing field provision.	None
<b>Section 6.7; Fair Oak and Horton Heath</b>			
<b>Support:</b> 5780/2	6.7.5	Buildings in the centre of Fair Oak could do with demolition and complete replacement, to help refurbish the local centre.	None
<b>Object:</b> 5780/3; 6393/3	FO1	<p><b>Principle/Scale of Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Represents an entire years worth of houses (as proposed by PUSH) for the entire borough at this site - smaller amount of land should be allocated</li> <li>• Impact on character of village</li> <li>• Alternative brownfield site available at Ford or at Allington Lane</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on roads and education provision</li> </ul> <p><b>Access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would increase traffic congestion on Bishopstoke Road, Alan Drayton Way and Fair Oak Road</li> <li>• Unclear how access from Hardings Lane will be restricted to emergency use, which is concerning because of problems with parking on Hardings Lane;</li> <li>• Emergency access removable bollards a "get around" as once built would request for the removal of bollards lead to access anyway</li> <li>• Applications for the site previously rejected on basis of road access</li> <li>• Concerns about cyclist safety</li> </ul> <p><b>Open Space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals for maintaining the proposed open space (2.9ha) would harm the biodiversity that has become established on this site (e.g. young oak trees and butterflies);</li> </ul> <p><b>Amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and light pollution from proposed development will have impacts on bats and owls and opportunities for astronomy.</li> </ul>	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern is raised regarding mineral extraction</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 6251/34	FO1	Would like to see the woodland buffer to be greater than 15m, so as to deliver a net gain for biodiversity, and render the woodland ecology more resilient to climate change. Advisory only.	None
<b>Support:</b> 5780/4	FO1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offers the opportunity to resolve problems with parking on Hardings Lane.</li> <li>Offers protection for the nature conservation interests of Stoke Park Woods SINC and Crowdhill Copse SINC.</li> <li>Retains the meadow in the southwest sector of the site, designated as a nature area.</li> <li>The demolition of ruined buildings in the southwest sector.</li> </ul>	N/a
<b>Object:</b> 6511/3	FO2	Support for the principle of the policy, but objects to the delineation of the northern boundary. It is logical to extend the allocation to maximise the development potential of the site, to maximise development potential without breaching environmental constraints. A preferred boundary is submitted.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4638/4; 6680/1	FO2	<p><b>Access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The access to the site as set out in the policy would be an incline steeper than 1 in 10. HCC are unlikely to adopt a 1 in 10 road and concern is raised on the maintenance and safety.</li> <li>Road safety especially in cold weather conditions, only main roads are grit treated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Topography</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Topography is unsuitable for development of 30 dwellings due to the steep incline and levels involved.</li> <li>Invasion of privacy, new residents will be looking into existing homes</li> <li>Landscape and visual impact.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on wildlife and nature conservation.</li> <li>Impacts of flooding from surface water.</li> <li>Light pollution.</li> <li>Loss of agricultural land.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 5715/5	FO2	Objects to the inclusion of a small strip of land directly adjacent to Glebe Court within the proposed allocation. The exclusion of this land from the area to be developed would make a significant difference to the quality of life for new and existing residents, and for local wildlife. This land enables the natural drainage of surface water. Strongly opposed to any form of access to FO2 via Glebe Court	None

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		due to existing parking and traffic issues, whilst access via Mortimers Lane could include speed calming measures. There are problems with local sewers, so new properties should not be connected to the current network without upgrades. Suggest only bungalow properties are build to protect amenity of existing residents as a result of the topography. The proposed amendments to the urban edge as these affect policy FO2 are however supported and should be adhered to.	
<b>Object:</b> 6700/4	FO5	Support for this policy in general terms, however the policy wording should be more flexible to enable a comprehensive scheme involving an element of residential development alongside employment uses, which would assist the delivery of a consolidated employment development. An addendum to the policy wording is proposed.	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/148	FO6	Not certain that the proposal is deliverable. HCC as highway authority is unlikely to be able to fund the improvements listed in the plan period unless substantial funding is available from other sources. Must be shown to be deliverable before development can proceed. Funding for the scheme needs to be clarified. Policy should be amended to state that delivery is subject to funding.	Accept – see proposed new paragraph 6.7.33A
<b>Section 6.8; Hamble-le-Rice</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 1440/15	HA1	<b>Highways</b> Proposed parking south of the station is not deliverable and is inadequate to meet future needs. The policy should specify improved parking plus park and ride, and improved pedestrian links.	None
<b>Object:</b> 5967/4	HA2	<b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature conservation value needs to be managed long-term. The supporting text should refer to the need for joint working with local authorities and statutory consultees</li> <li>There is currently no public access to the Mound. Reference should be made to exploring opportunities for public access as part of the development brief and masterplan.</li> </ul> <b>Flood Risk</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With reference to the sequential approach – the policy should be amended to acknowledge that alternative locations may be acceptable in exceptional circumstances</li> </ul> <b>Misc</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no fuelling facilities to retain;</li> <li>There is no intention by the operator to provide a slipway;</li> </ul>	Accepted in part. See proposed changes to policy HA2.

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Policies Map should be amended to show land currently used for boat storage near the northern entrance to the site</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 6674/1	HA3	HA3 should be deleted on the grounds that; it unnecessary duplicates policy 20 of the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and unreasonably requires the site to be restored in a different manner than is required in the adopted minerals plan.	None
<b>Section 6.9; Hedge End</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 82/7; 101/121; 149/7; 179/7; 626/9; 763/4; 2472/4; 3244/32; 3665/8; 3725/17; 3808/15; 3848/90; 3884/11; 3917/19; 3992/8; 4027/5; 4069/2; 4346/5; 4352/13; 4487/6; 4643/11; 4668/12; 4686/6; 4704/13; 4706/9; 4706/10; 4726/22; 4727/7; 4759/4; 4801/14; 4802/13; 4911/9; 4914/4; 4915/4; 4916/4; 4928/13; 4939/14; 4944/12; 5059/7; 5126/15; 5131/12; 5137/12; 5146/11; 5441/10; 5442/10; 5657/11; 5795/5; 5801/7; 5855/2; 6251/35; 6353/3; 6658/3; 6661/1; 6675/4; 6686/3; 6701/5; 6702/5; 6703/5; 6704/5; 6705/5; 6706/5	HE1	<p><b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would diminish the visual gap between Hedge End and Botley</li> <li>The Sustainability Appraisal has not treated this site in a fair and comparable manner to the option for land north of Hedge End. Further evidence is required to justify the allocation or it must be considered unjustified and undeliverable.</li> <li>Irreversible impact on the countryside, green space and village community</li> <li>There is no adequate assessment of, or mitigation measures to protect the Upper Hamble SPA from increased residential disturbance</li> <li>Development would lead to a loss of high quality agricultural land and would contravene policies DM14 and DM15</li> <li>Development would irrevocably damage the environment and remove recreational opportunities</li> <li>The site contains a public right-of-way which will be degraded by the development – this should be addressed in the policy (6251/35 – Natural England)</li> <li>Will cause damage to wildlife value</li> <li>Will cause increased light, air and noise pollution</li> </ul> <p><b>NPPF</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development is inconsistent with paras 34, 109, 110 and 112 of the NPPF</li> <li>Not positively prepared as it does not create better conditions for current and future population. Not consistent with national policy as will not improve the environment</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development will overload the local and wider road network by generating more car journeys - this will cause air pollution and congestion</li> <li>Development would have an adverse effect on road safety</li> <li>The new secondary school at Burnett's Lane has poor access from HE1</li> </ul>	Accept in part. See proposed change to the supporting text of policy DM1, paragraph 5.7 in response to Natural England (6251/35).

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Botley Bypass is unlikely to be built and in any event will not mitigate transport impacts</li> <li>• The transport assessment is too optimistic and not credible</li> </ul> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location is not sustainable - Hedge End does not have the facilities which people will require</li> <li>• The site is too far from the main employment locations of Southampton and Eastleigh</li> <li>• Too far from main transport links (M7 and the) airport</li> <li>• The distance between HE1 and Hedge End centre is too great</li> <li>• HE1 is also remote from other settlements</li> <li>• It has no relationship with the existing settlement at Hedge End;</li> <li>• The development will cause the coalescence of existing settlements</li> <li>• The council has not followed the findings of its own assessments regarding the location of new development</li> </ul> <p><b>Viability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is uncertainty about the capacity, deliverability, and developability of this site and the timescales for delivery.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are other sites that suffer from fewer constraints and fulfil the intentions of the local plan to a greater extent.</li> <li>• Land north of Hedge End would be a better location for development</li> <li>• Allington Lane would: be a more sustainable location for development; assist the regeneration of Eastleigh town centre; support a new school and link better with existing educational centres; would negate the need for the development of other greenfield sites such as Boorley Green, Horton Heath, Woodhouse Lane) ; have the potential to be a self-sustaining community;</li> <li>• Smaller developments in a number of villages would be a better alternative</li> <li>• The SA and the Hampshire Structure Plan favour the Allington Lane site</li> </ul> <p><b>Flood Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a severe flood risk due to surface water run-off and flood plain capacity being exceeded</li> <li>• The site has a high water table which will result in flooding</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wastewater infrastructure is insufficient and there are no sustainable plans to improve it</li> </ul>	

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are secondary school capacity constraints but the proposed new school at Burnett's Lane has poor access from HE1</li> <li>• Lack of employment, medical and educational facilities to accommodate the increase in population</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The criteria for the selection of HE1 have been inequitably applied</li> <li>• The proposal does not take into account the recession which will make the site unviable</li> <li>• Development would add to the urban sprawl of Eastleigh and Southampton</li> <li>• There is no evidence of effective consultation with local residents</li> <li>• The scale of development is too large</li> <li>• The development will encourage buy-to-let and second-home ownership</li> <li>• There is an oil pipeline through the site</li> <li>• Would damage the historic parish of Botley</li> <li>• There may be oil reserves under the site</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 804/149	HE1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to the requirement to provide 11 ha of public open space and financial contributions - the development does not give rise to this level of recreational need.</li> <li>• Objection to the requirements for this site to contribute to the Botley Bypass/ footpath and cycle links – not consistent with national policy requirements regarding developer contributions</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 5576/4; 4941/7; 6704/6; 6703/6; 6702/6; 6705/6; 6706/6; 6721/1; 6715/1; 6701/6;	HE2	<p><b>Countryside, landscape and biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of valuable wildlife habitat which should be compensated (NPPF)</li> <li>• Landscape buffer along north edge needs to be of sufficient width and planting - it should not be incorporated into gardens.</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is insufficient capacity on local roads to accommodate the increase in traffic</li> <li>• Transport assessment is inadequate (particularly in relation to the southern part of Hedge End</li> </ul> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate density and scale of development in this location</li> <li>• The site will be badly affected by noise from the M27</li> <li>• This site would be more suitable for hotel or employment uses</li> <li>• The SA has not treated this site in a fair and comparable manner to land north of Hedge End</li> </ul>	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The residential allocation should be extended south to Peewit Hill Close to bring the total up to 185 dwellings</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land at Home Farm should be included in HE2 – the land is partly brownfield and can be integrated with Hedge End</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Future residents will suffer unacceptable noise and pollution</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 6715/2; 6271/3;	HE4	<p><b>Alternative sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land at Home Farm should be included in HE2 – the land is partly brownfield and can be integrated with hedge end</li> <li>This site should be extended to the south of the new link road (policy HE8) to accommodate further employment development (with class B1b, B1c and B8, or alternatively new roadside uses, i.e. hotel (within class C1) or restaurant/public house/drive-thru units (within classes A3 and A4).</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 3364/2;	HE5	<p><b>Alternative Sites/Uses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy does not allow mixed use development - there is a concern that the entire site could remain vacant if it is allocated solely for employment purposes; a mixed housing and employment scheme would be more sustainable and in accordance with the NPPF.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Support:</b> 1906/8	HE6	Respondent welcomes further discussions between the two authorities to consider the management of these two sites at Netley Firs as this site is progressed	None
<b>Object:</b> 6678/1	HE7	The HE7 allocation would have a negative impact on the adjacent employment site (HE6). If HE7 was replaced with the development strategy of HE6 it would increase the potential volume of industrial units.	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/150; 5576/5;	HE8	<p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about potential for increased traffic routing through Dodwell Lane to access the A27</li> <li>Objects on the grounds that it would increase traffic congestion .</li> <li>Lack of detailed transport assessment in relation to the southern part of Hedge End</li> </ul>	None
<b>Support:</b> 6657/6;	HE10	Supports for the proposal to work with train operators and Network Rail to achieve improvements to Hedge End railway station.	None

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
<b>Section 6.11; West End</b>			
<p><b>Chapter 6 Parish Policies:</b> <b>West End Object:</b> 804/151; 2195/10; 2210/10; 4913/13; 6394/7; 6477/4; 6484/15; 6509/7; 6599/1; 6612/1; 6669/1; 6675/5; 6700/6; 6701/14; 6702/14; 6703/14; 6704/14; 6705/14; 6706/14;</p>	<p><b>WE1</b></p>	<p>Object to proposed residential development west of Horton Heath because:</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor location for development of this scale</li> <li>• Alternative sites dismissed without reasonable justification</li> <li>• Poor connections to existing settlement</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential density is too high</li> <li>• Policy should allow early development of parts of the site – requirement for a masterplan is too restrictive</li> <li>• Object to 200 increase in dwelling numbers between revised draft and revised pre-submission versions of Local Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about intensification of activity at the Chalcroft Business Park</li> </ul> <p><b>Countryside, landscape, biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green field site</li> <li>• Loss of gaps between settlements</li> <li>• Impact on biodiversity</li> <li>• Significant landscape impacts</li> </ul> <p><b>Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urbanisation will worsen climate change</li> <li>• Area is at risk from flooding</li> <li>• Will increase noise and air pollution</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Horton Heath is poorly served by roads</li> <li>• Roads are already congested</li> <li>• No complete transport solutions are on offer.</li> <li>• Public transport is inadequate and roads are too crowded for a bus service to operate.</li> <li>• Poor access to alternative transport modes so occupiers will use the car.</li> <li>• Major road-building is needed</li> <li>• New link road will not resolve traffic issues.</li> <li>• Fir Tree Lane cannot take any increase in traffic. Pavement should be retained – used by school children.</li> <li>• Policy should propose measures to control traffic using Fir Tree Lane – lane</li> </ul>	<p>Accept in part. See proposed changes to policy WE1(iv) and paragraph 6.6.16.</p>

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<p>should be closed to through traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept benefits of link between Burnett’s Lane and Bubb Lane but concerned about impact on links to M27 junctions 7 and 8 and through Bishopstoke and Fair Oak.</li> <li>• No justification for contribution to Botley bypass.</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure must be in place before development commences</li> </ul> <p><b>Community</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed school is too close to existing school at Wyvern, distant from West End</li> <li>• Schools should be located at Jacksons Farm north of Hedge End – would help to rationalise catchments.</li> <li>• Secondary school should be located at Woodhouse Lane, Hedge End.</li> <li>• Secondary school should not be built at Horton Heath.</li> <li>• School should be increased in size to 9-form entry and site area should be specified as 12ha, with pick-up and drop off located with new community facilities.</li> <li>• Plans should refer to HCC Children’s Services in masterplanning and design of schools.</li> <li>• Plan is based in migration which has a detrimental impact on existing residents</li> <li>• Loss of character of the area – Horton Heath is a small rural village – development will change this to its detriment.</li> <li>• Scale of development will swamp the existing community.</li> <li>• Inadequate local services.</li> <li>• Remote from the centre of Fair Oak</li> </ul> <p><b>Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No consultation on 200 increase in dwelling numbers</li> <li>• Proposal goes against overwhelming community rejection of the original proposal for 750 dwellings.</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 6701/14; 6702/14; 6703/14; 6704/14; 6705/14; 6706/14	<b>WE1</b> Object (alternative locations)	Land north of Hedge End should be allocated for residential development instead of land west of Horton Heath.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4913/13	<b>WE1</b> Object	A more appropriate alternative to Horton Heath exists on land to the south of Bishopstoke and west of Allington Lane.	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
	(alternative locations)		
<b>Object:</b> 2210/10	<b>WE1</b> Object (alternative locations)	Middle Farm is better related to Fair Oak and a better place for a primary school.	None
<b>Support:</b> 4557/28; 4557/29; 6251/36; 6694/1; 6714/4	<b>WE1</b>	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provision of new link road but it should be delivered before development of site WE1</li> <li>comprehensive landscape framework</li> </ul> Concerns expressed but no changes sought to policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development brief does not need to include a masterplan</li> <li>Development should not be expected to pay for the new secondary school. The need for this is not generated by the new development.</li> </ul>	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 6218/3; 6218/4	<b>WE5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimated capacity of site should be increased to 200 dwellings as additional land surplus to NHS requirements will be available during plan period.</li> <li>Exclude West End surgery which operates independently and Moorgreen Farm which is in another ownership, has its own access and should be treated as a separate allocation.</li> <li>Object to reference to continuing need for health-care facilities – this is not supported by evidence and should be deleted.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Object:</b> 804/152	<b>WE6</b>	HCC as highway authority is concerned about the impact of additional traffic from Chalcroft on the local road network.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6694/3;	<b>WE6</b>	Without the link road the policy is more restrictive than the current policy. WE6(i) is more restrictive than policy WE1 in respect of the requirement for no conflict with adjoining land uses. Amenity of existing users is already protected by national policies.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6694/2	<b>WE7</b>	Policy should allow for development of live-work units on this site.	None
<b>Support:</b> 4557/29	<b>WE7</b>	Provision of employment land in step with housing supports sustainable development and potentially reduces transport impacts.	n/a
<b>Object:</b> 101/124	<b>WE9</b>	Hotel and golf course proposals at the Ageas Bowl are not adequate to replace those lost at Boorley Green and represent a conflict of interest for the Council. The Ageas Bowl site is not suitable for these developments.	None
<b>Object:</b> 4135/1; 6251/37	<b>WE10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Woodland provides a sound barrier and wildlife refuge.</li> <li>Proposal will worsen traffic conditions in the area especially on match days at the Ageas Bowl.</li> </ul>	None

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a practical location for a recycling centre.</li> <li>Woodland has not been shown to be of low ecological value. Any value it has should be compensated for,</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 101/119	<b>WE11</b>	Hotel and golf course proposals at the Ageas Bowl are not adequate to replace those lost at Boorley green and represent a conflict of interest for the Council. The Ageas Bowl site is not suitable for these developments.	None
<b>Chapter 7; Monitoring and review</b>			
<b>MR1 and Object:</b> 6671/3	MR1	Given the acknowledged likely need for an early review of the plan, the policy should be more explicit in setting out the circumstances when a review might be commenced. for example, numerical triggers in relation to a lack of a 5 year supply of housing land and time triggers for the review of reports following their publication.	None
<b>Appendices</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 804/153	Appendix A parap.A15	Need to update the reference to the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy as no longer draft and provide a link to it.	Accept. See proposed change to para. A15.
<b>Object:</b> 6663/2	Appendix A para. A.42	North Whiteley transport assessment is not complete but transport modelling has been completed which indicates that this development will have an immaterial impact on Botley village. HCC as highway authority and the Highways Agency support these conclusions. EBC's transport assessment demonstrates that the bypass will increase traffic across the local network in peak periods. The reference to North Whiteley should be deleted from para. A.42.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6393/4	Appendix C	Query when housing trajectory information will be made available.	None
<b>Transport Assessment (TA)</b>			
<b>Impacts outside the borough</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 6236/1; 6662/3	TA	Requests amendments to the transport assessment to take into account existing traffic through Twyford and Colden Common and the in-combination impact on Twyford and Colden Common of traffic generated from development in the wider area, together with options for mitigation.	None
<b>Object:</b> 6575/6	TA	Para. 8.11.82: improvements to the Chestnut Avenue/Southampton Road junction would likely require the removal of residents parking spaces. If this were to happen, the Council would need to ensure that alternative parking arrangements are provided.	None
<b>Object:</b> 1906/7	TA	There is a need to better understand the traffic growth projections as presented in	None

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		the TA which show lower than expected traffic growth on the Eastern Access to the city from junction 8 of the M27 through to junction 5.	
<b>Support:</b> 6246/2	TA	The new Transport Assessment (TA) makes clear that the SRTM model has been used and includes all the local authority areas adjacent to Eastleigh. The Do Minimum 2031 scenario also assumes that all planned and consented development outside of Eastleigh is going to be undertaken. The Highways Agency is therefore content that the TA is in line with previous recommendations. Clarification is however sought on the values of junction entry figures, which are not shown on the link capacity maps.	None
<b>Assessment of options</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 6477/5	TA	Figure 41, page 120 has incorrect data. The revised local plan states that there will be 950 dwellings, the transport assessment states only 750.	See Transport Assessment supplementary statement (Background Paper T9A).
<b>Object:</b> 6706/9; 6705/9; 6704/9; 6703/9; 6702/9; 6701/9	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transport assessment (TA) has not assessed the options on a fair and reasonable basis. The Options A to D were modelled using assumptions for a greater quantum of development than is set out in the plan, whilst Option E was modelled for the correct number of dwellings. The highway impacts of Option C are therefore significantly exaggerated.</li> <li>The sites selected in the preferred strategy are considered to be unsustainable unlike development north of Hedge End, which would generate significantly higher levels of non-car based trips. The TA significantly under-values the sustainability credentials of Hedge End North, although it does conclude that this option has less highway impact than the Council's preferred development option.</li> <li>A transport strategy for development at Hedge End North is proposed in support of the allocation of this site. Development at Hedge End North, a highly sustainable location requiring less highways mitigation, should be included in the local plan.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Boorley Green/ Botley</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 101/126	TA	<p>Para 8:11:57 – 8:11:60 Mill Hill/Winchester St junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Botley Parish Council objects to the proposal to redevelop the layout of the Mill/Hill/Winchester St junction of the A334 by installing a mini-roundabout.</li> <li>The roundabout will not address the need to reduce traffic on the A334 through Botley.</li> <li>There will be a loss of pedestrian space in the Square which is already limited.</li> </ul>	None (this is not included as a proposal of the Local plan).

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the redesigned junction may ease the left turn for vehicles turning north from the High St the proposed layout and position of the mini-roundabout will make the right turn from Mill Hill into Winchester St considerably more difficult especially for larger vehicles.</li> <li>The roundabout has potential to increase air pollution in Botley High St particularly at peak times because the introduction of a mini-roundabout will change the priority of flow at the junction and by doing so further restrict the peak time flow rate of eastbound traffic.</li> </ul>	
<b>Object:</b> 5135/25	TA	The road improvements that are suggested to accommodate the Boorley Green development will lead to congestion and are irrelevant to current development proposals, as they are not being required before new development takes place.	None
<b>Object:</b> 5676/5	TA	TA is flawed. Anecdotally there is not enough capacity in Winchester Street and air quality in Botley is already poor.	None
<b>Support:</b> 101/127	TA	Para 5.7 - 2031 Network Performance (Do Something) with the Botley Bypass Supports the proposal for the Botley Bypass and welcomes the full investigation of the impact as a mitigation measure to relieve the volume of traffic using the A334 between Mill Hill and the Broadoak Roundabout. Concerned about increased air pollution in the village centre. Botley Bypass will merely move concentrations of air pollution from existing areas of pollution to other sections of the community; e.g. by increasing traffic density at the Maypole Roundabout and along Kings Copse Avenue. There are many differences shown between the no nothing and do something scenarios but the differences are very small and the percentages are meaningless because there is no indication of the deviation being used. It is no longer sufficient for the purposes of strategic planning to merely have a transport plan based on vehicle movement data. To be fully sensitive to the needs and well-being of communities it is important to evaluate the environmental impact of traffic density.	None
<b>Bursledon</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 655/55	TA	Traffic Assessments that have been prepared deal with strategic issues and fail to address the local problems and situations that will be exacerbated by traffic emerging from the proposed housing developments particularly in Bursledon.	None
<b>West of Horton Heath</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 2003/1	TA	The Transport Assessment has not analysed the impacts associated with the location of a proposed 8 to 10 form of entry (FE) secondary school to the south of Horton Heath. Planned growth in accordance with draft policy S3 has not been considered properly in the Transport Assessment. Post code data of those at (or approaching) secondary school age, combined with population forecasts for each	None

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		settlement should be analysed to ensure that any new secondary school is located in the most sustainable location. Proposing a new 8 to 10FE secondary school just 1,580 metres south of an existing 10FE secondary school makes no sense; particularly when the planned homes at Boorley Green, Botley, West End and Hedge End would be so remote from it.	
<b>Junction improvements</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 804/154	TA	Transport assessment shows that significant improvements are needed to junctions and the highway network to accommodate the proposed new developments. It is unclear how deliverable these are. All the proposed improvements will need to be delivered in advance of or alongside the developments being implemented which raises issues of viability.	Accepted. See proposed changes to the Local Plan paragraphs 4.40, 5.108, 5.165, 6.2.18, 6.3.29, 6.6.11, new para. 6.7.33A and 6.9.42
<b>Sustainability Appraisal (SA)</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 6701/8; 6702/8; 6703/8; 6704/8; 6705/8; 6706/8;	SA	The SA is fundamentally flawed because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan is based on an unjustified housing requirement.</li> <li>• The NPPF is clear that the balance is to fall in favour of meeting housing and employment needs through sustainable development.</li> <li>• The SA also fails to provide a robust and comparable assessment of alternative options because: not all gaps have been treated equally and there is a bias in the assessment of alternatives.</li> <li>• This results in fundamental concerns with the strategy set out in the local plan.</li> </ul>	None.
<b>Object:</b> 101/120; 655/54; 2879/8; 5004/10; 5135/24; 5161/18; 5711/7; 6668/3; 6682/3; 6684/3;	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The choice of preferred option (option E: Boorley Green, Stoneham and Hedge End) is biased. Advantages have been exaggerated and disadvantages have been minimised. The appraisal is inadequate and fails to address issues relating to the BO1 allocation, including traffic and transport, air quality, impacts on gap, character, views and loss of good quality land etc.</li> <li>• Failure in methodology: the appraisal assumes BO1 site allocation (and others) is a commitment and not a possible option</li> <li>• Boorley Green is not the most suitable site</li> <li>• Strategic spatial options do not include Allington Lane</li> <li>• Reasons for rejecting Allington Lane are inadequate and previous appraisals indicate Allington Lane is a more sustainable option than Boorley Green</li> <li>• Allington Lane is a better option and should be reconsidered</li> </ul>	None.
<b>Object:</b> 668/3	SA	Objects to the change in method and contents of the SA compared with previous	None.

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		versions.	
<b>Object:</b> 6236/2; 6662/4	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to consider traffic impacts to the Twyford and Colden Common villages.</li> <li>Failure to consider impacts on the South Downs National Park as required by Environment Act 1996. Amendments to the Sustainability analysis are required to include the impacts on Twyford and Colden Common and impact on National Park required.</li> </ul>	Accept in part. See SA update with regard to nearby villages in adjacent parishes and the South Downs National Park
<b>Object:</b> 6562/12	SA	<p><u>Option D - Maddoxford Lane</u> Objects to land south of Maddoxford Lane being included in option D which was classified as the scattered site option. Does not take into account the major development site the council were already minded to grant permission for. Site should be assessed against its ability to contribute to the sense of place being created at Boorley Green.</p> <p><u>Windfall sites</u> The Council is reliant on windfalls for providing at least 278 dwellings. There is no compelling evidence that windfall sites will consistently become available and provide a reliable source of supply. For example at Bursledon, in the case of the Providence Hill and Oakhill site, the SHLAA doubts whether this site is developable. This would result in the council having a deficit against the overall requirement of 1,140 not taking into account any historic undersupply and any other sites that may not come forward.</p>	Accept in part. See SA update with regard to Option D.
<b>Object:</b> 655/54	SA	No sequential tests carried out for brown field sites	None
<b>Object:</b> 4913/12	SA	Objects to the methodology used for assessing additional sites in the SA and the scoring itself in regard to certain SA objectives. The SA process also needs to be updated to account for the change in dwelling numbers in policy WE1.	Accept in part. See revised SA with regard to dwelling numbers for policy WE1.
<b>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</b>			
<b>Object:</b> 4944/14	HRA	<p>There are two significant omissions from the Habitats Regulations Assessment affecting the Botley area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Firstly the restriction of the assessment and consequent mitigation measures to coastal areas, which fails to recognise that the Solent and Southampton Water SPA includes upper reaches of the Hamble, within c.100m of Botley Mill. This part of the SPA is an important area for qualifying and headline assemblage species.</li> <li>Secondly, Regulation 66 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations means that a project that could have an adverse effect may be</li> </ul>	Accept in part. See updated Habitats Regulations Assessment.

Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan February 2014  
Key issues

Respondent ID	Plan/Para/ Policy	Summary	Proposed Changes
		<p>subject to costly review, if it fails to protect potential additions to the qualifying species. There are believed to be potential additions (the little egret) to the Solent &amp; Southampton Water SPA. A precautionary principle is therefore advised for the plan, to include Annex I species that are above the threshold of 50 individuals within the SPA. Furthermore, there is a need for a hydrology report/ SUDS design assessment as part of the HRA for the European sites in the upper reaches of the River Hamble. These assessments are required at a strategic not project level, to determine the effects of additional water flows at Botley and the in-combination effects with North Whiteley.</p>	
<b>Object:</b> 133/2	HRA	<p>Strongly disagree with the conclusion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment which states that “while visitors from Eastleigh District do visit the New Forest, their contribution is sufficiently small (approximately 2.6%) as to be effectively inconsequential even ‘in combination’ with other projects and plans.” This illogical approach to the ‘in combination’ assessment of recreational pressure were taken by each of the local authorities that are responsible for contributing to recreational pressure on the New Forest SPA, then the 1.05 million additional visits/annum would all go unmitigated. This is clearly unacceptable, and not compliant with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.</p>	<p>Accept in part. See updated Habitats Regulations Assessment (Background Paper G110).</p>
<b>Support:</b> 6251/38	HRA	<p>Provided the changes to policies S11 and DM9 are made, we concur with the conclusion of the HRA as set out in section 9.</p>	n/a

*This page is intentionally blank.*

## APPENDIX B

### ALLINGTON LANE – A BRIEF HISTORY

- B1.1 In many of the consultation responses, including a substantial proportion of those objecting to development proposals at Boorley Green and to the strategy of focussing development at Hedge End, Boorley Green and Botley, there are repeated references to 'Allington Lane' as being a preferable strategic development option. The origins of this idea are as follows.
- B1.2 In the 1990s the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review 1996 – 2011 proposed a 'major development area' of 4,000 dwellings "to the south east of Eastleigh". The precise location of the development was not specified in the Structure Plan and it was left to the Borough Council to identify its preferred form and location. The Borough Council undertook considerable work on this proposal at that time, including extensive local consultations, culminating in proposals for a 'new settlement' centred on the point where Allington Lane crosses the Eastleigh to Fareham railway line. It was considered that the location could ultimately accommodate up to 6,000 new homes with ancillary development including schools, shops, employment and community facilities. The development relied for access partly on a new link road across the Itchen valley to join the proposed Chickenhall Lane Link Road through the industrial areas east of Eastleigh and there were concerns about the environmental impact and feasibility of the road link. Ultimately, however, concerns about the extent of the development on green fields led to a decision to find other ways of meeting the structure plan housing requirement for the borough. These were set out in the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (Review) 2001 – 2011, adopted in 2006.
- B1.3 The Allington Lane option was reviewed briefly during the examination of the former South East Plan as an alternative to the then proposed north/north east Hedge End strategic development area, but again there was concern about the environmental implications of a link road across the Itchen valley and it was not pursued further. The Allington Lane option was considered again in 2011 – 2012 during preparation of the new Local Plan (broad location BL5), but during this process there came to be increasing uncertainty about the deliverability of the Chickenhall Lane proposal on which this development option relied.
- B1.4 Transport assessment of local plan options undertaken in July 2012 included an assessment of the Allington Lane option without and with the cross-valley link and the Chickenhall Lane link (Background Paper T9A options 3a and 3d). This demonstrated that without the cross-valley and Chickenhall Lane links, traffic generated by this scale of development in this location could not realistically be accommodated on local roads. An alternative put forward by objectors was a new junction 6 on the M27, between junctions 5 and 7, but this was not acceptable to the Highways Agency who were concerned about junction spacing and road safety on the M27. This was also an expensive option that involved more reliance on the private car rather than the alternative transport modes (bus, cycle etc) that would have been possible with the cross-valley link.
- B1.5 Without a new access via the Chickenhall Lane Link Road, the Allington Lane site could not be provided with adequate access and would not, therefore, be sustainable or deliverable. In addition, there remain concerns about the environmental impact of the cross-valley link on the River Itchen which is subject to national and European nature conservation designations (SSSI and SAC). For these reasons the Allington Lane option has not been pursued as a reasonable or viable alternative option in the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2029. This was explained in the first draft Local Plan of October 2011 (paragraphs 4.44 – 4.49) and in the Revised Draft Local Plan of October 2013 at paragraph 4.8. It is also set out in the current Sustainability Appraisal Report paragraph 10.2.16 and Appendix IV.