

EXPRESSION OF PREFERENCES FOLLOWING PUBLIC MEETING ON 28.11.17

COMMENTS

Site Selection

No	Comments	Form Ref
1	<p>Site 1 is one of the least desirable under consideration. Adverse impacts from development there would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- an increase in traffic on an already congested and dangerous Church Street, which lacks footpaths for use by schoolchildren as they enter the school (even if they have arrived by car), and suffers regular 'near misses' between vehicles</li><li>- a significant visual impact upon neighbouring properties not just on Church Street, but also Ashley Lane, Drury Lane and Village Street</li><li>- potential drainage issues increasing the flooding risk to properties to the north of the site (that field is poorly drained and not served by mains drainage)</li></ul> <p>Site 2 was submitted to the process some time after Site 1. It is well served by footpaths and a safe stretch of road that can accommodate the increase in vehicle and pedestrian traffic (indeed it is probably one of the safest stretches of road in the village). It does not have a significant visual impact, and there is no drainage issue (it may even be possible to provide mains drainage by expanding the capacity of the existing treatment works to the south of the road).</p> <p>There is no logical reason for EHDC to proceed with Site 1 over Site 2, other than its own bureaucratic rules which assign precedence by order of submission to the planning process. If the village votes in</p>	By e-mail

	favour of any of the alternatives, then it would be disingenuous to proceed with Site 1.	
2	Developing site BTW002 will mean that anyone driving to Alton, Medstead, Four Marks, Winchester etc will be avoiding Church Street. By contrast, the development of site BTW001 would make Church Street their main route to these places, which absolutely contradicts the objective of reducing congestion on Church Street!	By e-mail
3	We are concerned about traffic on Church Street as it is a small road that already gets congested and goes past the school. Therefore we are not in favour of BTW001 as we think this will increase traffic on Church Street. On the other hand BTW002 seems the best choice as it is walkable to the pub, church and school and would have less impact on traffic on Church Street.	C44

4	Building anywhere in Bentworth will affect us all and every potential site is 'in our back yard'. However there is a real sense that building on BTW001 would increase traffic on Church Street, which is very narrow especially around the bends outside the school and the Stockdales' house. And the road is very congested at school drop off and collection time. Adding further traffic on this road would in our view be inappropriate at best and dangerous, especially for small people.	By e-mail
5	BTW002 is better as it would keep the traffic on the main roads in Bentworth. Building on BTW001 would cause more traffic on Church Street which is already congested. Building on BTW002 would affect an existing and well used footpath. BTW002 has an already made up footpath to the church, hall and school	A145
6	I feel BTW001 would not be the ideal site for development. The increased traffic (possibly 22 - 24 vehicles) which would inevitably arise. would add to the already existing connection in this area. This would compromise the safety of the school children, parents and other users of Village Street, Ashley Road and Drury Lane. The footpath passing directly through the site may also be affected. BTW002 would be much more preferable. The existing footpath to the church and school could be used and would also be in close proximity to The Sun Pub. Any traffic could also have easy access in and out of the village.	A144
7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) New homes on BTW002 achieves community aspirations (3) of Neighbourhood Plan. Reducing congestion around school and aspiration (1) to build traffic calming in the core village - Church Lane will be supported.</li> <li>2) An entrance to BTW001, even on Drury Lane, would lead up to 24 additional cars driving past the school towards Medstead or south to Winchester. This contradicts the community aspiration (3), to relieve congestion around the school. 24 cars would cause pollution to the school children.</li> <li>3) If house are built on BTW002 - resident can use the existing paths from site to school, church, Jubilee Hall in support of plan objective (2).</li> </ol>	A143

8	<p>New homes on BTW002 achieves community aspirations (3) of Neighbourhood Plan. Reducing congestion around school and aspiration (1) to build traffic calming in the core village - Church Lane will be supported.</p> <p>An entrance to BTW001, even on Drury Lane, would lead up to 24 additional cars driving past the school towards Medstead or south to Winchester. This contradicts the community aspiration (3), to relieve congestion around the school. 24 cars would cause pollution to the school children.</p> <p>If house are built on BTW002 - resident can use the existing paths from site to school, church, Jubilee Hall in support of plan objective (2).</p>	A142
9	<p>Ashley Road / Church Street suffers too many car issues already. 12 more houses or 24 potential extra cars would be dangerous. All traffic would have to come up a little country lane. BTW002 and BTW003 have easier access from the A339 and according to the site assessment table have better conditions and positive points.</p>	A137
10	<p>I am not in favour of site BTW001 due to the increased traffic through an existing bottleneck (Church Street) as well as the presence of the school. I believe site BTW002 offers better access in front of the village, as well as safer walking access to both the church and St. Mary's school. There are also 5 negatives for BTW001 v's only 2 for BTW002,</p>	A136
11	<p>BTW004 has the best access on to a relatively quiet village road with an existing edge-line which would act as a good natural screen for any development. BTW001 has already been highlighted by EHDC and has good access onto a quiet country road. BTW002 should not be considered as it is on the main through road of the village, which unfortunately is a fast road by its nature. The access on to this road would be even more dangerous due to the limited visibility. This is already bad enough when trying to pull out of Glebe Fields and/or Sun Hill.</p>	A133
12	<p>Sites BTW003 and BTW004 would cause less traffic through the village.</p>	A132

13	BTW004 I feel has the best current access points on a straight road using the natural gap between housing settlements already there. BTW001 - Fair access and the area is already highlighted by EHDC. I feel BTW002 should not be entertained due to being on the already busy main road through the village and extremely limited vision of oncoming traffic from the centre of the village and up Sun Hill. BTW003 - large space but nice to keep so as to maintain the rural feel of the village as people drive into (& through) the village	A127
14	BTW002 has the safest (off road) access to school and church.	A125
15	BTW001: I do actually think this is the best site as they will be able to walk to school	A122
16	I am concerned about BTW002 as it would be very close to the T junction of Sun Hill and this junction is dangerous. Do we really need more entrances coming onto what is already a very busy section of road in the village?	A121
17	BTW001 seems like the ideal site. It poised good access to the village but does not compromise important views and feel of open countryside such as the walk to the church from Well Lane or the long view drinking through the village. Nor does it compromise any listed buildings or gardens. It would have ample and easy access. There is sufficient space to put all 12 houses at the low end of the density range - ideally this would be a little less dense than the most dense bits of Bentworth.	A115
18	I am strongly of the opinion that using site BTW001 will be a mistake. It will have an adverse effect on traffic round the school and church. BTW003 and BTW004 will not have the same traffic impact and being larger will mean less density for the houses on other sites.	A113

19	<p>Putting new homes on BTW002 will achieve community aspirations (3) of the N.P to reduce congestion around the school and (1) to build traffic calming in the core village - Church Lane - would be supported.. The entrance to BWT001, even on Drury Lane, will lead up to 24 cars driving past the school towards Medstead or south to Winchester. This is in contradiction to CS(3) to relieve congestion around the school.</p> <p>If houses are built on BTW002 residents can use existing paths from the site to the school, church and Jubilee Hall in support of (2)</p>	A111
20	<p>I am not in favour of site BTW001 being developed. My preference is BTW002. On the site assessment table there are only two negatives with building on 002 there are five on 001. The congestion around the school will increase with more cars using Church Street to get to Medstead, Alton and Winchester. This would not happen if site BTW002 was used. Church Street is already a nightmare when walking to school with young children. I would also be very sad to see the hedgerows be destroyed - they are a popular spot during blackberry season. I also feel that Ashley Road could cope with this increase in traffic if BTW001 was developed it's a small country lane whereas BTW002 is at least on the main village road. BTW002 also provides the safest way to church or school along the track path, so avoiding roads.</p>	A110
21	<p>BTW002 is in too busy a part of the village, particularly with Sun Hill.</p>	A104
22	<p>I am against BTW001 as it is totally unsuitable , it goes against the Bentworth NP in a number of ways and will not maintain footpaths, could harm footpaths which are a no in the village. The two road entrances could be or a totally unsuitable for the increased traffic and will add to an over-congested area with potentially dangerous consequences. 24 plus cars.</p> <p>BTW002 is far more suitable and the best of all six options. It fits about 12 dwellings, it fits with BNP aspirations - easy access to school, hall, church on protected path by bus stop and more suitable road for access to A339 and the new traffic will avoid dangerous Church St. and Ashley Road. So BTW002 has the best credentials.</p>	A97

23	<p>I have access/traffic impact concerns re BTW001.  Re BTW002: The comments on the large size template for this site assessment seem inaccurate to me.  This site:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would affect the amenity of neighbouring properties to both the N and E of the set. Screening would not help much.</li> <li>2. Landscape and views - there are views into the site from all angles and a development would lead to severe detriment. This piece of land provides a vital punctuation of tranquility along Station Road and surrounding properties, public rights of way and the conservation area. The policy of no street lighting is likely to be compromised by lighting from the houses.</li> <li>3. Road safety - visibility is not good along the relevant stretch of Station Road. There would be significant safety hazards so near the T- junction and blind bends.</li> </ol>	A94
24	<p>I feel that there is already a lot of traffic from the school around BTW001, for the safety of children, pedestrians and animals alike I feel we should keep traffic levels low by not using this area for more housing. More traffic safety is paramount.</p>	A91
25	<p>I don't believe that BTW001 would be suitable for development due to a number of reasons. One being that the increased congestion of this area on already quite narrow, congested roads would make it harder for access as the area is close to the school. This would then jeopardise the safety of the school children as they enter/leave the school. I think BTW002 would be a far better site as already sits on a main road of the village and has great access out of the village via the Sun. The traffic would be easier on this site and even the path to the school/church can be used for access to the rest of the village safely.</p>	A90
26	<p>BTW001 would create more traffic in a congested lane and particularly more cars on Church Street  BTW002 is a short walk to the school and cars will remain on the main road through the village.  BTW002 also has less scope for more houses or planning creep.</p>	A89

27	Concerned about adding to congestion in Church Street during school run times and potential danger to children.	A86
28	To put 12 houses on BTW001 is madness given the proximity of the school and the narrow roads from The Star to Drury Lane.	A78
29	I would prefer to avoid any development on BTW001 as this would create a problem with more traffic driving down Church Street and past the school where connection is already a problem.	A74
30	<p>New homes on BTW002 would achieve community aims (3) of the N.P. to reduce congestion around the school and aspiration (1) to build traffic calming in the core village - Church Lane will be supported. The entrance to BTW001, even on Duty Lane, will lead to up to an additional 24 cars driving past the school towards Medstead or south to Winchester. This is in contradiction to community aspiration (3), to relieve congestion around the school.</p> <p>If houses are built on BTW002 residents can use existing paths from the site to the school, church and Jubilee Hall in support of plan objective (2).</p> <p>24 cars in Church Street would increase air pollution to all the children at the school and therefore risk their health.</p>	A70
31	BTW002 is totally unsuitable for access. The road is already very busy and dangerous The visual impact would be significant.	A57

32	<p>There is robust evidence to alter and deviate from the current local plan. Building on BTW001 would be dangerous and against the N.P. for the following reasons:  Church Street is narrow and runs past the school, which is already potentially dangerous at school drop-off and collection times. Building about 12 properties on BTW001 would increase traffic along this road by a potentially further 24 cars (2 per home), which would drive up and down the road. This would cause further traffic problems and safety concerns ~ going against community aspirations (3).  Building the houses on BTW002 would be more suitable for the following reasons:  There is already a made up path from the site to the school, church and Hall, thereby saving children and residents having to walk along any road to get to these sites.  Traffic from the homes at BTW002 would go out on to the High Street - main road, taking traffic quickly to the A339 and not through the narrowest part of all the Bentworth roads.  Finally building on BTW001 would require moving or building around a footpath.</p>	A33
33	<p>We have only just moved to New Copse for its rural quiet ideal away from Four Marks. The site 6A is totally unsuitable for development for access reasons, too far from village for walking to school safely and impaction on rural environment</p>	A9
34	<p>In my opinion BTW001 is the only sensible option, provided that the owners still want it to be utilised. Is it possible to increase the number of affordable homes to the number of people there are expressing an interest? Would these then become “council houses” or “Housing Association”? I believe site BTW006A should be disqualified due to incorrect information.</p>	A13

35	<p>It should be made clear that including BTW001 in the local plan was not wrong as it was the only choice. A lot of time and effort has gone into making the best choice and this should not be ignored. I didn't think BTW001 was available until the end of the current lease, (July 2026), but even if it is BTW005 and BTW006A fail to meet policy 2.7 "built within safe...distance of village amenities..." (amongst others] and should therefore be ruled out. BTW001 fails to meet policy 1.2 and 1.3 and it would be different to meet 1.5 "keep existing footpaths..." whereas BTW002 would not fail these policies. BTW001 would not only fail to meet aspiration 3 "relieve congestion around the school", it would add to the connection, whereas BTW002 would have no affect on this. The pros and cons for BTW003 and BTW004 fall somewhere between BTW001 and BTW002.</p>	A40
36	<p>Re objective 2.5, please include for some bungalows. BTW002 is totally unsuitable - access, light pollution, rural landscape - views would all be impacted.</p>	A42
37	<p>If site BTW001 is selected for development it would closely affect more than 60 out of 553 residents of the village, living in close proximity. Secondly, it is inconceivable that the EHDC and any steering committee could build up to 12 houses with access only on to a tiny, narrow lane with high banks on either side, with up to 24 cars leaving for work at the same time as 20 or more are parking to deliver 100 small children the village school. Pollution would endanger the health orf everyone not to mention traffic accidents in already congested space.</p>	A4
38	<p>Given the need to encourage younger families into the village I support about 12 dwellings on BTW001 is the way to go; as well as being closer to the school (for children walking ) and the rest of the amenities.</p>	A12

39	Traffic/parked cars are already an issue on the lane by the school - this makes BTW001 unsuitable as it will be unsafe to walk up the lane and access on to Church Street / Ashley Lane will be difficult. BTW002 is preferable as it has an existing footpath to the school and church ( off road ) and it will take traffic onto the main road, avoiding the two narrow lanes and preserving established edges ( ref: objectives 2.7, 1.3, 1.7,5.1 and community aspiration 3. BTW002 may also be able to connect to the existing sewage treatment plant facility used by Glebe Fields next door to the site.	A65
40	I feel BTW002 is the best sites as it has footpaths to the church and school. It will have the least impact on traffic in the village as it is on the main road. Church Street is already extremely congested at school drop-off and collection times and housing at BTW001 would in my opinion make this much worse.	A62
41	BTW001 should not wrap around the rear of existing properties within the settlement boundary.	A80
42	24 additional cars on Church Lane is absurd and endangers and creates congestion near the school. It is an absurd idea. Additionally ancient hedgerows, mature trees at risk and the rural road of Ashley Road becomes another busy thoroughfare. BTW002 benefits from an established footpath to the school and lies on a busy road with better links to A roads to Alton / Basingstoke and has less of an impact on residents living within the settlement policy boundary. it can take 12 dwellings.	A5
43	Fundamental to Bentworth is the character expressed in the vision and objective 1. 1.2 is not expressed in the +vs and -vs and is crucial. E.G. BTW002 provides the only long view coming from The Star all the way to beyond the grain drier and would be lost if developed as would the character of the wonderful walk to the church.	A116
44	The area around BTW001 is already very busy with cars parked at school pick-up and drop-off times. More houses here will make this situation worse. From BTW002 there is a safe short walk via tarmac footpath to school and church. Cars from there more likely to go out to main road to exit the village. There will be no room to build more houses later.	A64

45	I strongly prefer site BTW002 as it does not extend the village and due to it's size couldn't be over-developed by developers wanting to maximise profits. If important to achieve 12 dwellings I would rather increase housing density to 22 per hectare thus allowing an extra house to be accommodated.	A46
46	I feel that BTW002 offers the best solution as it is adjacent to Glebe Fields and fills in a natural gap as you enter the village. It would also mean that the affordable housing rule must be adhered to which we feel is important for the continuing growth of the village. Also there is perfect access to the village amenities via the footpath already in place with the need to cross a busy road.	A60
47	The proposed BTW001 looks very good and could easily take all 12 homes and would have afforded housing.	C39
48	BTW002 is, in my opinion, the best site. There is direct access out of the village, there are footpaths in situ to the church and school. It reduces the potential for increased traffic around the school and hall, thus easing fears of parents whose children walk to school and bus stop.	C23
49	Concerned that voting will be weighted by those who are personally affected - the most popular site will be the one that affects least people i.e. BTW003 where we are the only ones to lose our view. Objective 1.7 - no pavements means it will be dangerous for young families to walk to school. That's why my choice is for a more central site BTW002. Very worried that BTW003 is a large space for 44 houses. The Council may increase the 12 to 44 - we need to curtail this and limit to 12, Table is not weighted as some items are far more important such as distance to centre rather than overhanging cables. No mention of traffic calming in Station Road. Need final decision to be made by an independent Council person.	C1

50	<p>The EHDC selected site, BTW001, would encourage a significant increase in traffic through the centre of the village. Church street is already dangerous, especially around school drop-off and collection times. There is no room for footpaths.</p> <p>Site BTW002 has the advantage of exiting footpaths which lead directly to the school. Any cars leaving this site would drive out onto the main village road.</p>	C2
51	<p>The site of BTW002 and BTW004 both have all the necessary attributes for 12 dwellings in letting better access via road, less traffic and less obstruction of other houses.</p>	A32

Vision, Objectives, Policies and Aspirations

No	Comment	Form Ref
1	I would urge the steering committee to be fully cognisant of the fact that any site capable of taking more than 12 properties is likely to be ruthlessly exploited by any developer.	A131
2	What traffic calming measures will be put in place; the knock on impact of additional traffic will be felt throughout the entire village not just the centre? What control does the committee have to stop further significant development in the village? Will this first 12 houses set a precedent for more significant developments within the village? BTW003 for example has capacity for 44 houses. How can the village be protected from Medstead-like development?	A130
3	We should say that we want affordable housing so I would favour one development. Both the sites I have chosen are within reasonable reach of the village centre. All houses should have a garage as well as parking. I see no point in having houses with one bedroom. They should be for couples who may then have children so 2/3 bedroom properties. I see no point in having a village shop. I suggest the one at Medstead would not be viable without the paper round. Can the village supports two pubs?	A118
4	If site BTW002 is chosen it would be very interesting if an archeological dig could be carried out first	A109
5	Do not understand question 4 !	A106
6	Because the cricket ground is privately owned, can we not create a new "green space" as part of any development?	A98
7	Huge thanks to everyone involved in this whole process. Excellent piece of work.	A73

8	Community aspirations 1 and 2 and 3 are critical. Over development i.c. Medstead and traffic congestion on the A31 and A339 is leading to rapid increase in “rat-run” traffic through the village. Large numbers of vehicles travel at unacceptable speeds , 50 mph for example - destroying the village environment , giving rise to serious damage to people, houses and property. 20 mph is the realistic maximum and has to be enforced by whatever means are effective. Otherwise objective 1 cannot be achieved.	A72
9	It would be preferred if the latest environmentally friendly methods of sewage disposal could be incorporated. The most effective form of traffic calming is surveillance and enforcement. Hard traffic calming measures increase disturbance to residents and have been shown to increase pollution.	A68
10	The latest methods of sewage disposal should be incorporated in any site chosen. The prospect of traffic calming i.e. “sleeping policemen” in the core of the village is appalling for those who live adjacent to them.	A67
11	Very keen to see all 12 new properties as “affordable” Very keen to see the properties being allocated to local people or people with a close connection with the village. Site(s) chosen based on the need to reduce traffic flow along the road between Bentworth and Medstead.	A25
12	I do not feel that the safe transit of walkers in and through the village has been properly addressed. If parents could safely walk children to the school etc this would ease traffic at the school. This can only be achieved by pavements. Perhaps if pavements were raised in this context then villagers would feel differently about them.	A26
13	I think affordable housing is the main priority. The village needs more diversity in wealth and age. To ensure this I reluctantly ticked the one site option rather than 2 smaller ones.	A34

14	The allocation of 'about 12' is relatively small, probably based on the lack of facilities ( shop, transport etc). Be careful about what you ask for. If a shop is suggested this will make the village more attractive as a site. Remember the government's intention is to build more every year. So next year or whenever, our allocation will re-assessed. Otherwise - well done - thank you for your hard work.	A35
15	I am concerned about the N.P. objectives 2.3, which states that the "affordable housing" will be for people with a local connection. I feel that the "affordable housing" should be allocated on the basis of: 1. Applicants with the greatest need and/or from people 2. Who are employed in the local area. Any other "local connection" seems like tribalism.	A39
16	In the event of smaller sites being chosen every effort should be made to ensure that developers are to include affordable housing as part of the contract.	A51
17	One site in centre of village to avoid "creep" and increase in village sprawl. We need more smaller houses and not second homes. Deeds to prevent seconds home purchase/use please.	A58
18	As I am in favour of one site I have not made a second choice for 2 developments.	A24
19	I support the need for affordable housing for local Bentworth families. This needs to be sited as close to the village amenities as possible.	A14
20	Il think that building development should be kept to the smaller plots so as to prevent future further development that may well take place on any of the larger plots.	A15
21	Houses with no more than 3 bedrooms to keep price down - not executive homes. Maximum amount of affordable housing that site will be able to sustain or landowner willing to develop.	C36
22	I am concerned if planning permission is given to the larger sites that, with time, more houses will be built on these sites whereas if a smaller plot is chosen e.g. 002, then more houses cannot be squeezed in.	A16

23	15 - 16 houses per hectare should be the maximum.	A59
24	It is imperative that affordable housing comes to the village be it on one site or two.	A31
25	If there is money to be allocated to the village, we need extra parking around the church, school and hall.	A29
26	Could you make it a condition for the developer of BTW001 to make parking for school use and hall functions on that site or for larger funerals?	A11
27	Houses need to be near main village amenities. Affordable scheme to be encouraged. Can these developments help to re-instate bus routes through village? Walking to school will avoid more congestion at peak times.	C30
28	Central to village centre so potential tenants/ purchasers can walk to school and easy access to amenities.	C29
29	No large houses - as a younger person we need more smaller houses. The village needs young families not just retired people.	C14
30	To preserve ground space - developer/planner should consider 1 bedroom dwellings in the storey construction with stair-lifts installed to access upstairs for those for whom it might be necessary.	C28
31	Waste of paper!	C3
32	In principle I welcome the prospect of a new development in Bentworth. The village is desperately short of smaller and affordable properties, and rather than preserving the village, the lack of development in recent years has caused an atrophy which would ultimately destroy the previously vibrant community. We need a greater diversity of residents to maintain the community.	By e-mail
33	If two sites are chosen I feel strongly that affordable housing should be a priority.	A41

34	I remain concerned that corrections to BTW006A were only announced after voting had started. The site assessment table was also incorrect - would not accommodate all 12 houses / overheads cables to west boundary / public right of way along track.	A1
35	We are extremely grateful for the work that you and all the committee have done, and continue to do on all our behalf in creating the Neighbourhood Plan. I think that you have all done an excellent job and feel that this will be an important and useful plan and document for the village. Thank you.	By e-mail
36	Congratulations and thank you for steering the plan to this point, it's a very different experience from the last time the village attempted anything similar.	By e-mail
37	<p>Our main query is how “core Village” is defined and why the section of Village Street from The Star roundabout to where the road straightens at Hill House is notable by its absence from the traffic calming measures section under “Community Aspirations”...</p> <p>There has a been a huge increase in volume of through traffic, especially light and heavy commercial vehicles, but also speeding passenger cars, since the roadworks in Whitedown Lane. Secondly, the recent removal of a verge and a tree on the south side of the road and the hedge at Bentworth House has now caused a great increase in the speed of passing traffic putting pedestrians and property at risk as well as increasing noise and pollution in this very rural setting. And finally, this problem is going to get much worse when the bridge is rebuilt at the Butts green and traffic routes through the villages instead.</p>	By e-mail

## Analysis of Site Preferences

Against BTW001 and in favour of BTW002	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,19,20,22,23,25,26,30,32,35,39,40,42,44,50	24
Against BTW001	24,27,28,29,37	5
In favour of BTW002	14,45,46,48	4
Against BTW001 and in favour of BTW003 and 004	18	1
In favour of BTW002 and 004	51	1
Against BTW002	16,21,31,36,43	5
Against BTW002 and in favour of 04 and 001	11,13	2
In favour of BTW001	15,17,38,47	4
In favour of BTW001 and against 006a	34	1
In favour of BTW003 and 004	12	1
Against BTW003	49	1
Against 006a	33	1