

Q11 Any other comments?

You're nearly at the end of the survey, so please keep going right to the end and be sure to click 'submit' to make your input count. Meanwhile do you have any further comments on the questionnaire or the Draft Plan? If so, ideally please refer to the relevant policy or page number.

Answered: 284 Skipped: 427

- | | | |
|----|--|------------------|
| 1 | I doubt that 'heritage' signage and new benches will encourage more people to the area, no-one ever visited somewhere because it had a nice bench. Safer cycle routes would be a super investment but more in line with | 27/05/2015 10:54 |
| 2 | This is yet another waste of time and paper as all will want areas designated near their homes not to be developed as has happened before! ((NB Writer also asks why he has 'to validate your input'.)) | 27/05/2015 10:40 |
| 3 | Q10 - Cyclists on the canal tow path are a mixed blessing due to lack of warning. Most are well behaved but some much less so as they seem to think they have right of way. | 23/05/2015 14:30 |
| 4 | Q9 Some how more parking facilities on periphery for businesses, visitors, trade - but essentially parking for residents who have chosen to live in Odiham. Green spaces also essential to keep the village lifestyle. Q1. Essential to keep Odiham and North Warnborough separate villages. | 23/05/2015 14:23 |
| 5 | Q 9 More parking at Robery May's to get cars off the road | 23/05/2015 14:08 |
| 6 | Q1 - keen not to lose last rural view to area. Concern about increase in traffic to area | 23/05/2015 14:05 |
| 7 | Not sure if it is in the control of OnwardPlan but as many residents have stated the footpath and safe walking situation in NW - The Street/Bridge Road/Hook Road are not safe. There are either no footpaths, narrow footpaths, few crossings and cars are regularly seen doing approx 50mph in the 30 zone. Just wanted it noted in case anything can be done. | 23/05/2015 13:17 |
| 8 | Areas 329, 29 and 228 are agricultural land and should remain that way to protect the 250 year old cricket club. | 23/05/2015 13:00 |
| 9 | Odiham needs an influx of younger families or it will just die. | 23/05/2015 12:58 |
| 10 | If it is practicable, consideration might be given to having a duck pond on the proposed village green similar to the one in Upton Grey. However this would only be practicable if the pond could be properly kept clean and properly maintained. It would also be necessary to ensure the security of any wildlife from predators natural and human. | 23/05/2015 12:33 |

Better 'street signage' should almost always mean 'less' street signage. The best example of how to get this wrong is provided by the once beautiful and ancient university city of Oxford. Local planners have plastered the road surfaces with differently coloured, garish paints. One colour for bus lanes, another for cycle paths, yet another for pedestrians, the list goes on, Then there are the signs, they are so numerous that that almost deserve separate signs warning of the danger of collision if too much time is spent looking at the signs, They stick out like a field of ghastly, florescent 'lolly pops'.

This must not be allowed to happen in Odiham. Even 'heritage style' street signage means more signage. That means signs, notices and boards. All of

this coupled with more 'street furniture' is exactly what turns a pleasing aspect into a display of gaudy and unsightly 'street junk'. It is precisely this sort of development which attracts vandalism. This must be avoided at all costs. ((Original typed sheet accompanies Form 115))

| | | |
|----|---|------------------|
| 11 | Q7, see comments above. NO + qualification | |
| 12 | The site of Deptford Lane must not be considered. It is a highly popular field for walkers and dog owners used by a large number of people. | 23/05/2015 12:04 |
| 13 | What about the risk of flooding in NW through increased development? | 23/05/2015 11:56 |
| 14 | ((Difficult to guess ranking given 2x1 and 3x4, so omitted)) | 23/05/2015 11:40 |
| 15 | One of the features to be seen on entering Odiham via the various approach roads is the number of large mature trees. These greatly add to the character of the village. All new housing plots should allocate some land, in proportion to the number of houses where stands of potentially large trees (oaks, beech, yew etc) of between one to three trees can be planted. this is a long term intent as 50-100 years will elapse before the trees become sizeable. The stands should be placed so that they are not impinging unduly on nearby houses so that future residents of nearby properties cannot complain about the trees blocking light, roots etc so that there is no excuse to have them removed. If we don't start now, future generations will not have the large trees that we currently enjoy. | 23/05/2015 11:30 |
| 16 | QR codes onto footpath posts and local information signs/maps - they can refer devices to web sites or other internet information. Canoe club and John Pinkerton have them on their signs at the wharf. Finally many thanks to everyone for all their hard work on this project. | 22/05/2015 22:08 |
| 17 | It should not be overlooked that the High Street is a residential area and that any changes must take this into account. | 22/05/2015 22:00 |
| 18 | I presume that the block 110 is without the plan area? if not it is madness not to make use of it. Filling in all the gaps in the village will make it a town in time whereas using land on the north side of the bypass will spread housing out and keep the village aspect of Odiham safe. As little as possible building in Odiham should be the mantra. | 22/05/2015 21:38 |
| 19 | Please consider making the bury a one way street which would ease congestion through this area at school drop off and pick up times. It would also go some way as to ease the negativity surrounding building on the area BC as traffic would flow more easily. Also, please consider making the high street parking pay and display and the car parks elsewhere free, to encourage people to walk who are able. It seems strange to make people pay for parking further away!! Thank you for the work to the path in North Warnborough that was recently resurfaced. A great job and makes walking to the village much less muddy! | 22/05/2015 18:46 |

Section 3 page 19: no mention of taking into account biodiversity considerations and impact on SSSI's or other designated sites.

Section 4 page 40 Parking, question 9 talks about a small car park for Odiham castle, this may have an effect on Warnborough Greens a SSSI site but comments could not be made at this juncture.

Objective 4 Flood risk:

The comments regarding whether or not a site was in Flood Zone 2 or 3 is largely irrelevant. These designations only refer to the probability of river or sea flooding. The majority of sites not located on Chalk require a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment even though there are Environment Agency

(<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change/strategic-flood-risk-assessment/>).

Here is a relevant extract;

The general approach and requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments should be applied to developments in areas at risk of flooding to be permitted by Neighbourhood Development/ Community Right to Build Orders. This means that for any development proposals:

- in Flood Zone 2 or 3;
- or of at least 1 hectare;
- or in an area that has critical drainage problems (as notified to the local planning authority by the Environment Agency);
- or that may be subject to other sources of flood risk;

a site-specific flood risk assessment should support the draft Order. The flood risk assessment checklist may be helpful in this respect. "

The Environment Agency Flood risk map for surface water flooding shows that significant portions of North Warnborough and Dunleys Hill Site (DH) have a medium – high flood risk whereas none of the sites in Odiham village / Archery fields do.

Section 2.1 - lacking reference to the biodiversity within the parish. The NP provides an opportunity to develop a vision for the parish in which wildlife can thrive and where an effective network of green space links the residential areas to the surrounding countryside enabling wildlife to move freely.

Objective 4, page 10 - Flood Risk: The comments regarding whether or not a site was in Flood Zone 2 or 3 is largely irrelevant. These designations only refer to the probability of river or sea flooding. The majority of sites not located on Chalk require a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment even though there are Environment Agency Surface water flood risk maps (see below)

(<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change/strategic-flood-risk-assessment/>).

Here is a relevant extract

"The general approach and requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments should be applied to developments in areas at risk of flooding to be permitted by Neighbourhood Development/ Community Right to Build Orders. This means that for any development proposals:

- in Flood Zone 2 or 3;
- or of at least 1 hectare;
- or in an area that has critical drainage problems (as notified to the local planning authority by the Environment Agency);
- or that may be subject to other sources of flood risk;

a site-specific flood risk assessment should support the draft Order. The flood risk assessment checklist may be helpful in this respect." The Environment Agency Flood risk map for surface water flooding shows that significant

portions of North Warnborough and Dunleys Hill site (DH) have a medium – high flood risk, whereas none of the sites in Odiham village / Archery fields do.

Objective 5 - separate this objective into two distinct sections as they can have opposite effects.

Section 3, page 19 - There is no mention of taking into account impact on biodiversity including designated sites such as SSSIs; this must be included.

Policy 11, page 37: The Parish Environment - should be entitled the Natural Environment. This policy can be significantly improved, for example by including the excellent comments made by the Hampshire & IoW Wildlife Trust. It should be noted that the River whitewater is classified as a chalk stream and as such is a rare and important habitat type of significance at a European level.

Section 4, page 40, Parking: Qu.9 refers to a small car parking site to serve visitors to Odiham Castle (related to site 232) - it is essential to consult the views of Natural England on criteria for this car park to minimise adverse impacts on the adjoining SSSIs.

- | | | |
|----|---|------------------|
| 22 | My further comments have been the subject of correspondence. In due course, I hope to make further suggestions as to suitable sites for housing. | 22/05/2015 17:18 |
| 23 | Bravo to all the hard work done by the organisers of this Plan. A balanced plan has been produced. | 22/05/2015 17:00 |
| 24 | Congratulations to the team that worked on this Plan, for their hard work and thoroughness in producing it. | 22/05/2015 16:30 |
| 25 | Not sure if adequate provision has been made for future ageing population, down-seizers, disabled, single person householders . | 22/05/2015 15:52 |

Traffic Management - Odiham High Street traffic calming.

We continue to ignore all police traffic surveys and excellent accident statistics that indicate Odiham roads are very safe area with low speeds through town Centre (so say the Police). Only a small number of misinformed members of community continue to complain about speed and ignore the facts. The N/Plan must work with facts and not hearsay and not react to the constant lobbying of a small number of vocal people.

I don't agree with proposals to introduce a 20 mph limit., also annoyed that any reduction in HGVs through Odiham would only increase HGVs through N/W. N/W suffers enough from school coaches, HGVs, school traffic as it is.

Have we proof of adequate consultation with local parishes. If not could fail on this.

Sustainability is very important. At present all infrastructure services are at their limits.

If more houses built we need to encourage more employers to stay or move into area, if not it is not sustainable. At present employers either sell land for housing, or purposely overpricing rents to make uneconomic, thereby changing use to residential. No plan how we intend encouraging employers to stop closing pubs or employment outlets or skilled jobs premises.

N/P area is not the same as the Settlement Boundary, important that there is no re-drawing of settlement boundaries to accommodate extra houses.

Swan Inn – good example of deliberate neglect allowing a listed building to fall into disrepair until uneconomical to repair. How will the N/P intend tackling this issue?

Policy 2

Site 147 Land at Swan Inn, N/W, site not recommended by Hart May 2012, I agree unless forming part of Albion Yard development - Impact on Canal, houses too near canal bank, too high and intrusive. Tree work in this area has already damaged the canal path.

Site 232 Albion Yard, N/W. Should be joined with Site 147. Need to restrict further development towards open countryside to Tunnel Lane. Although can be considered Brown Field. Risk of urbanizing this part of C/A.

Site 65 Dunleys Hill, Odiham, Strategic gap.

No of houses not known, and the size of area left as open space. Not happy with coach access across site, this would significantly reduce area available for Open Space and be an eye sore. Topography is a problem with rising ground. Happy with small car park for Green space use. Ok with this option generally if it retains open space' in perpetuity.'

Ground water collection could be a Duck pond at lowest level.

Site 58 Land at Hook Road, N/W Already significantly through planning stage awaiting decision (14/01704/major). Many objections, mainly flooding, urbanization of C/A, impact on Canal bank.

Site 60 Land at Roughts Cottage, N/W, considered unsuitable by Hart in 2012. Residents would be living with constant traffic generated noise, narrowness of land, poor layout, poor quality environment.

Policy 5: Odiham Conservation Area

No need for such detailed design considering development within conservation areas of Odiham & N/W are controlled by Hart Local Policy Framework for C/As and Article 4 Directions,

Policy 8: Education – Unmanaged land forms part of the Gap between Odiham & Bufton Field N/W, presently a much loved unmanaged open space for wildlife, insects and providing an open space for cyclists, walkers and the community to enjoy. When Bufton Fields was built this was promised as an open space for the community to enjoy. Seems Hart has very short memory. Would like the local community to be given option to purchase and manage as a truly open green space. Similar to Robert Mays Estate open space.

Should thank all the people involved in producing this draft plan, so much work, very well done.

26 The possible development at 138 would be a reference I would have over 327. 22/05/2015 15:37

27 Parking: That section did not provide enough information to comment. Parking in Odiham is a problem and will be made worse by all the local developments. It seems to call for a more significant enhancement near the centre and it is not clear if any of the 4 proposals really would change much in 22/05/2015 15:31

this respect.

- 28 See form 209 - 2 pages of notes 22/05/2015 14:23
- 29 Most of the proposals envisage sensible use of "in-fill" sites. The exception is the defilement of the Deer Park. 22/05/2015 13:51
- 30 Q6 - Odiham's Close and its Meadow with the beautiful fir tree is part of Odiham's history and heritage. Leave it as such. Also there are not many natural meadows left for wild life, the fields on Dunleys Hill are a haven for wild life. 22/05/2015 13:45
- 31 Thank you for all your hard work 22/05/2015 13:38
- 32 Q8 . Butcher, baker needed 22/05/2015 13:22
- 33 Q10 - Remove obsolete signs
- 33 Q6 - Adding LGS designation to small field between Hatchwood Farm (Spectro offices) and The Mapletons. 22/05/2015 13:20
- 34 Q8 - Speed limit through High Street 22/05/2015 13:16
- 35 The most important criterion listed in the draft plan for housing is 'As far as possible, development should not impact detrimentally on conservation areas, listed buildings and views valued by the community' Plan page 9 Objective 1. This is clearly not the case with sites 58, 147 and 232. 22/05/2015 13:13

The criteria set out with regard to historic buildings and flooding, walking distance to local services, green spaces and views, and countryside walking is also ignored in respect of sites 58, 147 and 232. Why are sites 58, 232 & 147 proposed for housing when they clearly do not meet the criteria?

How can the scoring show there is ease of access to the Hook Road site but not to the Archery Fields site? The Archery Fields site is already an established small estate and therefore there is ease of access. Access onto the Hook Road site and the Albion Yard site is dangerous on the busy road and also if the access to Albion Yard site is next to The Cat it will be totally inappropriate, but if next to the Swan it would be lethal. Absolutely nonsense to score these accesses as suitable.

Not one of the sites proposed for Green Space meet the criteria so why were they chosen? Why were no green spaces chosen in Broad Oak, Mill Corner, Derby Fields or North Warnborough?

The only mention of reduced speed limits is in Odiham High Street, where by its very nature it's not a road that is easily speeded in. Yet in Hook Road cars frequently reach speeds in excess of 60mph - but there is no proposal for any reduction in speed or any form of traffic calming / speed cameras etc there. There is already huge amount of HGV traffic coming through North Warnborough on Hook Road but under your plan this will increase.

The results in your draft plan appear to be totally aimed in favour of Odiham and do not reflect the views of the residents of North Warnborough. I am curious to know how they came about!

If the proposed developments take place we will be impacted upon and actually surrounded by three new sets of development - and according to the supposed criteria in your plan this should not be the case!!!!

| | | |
|----|--|------------------|
| 36 | Map: The proposed housing all appears to be heavily in the West of Odiham - nothing at all to the East or Centre. | 22/05/2015 11:13 |
| | Archery Fields, next to Hatchwood seems logical for new housing. I would like to know why this has been shelved. | |
| | I am wholly opposed to Crownfields being developed. | |
| 37 | Q 10 I cannot see the proposed village green area at Dunleys Hill working. What is wrong with the recreation ground? | 22/05/2015 11:00 |
| 38 | The villages of Odiham and North Warnborough really do need to preserve their identity or they will lose this by allowing ill advised development simply to meet the government's quota. Otherwise it could end up with Odiham, North Warnborough and other local villages eventually all merging into one huge housing development as has happened in other areas not so very far away from here. | 22/05/2015 10:58 |
| | Meanwhile local businesses need objective support from the Parish council to maintain a thriving local community. | |
| 39 | Q.10 Talk to Canal Society about what, if anything, is needed on towpath | 22/05/2015 10:32 |
| 40 | Q8. High Street should be 20 mph. | 22/05/2015 10:22 |
| 41 | Q8. 20 mph speed limit through High Street. | 22/05/2015 10:15 |
| 42 | Q 6. Care should be taken to avoid the contention that designated LGS sites are purely a defence against planned proposals. | 22/05/2015 10:12 |
| 43 | Very sad to hear that crown fields may be built on ,, live in buffins corner with my children and we love spending time walking and enjoying the field .. Hope there will be no sewage problems | 22/05/2015 10:10 |
| 44 | We believe that other areas on the outskirts of Odiham should be considered in the NP that are similar to the new development opposite to Hatchwood House. | 22/05/2015 07:58 |
| 45 | Could 108 be considered for LGS given its proximity to Odiham castle; the views and extensive recreational use? | 21/05/2015 21:40 |
| 46 | Access feasibility was marked green for 108- the existing roads adjacent to the area are unsuitable for increased volumes of traffic. Is it possible to factor this into the assessment? | 21/05/2015 21:32 |
| 47 | We must not allow Hart to determine the future of our village. | 21/05/2015 21:25 |
| 48 | I fully appreciate the need to build new houses, especially smaller properties to encourage first time buyers and local people to remain in the parish - the village needs these to be able to maintain a thriving community. | 21/05/2015 21:12 |
| | I would like every effort to be made to avoid building on green/agricultural land and to protect the existing boundaries of the villages. We are in danger of becoming another 'Hook', a characterless and soulless commuter town. Please preserve the village, its history and identity that is so unique. | |
| 49 | AS NOTED ABOVE SITE 108 IS A REAL CAUSE FOR CONCERN, ESPECIALLY REGARDING THE REPUTATION OF THE DEVELOPER'S AGENTS | 21/05/2015 20:57 |
| 50 | I don't agree with housing site 327 so didn't answer that question. There was no opportunity to say 'neither.' | 21/05/2015 20:03 |
| 51 | Page 1 | 21/05/2015 19:14 |

Having been a resident here for nearly 50 years I have found that they have plans to build on land by buffins road this has a nice view which would be

spoilt by the building of a residential home or a housing estate, which could possibly overlook our property or other properties at the top of Buffing road.

the second issue is assess to and from the proposed site if it is straight out on to the already busy Alton road as it is quite congested on the mornings during the morning rush hour and school run and afternoons. The only options to this is using exits for buffins Rd salmon road or recreation road again this is not practical as Robert Mays school is situated at the bottom and traffic is high at certain times of the day. Firs lane is not wide enough for high volume of traffic I think another site would be more appropriate.

| | | |
|----|--|------------------|
| 52 | no | 21/05/2015 19:00 |
| 53 | Where we have been given the opportunity to object to proposed development areas, we have no opportunity to suggest alternatives. | 21/05/2015 18:55 |
| 54 | Feel that the results are rather 'Odiham centric' and do not reflect the views of the residents of North Warnborough and its many listed buildings. | 21/05/2015 18:44 |
| 55 | Having two of the three 'consultation days' over the same weekend made it impossible for us to attend and we had family commitments that could not be altered. I would hope that the dangerous conditions on The Street, NW - no pavement, huge European lorries and drivers using it as a rat run - to the M3 would be considered when developers try to obtain land for building. | 21/05/2015 17:51 |
| 56 | Re. High st. Will appreciate an explanation of your policy and its aims. | 21/05/2015 17:47 |
| 57 | Re Parking A small DROPPING OFF point for leapfrogs nursery ((rather than a car park)) Emphasis should be placed on explaining how influential will be on the planning authorities. | 21/05/2015 17:38 |
| 58 | I do not think that 108 should be used for any form of development. We do not need another community centre, football pitch or cricket club. | 21/05/2015 17:14 |
| 59 | Re Q1 ' Maybe. I do not have enough information about 65 - is housing to be restricted to a small part of this important gap. If yes - then I agree with all sites' ((see form no 189)) | 21/05/2015 16:53 |
| 60 | Re Q 9. Extra capacity at Palace Gate should be for the Cross Barn. New planning applications should adhere to the proposed Plan. | 21/05/2015 16:47 |
| 61 | Make a small car park in front of Leapfrogs. 200 x 200 ft should be big enough. | 21/05/2015 16:41 |
| 62 | I question the validity of the Plan and support the representations already made to you by Mr Sorrentino of Lightwood Planning. | 21/05/2015 16:30 |
| 63 | I question the validity of the Plan and support the representations already made to you by Mr Sorrentino of Lightwood Planning. | 21/05/2015 16:24 |
| 64 | Parking off Hook Road instead of allotments. | 21/05/2015 16:20 |
| 65 | The NP Steering Group have done an outstanding job in preparing this NP. Thank you | 21/05/2015 16:18 |
| 66 | Please don't turn Odiham into another Hook. We don't want to live on a huge housing estate with very few shops/restaurants and schools bursting at the seams. | 21/05/2015 16:16 |
| 67 | It's a pity that the vehicular parking down Tunnel Lane was not made deeper. ie. if the ditch had been piped and the parking area laid back to the hedge. Cars could have parked nose in, doubling the number of cars that could have | 21/05/2015 16:11 |

parked there.

- 68 Congratulations to the team for excellent presentations. 21/05/2015 16:09
- 69 The proposed development in the deer park is of great concern to me and my family. No development should be allowed on this site. Any development would destroy the view and access to an area that has been available for a significant period of time. 21/05/2015 15:48
- Any small development here would give the green light for future development which the two villages do not want
- The draft plan seems to be sleep walking into a disaster if this area is not addressed
- 70 Development proposed at Roughts Cottage causes concern. Joining the roundabout from Newlyn Farm is dangerous at present. Other traffic doesn't seem to appreciate there is an exit here. Many a near miss has happened. 21/05/2015 15:46
- 71 Very important to maintain in a good order the existing pavements and footpaths e.g. overgrown pavements NW to Odiham and regular clearing of dropped litter and regular road sweeping. 21/05/2015 15:37
- 72 Proposals need to be more balanced between Odiham and North Warnborough. Surprising that other sites e.g. 108, Long Sutton did not feature 21/05/2015 15:23
- 73 Why is Deptford Lane now about to be developed but not part of the NP? I think there will always be a parking problem in Odiham as there are so many extra houses being built. Parking should have been provided before all the extra houses were built. 21/05/2015 15:14
- 74 Better bus service including a Community Bus to offer lifts to and from Winchfield Station similar to what HW currently has. 21/05/2015 15:07
- 75 Q1 - My "yes" answer would be subject to the reality of flooding 21/05/2015 15:04
- 76 I would like to see funds allocated for sporting activities such as better football or rugby pitches, or helping the cricket club. This is a neglected part of village life. 21/05/2015 15:03
- 77 Q1 - My only caveat is that Dunleys Hill should include substantial retained green space facing Dunleys Hill to maintain separation between the two settlements. 21/05/2015 14:54
- 78 Q1 - I would recommend that the green area in 65 Dunley sHill is make into a proper village green space and not just a poorly maintained field. It needs looking after. 21/05/2015 14:47
- 79 Growth is essential to ensure the survival of the many independent businesses and the general sense of vitality in our villages, so anything that increases and encourages both residents and visitors alike to spend time (and money) within the parish would be a massive plus ... as much as I don't want Odiham or N Warnborough to change, I fully understand that change is necessary to maintain their viability. 21/05/2015 14:19

Whilst parking is obviously not something that the NP can control, I do strongly feel that any increase to the existing parking facilities would be of benefit to the area as a whole - and I live in hope that a Resident's Permit Scheme is introduced!

Other than that, keep up the good work and thanks for the opportunity to put my thoughts forward ...

| | | |
|----|---|------------------|
| 80 | Q1 - Don't understand why 59 and 139 are not scheduled for development. They are both perfect and only presently basic farmland with no footpaths, with easy access. Also need funding for projects for young people!! | 21/05/2015 13:52 |
| 81 | Emphasise the importance of no development which increased traffic in Deer Park View and Palace Gate | 21/05/2015 12:21 |
| 82 | Q. 10 - Get rid of King Street toilets (they are terrible and I question if they are ever used and build more toilets in main car park) | 21/05/2015 12:16 |
| 83 | Q. 9 - Extend Deer Park car park Whilst it is understood Odiham is a great, profitable village due to its close link to London, there should not be such an emphasis on expansion. There runs the risk of upsetting residents so much that they leave, which would be a sacrilege. Think about residents before the money brought in by new houses that would spoil their enjoyment of their properties | 21/05/2015 11:59 |
| 84 | Important to maintain character of historic centre of Odiham village and not allow building on its open spaces behind Beech Cottage, in Kitchen Garden, Close Meadow and Archery Fields. Fully support proposal for NO housing on sites numbered 328, 329 29 and 228 on map. | 21/05/2015 11:09 |
| 85 | I agree with most of the plan but would like to see public access to the Local Green Spaces. | 21/05/2015 09:45 |
| 86 | Lots of hard work producing great plan | 21/05/2015 08:51 |
| 87 | An excellent job | 21/05/2015 08:44 |
| 88 | Odiham should have a bypass as the traffic needs slowing down and controlling especially on Hook Road The process hasn't been published - what was your scores on each site There seems to be some bias - Odiham seems to be protected from development There are plenty of sites to consider that you have thrown out - why? I came to the consultations and you couldn't answer my questions - there was lack of knowledge or reluctance to tell me | 21/05/2015 08:36 |
| 89 | Ref. Q 8 High St, it already does !! Very poorly worded question. It should have asked if residents agree with shops/offices cafes and restaurants being converted to houses/flats. | 20/05/2015 20:52 |
| 90 | Please see and read the attached paper based on this survey form and the OPC Neighbourhood Plan May 2015. ([REDACTED]) Re. Green spaces. This space could provide some car parking in addition to a space for residents and visitors to relax and enjoy. The designation as a GS should be dependent on full access to the village. | 20/05/2015 19:56 |
| 91 | Q. 8 High St We need more shops - there are lots of houses near the houses and offices offer nothing to a lovely village. | 20/05/2015 19:41 |
| 92 | Q9 Parking. Some capacity at Palace Gate - there is too much already! Sadly O is becoming crowded with housing - we live in a beautiful part of Hampshire and it's v important not to overfill it - your plan is excellent but let's go slowly. We mustn't end up too suburban. Congratulations on a really professional piece of work : We owe all those who have worked so hard a great debt. | 20/05/2015 19:35 |

- 93 Responding separately, so please delete name from joint response with husband. (At her request - form 128) 20/05/2015 19:27
- 94 Re q 9. Parking needed to encourage people to Odiham. 20/05/2015 19:22
- Odiham's ambiance and character must be maintained and its attraction to all ages must be developed.
- 95 Re q 8 above...The question is not clear. The High St requires more shops of day to day value eg. delicatessen bakery butcher etc. 20/05/2015 19:11
- 96 The two hour limit in the lower High St has helped but parking remains difficult. On many occasions one finds no space so go to Hook. More parking must be a priority for this village. 20/05/2015 19:05
- 97 I am concerned, having attended one of the consultation events, that several members of the team were advising that if you object to one of the proposed sites for development then you needed to confirm which site you would prefer instead?! Yet there is clearly no option to provide this? This therefore seems a wasted opportunity if the village requires all the sites proposed to meet the number of properties required? 20/05/2015 19:00
- I also feel disappointed at how only smaller sites have been proposed within the village - with the risk of a sense of overcrowding. Why were some of the larger sites not proposed for smaller developments? Surely there should be a balance of having new housing close to amenities as well as more rural locations.
- 98 The land north of Deptford Lane development proposal was sneaked in under the radar. No mention at all even in passing from your organisation. 20/05/2015 17:38
- A pointless proposal if I ever saw one. Whatever next.
- 99 The 'scoring' presented at the consultation meetings does not seem to be objective as some sites - notably Archery Fields, 79, 328, 329 and Beech Cottage seem to have been marked down and there is a bias in the methodology which has led to a preference to infill sites, and sites to the West of the villages, even when they are in conservation areas, over greenfield sites on the edge of settlements. 20/05/2015 17:30
- In terms of large, medium, small sites, the Dunleys Hill sites total nearly 100 dwellings, making it really quite a large development... Would the landowner of 138 (Firs Lane) or 79 (Broad Oak) have accepted a 100 dwelling proposal, which could have been made along the road and without so much damage to views or conservation areas? If the local community says they don't want infill between settlements, they want to protect the history and heritage, surely the preference should be to develop without infill and to protect conservation areas.
- We are told that for site 58, 'only' 15 dwellings would be permitted, yet the SHLAA site put forward was for so much more than this - how come ONW can stipulate a lower number of dwellings here yet turn down the larger sites on the grounds that the number of dwellings on those sites could not be reduced. It is not consistent at all...
- 100 Ref.Q1. 20/05/2015 17:01
- Agricultural land should remain as agricultural land - provision of food is also very important.
- Re. Q8
No more building in the High Street.
- Re Q9

None of the above. Free parking in O.

No building near King St - infrastructure cannot support this. Preserve O as it is. Don't let greedy landowners and developers spoil this. Save our trees, and ensure buildings work does not cause flood issues for the future.

- 101 London Road is now used as an overflow (free!) parking area for the High St, and this, together with resident parking, creates an almost one way traffic system which is potentially hazardous particularly for large and emergency vehicles. It would help the situation if residents who have designated off road parking were persuaded to use it rather than taking up road space which creates difficulties for delivery vehicles as well as a zig zag traffic situation. There is also a tendency to park partly on the footway/pavement which is inconvenient for pedestrians. I recommend that parking is considered on a village-wide basis rather than piecemeal. 20/05/2015 16:33
- 102 It is difficult from the map to define the map between O and NW, especially where Dunleys Hill meets the area by Crumplins Yard/Buftons Field. There was always meant to be a green area between the two. When does a village stop being a village? 20/05/2015 16:28
- 103 Re. q 8
Bias towards 'useful' shops (such as greengrocers/ironmonger etc) would be great rather than just high end shops and restaurants. Good that there are only two chains so far and will be nice not to have any more. 20/05/2015 16:16
- Re. q 10
More funds to enable litter picking.
- 104 Finally well done to all members of OP for putting in such hard work and personal time to drive this forward.
Designate the small field next to the Mapletons as a green field site with footpath. 20/05/2015 16:06
- 105 The view over AF is the loveliest around O - that, followed by the church on the hill are the essence of O. Also AF developed will create terrible traffic risk. 20/05/2015 15:58
- 106 I congratulate OPC on this well organised public consultation. 20/05/2015 15:52
- 107 I've recently retired. When working I used to cycle from Odiham to Hook station (both ways) and I always very conscious of the dangers from cars/trucks especially on dark winter mornings/evenings. Please create a combined cycle foot-path along this route as a priority. I guess it would ideally begin/end on the high street. 20/05/2015 15:49
- 108 Priority to traffic control and ease at Western Lane onto Dunleys Hill - school traffic + additional from development. Possibly residential permits for parking in street. Doing whatever possible to retain variety of shops/restaurants in High St. 20/05/2015 15:47
- 109 Very disappointing that most sites proposed are in NW. 20/05/2015 15:45
- 110 I still see a bias to areas in NW for housing. More importantly, I feel there should not be social housing in the area. 20/05/2015 15:39
- 111 People who require such housing do not have the required facilities locally like jobs, transport to work, health centre capacity to make it useful for them.
Would have liked to have seen some specific proposals re cycle paths on the Draft Plan. Granted, the Deer Park proposal, does include a useful route that would skirt around the edge of the village, but unfortunately at only as part of the overall development proposal 20/05/2015 15:35

- 112 Do not believe there appears to be any proposed improvements to the quality of the tow path or improved access to the canal and there is a definite need to increasing the parking at or near the Wharf and Castle. 20/05/2015 14:44
- I believe that the canal is the highest "value and amenity asset" that Odiham has for just walking the towpath or on a canoe or a boat and this study does not recognize these facts that also unfortunately needs day to day maintenance to survive for successive generations.
- 113 I've lived in Odiham for 20 years. When I first arrived there were two butchers, one selling cold meats, cheeses, eggs etc. two bakers, one fruit & veg shop, a well run wine shop even though part of a national chain, a child friendly sweet shop and a small supermarket. It was a busy high street where locals could shop on a daily basis for their grocery needs. Then came Tesco in Hook and we very quickly lost all these shops. Then came the Co-op which has had a captive market for too long that it didn't have to improve its standard. It has never been well run, never consistently well stocked. I hope the new one when it eventually opens will bring some self respect to the Co-ops local image. 20/05/2015 13:42
- We've seen too many 'lifestyle' shops come and go on a very regular basis. Often there are shops empty for long periods of time. Currently we have a lot of shops selling 'old 'tat', new 'tat' and even 'tat' for children. It is astounding how much coffee and home tat is generally for sale on our high street.
- Odiham needs a high street that it can be proud of. We don't need a high street for visitors we need a high street for locals. Let's do something about it!
- 114 Yes I think it is kind of weird to be considering the plan in isolation given the massive housing development proposed right on the edge of the area around Winchfield. That would have a huge impact on the adjoining land and ought to feature as part of the discussion. 20/05/2015 12:13
- 115 The comprehensive overview is extremely helpful and I agree with all of your outcomes. It seems paramount that this NP is submitted at the earliest opportunity so that Odiham and North Warnborough only have the development with which they agree. Thank you all so much for all your hard work. 20/05/2015 11:53
- 116 Re Question 1: Although in principle I agree with the proposed plan, there are several areas that do not seem to have given consideration to the EXISTING residents of the area:
 Sites 66 and 119 would directly back onto existing houses blocking out their existing views. I know that no-one is 'entitled' to a view but with more consideration this could be avoided by placing the houses on the northern side of Western Lane adjacent to Dunleys Hill.
 Site 327 similarly will ruin the views for existing residents of Crownfields and would be far less obstructive if the long end of the site lay along the border with the Alton Road.
 Site 58 needs very careful consideration as the houses in that area have already flooded recently and will continue to do so and with more dire results if more houses are built there. The numbers on this site should therefore be reduced to a minimum of 5
 The Deer Park should NEVER be built on and it seems a blight on Odiham that the proposal to do so is even being considered. I suspect the whole idea may be illegal as well. 20/05/2015 11:52

- 117 May not be part of the Draft Plan, but it would make such a difference to the traffic in the village particularly at busy times if the road both sides was double yellow lines to stop parking as you drive from Dunleys a hill roundabout into the village before you get to the palace gate turning to the left-this causes such problems as it so often becomes a one way street and causes blocks to the roundabout and high street. 20/05/2015 11:10
- 118 I am alarmed at the way the survey has been used to apportion sites for development with giving seemingly equal weight to the various criteria... eg flood risk is given no more weight than walking amenity. 20/05/2015 10:28
- Site 58 has been the subject of a huge amount of objection to the current development by Bell Cornwell. The plan to develop 33 homes has been deferred - for reasons of over development, for proximity of the site to the canal, and in particular flooding concerns. Unless these can be properly addressed development should no go ahead. If the flooding issue was properly understood, then no development should ever happen here, and certainly not be put forward as a site by the Neighbourhood Plan. Historically this site, known as The Swamp (opposite The Cat) has flooded, and especially after heavy rainfall when the culverts overtop and flood neighbouring listed buildings (Nevills, The Granary, The Bakery, Castlebridge Cottages, The Barn House and Strete Farm. Any interference with this site could only make this worse, and even Flood experts cannot guarantee this will not happen.
- For the local Neighbourhood Plan to be supporting this site for development after all the local knowledge and objection is preposterous, and a sad reflection of your efforts.
- 119 Regarding the housing sites, I agree with the selection but do not think the sites chosen necessarily conform to the criteria. There are flooding issues with 147, 232 and 58. Access issues with 327, 147, 58 and 233. 58, 147 and 58 are some distance from shops and schools. Separate planning permission is being sought for 108 which is as well sited as some others. CM is very central to all amenities. 20/05/2015 09:32
- 120 The Parish should already be investing money to the cycle routes, footpaths, historic signage, bins, benches, planters, canal maintenance etc. and should not be using the extra funds to do what should already be done. Perhaps invest in the younger community - a youth club perhaps! after all these are the future of the village. Provide more interest in areas of significance more seating spaces, advertising of our beautiful historic village to outside communities to get people from Basingstoke for example to visit and spend! Have local "heroes" visit local schools to promote the local wildlife and areas of significance, historic, and conservation - If the youth are involved positively then they too will nurture and look after the area in return. 20/05/2015 08:26
- 121 I am opposed to The Crownfields development. 20/05/2015 07:11
- 122 I am amazed that anyone would think they have the right to suggest that someone's land can become public open space - i.e. Dunley's Hill - just because they want it. If this land has been offered by the owner for this option then that would be a different matter. However, it is likely to become a dogs toilet as people will treat it the way as that is how many already treat the countryside footpaths 20/05/2015 06:09
- 123 I intend to submit some more detailed comments by email. 19/05/2015 22:42
- 124 I have a number of additional comments on the Draft Plan which I intend to submit separately via email. 19/05/2015 21:29

I have a number of additional comments in the Draft Plan which I intende to submit separately by email.

- 125 The new proposed houses should be sited North of Odiham/ (North Warnborough) to lessen traffic through village as most work traffic will move to and from the M3. 19/05/2015 20:22
- 126 The justification for 150-200 dwellings is not adequately explained. 19/05/2015 20:21
- The Village Design Statement provides details on character and design considerations that the general principles in Policy 4 do not match. Consideration should be given to relying more on the VDS than on suggested Policy 4. The statement on p 29 that the policy (Policy 4) establishes important design principles is not justified; it does not.
- Policy 5 purports to provide design guidance but does not. It provides some description of building characteristics, but not guidance. Similarly, Policy 6 does not provide useful guidance. Policy 7 delineates part of the High Street without explaining what that sub-area is or does or what the policy is intended to achieve. It is stated on p33 that Policy 8 would replace saved Policy DEV19. Is that correct?
- It does not appear to be acknowledged that the deer park is a conservation area (CA). This is highly significant and should be mentioned and its significance noted. It would be a major oversight to fail to acknowledge its CA status.
- Development of the deer park in the form suggested would suburbanise it - and unnecessarily in view of the network of paths that already exists. Reference on p 38 to the efficient use of energy is unclear. Much greater clarity is needed, if indeed the NP can say anything useful about the subject. The suggested assets of community value include buildings that are unlikely to be offered for sale (such as the church).
- 127 Please can you explain why a separate proposal from developers for building on the whole of site 108, including a proposal for a village green has been received. I am deeply concerned by this in particular how traffic access would be managed. I am supportive of the odiham plans proposal that this should be a site not proposed for housing. It would be helpful if you could provide information about this so I know if I should be taking further action to attempt to prevent this developers proposal. Receiving this information undermines the whole process of a neighbourhood plan. 19/05/2015 20:08
- 128 108 - Deptford Lane 19/05/2015 19:29
- Would not like to see any future housing development in this area. As the younger and sporting population of Odiham/North Warnborough increases this area should be further developed for sporting and recreational activities
- 129 Just moved into Odiham, so difficult to assess all angles at this early stage. 19/05/2015 19:17
- 130 12 houses on Site 60 (Rough's Cottage) seems excessive and no housing development should be permitted on the strip of land adjacent/closest to the dual carriageway. 19/05/2015 19:00
- 131 I would very much regret breaking into any of the fields along Tunnel Lane to make a car park for the castle. Some work has already been done to create some hard standing. I would push the owner of Albion Yard to provide some space alongside the new housing. After all, he gets to build houses in a rural part of the CA - he could give something in return. Allowing him to break into fields along Tunnel Lane just creates a precedent and could become the thin end of the wedge for building along there too. 19/05/2015 16:52

Please see attached comments which have been linked to the objectives and criteria in the draft plan:

The draft plan shows the following as criteria for housing:

On page 8 it states: As far as possible, development should not impact detrimentally on conservation areas, listed buildings and views valued by the community - that was considered the most important criterion for assessing housing sites.

One page 9 it states: To protect and enhance the local history environment – Will it sustain & enhance listed buildings and their settings? Will it sustain and enhance the three conservation areas and their settings?

On page 10 it states: To avoid and mitigate the risks to existing and new development from flooding – Will it avoid allocating development in flood zones 2 & 3? This should also recognise the importance of considering development on historic areas which flood such as site 58. Development should be avoided where there is a known flood risk.

Page 19 states: The importance of developments being reasonable walking distance to local services i.e. schools, doctors, dentists etc. All local services are based in Odiham and North Warnborough is over half a mile from any making Odiham more accessible to local amenities than North Warnborough and other outlying areas.

Page 31 states: 1. The presence of notable green spaces interwoven with natural water features. 2. The prominence of listed buildings and buildings of local interest in the village street scene especially in framing, punctuating or terminating key views through, out of and/or into the village. 5. The importance of open space opposite 'The Cat' allowing views to the canal.

Page 38 states: Development that would have an adverse impact on views from the good network of footpaths in Odiham Parish or would suburbanise their surroundings will therefore normally be resisted. Examples of areas currently important for countryside walking include the countryside around the Basingstoke canal.

I would propose that sites 58, 232 & 147 do not meet all of the above criteria and should be changed from proposed housing development sites into green sites which, according to the plan criteria, all three sites meet in their entirety.

I would also challenge the scoring methodology.

With regard to ease of vehicle access – AF is Red whilst Hook Road is Green – Clearly a mistake on the scoring for AF as Wates in their Design & Access Statement have stated 'The proposed access arrangements have been discussed in detail and agreed with Hampshire County Council'. AF should be scored Green as ease of vehicle access is possible.

With regard to impact on the historic settlement pattern of the Parish – AF is Amber whilst Hook Road is Green – why is Hook Road not Red (surrounding and opposite 17 listed buildings and historically a linear development) and AF Green (only 1 listed building 200m away and next to a 1960's development)?

The draft plan shows the following as criteria for green spaces:

On page 7 it states: The preservation of our heritage, including conservation areas and view/landscape was considered more important than 'the provision

of new community/recreation facilities. One of the most valued spaces is the Canal which has its own conservation area.

On page 34 it states: Following the Neighbourhood plan consultations one of the five green spaces most valued by the residents is the canal.

On page 38 it states: Development that would have an adverse impact on views from the good network of footpaths in Odiham Parish or would suburbanise their surroundings will therefore normally be resisted. Examples of areas currently important for countryside walking include the countryside around the Basingstoke canal.

None of the proposed green sites meet the criteria whereas sites 58 in particular meets all the criteria and yet has not been considered a green site.

Why were no green spaces chosen in Broad Oak, Mill Corner, Derby Fields or North Warnborough?

The draft plan only refers to a suggested 20MPH speed limit and some limitations on HGV traffic through Odiham Village. The parish is bigger than just Odiham and some year ago without any consultation, Alton traffic was diverted away from Odiham High Street down Dunleys Hill to Bridge and Hook Roads through North Warnborough. The traffic along these three roads is disproportionate to that travelling along the High even though there are many listed buildings adjoining Hook Road and The High . No mention has been made of traffic calming measures anywhere in the parish bar the High Street. Why not?

Also by implication all heavy HGVs would be directed to Dunlays Hill and Bridge/Hook Roads which is unacceptable as these are very busy roads and have 17 listed buildings adjoin them.

In summary I have to conclude that the results of the consultation and the methodology in scoring has been biased in favour of Odiham and do not reflect the views of North Warnborough residents.

We have lived in our Grade 2 listed building in North Warnborough for 28 years and have seen many changes but have fought, as responsible custodians of our property, to keep any development in keeping with and sensitive to, the historic and environmental values of our village. This draft plan does not adhere to those values because it shows scant respect for listed buildings, the conservation areas and hence has no respect for the preservation of our heritage or the future of our village.

133

The Draft Plan (Policy 2)pages 21-25 only discusses supported development. There is no discussion about how and why particular sites were chosen or dismissed.

19/05/2015 13:00

The 'traffic light ' selection criteria diagram shown at the consultations was extremely poorly explained, contained numerous errors and was attacked by very many residents. There is no explanation of the selection process in the draft plan, only the criteria used. Clearly these are criteria that have different 'weighting' and should be ranked in an appropriate manner.

The committee MUST reconsider the technique if the selected sites are to have any validity..... it was apparent that the team trying to explain the diagram were lacking the technical skills required to perform such an analysis

- 134 I really feel that the area is in need of outdoor recreational facilities for people of all ages. There's currently just 2 parks in Odiham! No duck ponds or nature garden picnic areas! The nearest being Alton, Basingstoke or Farnham. Though there are lots of walks and a canal these are not always ideal with young children or the less physical able. There could be a bigger community hall offering more for the youths such as craft, dance, cooking, games etc. and a little off topic but in the interest of the community-a better bus service! It's appalling! No route to Alton (students only) or church Crookham/fleet/farnborough! All routes with alternative education. Opens up more opportunities for college age students especially being that education till 18 yrs is now compulsory. 19/05/2015 11:37
- 135 There is much to commend the plan but I urge that the site 58 is excluded from the development area. Whilst I can see that to anyone without direct experience of living adjacent to the site it may appear to be an obvious place to put houses, but the groundwater flooding issues are very serious and there is a serious history of flooding. 19/05/2015 11:22
- Surely, one of the real points of a genuinely neighbourhood development plan is that it can give real weight and consideration to the actual lived experience of local residents who know how an area functions year on year in all kinds of weather. I am not against development per se, but it must be safe and sustainable and protect local inhabitants from environmental risks. The experience of flooding in North Warnborough Street should itself show how serious the issues around groundwater are in North Warnborough. Please do not repeat this problem elsewhere in North Warnborough.
- 136 Thank you for the hard work of the committee in producing this plan. 19/05/2015 11:20
- 137 No 19/05/2015 11:14
- 138 I would like to thank the group and the Parish Council for such a thorough and professional approach to this matter. 19/05/2015 10:43
- 139 Development in and around North Warnborough will completely ruin the look and historic value of these beautiful areas. Not enough has been done to look into the possibilities of flooding - which is clearly an issue and into improving the current infrastructure. 19/05/2015 09:51
- 140 This questionnaire gives the impression that car parking is not an issue. London Road, Palace Gate and Manley James are crowded on an almost daily basis with cars that people are not willing to put in car parks. London Road is a difficult passage on many days and at some stage emergency vehicles are not going to have access. 19/05/2015 09:46
- Can the housing requirement change over the period of the Plan. Can decisions on the likes of 'Winchfield New Town' change the Plan assumptions? If so what then?
- 141 Developing in Odiham and NW with considerable heritage and conservation significance is always going to result in local opposition and issues with over-development, changing the appearance, flood risk and increasing existing congestion. 19/05/2015 09:39
- You have fields closer to the A287 which would enable new homeowner's to get fast access to M3 which is primarily what they will need without having to travel through the villages.
- There is almost no public transport in the villages so this would in no way help reduce congestion.
- Council hate so called NIMBY's and the costs and problems with objections, appeals etc and of course the increased prices to houses in these areas for

affordable housing so why suggest multiple small sites in the conservation gaps?

Before entering the village in the car my 8 year old said to me "daddy why don't they just build the houses here where it would be easier for everyone to get to?"

142

Comments on Odiham Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2032 Draft v9

19/05/2015 09:20

Housing Sites – from your draft plan these are the criteria for housing

Plan page 8 Housing: – As far as possible, development should not impact detrimentally on conservation areas, listed buildings and views valued by the community - that was considered the most important criterion for assessing housing sites. Plan page 9 Objective 1 Historic Environment :- To protect and enhance the local history environment – 2A Will it sustain & enhance listed buildings and their settings? 2B Will it sustain and enhance the three conservation areas and their settings? Plan page 10 Objective 4 Flood Risk: – To avoid and mitigate the risks to existing and new development from flooding - 5A – Will it avoid allocating development in flood zones 2 & 3? Should this read: Avoid development where there is a flood risk or site has previously flooded? Plan page 19 Policy 1 Spatial plan for the Parish: The reasonable walking distance of the site to local services i.e. schools, doctors, dentists etc. Page 31 Policy 6 North Warnborough Conservation area: 1. The presence of notable green spaces interwoven with natural water features. 2 .The prominence of listed buildings and buildings of local interest in the village street scene especially in framing, punctuating or terminating key views through, out of and/or into the village. 5. The importance of open space opposite 'The Cat' allowing views to the canal. Plan page 38: Development that would have an adverse impact on views from the good network of footpaths in Odiham Parish or would suburbanise their surroundings will therefore normally be resisted. Examples of areas currently important for countryside walking include the countryside around the Basingstoke canal.

Why were sites 58, 232 & 147 proposed for housing when they clearly do not meet the above criteria?

Challenges to scoring:

Ease of vehicle access - AF Red Hook Road Green – Clearly a mistake on the scoring for AF as Wates in their Design & Access Statement have stated 'The proposed access arrangements have been discussed in detail and agreed with Hampshire County Council'. AF should be scored Green as ease of vehicle access is possible.

Impact on the historic settlement pattern of the Parish – AF Amber Hook Road Green – why is Hook Road is not Red (surrounding and opposite 17 listed buildings and historically a linear development) and AF Green (only 1 listed building 200m away and next to a 1960's development)

Green Spaces – from your draft plan these are the criteria for Green Spaces

Plan page 7 Green spaces – The preservation of our heritage, including conservation areas and view/landscape was considered more important than 'the provision of new community/recreation facilities. One of the most valued spaces is the Canal. Plan page 34 Policy 9 Green spaces – Following the Neighbourhood plan consultations (C1) one of the five green spaces most valued by the residents is the canal. Plan page 38: Development that would have an adverse impact on views from the good network of footpaths in

Odiham Parish or would suburbanise their surroundings will therefore normally be resisted. Examples of areas currently important for countryside walking include the countryside around the Basingstoke canal.

Not one of the sites proposed for Green Space meet the criteria so why were they chosen?

Why were no green spaces chosen in Broad Oak, Mill Corner, Derby Fields or North Warnborough?

Traffic:

Only views shown in the plan are for the High Street in Odiham with a suggested a 20MPH speed limit & some limitations on HGV traffic through Odiham Village.

How about traffic calming in other places such as 20MPH on Dunleys Hill and Bridge/Hook Road in NW?

Where do you suggest the HGV traffic goes to avoid the Odiham Village?

Summary

The results are very skewed in favour of Odiham and do not reflect the views of many residents in North Warnborough.

As guardians of a Grade 2 listed building we are totally and utterly devastated that the neighbourhood plan has shown no respect for listed buildings, the conservation areas and hence no respect to the preservation of our heritage.

- 17th May 2015
- 143 If the village had to consider some larger sites simply because the working assumption of 150-200 houses is not accepted, then Hockley's Farm and site 108 offer the lowest impact solution near to existing infrastructure. These sites ought to be included as potential development sites, but reduced accordingly from the full extent of the site shown on the map. 19/05/2015 08:21
- 144 I believe the plans suggested are a good way of integrating the required new housing into the existing village structure rather than their expanding into new large developments. 18/05/2015 21:13
- 145 I am concerned about a communication from Hallam Land management on a proposal for development of site 108. This site has been rejected by NP and I sincerely hope it will stay that way. 18/05/2015 21:05
- Re q 1, Have some concerns about vehicular access for 147 and 232. Swan Bridge is a dangerous part of Hook Road for traffic if the access is near the bridge.
- 146 Heavily Odiham biased, majority of development in North Warnborough. Local green space is in Odiham. 18/05/2015 21:02
- Nothing addresses parking in the high st
- No mention of volume of heavy traffic (18 wheelers especially) on the Street where there is no pavement to walk on.
- 147 No more large houses. We need houses our children can afford. 18/05/2015 20:53
- 148 Improve sewage for whole village ! 18/05/2015 20:50
- 149 Why no development of businesses (factories, offices etc). I do NOT want Odiham to become a large retirement home! 18/05/2015 20:48

Re. Q 9 parking. The first three are all MUCH too far from the centre of

Odiham.

- 150 Question1: although I don't object to the sites chosen; I do disagree with the number of houses proposed at site 58 at a recent district council meeting. 18/05/2015 20:42
- I would prefer to see lower density proper homes with gardens at all sites.
- Every effort should be made to place houses away from current residents with less regard for planning policy which always seeks to infill and abut existing housing. The charm of this area is the open feeling and rural character and we should avoid making it another Fleet or Basingstoke.
- 151 Although no-one has a right to a view ; surely some provision should be made for those who want to live in a village setting rather than a town. It seems essential that the traffic impact and access to new sites is given high priority for instance some sort of traffic management should be implemented at the top of Western Lane 18/05/2015 20:36
- 152 A pedestrian crossing is urgently required across the High St from the new Coop to the Post Office. This would slow the traffic which is unacceptably fast at this end of the High St. Ideally the High St should have a 20 mph speed limit and very large vehicle excluded altogether. 18/05/2015 20:29
- 153 We live in king street with property bordering the public toilets and if they were ever offered for sale , would be interested in purchasing them as we own the cellar beneath. The sale would free up parish funds to build a more modern modular public toilet facility with better disabled access on a less busy road, that would be cheaper and easier to maintain and clean and more conveniently located e.g in the car park near the Bury. 18/05/2015 20:09
- 154 No Parking from Church Street to Alton Road. 18/05/2015 19:46
- 155 A cycle path between Odiham and Hook railway station would greatly benefit residents. We live in king street with property bordering the public toilets and if they were ever offered for sale , would be interested in purchasing them as we own the cellar beneath. The sale would free up funds to build a more modern modular public toilet facility with better disabled access on a less busy road, that would be cheaper and easier to maintain and clean and more conveniently located e.g in the car park near the Bury. 18/05/2015 19:46
- 156 The canal is already fine for cycling and walking. I can see Kingfishers, wild deer and Herons plus lots more wildlife at present. 18/05/2015 19:41
- 157 There should not be any more development until the sewage/groundwater problems in the parish are addressed. Hatchwood is going to be a big problem in this regard. But Hart Council and, to a lesser extent, the Parish Council don't seem worried about the implications of this. 18/05/2015 19:37
- 158 Note the Sentinel Low cost housing in London Road has car park spaces at the back, but do the residents use these? NO!! They prefer to block the path with their cars - not all, but a large majority. We need a yellow line down in front of these homes to stop having to zig zag down the road. 18/05/2015 19:35
- Do we really need so many new houses for local people who live and work in the area?
(NB. Writer underlined 'small' in q 1.
- 159 Thank to all for your hard work and efforts on your behalf. The NP seem to have proposed all the new houses to be built in the same area of Odiham (65, 66, 119 and 233) and a little further away 327, and not apportioned across the whole of the village. 18/05/2015 19:32

| | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 160 | There is too much traffic on Dunleys Hill already. So anything that creates more traffic would be a disaster. | 18/05/2015 19:30 |
| 161 | Surely there should be more general use allowed for the car park above the church | 18/05/2015 19:26 |
| 162 | currently used for collecting or dropping off primary school children 9C too far for KJC | 18/05/2015 19:25 |
| 163 | I suggest access on Upper Greywell Road and then from track down to towpath (due south) and small car park at south end Parking - Palace Gate. The road to Palace Gate and X Barn is already used for parking cars, the area in Palace Gate is only for residents, their visitors, tradesmen and carers so where is there capacity for car parking? | 18/05/2015 19:11 |
| 164 | Not clear on proportion to be 'green space'/housing | 18/05/2015 19:04 |
| 165 | Re q 8, priority for High St 1 - shops; 2 - restaurants; 3 - offices | 18/05/2015 19:02 |
| 166 | What is happening with the area between Archery Fields and Hatchwood House? Happily I see it has been proposed as a Green Space, which I do endorse. The view into the surrounding countryside and Hillside Farm is particularly beautiful and it would be a great pity if we were to lose it. | 18/05/2015 19:00 |
| 167 | What is happening about the re-establishment of the bus service through the High Street? Re No9 Parking. | 18/05/2015 17:16 |
| 168 | A multi storey carpark could be built on the site of the existing car park in Deerpark View. One storey UNDERGROUND ,another at ground level,another above that. If not three stories, then two, one underground and one at ground level.Can't think why this wasn't built originally! A pat on the back for the OnwardPlan Steering Committee - well done. Thank you for all your hard work on our behalf. | 18/05/2015 15:58 |
| 169 | What Odiham needs is MORE shops, MORE schools and MORE access to Doctors. Not more houses full stop. A lot more thinking needs to be done. Why close Odiham Hospital and then propose a Care Home. Why not use the facility already there? Do you enjoy wasting money? | 18/05/2015 13:33 |
| 170 | Odiham is in desperate need of Shops, and should be returned to the bustling High Street it was in the 50/60,s. If all this house building goes ahead where the people going to shop? send children to our already full schools, and have access to Dr,s?. | 18/05/2015 13:14 |
| 171 | On the whole I think the Draft Plan is good except for the change of use to the Deer Park. | 18/05/2015 12:53 |
| 172 | I think most people are 'singing of the same song sheet' with the future plans for the villages which is great. What I am most concerned with is with companies like Hallam who are putting in proposals for development with the implication that its the best thing for the villages. These people do not live here, have no interest here and have no idea what is best for us. Is there nothing we can do to stop them and let the residents and locals decide, this nothing to do with them and i guess they are only interested in making money. | 18/05/2015 12:34 |

| | | |
|-----|--|------------------|
| 173 | Please consider the DP as a special test case for LGS given its clearly defined boundaries and special heritage in this Magna Carta year. AND please explore options for the Community to buy it and protect it for generations to come. That would be a real and lasting legacy for the OnwardPlan. | 18/05/2015 12:29 |
| 174 | The conclusions of the NP to date seem to me to be sensible and commendable. I am concerned by the Deer Park proposal. It seems very contrived and I have doubts about its durability beyond the current owner of the land. | 18/05/2015 12:08 |
| 175 | No further comments. | 18/05/2015 11:53 |
| 176 | Re question 8: | 18/05/2015 10:52 |
| | Parking: the present situation favours short-term visitors, not the residents of the High St living in the restricted area and without off street parking. This will most likely become worse when the Coop opens and when the various new housing projects are completed. | |
| 177 | There is nothing in the questionnaire about the big increase in traffic which will be a consequence of increased development. | 18/05/2015 10:41 |
| | The speed of traffic (mostly large lorries) in the High Street will soon start to undermine the historic houses. A properly monitored speed limit throughout the villages (both Odiham & North Warnborough) would not go amiss. | |
| 178 | I would also prefer to see more sites used with less density of development. There are 3 pubs that have fallen into disuse for a variety of reason (Jolly Miller, Swan, Crown). Fortunately there are others that are going-concerns elsewhere in the area, so we are not too badly served. Is there potential to redevelop these 3 sites for the benefit of the community whilst building on the heritage/history of the area? | 18/05/2015 10:03 |
| 179 | Point 7. The Deer Park. | 17/05/2015 21:14 |
| | Every effort should be made to protect this for future generations. Application to English Heritage should be considered now that the Deer Park is known to be under threat. | |
| 180 | Point 7 the Deer Park. Every effort should be made to protect this community asset for future generations, contacting English Heritage maybe now that this area of the Deer Park is known to be under threat. | 17/05/2015 19:50 |
| 181 | I'm sympathetic to the need for more housing in the area but I have grave concerns over the infra structure. Odiham and North Warnborough are unique and many of our roads are not suitable for an increase in traffic that would arise through further development here. | 17/05/2015 19:50 |
| 182 | YES Question No.9 on Parking I have no specific preferences here but what I would wish to comment on is parking in Odiham generally. You say in the Plan that parking was bad in December because of construction work. While this may be true the parking in Odiham generally is diabolical. London Road has parked cars down its length and often on both sides. It has been a concern of residents at this end of Odiham for years that the time is going to come when an emergency vehicle will not be able to gain access to the fire/medical emergency. The streets surrounding London Road | 17/05/2015 18:36 |

also act as car parks during daylight hours.

Mention was made of a car park in Palace Gate. From experience Palace Gate is already used as a car park by those unable to find a space on the High Street or are unwilling to pay to use the existing car parks.

At the Consultation on Saturday, 16th May one of the proposals on the boards was for free time restricted parking adjacent to the surgery. While I think this is an excellent idea (I have noted the numbers of elderly who need to use a car to attend) would be interested as to how this would be enforced unless there is a traffic warden on permanent duty or the elderly are issued with some sort of parking pass.

Question No.10 Infrastructure Aims

I have no specific preferences on the items listed.

However, I do have concerns concerning the wider issues on infrastructure. I am aware that schools, roads, doctors are outwith the remit of HDC but these must be addressed now and not years down the line. Parents will not be pleased when they are told their child cannot have a place at the schools in Odiham.

Draft Plan - Introduction 1.14 GEN 11 Areas affected by Flooding or Poor Drainage

Site 58 Hook Road

This site has been up for development previously and been rejected on the grounds of general unsuitability, access and tendency to flood. Has anything changed or is it proposed that the site will be drained before any development takes place.

Site 59 designated a flood area.

Developments are being built on areas that previously were prone to flooding, the solution being to drain the land. Could this not be done here.

Hatchwood Place

Outwith the NP but I am referring to it here in the context of poor drainage. You will be aware (I hope) of there being instances of the North Warnborough Pumping Station breaking down and the consequences of that. We have seen sewage running down London Road and only three or four days ago Thames Water had a huge bowser working on the drains opposite Waverley Close. There is a problem with venting at the top of Waverley Close. Although Hart DC have signed off Condition 3 relating to sewage/drainage at the Hatchwood development the problem has not been resolved. Future developments will only add to the problem and the Steering Group, residents and future residents should be made aware of this.

General

I seem to remember that a figure of a further 500 houses was mentioned in a document last year. Unfortunately, I have been unable to identify that document so have read the minutes of HDC for 27th November 2014 in which your figure of 150 - 200 houses appears. From this I note that these figures relate to Odiham, North Warnborough, SOUTH WARNBOROUGH, GREYWELL AND LONG SUTTON so has there been any liaison with these communities to ascertain how many, if any, houses they feel able to take? I also note from the minutes that these figures are for the first ten years of the Local Plan. Has the Steering Group established how many houses the Parish will be required after this time through to the current end of Plan date of 2032.

You will see from my comments why I am a reluctant supporter of Hart New Town rather than numerous smaller developments without the benefit of

adequate infrastructure.

- 183 I'm not against houses being built. I feel this is very bias towards Crownfields site and should have been done independently. I cannot believe how this site is more preferable to some of the other sites. The graph the Onwardplansteering group have made is bias and not on their doorstep. This should have been done by a professional independent company!! 17/05/2015 16:58
- 184 It appears that there are a number of sites that fall firmly within the preferences of the village but that have not been pursued in this plan to the detriment of others. As the preference has been for infill sites that are either surrounded by development or on two or more sides should be treated as preferential. In addition some sites that have a visual impact from afar (on the main approaches from M3), such as 327, have been chosen ahead of those that sit on downward slopes away from the village where there is not significant approaching traffic (e.g. AF). It would appear that there is a concerted effort to limit the development in the village of cheaper housing stock to one area at the expense of the overall planning preferences of the majority or residents. 17/05/2015 10:38
- 185 I really think the issue of parking still hasn't been addressed - especially around the high street and up king street. 16/05/2015 21:35
- Although not specifically mentioned I feel very strongly about protecting views across Odiham, particularly across the fields from South Ridge, Deer Park, over to RAF base.
- I continue to feel that a large development like the Charles church one on the farnham road is fundamentally wrong for the entrance to a village like Odiham and dread its arrival, so I strongly support the infill approach and smaller developments. We just need to watch out for new housing fitting in with the local area, and not all becoming the bland new brick and render that recent developments have followed.
- 186 I do not know if the draft plan includes the flow of traffic through the village, but the situation on the western end of the High Street is, frankly, ridiculous. Parked cars result in the remainder of the road being just wide enough for two cars to pass, but many drivers do not think there is enough spare room. Westbound drivers, who have priority, often have to give way to eastbound traffic. On the north side, the pavement is very wide and little used. Removing one metre of this pavement would increase the width of remaining road to allow free flow of traffic in both directions, reducing pollution and noise. 16/05/2015 18:50
- 187 Have you thought instead about approaching existing home owners / council properties with enormous gardens to see if they would be willing to sell to make space for more housing? 16/05/2015 17:58
- 188 A general comment only. Please could the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers be considered in the road design. It would be nice to avoid lots of road signs with warnings and speed limits and have design that naturally slows drivers and makes pedestrians pay attention 16/05/2015 15:06
- 189 Thanks
There is a high proportion of new development recommended for North Warnborough. Did the methodology for site selection take proper account of the relative population size of the two communities, and were environmental factors given due weight? There is a very real flood risk in North Warnborough and the plan should take this into account before making any recommendations which could endanger residents' homes. Developers' promises to mitigate risk are not to be relied on! 16/05/2015 13:16

- 190 Many existing marked footpaths are made difficult to walk on, sometimes almost impassable, by local horse riders - who even sometimes remove the FP signposts. I once met a lady "off piste" in the woods on Odiham Common who remarked that she had had to give up walking her small grandchildren on the common as they were not able to deal with the depth of the ruts in the churned mess resulting from horse traffic on the footpaths. There are marked bridleways but riders will not stick to them. 16/05/2015 10:31
- It would be very helpful if there was a publicity campaign to nudge those riders responsible to think of the inconvenience caused to the many users of our footpaths by their uncaring actions.
- 191 Maintenance and signing of existing paths/ waymarks/ toilets and seating are not matters for a neighbourhood plan. Leave the Parish Council some matters to get concerned about. Give them the C.I.L. income and let them micro-manage their domain. 16/05/2015 08:18
- I absolutely fail to see how this purports to be a plan for RAF Odiham and its resident parishioners. There should be proposals for their development needs and aspirations. Perhaps the same could be validly said for the Whitehall and Broad Oak settlements and their residents aspirations to ensure the health of their small communities.
- 192 Policy 7. It must be made perfectly clear to the owner of the Deer Park that his proposal will not under any circumstances be included in the Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2032. 15/05/2015 21:54
- 193 The draft plan has taken in the view of residents who have been able to attend the few consultations provided or have access to the Internet. However, little time has been taken to get the views of the community who are not necessary able to get to the meetings and may not have access to the Internet (of particular concern are the elderly). If a true view of the whole community's feelings on development within Odiham and North Warnborough is to be achieved perhaps knocking on a few doors would be beneficial. 15/05/2015 18:07
- 194 For Q9, I would ideally like to see improvements to children's playgrounds too. The ones we have in the village are nice, but could be enhanced by providing a greater range of play equipment covering a wider age range. 15/05/2015 15:44
- 195 Too much development (all nine sites proposed) is to the west of the A3349 mini roundabout at the top of the High Street. Why is this so? 15/05/2015 15:40
- 196 My priority would be to maintain the overall nature of Odiham and North Warnborough as a beautiful rural small villages area rather than one where large modern housing estates are the predominance. After all that's why we chose to live here in the first place. 15/05/2015 14:31
- 197 It seems inevitable that responses to the questionnaire will impact more heavily on North Warnborough because of the greater population in Odiham. The Parish Council has acknowledged this by separating responses from Odiham, N. Warnborough and RAF and then looking for common ground between them in the sites which scored better than average. 15/05/2015 12:47
- 198 Prices of the housing needs to be more affordable as many living in and around the area cannot afford to buy at current market prices. 15/05/2015 12:11
- By doing this it means less families can afford to live in the area and increases the percentage of older generations living in the area which in turn changes the shift of the needs of the village.
- Odiham needs more families and younger generations in order to survive as once the older generations leave there is no one who can afford to fill the gap.

Odiham is a beautiful village to bring up children in and to teach them the values of respecting the countryside and village life. The new plan needs to embrace this more.

- | | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 199 | What can you do about the bus service? | 15/05/2015 10:31 |
| 200 | Only to say that you are doing a great job and that this particular resident is proud to support you. | 15/05/2015 08:54 |
| 201 | well done.it is fair, balanced and professional. | 14/05/2015 21:25 |
| 202 | Please see below my additional comments. | 14/05/2015 20:20 |

1. You are confusing people with the local green spaces issue. Why for instance is site 65 shown for proposed housing,as well as local green space? (I have had numerous people comment to me that they do not understand this)

2.you state in your Community Views section of the draft plan that 86% of the 218 residents who gave feedback (188) supported this initiative and its proposed main focus. This is a very low number against actual population and lets hope the Residence have been engaged more with the latest communications and that all of the questionnaires are fully examined and comments/views considered and acted upon.

3.The Plan Steering Group do not appear to have grasped the impact on vehicle traffic that building on the proposed 9 sites would have . To increase the housing capacity to the proposed numbers (with site 65 still showing no numbers ?) would increase the car numbers by approx 150 upwards !!

This is not even taking into consideration the large new housing development currently underway at the end of the High st. , just before the roundabout .

Why have you not considered sites such as 110, 59, 139 instead which have access via the existing dual carriageway facilities. ?

Existing parking facilities are already poor along the Odiham High st., the current proposals will only add to this problem.

Your plan update does refer to the fact that in Jan 15 many respondents said they would like additional parking close to the centre of Odiham. However your report appears to have dismissed this..to quote.."due to the fact the Steering Group is aware that this consolation period coincided with the unprecedented peak in demand for parking in early 2015 during construction work in the High St." !!

The said Steering Group are clearly out of touch with the reality of the current situation and the challenge to find parking spaces around the High St. Do you really believe that those who responded misjudged the problem due to construction work.....!!? Please get this back on the Plans agenda...car parking is an important issue to both residence and local business development within our community.

- | | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 203 | Please don't decrease the value of our houses under the crown fields site as nearly all the houses are owned! | 14/05/2015 15:52 |
|-----|---|------------------|

- | | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 204 | Thank-you for pushing through with this work, i know you all do it in your spare time and it will be of great value to the village. | 14/05/2015 12:17 |
|-----|---|------------------|

| | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 205 | thank you all for your hard work and commitment in preparing this plan. However, I have to say I am disappointed by its contents on a number of fronts. Building on site 58 is a huge mistake I would urge you to re-visit your assessment as it is completely wrong. There are other sites that would impact the community very much less that are not recommended e.g 79, 78, 110, 59. It is a fallacy to believe that we need to build 'on sites that are not isolated' because this will make people use their cars. They will use them any way. People don't walk from NW to Odiham or vice versa so this won't make a difference and at least with some of the sites the traffic will go directly on to the A287 and not have to add to the congestion on Odiham High Street AND Hook Road NW (which everyone seems to forget about). | 14/05/2015 12:16 |
| 206 | The biggest issues for us are: control traffic speed through the town a restriction on large vehicles other than access for loading and unloading residents who live on the High Street should have one parking permit for the High Street we have a lot of cycles using the town's facilities, there should be cycle racks provided, so that cyclists don't lean their cycles on the walls and can secure them by chain | 14/05/2015 12:08 |
| 207 | I realise that nothing can stay as it is. I came to Odiham as a young married man in 1957, first house..first bungalow on West St....there were only people with horses and pasture, or council housing. This is only a slight exaggeration ! Our bungalows were the only private building in Odiham for years before. I have watched Archery fields and other very large sites being built..all without a plan. Most of the housing in Odiham is occupied by 'newcomers', however far back you go. It is impossible for Odiham to remain a VILLAGE. I feel that no plan can prevent 'so called' progress. | 14/05/2015 09:18 |
| 208 | Really encouraging, thank you. | 13/05/2015 20:44 |
| 209 | Parking. Some capacity already exists at Palace Gate. What is needed is more parking for the users of the Cross Barn - but not in Palace Gate Farm Road. This already has restrictions. | 13/05/2015 20:36 |
| 210 | a very good exercise - please continue | 13/05/2015 20:31 |
| 211 | High Street - The High St is unique leave it alone | 13/05/2015 20:26 |
| | NW small village but looks to bear of this dev. plan. I can't understand why areas next to A287 are not taking all or any of the new housing - makes no sense | |
| 212 | It would be nice if there were some of the swinging gates on local walks removed and replaced with normal gates so pushchairs and mobility scooters can access the local countryside and walks. | 13/05/2015 20:21 |
| 213 | High Street - Possibly There should be traffic calming signs for the High Street | 13/05/2015 20:04 |
| 214 | Again repeating earlier comments on why development in Odiham is always such high density, high volume of new dwellings. Why can't development be directed to lower number of dwellings of a bigger size. | 13/05/2015 20:00 |
| | Housing site comments- how can sites which propose small developments, 6 dwellings max., which are directly next to the village settlement boundary not be considered? Why is it always higher density. | |
| 215 | Car parks at Leapfrogs and Dunleys are too far from the shops. | 13/05/2015 20:00 |
| 216 | A very good plan thank you | 13/05/2015 19:55 |
| 217 | High Street - I would not support converting more conversions of shops to | 13/05/2015 19:44 |

| | | |
|-----|--|------------------|
| | housing. | |
| 218 | Resident parking permits on the high St; marked bays for parking on the high st | 13/05/2015 19:43 |
| 219 | I am keen to see a better selection of shops on the High Street. I would love to see a butcher's again and a good baker/deli. I think the addition of the shops would serve to enhance visitors' experience of Odiham as well as current residents. | 13/05/2015 19:41 |
| 220 | I think it inappropriate that the organisers at the research should direct the audience to a PR website (Bell Cornwall) without indicating that there are alternatives to developing the Deer Park | 13/05/2015 19:38 |
| 221 | Resident parking permits on the High Street; marked bays for parking on the High St | 13/05/2015 19:38 |
| 222 | Car Park at end of Deer Park View has become busy since high st restrictions introduced. Whilst I accept this I would not like to see this car park extended due to noise | 13/05/2015 19:36 |
| 223 | More signage in areas than just the High Street. | 13/05/2015 19:34 |
| 224 | The OPSG has done a great job and we appreciate the opportunity to comment. | 13/05/2015 19:33 |
| 225 | The OPSG have done a great job and we appreciate the opportunity to comment | 13/05/2015 19:28 |
| 226 | a village Green green at Dunleys Hill seems very out of the way and suspect it would not be well used. a village green should be central. This seems like a odd choice | 13/05/2015 19:22 |
| | Surprised there is no extra provision / thought for High Street Parking as this seems vital to the survival of our shops. | |
| | Feels like we are missing the opportunity for a bigger vision for Odiham. For the high street to survive we need to be able to attract more people to visit. Something that combines the canal warf, castle and common area, look at the success of places like Alice Holt. | |
| 227 | The draft plan is not a credible response to the housing crisis. It proposes less than 10 new houses per year until 2032. Some larger blocks of land need to be released to substantially boost the supply of new homes. | 13/05/2015 19:20 |
| 228 | I lived in various regions in France and Germany and both countries demand much higher standards of workmanship in construction AND make plots much bigger. If you could enforce rules such as those that were enforced when Archery Fields was built you will set Odiham apart from the rest. | 13/05/2015 19:17 |
| 229 | I think this plan is a good improvement vs the last one. Well done. I still have concerns about % of 1-2 bedroom because these are the ones that have not sold in Dilly Lane HW and why would Odiham be any different? | 13/05/2015 19:12 |
| 230 | congratulations to the steering group for all the hard work in drawing up this draft plan | 13/05/2015 19:10 |
| 231 | Parking in the village is essential to allow shops to flourish, availability of parking encourages visitors to stop & spend money in local businesses. Parking bays interspersed by panting of trees or shrubs (similar to High St of Hartley Wintney) would greatly enhance the appearance & appeal of our High St. | 13/05/2015 19:05 |

Unless sufficient car parking is made a requirement for all new housing projects (not the ludicrous 1.25 spaces for a 2 bedroom property that developers are allowed to regard as the norm) - vehicles overflow onto

surrounding roads. Access is becoming increasingly difficult with the number of parked cars in narrow streets around the village.

- 232 Good work onwardplanners. I hope the final plan also includes measures to control the speed of traffic through Odiham, as is the case already in North Warnborough, and to control the volume of traffic in King Street by restricting further development in that area. 13/05/2015 18:47
- 233 The issue of the North Warnborough Pumping Station needs to be addressed before any new development sites are agreed. During periods of 'average' rainfall the pumping station cannot cope and backs up to various locations. During periods of 'heavy' rainfall the station fails totally. Even in dry spells due to the lack of maintenance by Thames Water 'allegedly' because of poor access the pumping station fails. This pumping station was never designed for so many houses that its catchment area now holds (and this was told to me by Thames engineer) The pumps have been replaced on a regular basis (I believe at least 3 times in the last 5 years) and still there are problems. this is a very serious issue to those residents that suffer from this problem and to the river Whitewater where significant amounts of sewage flows when there is a problem. 13/05/2015 16:59
- 234 I understand the focus of the plan has to be on where new building are to be sited, but I am very disappointed that we seem to have missed a big opportunity to improve the sustainability and quality of life for the whole area. I just walked the children to school this morning and it is really a very very unpleasant walk along Hook Road and Dunleys Hill due to the traffic, the narrowness of the pavements and the fact that footpaths are roadside without any space between the pedestrian and really fast moving traffic. This is self perpetuating as with it being so unpleasant we have no choice but to get in our cars, which only makes the problem worse. The NP could do much more to specify minimum pavement widths on roads, grass verges, road calming to encourage lower traffic volume and discourage larger vehicles. This is especially true on the south side of Hook Road, Dunleys Hill, Farnham Road and road crossing points at the M3 junction 5, the Derbyfields roundabout and the Farnham Road/Broad Oak roundabout. 13/05/2015 13:14
- 235 The impact of these new developments are going to have a significant impact on the lives of those who already live here, with increased traffic and on school spaces. I don't believe that what villagers want will be listened to at all and this is just an exercise in pretence - that in fact the decisions have already been made. I will be incredibly sad for my children to grow up in a village so far removed from what it used to be when I was growing up. I understand that we are growing as a nation so houses are needed, but why so many 13/05/2015 13:06
- 236 I am concerned about where the access to any new site at crown fields would be as a resident of recreation rd a I am already concerned about the amount of traffic speeding up and down the road to and from the playschool I have small children and I am worried about their safety if access to this new estate was put at the top of recreation road that would only exasperate the situation parking is also a serious problem up recreation rd most of the time I can't park outside my own house as parents from the playschool park there and when I do get parked they block me in I know this has caused problems with a lot of my neighbours with residents parking down one side the road is reduced to being a single lane and it is not suitable at all for through traffic !! 13/05/2015 05:26
- 237 Just to thank the Onward Plan Steering Group for all their hard work. 13/05/2015 04:12
- 238 In some way we need affordable 2-3 bedroom houses for young families from the area. 12/05/2015 20:43

Restricted parking in the village needs to be enforced.
Please find more public parking areas, why not at the KG site?

- 239 While in general I understand the need to increase the available housing in the UK and part of that is to extend existing villages and towns, I would worry that a glut of new housing in and around Odiham will lessen it's appeal as a beautiful market town in rural England. 12/05/2015 20:02
- I think careful consideration should be used when approving the architecture and design of the new housing developments - without always going for the cheapest solution is the best. Given the volume of Grade 2, 2* and 1 listed buildings in and around Odiham and North Warnborough, I would expect the council and local population to push for buildings that fit the area (for instance, the estate backing onto the deer park in NW does not fit this bill, the new housing behind the new co-op is certainly closer)
- In addition, I do not really see much in the way of a proposal to improve the infrastructure. Dunley's hill in particular is becoming exceptionally busy and the lack of traffic calming measures on a '30' limit road is causing damage to the houses the council has deemed historically important.
- 240 No - fully support 12/05/2015 16:41
- 241 I would like to see some traffic control put into place in the form of a roundabout or traffic light system at the entrance to RAF odiham on the Alton Road. Traffic is too fast for cars to safely pull in and out of the junction and pedestrian crossing is virtually none existant. Also at rush hour times, traffic is backed up all the way down to RAF Odihams main gate, often taking up to 20 minutes to join the main alton road. 12/05/2015 16:37
- 242 The draft plan seems to be well considered. The proposed housing locations seem acceptable.I understand that area AF is under threat of planning permission and this should be opposed for the reasons mentioned. 12/05/2015 12:45
- 243 I think the team which has created the proposed Neighbourhood Plan has done a simply outstanding job. The proposals are very clear and totally suited to the needs of our community. The communication of the plan and its presentation at local venues has been brilliant. Sincere thanks to the whole team! 11/05/2015 16:04
- 244 I feel strongly that the most crucial thing for the village plan to address are the future provision of new housing - and particularly making sure it'snot more of the same large houses which are commercially beneficial to the developers but not socially useful for the village - and protection of the rural character of the village. I think the proposal goes a long way to highlighting and addressing these concerns and the Onward Plan group should be commended for its efforts. 10/05/2015 16:11
- 245 Leave the deer park as it is...keep it for dog walkers and cattle. 10/05/2015 16:08
- 246 Leave the Deer Park alone! 10/05/2015 13:00
- 247 We are constantly hearing that we should be walking children to school. We have 1200 children at Robert Mays School, of which approx 300 do not use the buses. There have been numerous newsletters from the school highlighting the 'near misses' of traffic accidents outside the school. Some form of pedestrian crossing is required outside the school. 10/05/2015 12:59

To walk from North Warnborough to the Odiham schools it is necessary to cross the High Street. To reach the High Street's pedestrian crossing two roads have to be crossed. It would be much safer and act as a traffic calmer if a crossing were put at the end of the High Street that meets Dunley's Hill.

Following the plans I have noted that when walking from North Warnborough to Odiham there is only one green area, if this is turned into a village green, this will continue to be a positive part of the village, if buildings are put near to

the road at this point, then the only area of green seen by road will disappear.

| | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 248 | Many thanks for the opportunity to have an input to the plan. Surely the deer park should be a designated green space | 09/05/2015 13:27 |
| 249 | Has further consideration been given to potential uses within the otherwise unused Chalk Pit on the Alton Road? | 08/05/2015 17:18 |
| 250 | Thank you for your efforts to draft our plan, please continue your efforts with my support. Please protect the jewel at the heart of our community, the Deer Park and have the confidence to designate it as a green space. | 08/05/2015 13:36 |
| 251 | One ISSUE addressed in the Plan: How can the Plan assist the long term viability and vitality of Odiham High St.? | 08/05/2015 09:30 |

It would appear that the questionnaire has little or no comment to address the problem how the through traffic flow using the High St affect the viability and vitality of the High St.

Long term measures should be proposed (and implemented) so as to:

- reduce the flow of through traffic using the High St
- review the areas on which car parking is allowed
- provision of additional safe crossing places for pedestrians
- reduce speed limit to at least 20 mph

Action should be taken to renew the previous request for the Odiham by-pass to be extended to include the SE section from the Broadoak roundabout at the Farnham end of the present by-pass to meet up with the Alton Road. This should also contribute to reducing the flow of through traffic in NW.

| | | |
|-----|--|------------------|
| 252 | Increased car parking to the rear of the Deer Park View car park | 08/05/2015 06:09 |
| 253 | This Neighbourhood Plan is exceptionally important to the community and I would like to sincerely thank the people involved in its development. | 07/05/2015 20:48 |
| 254 | More affordable housing, but not social housing, is required for the mid level earners unable to afford the higher level (500k+) of house prices. More traditional shops in the high street as well. Butcher, bakers, green grocer etc | 07/05/2015 20:19 |
| 255 | Some draft plan options seem odd choice. IN MY OPINION. Especially why some areas of land designated as LGS AND I wonder if local residents' feedback/opinion will have any influence on final plan. | 07/05/2015 19:13 |

High St. Depends on the balance/%.

Parking Q. Don't understand suitability of site 232 and I support more capacity at Palace Gate if it includes parking for doctors' surgery and X Barn functions.

| | | |
|-----|--|------------------|
| 256 | Leapfrogs parking. Already there? Referring back to Q1 of the questionnaire, I do agree with the selection of sites but they are mostly in North Warnborough or on the boundary between Odiham & North Warnborough or on the North Warnborough side of the Alton Road. The Kitchen Garden site should either be used for development or enhanced as a public place to visit or hold events. | 07/05/2015 15:27 |
|-----|--|------------------|

Thank you for all the teams efforts in putting this neighbourhood plan together for the benefit of our villages.

| | | |
|-----|--|------------------|
| 257 | The council's policy of charging for parking in the carpark adjacent to the Doctor's surgery encourages people to park on the road in the High St, particularly when people just need to be in the village for a few minutes. The parking along the entrance to the High St (Dunleys Hill end) causes congestion in the village around the shops as it reduces the road capacity to a single lane. Any changes to the parking facilities in the village, including parking charges should seek to encourage more people to use parking | 07/05/2015 13:26 |
|-----|--|------------------|

- spaces off the road.
- 258 My family came from odiham. I was brought up here from age 11. It continues to grow in size and due to population increasing I am not naive of the need for more houses. 07/05/2015 12:26
- I am 28 and will be wanting to purchase my first house in a few years. I want to live in a close knit community where the transport links are good and there is a convenience shop near. I want open spaces for my children (hopefully) to grow up in. I want to ensure my child will have a good education,attending a school not overflowing with children.
- I do not want to see houses for miles. I want peace.
- There is one bus an hour unless its the first bus of the day- with this amount of house being built, more people will use public transport which is not even provided enough. There is one overpriced shop (still awaiting the new coop) and the post office service is less than it used to be. There are no proper parks for children to go to. Only one field to play in.
- Rather than bombarding this small village with houses, space could be used to get children outside. Proper areas for them to explore.
- 259 The deer park would be lovely if it was free for all. section 6 - Green Space 06/05/2015 21:33
- why is the Deer Park not proposed or listed of a local green space - surely such a large and historical site should be listed as a green space
- 260 it is imperative this land is protected from development Thank you to everyone who has given up so much time and effort to come up with this Draft Plan. Please could you make sure that the views of the people who have taken part are truly represented in the Final Plan so that the deer park issue is fairly considered. 06/05/2015 20:15
- 261 My main observation is as follows. When any proposals are accepted and implemented who will be responsible for the consequences at Hart council? 06/05/2015 19:56
- 262 No happy with both ideas and process so far 06/05/2015 19:40
- 263 No 06/05/2015 18:57
- 264 Continue to try avoid or at least strongly resist wholesale additiuonal housng developments in the area, ie no 500 homes developments which would swamp infrastructure and ruin the local environment. This may be difficult longer term due to immigration levels which will continue at the current rate as long as we have no control over UK borders, which is the likely case. 06/05/2015 18:45
- 265 Parking: 65 Could agree to small car park here, Nowhere near 232, maybe piece of 108 for car park. You do not need a car park for the castle at 232, It's far too small. Maybe a small car park at 108, not 232. 232 should be green belt. 06/05/2015 11:06
- No to parking at Palace Gate, Already has major parking issues and lorries destroy footpaths.
- Children have been hit by cars parking at Palace Gate.

- 266 Parking has to be stopped along West St especially by RMS. There needs to be more parking available maybe at 57 or 119 on map. 06/05/2015 10:33
- 267 I don't see any merit in the development proposals for Lodge Farm, this is just urban sprawl in the countryside. 06/05/2015 10:21
- There is some technical merit for the Winchfield proposals but I am worried about traffic generation and routing.
- The time is right to be creative and proactive about the future of Odiham, and this WILL involve development if we are to remain a vibrant community rather than become a museum.
- 268 The NP states has as its first objective to protect and enhance the local historic environment. It then proposes development along both side of Hook Road in North Warnborough where the historic spatial development has a particular character of linear development along the road and a mix of very high density terraced houses (CastleBridge Cottages) and very low density large houses with significant gardens (all the rest). It is hard to see how this proposal will protect or enhance the local historic environment. 06/05/2015 10:04
- To explicitly encourage infill will continue to chip away at large gardens and the feeling of space that one gets around these could be lost in the longer term. This is especially true at the entrance to Odiham High St and the area between The Mill House pub and the Swan Bridge.
- I do not follow the logic of why some sites have been proposed that are within the conservation area when other sites that are not are rejected. Has the perceived value of agricultural land been put above protecting the conservation areas? It seems that SHLAA sites have been accepted or rejected in their entirety rather than considering whether a part of the larger sites could be used. This has meant that larger SHLAA sites have been rejected when smaller developments on parts of these sites could have been put forward. This is especially true for sites 138, 328 and 329.
- 269 Seems to be well thought out with not an overwhelming amount of new building and an attempt to keep many green spaces. Hope someone listens to villagers' opinions and acts accordingly. 05/05/2015 17:20
- 270 I live in The Street and concerned about the heavy traffic that passes up this narrow road. Would there be any plans to address this issue? 05/05/2015 13:55
- 271 I would like to suggest some adult and adolescent exercise provision for public places e.g. 2-3 outdoor Table Tennis tables for public use, outdoor exercise machines (cross trainer and upper body machines) in small groups for everyone to use, hoping to raise fitness levels and to help us combat the obesity epidemic which is a national problem. If these were put near playgrounds then those with young children could exercise and talk while supervising young people. 05/05/2015 12:17
- e.g. Locations to be considered include near to the playgrounds near Odiham Almshouses, Crownfields where there are playgrounds already, or even in the Telephone Exchange garden on Farnham Road, and/or next to the brazier pole behind the cottage hospital site. Possibly in school playgrounds, which seem to be closed for so much of the day and through every school holiday.
- These are found in large cities and many foreign countries.

| | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 272 | I support most aspects of this plan & think it really cover my main concerns & aspirations for our community. . Although this is near my house I think that Site 327 is a dangerous place to build as it starts a new president on that site and the houses could just grow and grow over time eventually covering the whole field.. Infil spaces are better or sites that are within an existing defined boundary ie site AF or HF. | 04/05/2015 21:22 |
| 273 | Sites 138 and 57 appear good sites to develop which would not be too detrimental to the settings of Odiham or North Warnborough. The development of Dunleys Hill must be minimal to maintain the physical open break between Odiham and North Warnborough. | 04/05/2015 19:48 |
| 274 | With regard to car parking specifically at the proposed sites of dunleys Hill (65) and Odiham Castle site (232), we would support these sites provided they are gated and closed at night. This will help to curb anti social behaviour. | 04/05/2015 14:31 |
| 275 | We need signage in the High Street and elsewhere to promote the availability and use of our recreational resources ,cricket club, bowls club, tennis club etc | 04/05/2015 09:19 |
| 276 | Current proposals for developments on the mentioned sites include tens of houses (30>60 typically). In principle, if each site was developed with significantly fewer houses (<10) it would spread the burden across the village, keep the density of development in keeping with the remainder of the outlying sections of the village, still allow for green space and access to open country side beyond. It would also allow for preservation of SSSI's, etc by setting a larger boundary around the developed areas. | 04/05/2015 08:02 |
| 277 | The demand for more housing development in NE Hampshire is alarming and probably not helped by the fact it's been voted one of the most desirable places to live in England. The real threat is Odiham will eventually become just another dormitory town given it's location for London etc. Landowners of course must be tempted by the high value of their land for housing and therefore if these proposals are eventually approved, then the balance is probably the best that can hoped for. But will that stop future pressure - I doubt it. | 03/05/2015 18:16 |
| 278 | This is a good exercise in local consultation and we appreciate the thought which has gone into it so far. | 03/05/2015 17:52 |
| 279 | 11. A possible option for site 327 would be for it to be predominantly north/south or squarer in shape as opposed to the current east/west orientation. Occupying greater frontage along Alton Road would retain the same area of the proposed development; avoid the site being isolated; and minimise the impact of removing green field space adjacent to current residential areas. The stipulation for no access from the site to Recreation Road, Salmons Road or Buffins Road remains. | 03/05/2015 16:16 |
| 280 | I fail to understand why site 65 is being proposed for housing development as well as a local green space!? This site needs to be fully left as a local green site. Why are sites that have direct access from the benefit of a dual carriage way and are less congested ,not being proposed for new housing development , whereas many of the 9 sites you are proposing are already congested.?.....this is totally illogical . | 03/05/2015 16:14 |
| 281 | Great work. Thanks | 03/05/2015 15:52 |
| 282 | Policy 9 Pages 34/35 I do not think that Dunley's Hill is the right location for a village green space as I do not think it will be used. | 03/05/2015 15:19 |

- 283 With reference to Question 8, the "balance" of the High Street is undoubtedly important, but it is a reflection of this importance that rents and business rates are set at a level appropriate to attract new businesses and maintain the tenancy of existing ones. 03/05/2015 13:21
- Whilst charity shops are an important part of the "mix" in any High Street across the land, a surfeit of them by way of maintaining rental income - albeit at a reduced rate - can make an area look run down and in decline.
- PLEASE do not take this as my being "anti Charity Shops" - I am decidedly not, as they have an important role to play in any local community - but too many of them would run the risk of conveying the wrong message about Odiham High Street.
- 284 A more specific policy to protect the Basingstoke Canal should be included. The area protected by a 10m strip should be shown on the map where relevant. 03/05/2015 09:12
- A contingency of an alternative site or sites is needed where mitigation of flood risk cannot be guaranteed.
- It would be sensible to pursue an additional cricket pitch in filed 228 in return for a small amount of housing suitably sited in this field (eg 5-10).
- The financil considerations of the offset of housing for green space at Dunleys Hill should be decreed to be transparent to provide public verification and credibility.
- Parking for the High Street, 100+ spaces (screened), adjacent to Deer Park View should be part of the Deer Park negotiations.
- Please consider the need for a Netball Court. Either at the Beacon or near the Cricket Club to serve the needs of female residents.
- A good start with some amendment necessary. 03/05/2015 08:57

GENERAL COMMENTS RECEIVED AT C2 EVENTS

| |
|--|
| Just to say well done on lots of hard work and a very clear and helpful presentation |
| We all owe the Odiham Neighbourhood Plan committees a huge debt of gratitude for the work done and we wish you all the best for the responsibilities to come |
| LGS – King Street |
| Good plan – welcome the smaller developments. Village facilities – suggest steps onto filed footpath opposite the cricket club to make it safer for pedestrians |
| Was site 108 considered for LGS designation? If not, would it be possible to revisit this? |
| 1. Overall comment – significant bias towards non-Odiham development. All proposed sites to west of roundabout at top of High Street. 2. Ranking system appears skewed. It is subjective, depending on views of NP members? |

| |
|---|
| 3. What grounds for protecting, say Archery fields? Nothing listed there! |
| I would just like to congratulate the members of the NP team for all their hard work and brilliant presentations of the current situation. Well done!! |
| Please consider the field between Hatchwood Place and Mapletons for LGS |
| Why are the footpaths not marked on the plan in the Deer Park area? |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Surely Deptford Lane development and Deer Park should have formed part of NP? These are major items. 2. I doubt that flooding risk in NW proposed sites has been properly accounted for. 3. If referendum is one person/property per vote, then clearly Odiham will outnumber NW, therefore rather pointless vote? |
| What criteria are used to determine access feasibility? I noticed that Deptford Lane was coded green even though the surrounding roads would be unsuitable for additional traffic. |
| <p>Issues still not addressed with an increase in population:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public transport links to Farnham, Farnborough, Fleet 2. Health centre which already can't cope with the number of people who will require appointments (goes up with social housing) 3. Traffic – three schools and roads unsafe to cross! |
| <p>Scoring system – nonsensical if no weighting given to criteria e.g. if a site floods – far more significant than brownfield site – yet all weighted equally.</p> <p>Serious disagreement with red/amber/green values assigned – subjective, needs much more consultation</p> <p>No mention of dangerous heavy lorries on The Street, where there are no pavements at all.</p> <p>Looks very pro-Odiham, majority of development on flooded areas in North Warnborough while green spaces in Odiham</p> |
| <p>The draft plan as it relates to North Warnborough Hook Road is severely flawed. North Warnborough is currently designated to take a heavy share of development on what is a very busy road and an area that suffers from flooding from ground water and sewages. The area 58 is cut through by a drain that takes water from the area down to the Whitewater and the field is boggy – any attempt to drain this area for housing will send water into the culvert and increase flood problems.</p> <p>The drainage of sewage is also a regular problem, with the regular failures resulting in the flooding of gardens. What provision will be made for improving sewage drainage? The pumping station still fails in heavy weather despite improvements made to it.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with the idea that land adjacent to Hook Road is suitable for development. Your questionnaire is biased against a true representation of this problem.</p> |
| Proposed development sites – why is the lion's share of these in North Warnborough rather than in Odiham especially in view of the negative impact on conservation areas and the risk to flooding (sites iv, v and vii) |