Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
1	Derek Oswold	Exec Summary 1. The summary doc delivered to households is not very well presented – the various colours confuse rather than clarify (it is actually quite difficult to read the page on Traffic Policies)		*Noted*	*No action taken*
2	Derek Oswold	Exec Summary 2. The summary doc refers to previous widespread consultation – I would dispute this and anyway it would be useful to remind readers when and where this took place		*Noted*	*consultation statement identifies when / where consultation has taken place*
3	Derek Oswold	Exec Summary 3. The full Plan is available om line BUT each sectIon is large and I am reluctant to overload my computer by downloading it – it would seem we need to download each section rather than read it on-line on the website. The Exec Summary should be larger so that it better reflects the full Plan since most residents will not make the effort to download or get a hard copy		*Noted*	*No action taken*
4	Derek Oswold	Exec Summary 4. The feedback/comment form is not well designed and it is not clear how to fill it in relating to the different policies		*Noted*	*No action taken*
5	Derek Oswold	Exec Summary 5. The summary doc does not emphasise clearly enough the Scope or constraints- most people will want to comment on a lot of things not included in the Plan and without reading the Scope will wonder why they are not included. There should be an opportunity to provide comments on these areas of concern		*Noted*	*No action taken*
6	Stuart Brookes	No Objections		*Noted*	*No action taken*
7	Linda Ettie	commenting/questions only	Page 30-where is the exact retail development location? Page 46-where is the new cemetery site located? Page 49-the maps re settlement gaps outlined in purple is this land to stay green or to be built on? **Page 69-ESSO pipeline map does not show route through/under new housing at Boorley Park**. Page 81-New nursery school car parking looks totally inadequate. Page 87- appears totally blank	*P30-the NP is not allocating a site for retail development. But supporting the location in the right areas. P46-as per P30, the site for a cemetery is not identified in the NP, but suporting the development of a new cemetery in the right place. P81 & P87 noted*	*pipeline map has been redrawn*
8	Paul Turner	I support the restriction on development of our local green spaces. It is important to maintain the character of the area and protect habitat for wildlife.		*Noted*	*No action taken*
9	Paul Turner	I fully support protecting the gaps between the local villages. This will preserve green areas for wildlife, prevent overdevelopment and maintain the character and identity of the different areas. It is especially important not to allow Botley to be "absorbed" into Hedge End and lose its distinct history and character	I would like to go further and ban outright any residential or industrial development in these areas whatsoever, reserving them as protected green space.	*Noted*	*Policy 6 has been reworded and further significant evidence has been added to give greater weight to this policy, however it is not the role of the NP to toally "ban" development*
10	Tracey Shrimpton	A neighbourhood plan is required to act as a guide for future development so is necessary.	The only suggestion I would make is that the word 'should' is used too often throughout the document. It would be preferable to use the word 'must' and 'unless' stating the reasons why something might be permitted Otherwise 'should' simply means that it is simply an aspiration and can be ignored.	*Policies within the Neighbourhood Plan are required to be reasonable and worded in a way that demonstrates this.*	*No action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
11	Maureen Sheehan Platt	Far to many houses being built in the Botley area. We bought our house because of the beautiful green area that has deer, ponies, foxes and beautiful birds., grazing. It is do lovely to be qble to see these creatures in their natural habitat.	Three houses in Ambleside have suffered from a massive sink hole in 2021. We feel any further construction work to said field would put our properties at further risk.	*Botley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 refers to EBC Local Plan Policy BO3-which is a strategic allocated site- and therefore the removal of the site or any amendments to policy BO3 is beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan.*	*No action taken*
12	Helen North	Policy 9 BO3. I object to paragraph b) of this policy - to put houses on this site. The area outlined is home to deer and other wildlife which have already been pushed out of other surrounding fields which are either in the process of being developed on or have been developed in recent years. The amount of green space has drastically decreased around this area in recent years and the disruption from the development never stops. The houses in Barnfield way have recently been developed and new housing is also now in development on the other side of the Norman Rodaway playing fields. Then there is the substantial developments on Woodhouse Lane. Soon there will be wall to wall development all along Kings Copse Avenue with no green spaces for the wildlife. I am also concerned about the increased levels of traffic and the additional pollution that yet more homes will add to the existing congestion already experienced in Barnfield Way and the additional impact this will have on J8 of the M27 which is already significantly congested. With all these new houses in the Kings Copse avenue area, no additional facilities have been developed except for one small play park. The local primary school is already over subscribed. The field identified for development is key in managing the flood risk as there is already significant excess water flow running down Kings Copse Avenue and into the stream at the bottom of the hill when it rains which frequently overwhelms the drainage currently in place. If the field is built on, the natural drainage will not be there leading to more flooding.	No housing on site BO3.	*Botley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 refers to EBC Local Plan Policy BO3-which is a strategicaly allocated site- and therefore the removal of the site or any amendments to policy BO3 is beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan.*	*No action taken*
13	Derek Turner	According to the map, the proposed plan comes right up to the end of our back garden. It means instead of looking out into open fields, we will be looking at a building site which will become a housing estate, obliterating our view. These fields are used by horses and very often, also have deer in them, and all manner of wildlife. Another of our main objections, is that if this plan goes ahead, then i am sure it would have a detrimental effect on the value of our property !! How would we be compensated for that ??	Based on where we live, we strongly object to the plan proceeding at all ! However if it were to proceed, then we would definitely want compensated for the loss in value on our property.	*Botley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 refers to EBC Local Plan Policy BO3-which is a strategic allocated site- and therefore the removal of the site or any amendments to policy BO3 is beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan.*	*No action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
14	Aaron Penney	Support the identification of Boorley Park Allotments as a designated Local Green Space. This is justified in accordance with Paragraph 99 of the NPPF and represents a green area of demonstrable local significance.		*Noted*	*No action taken*
15	Aaron Penney	Support the identified challenges for Botley.		*Noted*	*No action taken*
16	Aaron Penney	Support policies one to eighteen (inclusive)		*Noted*	*No action taken*
17	Aaron Penney	Support the overall Vision for Botley.		*Noted*	*No action taken*
18	Aaron Penney	Support the Plan which appears to adhere to the requirements of NPPF and Eastleigh Borough Local Plan. Support the submission of the Neighbourhood Plan and progression to Examination.		*Noted*	*No action taken*
19	Aaron Penney	Support identified Objectives for Neighbourhood Plan.		*noted*	*no action taken*
20	Adrian Furlong	The area of Botley has been Completely over developed. Mature trees were cut down to make way for the road leading to the Deer Park school (Ironic as all the deer have gone). I strongly oppose any further development. I strongly oppose the renewable energy development. Renewable energy is a total farce.	I would remove anything that involves the building of new accommodation. The traffic is horrendous in Botley with no end in sight. This executive summary is just a commercial development plan that does not consider the existing residents and their quality of life. This once lovely area is turning into one large, soulless estate.	*Noted*	*No action taken*
21	Richard Carter	As a resident of the High Street	From 31 to 45 High Street the pavement is dangerously narrow with vehicles accelerating out of the village passing within inches of pedestrians. There have been two instances in the last nine years of vehicles crashing into the brick walls fronting the houses. I believe widening of the pavement and or traffic calming is necessary for pedestrian safety.	*Noted*	*Traffic calming measures and pavement widening are community aspirations, and have been added to this appendix for the Parish Council to take forward.*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
22	Sarah Baker	I am the owner and landlord of 47 Ambleside, SO30 2NT (home address **REDACTED**) and I would like to oppose the BO3 (Botley NP Reg 14 as detailed on map 8) development for the following reasons: Existing storm water drainage problem/potential flooding risk due to landslide /extensive damage to existing residents' gardens/risk to sewage pipe By itself, the Hedge End Stream has a gentle flow, but Southern Water are already discharging an excessive flow (torrent) of storm water into the Hedge End Stream from 400 houses via a culvert just prior to no.43 Ambleside. This is adjacent to the proposed BO3 development. The runoff water from housing and roads that enters storm drains during heavy downfalls is scouring out the streambed of the Hedge End Stream causing undercutting of both banks causing collapse and rapidly accelerating natural erosion. The South Bank belonging to Manor Farm (HCC) which forms part of BO3 site, has slid into the stream practically blocking it in places and the storm water has scoured out under the culvert, exposing the sewerage pipe underneath which is now at risk. This erosion has also allowed water to get behind the pilings of no.43-47 Ambleside causing a sinkhole in 2016 at rear of no.43. As the streambed has now been eroded some 1.2meters and the water has also passed under the pilings in other places causing further sink holes and garden collapse in September 2021 at the rear of no. 45 to 47 Ambleside. This matter is still unresolved. It is therefore evident that further storm water discharge into the Hedge End Stream from a new housing complex of 120 dwellings would be disastrous unless action was taken to mitigate the damage. Southern Water (Stephen Dart) did say at a recent meeting with residents on 28 September 2022 that mitigating the flow of storm water discharge could cause flooding upstream. I asked SW if the flow could be split and discharged at two points to reduce the damage to the environment and residents' properties, Stephen Dart's reply was that it would not be seen as cost effective and that residents would most likely have to pay for any modification themselves. At present Southern Water are reluctant to take responsibility for their water once it leaves their storm water pipeline which is totally unacceptable. They are causing an Environment/Statutory nuisance to the existing residents who are Southern Water customers. The residents have launched a complaint to CCW (Consumer Council for Water) as Southern Water have not adequately answered our concerns nor accept any responsibility. This is now in the process of being escalated to Ofwat by Mr. Waheed Qureshi of CCW. Case reference 220817-000024	I feel the risks of further environmental damage and flooding are too great and that the proposed BO3 development should not be allowed to go ahead.	*Botley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 refers to EBC Local Plan Policy BO3-which is a strategic allocated site- and therefore the removal of the site or any amendments to policy BO3 is beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan.* *The Neighbourhood Plan includes a Policy on flood mitigation (Policy 11)*	*No action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
22 (cont)	Sarah Baker (continued)	Keith House, Head of EBC is aware of these problems. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the land immediately opposite my property (cross hatched area on Map 8) has more than one watercourse and several underwater water channels. The soil in the area is London clay which is waterlogged for the majority of the year. The field above which forms part of the proposed BO3 development, is on higher ground and there could be considerable runoff if it were built on which no doubt could cause further flooding of the land below and the Hedge End Stream, adding to the problems of the existing residents. Damage to wildlife habit Secondly, the proposed development is planned on a site of natural beauty which is home to many species already mentioned such as Bechstein Bats, European Otters, Honey Buzzards, and also, Wild Deer, Foxes and Badgers which I have personally witnessed in the area adjacent my property. I am opposed to a further housing develop being allowed to encroach on the dwindling habitats of these animals. Botley will lose its charm as a village and become a sprawling housing complex adjoined to Hedge End. Provision for a Cemetery The proposal for the inclusion of a cemetery on this site. The land is heavy London clay and can become waterlogged and I would not think this would be suitable for a cemetery. Furthermore, a cemetery would not be desirable in the area as it would devalue existing properties. I would not buy a property next to a graveyard and would be opposed to one being place near my house. Most people are electing to be cremated these days as they recognise there is a land shortage and should adopt an eco-friendlier end of life solution. Conclusion I do not feel that this plan should be allowed to go ahead as there is already a lack of consideration for residents which has not yet been addressed in over a year. I feel Ambleside resident's problems need to be resolved before any new housing is allowed in the area. Southern Water (Stephen Dart) stated at the meeting with local residents that they were unable to turn down requests from developers wanting to link up to the existing network and therefore it is up to the Council to make sure permission is not granted for housing until the network is modified to stop the environment damage it is currently causing. Any additional discharge of storm water from new housing into the Hedge End Stream would undoubtedly cause even more environmental damage and damage to the existing properties. Further landslides caused by streambed erosion, could potentially block the stream causing flooding in the local area endangering housing, wildlife and residents.	I feel the risks of further environmental damage and flooding are too great and that the proposed BO3 development should not be allowed to go ahead. (Continued from above)	*Botley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 refers to EBC Local Plan Policy BO3-which is a strategic allocated site- and therefore the removal of the site or any amendments to policy BO3 is beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan.* *The Neighbourhood Plan includes a Policy on flood mitigation (Policy 11)*	*No action taken*
23	Louise Evans	Botley will retain its rural links and maintain working farms with the ability to provide local food, education, job and volunteering opportunities. The farmland will support the current and additional networks of hedgerows for wildlife providing food and breeding corridors. (The proposed community orchard, allotments and dog walking area behind Winchester street will be established). 'Gaps' around the development will be actively poplated with native trees, dragonfly pools, thickets to generate increased bio-diversity, and provide and enhance wildlife corridors.	Addition ….. Vision 3. Cycleways, footpaths and bridleways will link residents to shops. (I am thinking particularly of cuts through from Winchester Street to Hedge End and Hellyars for shops and cuts through from Homesland Lane end of Winchester Street to the railway station). There will also be a safe way for horses to cross Mill Hill to the stables , and children to get across Mill Hill to Botley school).	*Noted*	*No action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
24	Louise Evans	Policy 1 support in principle-	though I do not think that the floodplain as shown is sufficient for a 1.5% rise in temperatures given a double tide. We are currently looking at a 2.7% rise in temperatures. I would like to see a map showing what both a 1% and 2.7% rise means for Botley- and Southampton- and Portsmouth?. Will Botley Mill and How many residents from Weston shore will need to be rehomed by 2030 if there is a 2.7% rise? How many of those would Botley Parish be expecting to house? The answer cant be none.. we have a bold and proactive plan to provide renewable energy in the Villag, reduce the use of all energy/ production of CO2, grow additional trees	*Noted*	*No action taken, can be considered in NP update in five years time*
25	Louise Evans	Poilcy 2. Support in principle		*Noted*	*No action taken*
26	Louise Evans	Policy 3. Support in principle	with the addition of 3 enclosed areas for dog walking- which are linked by footpaths so that people can walk to them. These areas will have hedgerows to provide food and passage for wildlife and a number of dog bins. Sadly they will probably also need car parking…… Consultation with the dog owners will be required – could one area be at Manor Farm?	*Noted*	*No action taken, additional local green spaces can be added at the NP review in five years time*
27	Louise Evans	Policy 4. Support	with the addition of bridleways which link up so that people can get to and from Manor Farm network and preferably join with other Villages. This was a vision of the Local Area Committee in the 1990's and it seems to have got lost.	*Noted*	*No action taken in NP, added to Community Aspirations*
28	Louise Evans	Policy 5 . support.		*Noted*	*No action taken*
29	Louise Evans	Policy 6. Support	local settlement gaps though Area 2 might be difficult without a boundary change. Having a large green area between Brook Lane and West Botley is an invitation to fill and difficult to make a gap between Botley and Hedge End.	*Noted*	*Policy wording of Policy 6 altered and aditional evidence added*
30	Louise Evans	Policy 7 and Policy 14 Housing	I feel strongly that any thriving community must provide housing from cradle to grave. That is housing stock should be balanced so that residents can move from a single person dwelling as a young person, to a dwelling suitable for a couple, through a family home and back to a dwelling suitable for older people, and then supported housing. There should be a mix of rented and private ownership. . Any further housing build should be mandated to have solar panels and integral water saving properties- ie toilets that are flushed using the hand washing water. Water storage for watering gardens. Provision for flash flooding which will be an increasing problem with a 1.5% increase in world temperature.	*Noted*	*No action taken. Actions suggested pose conditions on developers which may make the projects non-viable.*
31	Louise Evans	Policy 7 and Policy 14 Housing	Linked bungalows as in the Anchor Housing in Cheping gardens will meet the needs of older / residents with mobility issues would be suited to both this site and the housing behind Winchester Street as they are within close walking distance of bus stops, shops, community facilities etc	*Noted*	*No action taken*
32	Louise Evans	Policy 13. Support	with the addition of links to footpaths, cycleways and public transport. Might some developer contributions be used to subsidise bus use? A bus is of no use unless it is cheap, and one can drop children at school, go shopping/ the dentist and get back to school/work.	*Noted*	*No action taken in NP, added to Community Aspirations*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
33	Louise Evans	Policy 15. Support		*Noted*	*No action taken*
34	Louise Evans	Policy 16 Yay! support.	Though could we be bolder? Could the Mill provide energy? I understand that heat can be used from water to heat local homes. Could the water by the bark store and Mill be used for this?	*Noted*	*No action taken in NP, can be reviewd at NP review in five years time*
35	Louise Evans	Policy 17. Support		*Noted*	*No action taken*
36	Louise Evans	Policy 18 . Support	though Community infrastructure, existence and activity needs to be actively supported. New residents need initial welcomes and introductions. Not everyone uses facebook or social media. Volunteers should not be expected to give responses within 24 hours to online enquiries. Parish, Local Area and County grants are much appreciated	*Noted*	*No action taken*
37	Stanley Holden	Polciy 6commenting a) – This is a weak requirement.	I would like to substitute the following; a) Housing development in the gaps identified on proposals map 4 should not be allowed. Other development and use should not lead to the physical or visual coalescence of the areas they separate or damage their separate identity.	*Noted*	*No action taken, positive wording needs to be used in the policies within the plan*
38	Stanley Holden	Policy 7/8 commenting items g) and f) respectively. It is not clear what the requirement of 40% affordable housing refers to, and what the criteria listed at 144 is. Please could you clarify?		*40% of the total number of dwellings on the site should be affordable housing compared to Eastleigh Borough council requirement of 35%. This represents an increase of 5%. The "criteria" referred to is to determine a "local connection" which will prioritise those peole with a need for affordable housing and a local conncection,*	*No action taken*
39	Stanley Holden	Policy 9 commenting b) It is not stated how many houses are referred to in this clause. i.e. 40% affordable housing of how many houses in total, in line with Policy Fourteen?	Please clarify.	*Site BO3 is a site allocated by EBC. Therefore Botley BP cannot determine the final number of dwellings on the site. This policy requires a ratio of 40% affordable housing if feasible and viable*	*No action taken*
40	Stanley Holden	Policy 10 commenting e) – this is a weak requirement	I would like to substitute the following; e) Provision of water supply, surface water drainage and waste water disposal which meets the identified needs of the community is required including new and improved utility infrastructure where necessary.	*Noted*	*No action taken*
41	Stanley Holden	Policy 10 commenting f) – This is a weak requirement.	I would like to substitute the following: f) Development that provides housing specifically designed to address the needs of older people in Botley will be required. This includes the provision of sheltered housing	*Noted*	*No action taken. A policy on sheltered housing would require a new HNA to identify need for this provision*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
42	Stanley Holden	Policy 15 commenting h) and i) – These are weak requirements.	I would like to substitute the following: h) In all cases distinctive trees should be retained. i) Where it is necessary to fell trees, in all cases replacements of native species will be required to be consistent with Local Plan SPD on trees and development.	*Noted*	*new wording added to this policy: Where possible, distinctive trees should be retained.* *vii Where it is necessary to fell trees, replacement of native species will be expected to be consistent with Local Plan SPD on trees and development.*
43	Stanley Holden	Community Aspirations-Traffic Management planscommentingIn view of the very disruptive road closures and temporary traffic light installations recently and currently, in the Boorley Green area in particular, the policy on traffic management plans in Appendix 4	should be strengthened as follows: Ensure robust traffic management plans are in place for housing and highway developments. This should include the Highways Authority liaising with and taking account of the aspirations of BPC in all cases of highway developments including temporary features.	*Noted*	*No action taken. Community aspirations are to be undertaken by the Parish council and as such, the PC have total control as to how these are undertaken. This portion of the Neighbourhood Plan will not be subject to examination, therefore wording can be "loose".*
44	Stanley Holden	Community Aspirations-Health Care Provisioncommenting	I would like to substitute the final paragraph as follows: It's important that the growing population of Botley has access to appropriate primary healthcare services. Using the Section 106 funding already available as part of the Boorley Park development, within the Neighbourhood Plan Area, opportunities will be taken to both fully utilise and expand the provision of health services.	*Noted*	*No action taken as above*
45	Melanie Holmes	Policy 9 Objecting. I set out the following reasons for my decision to object to the proposal as follows: 1) Noise disturbance; 2) Loss of Trees; 3) Nature conservation; 4) Overlooking / loss of privacy in respect of local residents dwelling in Ambleside and bordering this site; 5) Traffic generation; 6) Kings Copse Avenue traffic has increased massively over the past couple of years. This is a residential community, and my concerns are for both the elderly and young people's safety in crossing Kings Copse Avenue. Although there is an underpass, in my own personal experience, this is not something I resort to using especially on dark winter days/evenings.		*Botley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 refers to EBC Local Plan Policy BO3-which is a strategicaly allocated site- and therefore the removal of the site or any amendments to policy BO3 is beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan.*	*No action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
46	Derek Oswold	Community Aspirations commenting The Plan accepts that these are strictly outside the remit of a N Plan yet many if not most of the Community Aspirations are directly linked to particular chapters or sections of the Plan and those sections should include or acknowledge the Aspirations –	these aspirations should be more integrated into the Plan and not seen as an "add on"	*Noted*	*No action taken. The Neighbourhood Plan is a planning document, and the community aspirations cannot be "acted on" within the body of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is for the Parish council to take them forward for action.*
47	Derek Oswold	commenting Square – there is insufficient information or proposals for the protections or development of the Square or High Street in the Plan. It is the heart of the village and although the Plan does talk about parking, businesses etc. I feel there should be more emphasis on it and there needs to be an overall Plan for the Square/High Street (including the Mill). This should include an acceptance that there must be more parking for the village centre		*Noted*	*No action taken*
48	Derek Oswold	commenting Green gaps – There should be more emphasis and detail on how the remaining few green spaces or gaps should be managed and protected. There is inadequate information or proposals for the planting of trees in such areas . There needs to be (rather like the Village Centre) an overall Plan for all such green areas		*Noted*	*No action taken. The Neighbourhood Plan can deal with the allocation of the Local Green Gaps, however it does not deal with the maintenance of the gaps.*
49	Elaine Furse	Whole Plan supporting All is thorough and highlights the communities need for smaller housing and retirement housing		*Noted*	*No action taken*
50	Elaine Furse	Community Aspirations supporting The steering group is an excellent idea but must include 'Air Pollution'. The Bypass will help Botley but push all the traffic elsewhere.		*Noted*	*No action taken in NP. Added to community aspirations*
51	Nigel Mottashed	Poliy 3 commenting On proportional planning approval to so many housing developments within the Botley Parish. Wait for a few more years until the current plan/approval have been recognised and successful	1. Waiting to see if we can work with the developers to ensure that project 'fits in' with the village look. 'Reserved Matters Meeting'; 2.Quite a few elderly neighbours worried about their 'outlook' currently 'open fields' Cows, Deer, Sheep etc; 3.Happy to be involved with the planning and positioning of amenities and green space too.	*noted*	*no action taken*
52	Graham Hunter	Whole Plan commenting Page numbering is sporadic		*noted*	*actioned*
53	Graham Hunter	Page 87 commenting Final housing numbers will need to be corrected prior to submission.		*noted*	*actioned*
54	Graham Hunter	Page 11 commenting The picture at the bottom of the page is not Botley, Hampshire		*noted*	*removed*
55	Graham Hunter	Page 15 commenting Fig 4 – Needs updating with the correct application status prior to submission. The figure is now out of date.		*noted*	*actioned*
56	Graham Hunter	Page 17 commenting Will need to be revised with corrected housing numbers prior to submission.		*noted*	*actioned*
57	Graham Hunter	Page 18 commenting	add… The Local Plan was adopted after changes required by the inspector in April 2022.	*noted*	*actioned*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
58	Graham Hunter	Page 19 commentingHosing numbers will need revising prior to submission.		*noted*	*actioned*
59	Graham Hunter	Whole Plan supporting Botley needs to have a greater say and protection from overdevelopment. And protection of its rich heritage, green spaces, settlement gaps, countryside, and ecology. In recent years it has had a massive amount of unsustainable housing forced upon it without, in some cases, proper community engagement and without proper consideration to the impact on the local infrastructure, service and green spaces. Often with wrong types of dwellings and housing mix. Much of this before the EBC Local Plan 2016 – 2036 was adopted in April 2022. The last Local Plan ended in 2011 and its saved policies had little weight since then. In particular I strong support Policy 6 that will help prevent coalescence and strengthen Policy 6 in the EBC Local Plan 2016-2036.	NO OBJECTIONS IF THE COMMENTS AND CORRECTIONS ARE MADE	*noted*	*policies three and six relate to these issues. Policy six has been reworded with additional evidence added to create a stronger policy*
60	Graham Hunter	Policy 6 commenting I strongly support Policy 6 that ot will prevent coalescence of local communities and strengthen Policy 6 in the EBC adopted Local Plan 2016-2036.		*noted*	*as above*
61	Graham Hunter	Policy 7 & 8 commenting Housing numbers will need revising before submission. Strongly support these two policies.		*noted*	*actioned. Policies 7 / 8 reworded with additional evidence added to support them to create stronger policies.*
62	Graham Hunter	Policy 9 commenting Text needed to clarify that Strategic Policy site BO3 is an EBC Local Plan Strategic Policy Site. It is not an NP Policy Site, only the NP must be in 'General Conformity' with the Local Plan. The site is part of Manor Farm Estate that is within the River Hamble County Park.		*noted*	*Policy Nine is identified as being a "Strategic Allocation" and therefore outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan*
63	Graham Hunter	Policy 12 commenting Strong support for this important policy. However the map has incorrect labelling of the 'Pipelines'.	1. The Blue Line(pipelines) contains 2 pipelines one ESSO High Pressure Fuel pipeline and one SGN Intermediate pressure Gas pipeline. 2. The Green Line is a replacement ESSO Third High Pressure Fuel pipeline.	*noted*	*map amended*
64	Marilyn Robinson	Policy 9 'allotments' commenting Supporting but suggest a setting up of a 'Community Farm' similar to 'Highbridge Community Farm Allotment'. This is better than just allotments as it is never neglected as each member helps wherever it is needed as well as looking after their given space.	Means no barren bits of neglected areas * Veg at excellent price with added social life from young to old.	*Noted*	*No action taken as not within remit of the NP as this is a Strategic Allocation*
65	Maureen Sheeman	Policy 9 objecting The land to the rear of Ambleside has so many mature trees. The land is on the 'Boggy' side. We have had 'subsidence' to three properties since last year, feel that any development (B03) would cause major problems. The land is a haven for wildlife, foxes,deer,horses and badgers. It would be disastrous for them to lose their habitat.		*Botley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 refers to EBC Local Plan Policy BO3-which is a strategic allocated site- and therefore the removal of the site or any amendments to policy BO3 is beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan.*	*No action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
66	Helen Humphrey	Policy 9 objecting While I appreciate there may be a need for more housing, I am concerned that a road will be placed in Salwey Road/Ambleside to access the development. I believe access should be from 'Kings Copse Avenue' although this will become excessively busy due to the 'Botley Bypass'. It is already dangerous to get onto the small roundabout with speeding/noisy traffic along 'Kings Copse Avenue'.		*Botley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 refers to EBC Local Plan Policy BO3-which is a strategic allocated site- and therefore the removal of the site or any amendments to policy BO3 is beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan.*	*No action taken*
67	Helen Humphrey	Policy 6 plus Policies 7,8 and 9 commenting It is suggested more housing is required in the Parish. It is remarkable that many of the houses in the 'Boorley Park' development have not been sold.		*Noted*	*No action taken*
68	Helen Humphrey	Policy 18 Community Infrastructure objecting If Little Hatts has a MUGA for communal use, the road network is not suitable for amounts of traffic. Although a facility is available through active travel, this does not mean that it will be used.		*Noted*	*No action taken*
69	Doswell Projects	4 pg document		*noted*	*no action taken*
70	Landquest UK	5 pg document		*contrary to comments in section 2 (the NP does not seek to make any specific housing allocation) the Neighbourhood Plan makes two allocations totally 40 dwelings, plus repurposing of the listed building possibly as apartments, not counted within the 40 dwellings.*	*no action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
71	Bloor Homes (Maddoxford Lane)	16 pg document		*noted*	*all technical information updated to latest information prior to submission.* *Policy 6 has been re-worded with additional evidence which provides justification for the policy and it is general conformity with strategic policies of the EBCLP.* *Site BO3 is outside the remit of the NP given it is a strategic allocation, however, the Neighbourhood Plan can seek to influence what type of development is delivered as it is required to meet the needs of the community. The policy wording is flexible in that it requires a 40% delivery of affordable housing, however it does allow for credible evidence to be put forward showing how this is not viable.* *in Feedback, Eastleigh Borough council supported strongly the Utilities provision (Policy 10) as it goes further than the Local Plan Policy, and wording has been adjusted to take account of their feedback.*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
72	Bloor Homes (Maddoxford Lane)	16 pg document (cont from above)		*noted*	*Policy 11 comments noted, no action taken. Wording adjusted in light of feedback from southern Water. Policy wording of policy 13 has been adjusted and further evidence presented to create a more robust policy. Policy 14 comments noted, no action taken. Policy 15, comments noted, no action taken.*
73	Bloor Homes (Maddoxford Farm)	18 pg document		*noted*	*no action taken*
74	Warren Jackson-Hookins, EBC	13 pg document		*noted*	*actions taken noted separately*
75	Historic England	6 page document		*noted*	*no action taken*
76	HCC	4 pg document		*noted* *it should be noted that Policies 7 & 8 are for WOODHILL School not WOODMILL school as written in HCC response to Reg 14.*	*the issue of "active travel" and the HCC suggestion for a discussion on educational parking has been added to the Appendix on Community Aspirations. This will be for the Parish Council to take forward and action.* *No other action taken in the Neighbourhood Plan as HCC comments largely support the policies.*
77	National Grid	3 pg document		*noted*	*no action taken*
78	Stratland Estates and landowners (Gillings Planning)	5 pg document		*noted*	*no action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
79	Gillian Roberts	Policies Commenting Botley "village" has been split in two with Boorley Park area too far away from the centre to be called Botley. Residents of Boorley Park will not shop in Botley High Street. They will need cars to travel anywhere. The planners seem to be obsessed with the number of parking spaces per home (obviously in view of the mass of cars parking on the pavement in the main roads of the Estate). No mention of a better bus service. No mention of improvements to walk to Botley railway station/or parking whilst there. As usual all roads this development inadequate to take traffic. Biggest "crime" is NO doctors surgery/clinic planned. Botley/Hedge End already under tremendous pressure and you have just overloaded it.	Provision for doctors surgery/health clinic/dental surgery. In your Vision for Botley in 2036 (when I probably won't be alive) you still seem to be under the impression people will walk everywhere. Still no mention of public transport. Deer Park School is already too small to accommodate a growing population	*Noted. Education and Health infrastructure are part of strategic policy and not within the remit of the NP.*	*No action taken*
80	Laura Lax Environment Agency	Policies 7 and 8 Objecting The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 161 is very clear that all plans should apply a sequential, risk based approach to the location of development - taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change. Both policies 7 and 8 in the plan allocate sites for development that are partially within flood zone 3 and potentially have a main river within or adjacent to the sites. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the sequential test has been undertaken and there is no recognition or assessment of the flood risk to the sites. Although these elements are mentioned within the criteria of the policies, flood risk is an issue that should be dealt with upfront and it needs to be ensured that the site is suitable for allocation in terms of flood risk prior to their inclusion.	Robust evidence should be provided to demonstrate that the sequential and exception tests have been undertaken as per paragraphs 162 - 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Assessment of the flood risk to both the site itself and to others should be undertaken.	*noted*	*additional policy wording has been added: c) Supporting evidence demonstrating how site constraints (such as flood risk, biodiversity etc) will be addressed, needs to be included with applications. Development on this site is subject to flood risk sequential testing and if approved, proposals for a strategic flood risk assessment will be required to demonstrate how the site will be safe for the lifetime of the proposed development.*
81	Lauren Whitehead	Vision, Policy 1, 4, 13 and 15 Commenting Vision - It's imperative that safe walking and cycling routes are provided for children in all catchment schools. Bus services should be more frequent from Boorley to and from Wildern. Policy 1 - You should retain all commercial including agriculture. B Class industrial uses, retail and leisure. Provision of adequate retail to sustain all new developments before housing is sold or occupied (where social) is imperative. Policy 4 - As Vision Policy 13 - 4 Bed houses should have at least 4 parking spaces. The lack of parking on new developments makes them unsafe for pedestrians and causes neighbourhood unrest. Roads should be completed and main roads through estates should have double yellow lines or estates should be built without residential frontage to main roads like Knightwood (C Ford) and Grange Park (Hedge End). All homes should have EV as standard and full solar (cross over to Policy 15/16). Policy 15 - Agree, must be built before homes are occupied and public transport must be better.	13 B - Particularly concerned by lack of parking for larger homes (occupants and visitors) Boorley is a testament to development failure in this respect. 1 - All commercial should be retained and further provided on new estates. People can't be expected to not work/ shop/ socialise near to where they live. Convenience retail within reasonable walking distance, safely for all new developments is imperative. 3. Green space should be provided from start of new development, accessible to all and paid for by Eastleigh BC not homeowners. Adequate waste bins should be provided and play areas for older children (see Dowds Park Hedge End). Unacceptable that homeowners are sold homes with gardens smaller than footprint of house and no open space is given for years after the homes are occupied (again a Boorley failure).	*Noted*	*No action taken. Since the change to the "use classes" more businesses have permitted development rights automatically. The residential parking policy has been reworded and additional evidence added, however numbers are required to remain realistic in order for the development to remain viable.Roads are outside the remit of the NP.*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
82	Malcolm van Rooyen	The whole proposal-Objecting. The Botley surgery no longer operates as a surgery living next door to the surgery we have had to move to Hedge End surgery to obtain any kind of care. At one stage Botley Surgery operated as the hub for after hour work but this has now been moved to Lowford. Thers is not enough capacity for either St Lukes/Botley or Hedge end surgeries to absorb this level of housing (especially when you consider the housing that has already been passed and coming) as both are over subscribed which already impacts the existing residents in trying to find suitable care. Secondly, the Botley bypass will now not be delivered for another 2 years as the second phase is only in the design process. As a resident of Botley we cannot continue to live with the current level of congestion and poor air quality. My partner is already suffering with the current increased levels of poor air quality. Cars are now going through the pedestrial crossing even when red in the Botley village square (I have nearly been hit twice now) by drivers trying to jump the light or avoid stopping. The speed limit needs to lowered to 20mph with average speed cameras if the bypass is not goin to be completed for another 2 years.	Before anything is passed there needs to be a concrete plan and implementation plan to increase surgeries in the area. More dentists are also required Improved infrastructure in Botley and the surrounding areas. Better bus service - immediately. Better train service. A clamp down on inconsiderate parents around the Botley parish school who park in residents driveways, on cormers, in bus stops, on pavements, on communal green spaces all whil destroying the verges and pavements in Mortimer Road, Bailey Close and Boswell Close. When challenged residents are sworn at and abused by these inconsiderate parents. Eastleigh Borough need to stop hiding what the surrounding areas have planned as these plans impact Botley. Botely was never meant to be the rat run for Whitely the bollards at the Yew Tree roundabout were for busses only since theie removal the problems started. Now Junction 7 and Botley are the rat run for Whitely when the burridge road is closed Botley can survive.	*Noted. Health care is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan, as are busses and trains and inconsiderate parking.*	*No action taken*
83	Peter Newcombe	Policy nine B03 proposed development of 120 dwellings Commenting Policy nine B03 proposed development of 120 dwellings is too high, the size of the develoment site is insufficient to be be in keeping with existing established developments. Previously local authorites have been negligent in there duties to protect the enviroment/biodiversity of our SINC area's.	Revert back to the orlginal outline planning permission of 70 dwellings, allowing the proposed site to be in keeping with exsisting developments, protecting the SINC area's.	*Botley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 refers to EBC Local Plan Policy BO3-which is a strategic allocated site- and therefore the removal of the site or any amendments to policy BO3 is beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan.*	*No action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
84	Stephen Carrington, Foreman Homes	Policy 6, Policy 7, Policy 8, and Policy 14 Commenting Policy 6: I am concerned that b)ii's outline of the 'local gap' will conflict with the housing allocation - albeit in part - at Policy 8? Policy 7: whilst supportive in principle, I am concerned that b) and c) place severe restrictions upon delivery, and that such may hinder the Listed Building's restoration in sufficient time for it to be properly saved: the early release of development land will better facilitate/enable the restoration project? d) sets a "maximum" figure, whereas it may be more appropriate to set a dwellings per hectare (dph) figure instead, as a 30-40dph figure would be less onerous? g) suggests a higher level than normal of affordable housing, and - as above - that could affect the timely restoration of the Listed Building? i) ought be less restrictive, as we currently envisage the Listed Building coming back to life as a single family home (once its inappropriate extensions have been removed), as this ought better serve its longevity? Policy 8: as above - for Policy 7 - b), c) and f) may frustrate the timely implementation of a scheme necessary to help save the Listed Building? It does - as also set out above - seem to be in conflict with Policy 6's gap designation (so 6 ought be adjusted to suit this allocation for housing)? Policy 14: at k), it may be appropriate to suggest that the affordable units are "pepper-potted" throughout the development, so as to avoid clusters of say 6 or more, to help create a better mixed community?	The offer of greater certainty-of-delivery (in a more timely fashion), with regard to the housing allocations, coupled with foreknowledge of all likely costs inherent, ought make for an earlier investment in local facilities, and the saving of structures and landscapes of greater public worth?	*noted*	*Policy 7 & 8 have been re-worded to reflect the requirements of the community and additional evidence has been added to explain why the proposed numbers are sufficient for these two sites. The policy also requires a proposal for resuse of the Grade II listed building, and the numbers for this proposal are in addition to the 20 for each site.*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
85	Ms C A Mayall, Southern Water	Housing Aims and Objectives – Page 25 Commenting Southern Water is the water and wastewater undertaker for the parish of Botley. We support objectives 11, 12 and 14, but note that nowhere in the plan is there a requirement for new development to be water efficient. Water UK's '21st Century Drainage Programme – the context' states 'more people, bigger towns and cities and the effects of climate change will mean a greater demand for water'. To ensure a holistic approach to sustainability, all types of new development should be encouraged to not only reduce carbon, but also achieve higher levels of water efficiency. The Environment Agency classifies the south east as an area of 'serious water stress', and a variety of factors such as an increasing need to limit surface and groundwater abstractions, increase drought resilience, meet the needs of a growing population and adapt to climate change, all combine to present both challenges and opportunities to change the way we manage water. Whilst tackling this challenge will require a multi-faceted approach, there is an opportunity for all levels of the planning system to play their part, by ensuring through policy that new development is required to meet higher standards of water efficiency. High standards of water efficiency in new developments equate to greater long-term sustainability – with the potential to delay or reduce the need to increase abstraction or find new water resources. There are also additional benefits to minimising water use in terms of reduced carbon emissions from treating, supplying, and heating water, as well as lower water and energy bills for future occupants. We would therefore encourage neighbourhood plan policy to ensure that new development is not only water efficient, but should also seek to harvest rainwater and/or recycle greywater where possible. In addition, since around 95% of potable water used in the home drains back into the foul network, higher water efficiency measures can not only help to conserve water resources, but also help to reduce the impact of new development on the existing foul drainage network, which would align with Objectives 11 and 12, and Policy 10 of this plan. We would ask the council to include a policy requirement for all new development to meet, as a minimum, the higher optional Building Regulations standard of 110 litres per person per day, as this should be achievable even without implementing recycling systems. This would support Southern Water's Target 100 Programme (which is working to reduce water consumption to 100l/p/d in conjunction with reducing leakage by 40% by 2040) and would also be in line with paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires a	Having regard to the above, Southern Water proposes the following additional policy; All new development will need to meet optional Building Regulations water efficiency standards of 110 l/p/d and proposals which meet lower water consumption targets will be supported. Rainwater harvesting and/or greywater recycling will also be encouraged.	*noted*	*Bullet point added to policy 15 a) All new development will need to meet optional Building Regulations water efficiency standards of 110 l/p/d and proposals which meet lower water consumption targets will be supported. Rainwater harvesting and/or greywater recycling will also be encouraged.*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
86	Ms C A Mayall, Southern Water	Policy 3: Protection and maintenance of Local Green Space Objecting Southern Water is the statutory water supplier and wastewater undertaker for Botley. As such, we are responsible for a network of pipes and pumping stations across the parish. Whilst we agree that Local Green Spaces should be preserved for the benefit of local communities, unfortunately we cannot support the current wording of the above policy as it could create a barrier to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, from delivering essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development. Although there are no current plans, sometimes there is a need for new, or upgrades to existing, infrastructure in areas where there may be limited options available with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. The National Planning Practice Guidance recognises this scenario and states that 'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has needs particular to the location (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'. The NPPF (2021) establishes in paragraph 101 that Local Green Space policies should be consistent with those for Green Belts, which identifies in paragraph 146 that 'certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate' including 'engineering operations'. Paragraph 143 sets the intention of ruling out inappropriate development 'except in very special circumstances'. Paragraph 144 explains that special circumstances exist if the potential harm of a development proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations.	Accordingly, we propose the following addition to Policy 3: b) Proposals for development on these Local Green Spaces will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated with compelling evidence that it is required, to enhance the role and function of an identified Local Green Space, or it is for the provision of essential utility infrastructure, where the benefit outweighs any harm or loss and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.	*noted*	*policy 3 allows for necessary infrastructure:* *Proposals for development on these Local Green Spaces will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated with compelling evidence that it is required, to enhance the role and function of an identified Local Green Space.* *c) Where permission for development can be demonstrated to be required with compelling evidence, developers will be expected to demonstrate how the existing flora and fauna will be protected or be subject to mitigation measures.*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
87	Ms C A Mayall, Southern Water	Policy 11: Flood mitigation Commenting Southern Water supports most of the criteria of this policy - in terms of flood risk, better rainwater management is key to achieving not only a reduced risk of flooding, but also a reduction in storm overflow releases and reduced demand on water resources. To help achieve this, Southern Water supports policies that prioritise on-site surface water management through effective SuDS provision. However, whilst criterion e of this policy is aligned to current Building Regulations, we feel that this legislation is fast becoming outdated. DEFRA's recently published Storm Overflows Discharge Reduction Plan (August 2022) sets an expectation on water companies to reduce year on year the amount of surface water connected to the combined network and state that 'this should include limiting any new connections of surface water to the combined sewer network, and any new connections should be offset by disconnecting a greater volume of surface water elsewhere within the network' It would therefore be contrary to the above to allow new surface water connections into the combined network, and on that basis we recommend a requirement that development is not permitted to connect surface water into the foul or combined network. Unless or until Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 is enacted, Southern Water cannot legally refuse applications to connect surface water to the combined network. If flooding occurs due to excessive prolonged rainfall, a policy to prevent surface water from being connected to the foul/combined network will help reduce the risk that flood water is contaminated with wastewater, thereby reducing the risk of pollution.	We would therefore request under criterion e of this policy that 'drainage to a combined sewer' is removed. We also feel that 'another drainage system' is ambiguous, particularly where surface water, highways and combined sewer drainage systems have already been referenced. We would not wish the foul sewers to be considered as a potential drainage option for surface water and would therefore recommend that a further criterion is added to policy that 'Surface water will not be permitted to drain to the foul or combined sewer network in order to mitigate the risk of pollution from foul flooding'. This would align with paragraph 174(e) of the NPPF which requires that policies prevent development from contributing to unacceptable levels of pollution.	*minor ammendments already made to Policy in line with feedback from Eastleigh Borough council*	*as requested: "another drainge system" has been removed. Additional bullet point added as suggestion: "Surface water will not be permitted to drain to foul or combined sewer network in order to mitigate the risk of polution from foul flooding"*
88	Tom Rushby	Policy Thirteen: Parking standards for new residential developments d) Parking spaces will be required to be constructed of permeable surfaces to maximise surface water run-off.Objecting I am objecting because the policy should be to minimise surface water run-off, NOT maximise it.	This paragraph should read "... to minimise surface water run-off".	*noted*	*wording corrected*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
89	Tom Rushby	Policy Fifteen: Built form, design and materials Paragraph (c), first bullet point: "Developments, extensions and renovations requiring planning permission will generally be expected to harmonise with their immediate surroundings." Objecting I am objecting to this policy as the wording of the text may constitute a barrier to residents undertaking retrofitting of their property to improve thermal/energy performance (for example installation of external wall insulation and upgraded glazing). Retrofitting existing homes within the parish is one of the most important actions to be taken for climate change over the next 10-15 years with many of the properties within Botley parish requiring extensive external renovation to meet emissions reduction targets. This mitigation will require a forward-looking approach to planning which should allow innovative techniques which may not harmonise with the current general aesthetic of the parish but must not be ruled out on these grounds alone. A balance must be struck between aesthetics and future-proofing the housing stock of the parish and the community should consult further on how these aspects are weighted in the plan.	The policy should be further consulted on and updated in order to facilitate, rather than prevent, wide-scale and deep energy retrofitting of homes within the parish (at speed).	*noted. The policy bullet point refers to architectural design of the property and is in no way intended to prevent or hinder measures to combat climate change.*	*no action*
90	Tom Rushby	Policy Four: Infrastructure investment priorities Specifically provision of continuous cycle routes and improvement of parking provision. Commenting I am supporting the plan but feel that the text provided for the support of the continuous cycle route from the Maypole roundabout through the high street to the station should be included in the policy specifically as a priority. It currently appears in the evidence section. In terms of parking provision, the policy needs clarification that 'improvement' of the parking in Botley square not be interpreted as increasing parking provision but providing better provision for disabled car users.	Move the text on the continuous cycling route from evidence section to policy section. Further evidence should be gathered to support the policy on parking provision within the high street/square. The building of the bypass creates an opportunity for the village centre to benefit greatly from reduced traffic movements and a far more people-friendly street-space. This space could provide great benefit to the local businesses but the opportunity will be missed if the focus is on providing greater/easier vehicular access rather than prioritising the experience (and retention) of those visiting the high street shops and businesses. The community should be consulted explicitly on balancing access for those vehicles that need it, and providing a revitalised high street that provides safe access for active modes of travel, along with places to meet and for businesses to utilise - this maximising the value of this important part of the public realm.	*noted*	*added to community aspirations as "shared space project for village centre".*
91	Peter Newcombe	infrastructure funding Commenting Additional funding allocated to improve existing road network, especially unclassified residential roads, such as Kings Copse Ave, which will be picking up part of the traffic burden.	with the population of Botley increasing by 24.4% plus neighbouring area's increasing substancially, residentials roads need additional funding to improve the quality of road surface, to reduce the impact of road noise.	*improving the roads is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan*	*no action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
92	Joe Appleby	I have two main comments that I feel need to be made urgently and adopted within the plan, both of which relate to flooding at Botley Mills. These areas need to be identified within the current plan as the developments within Botley that have been proposed and the ones that have already been constructed over the past few years are having a significant effect, so Section 106 money needs to be directed towards improvements that can be made to mitigate any future flooding.	Widening of Mill Hill footpath – Although the footpath to Botley mills from the village square has already been identified as a priority to improve through widening I feel further consideration needs to be made as part of these works. Currently the footpath crosses 3 poorly constructed and maintained cobbled sections leading into the entrances to No.2/4 Winchester street and the two entrances to Botley Mills. Due to flooding and water flow, these cobbles (installed 25 years ago) have become loose from the mortar holding them in position, which makes crossing these areas extremely hazardous for pedestrians. The cobbled entrance into Botley Mills has sunk making a perfect channel for water running down Mill Hill and then flooding the visitor car park at the front of the site and the surrounding businesses (this is now a common occurrence every year during heavy rainfall). This problem is exaggerated further by a combination of the shallow drains along Mill Hill which become blocked with mud and debris within weeks of being cleared by Highways. The bridge to the east side of Botley Mills site crossing the A334 has also had its natural drainage design compromised by the construction of the pavement on the north side and debris build-up of the south side – see picture attached (the bridge has natural drainage slots in its railings for water running down the road to flow through, but this can now no longer happen). Any improvements to the pedestrian links must include a remodel of the Highway drainage, cobbled entrances and camber of the road. If the camber of the road was altered then the waterflow from the road could be directed to the South side away from Botley Mills and into the river.	*noted see below*	*no action taken*

Ref No	Name	details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	*SG Response*	*NP Action*
93	Joe Appleby	I have two main comments that I feel need to be made urgently and adopted within the plan, both of which relate to flooding at Botley Mills. These areas need to be identified within the current plan as the developments within Botley that have been proposed and the ones that have already been constructed over the past few years are having a significant effect, so Section 106 money needs to be directed towards improvements that can be made to mitigate any future flooding.	Upgrade of the main river, sluice gates and road bridge - There has already been significant development upstream of Botley Mills in the basin catchment area of the main river and significant further development (including the new bypass) is being considered within this Neighbourhood plan. Even though all new developments are being constructed, one assumes, with SUDS, this does not protect the river from flash flooding. Within the past decade the frequency of intense rain showers depositing huge volumes of water in a matter of minutes has significantly increased due to Climate Change (each 1C rise means the atmosphere can store up to 7% more water vapour) and this is expected to increase further. Once the rainwater flows into the main river it reaches a bottle neck at Botley Mills, with only the passage under the Old Mill building or through the manually operated sluice gates. The sluice gates are manually operated, over 100 years old and in the control of a private individual not the EA. Of the 6 sluice gates, only 3 are operational. Down stream of the sluice gates the bridge crossing the A334 has had multiple services running underneath which significantly restricts waterflow at high tide (see picture attached). The services under the bridge are battered by debris (including fallen trees) as the water tries to squeeze through. The consequence of the restricted flow means water backs up towards the river retaining wall on the Botley Mills site (see picture attached) and causes flooding. The implications of debris damaging the electricity cables or gas main under the bridge is incomprehensible. The issue of the historic manual sluice gates, and A334 bridge restrictions have been explored by the Environment Agency and Highways over the past few years, but no solution has been considered due to lack of funding commitment.	*The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan is proposing the ByPass together with the majority of the development through strategic sites. There will be significant CIL or 106 agreements attached to these strategic developments. Therefore, these items will be added to the Community Aspirations Appendix for further investigation by the Parish Council with a view to taking this forward with Eastleigh*	*no action taken*
94	Joe Appleby	Conclusion	No identification has been made in the Botley Neighbourhood plan for the impact caused by current and future developments (including the Botley Bypass) on the waterflow down the main river towards Botley Mills or the implication of water runoff from the A334 into the Botley Mills site. Botley Mills has been flooded numerous times due to the above mentioned reasons and with further development and the impact of climate change the situation is expected to get much worse. Botley Flour Milling Company, the owner and custodian of the Botley Mills site has already spent in excess of £100,000 in recent years protecting this site of Historic interest and the livelihood of the businesses operating from it. It is right and proper that improvements as listed above are considered to be funded by Section 106 money from the developments as they are having a direct and significant impact on the viability of maintaining this historic site.	*noted*	*no action taken*

END