

| Date | Ref | Name & category of respondent | Summary of Comments | OB&L Response | NP Action |
|-------------|------------|--|--|---|---|
| 03/07/17 | 1 | Tom Till, Landowner | Concern that safety aspects relating to Newnham Rd adjacent to Lower Mill not addressed | the issues raised are not within the scope of the OB&LNP | no action taken |
| 30/05/17 | 2 | Tony Vine, Resident | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document is too lengthy • Lychpit in not included enough in the NP, especially in variety of design • There is no mention of flooding issues • Minor points of accuracy | Issues of surface and waste water & flooding are covered in B&D LP. Need for variety of design style across the parish acknowledged | Amendments made to include Lychpit design style. Minor points of accuracy corrected |
| 09/06/17 | 3 | Beata Ginn, Highways England | We have reviewed the consultation and have no comments. | | no action taken |
| 09/06/17 | 4 | Clark Gordon, Environmental Agency | no detailed comments to make in relation to the Plan | | no action taken |
| 13/06/17 | 5 | Julie Johnston, Chineham PC | no comments to make | | no action taken |
| 22/06/17 | 6 | David Wilson, Savils (on behalf of Thames Water) | letter outlining suggested additions referring to surface water drainage and water supply, wastewater and sewerage infrastructure | B&D addresses these issues, specifically in Local Plan policies CN6, SS3.1, SS3.9 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan | no action taken |
| 26/06/17 | 7 | Gill Ashworth, resident | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan is focused on Old Basing, limited mention of Lychpit • Many of the policies/objectives are not clear in terms of delivery or evidence • Why are there so few green spaces suggested for protection? • Policy 8 (Housing Mix) objectives, policy & evidence don't match | Many green spaces/amenity spaces were considered, but already have designation in other forms. | amendments made to include Lychpit, policy 8 considered and amended |

| | | | | | |
|----------|----|--|--|---|--|
| no date | 8 | John Fleming, Gladman Developments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 3 Built up boundary (now renamed settlement policy boundary) thought not to be an effective response to future development proposals • Policy 7-Appearance of residential development is thought may have an adverse effect on development viability | The Settlement Policy Boundary conforms to the B&D ALP with provision for outside the Boundary in particular circumstances. The NP aims to apply the VDS within the Conservation Area while recognising that elsewhere design should be appropriate to existing location. | Objective 8 and Policy 7 reworded to recognise the part the VDS plays in Planning |
| 01/06/17 | 9 | HCC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies 1 & 2 are very specific without the benefit of a Transport Assessment • Policy 8 (Housing size) The CC do not consider this policy to be consistent with B&D LP • Green infrastructure and local green gaps not identified • Noted there are no policies related to flood risk-but recognises flood risks from all sources, including 2 strategic development sites identified in the B&D LP are covered by policies in the B&D LP • Primary school not mentioned by name | The most up-to-date Transport Assessment figures available and other sources of information have been used. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 8 reworded and more evidence added • Strategic gaps map added • Primary schools names added |
| 03/07/17 | 10 | Rebecca Aziz, Natural England | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A broader emphasis should be applied to green infrastructure within the plan along with other issues including biodiversity enhancement and foul water/surface run-off drainage. • Suggestions made to incorporate wording matching BDBC local plan policies SS3.1 and SS3.9 • Additional information regarding the Loddon valley & river suggested to add into the NP | Incorporation of Green Space within new development id covered in the B&D ALP, as is surface and waste water and flooding risk management, and conservation of SINCs, biodiversity and ecologically sensitive areas. Repeating LP policies not added as these are already statutory docs. | suggested additional wording added to NP |

| | | | | | |
|----------|----|---|---|--|---|
| 05/06/17 | 11 | Anne Francis, Mill Field Conservation Group Chair | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough emphasis as been placed on the importance of Mill Field and Bartons Lane to be protected as part of the Green Character of the parish and • meeting objectives 3 and 5 including the safety of pedestrians and cyclists as per your vision statement. Bartons Lane should become Access Only for pub and residents | Mill Field is designated as a Local Nature Reserve and part of the Strategic Gap in BDBC Local Plan. Increased traffic on Bartons Lane as a result of Swing Swang Lane development is not within the scope of OB&L NP. | Mill Field added to list of important community areas |
| 19/04/17 | 12 | Savills on behalf of Kings Fund | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area of Basingstoke Canal is isolated between private gardens and farmland and benefits from no right of way. • We do not therefore consider that the proposal affords any benefit or value to the wider community. • We do not believe that any designation is necessary or appropriate for either site as neither is under threat from development and both are already well protected. | Requested more info regarding protection Savills believe the sites already have. We have spoken to BDBC to clarify if they believe there is already any designation on the 2 pieces of land and they could not find any. | Green Space allocation not changed |

Please see separate document for BDBC comments