

SCHEDULE of responses to public consultation 21 July to 28 September 2015

(compiled October 2015)

REF:	CAT:	COMMENTS -	FOR	MAYBE	AGAINST	OTHER
		HP26 Allotment Gardens -Comments (Difficult to separate out the two sites)				
1	m	Good development, not too densely built, good access	*			
2	m	Agree has potential small scale development.Access onto Ldn Rd if demolish Moat House (Mouse House?) should be acceptable to Highways given they think access onto LdnRd by Sayers/Aymers is acceptable for 120 properties though it has less visibility.Should not be issue Dukes Place was built as a high density enclosed gated community with large impact on existing bordering properties residential amenities.If Council could find alternative allotment facilities for villagers would help this potential development.		*		
4	m	Good option,adjacent existing housing,preserves integrity of SC,does not encroach on countryside,close to rd,reasonable size development.	*			
11	m	Object to any development on this patch of land,road access unsuitable,too narrow access road bldgs close to rear boundary of garden,cause unacceptable loss of privacy, detrimental to open outlook,increase noise&light pollution,devalue existing residences.			*	
12	m	NO. You cannot take allotments, nationally the country is crying out for more allotments so many people want to grow fruit & veg and should be encouraged to do so.			*	
13	m	The Allotments have been on that site since before 1874(CountyHallRecords)&are recorded on an old ordinance survey map , 1874. Facility is a great asset to the village&because of distance &being over subscribed with long wait list Albourne Rd allotments are not an alternative. Govt. legislation makes Parish-DistrictCouncil legally obliged to supply land for allotments if >6 electors request it.I have been running SC Allotments for over 30 yrs.If the proposal does come about I will gather together interested parties to make land available. There 4 oak trees on the boundary with TPO's, one would have to be felled to allow carriage way access.			*	
14	m	If access is opposite DunlopClose there are parking problems from Dukes Place vehicles parked out on theB2118.			*	
15	m	Seems a better choice.	*			
16	m	May be OK if does not impact the sports field and hedges		*		
17	m	May be acceptable if does not impinge on recreation ground.		*		
18	m	Shame to lose allotment space, but relatively small development in keeping with the village.		*		
21	m	Good development-not too densely built-great access.	*			
23	m	Yes	*			
25	m	Have been allotments here since 1874 & if more houses are to be built in Sc allotments need to remain for future generations. Loss of natural habitat for slow worms,frogs,toads,bats,owls,			*	

SCHEDULE of responses to public consultation 21 July to 28 September 2015

(compiled October 2015)

		badgers,grass snakes - could be a nature reserve.				
26	m	Good Access				*
27	m	Am appalled that land which has been allotments for over 100 years&has been improved horticulturally can be proposed for building.The map area is incorrect.The Trees at north end are subject to TPO's.			*	
28	m	OK.	*			
29	m	NO.			*	
30	m	Not suitable-It would be great shame to deprive people of opportunity to be as self sufficient as possible.			*	
31	m	Only if there is an alternative site for allotments.		*		
32	m	I would have no objection to this development.	*			
33	m	Access problems, losing a public amenity - allotments - AGAINST			*	
			7	5	9	1

REF:	CAT:	HP28 Land North of Coombe Down -Comments	FOR	MAYBE	AGAINST	OTHER
1	m	Revised plan 15 houses good, not too dense, ornamental lake help water run off B2118 & alleviate flooding problem in rest of village.	*			
2	m	Drainage issues land at bottom of hill&floods every winter, public footpath impassable under several inches water - feeds stream eventually goes under Reeds Lane&into land north of Kingsland Laines site.Planning permission on this site needs to properly deal with water issues on it +possible adverse affects on sites further downstream.		*		
4	m	Poor option. Adjacent to existing housing, preserves integrity of SC,close to road,40 houses too large when so close to green belt.			*	
7	m	Would have huge impact on street scene due to topography of site.Lg development would exacerbate flooding issues on B2118 & lower ground(HP32,HP33)			*	
8	m	as 7 above.			*	
9	m	as 7 above.			*	
10	m	as 7 above.			*	
11	m	Seems a suitable site.	*			
12	m	NO I am against any more building in any of these areas			*	
14	m	Could divert some of water problems from B2118	*			
15	m	Not sure.				*
16	m	Flooding issues.Too many houses.Destruction of open area-we are not a town.Sewage floats to the surface in bad weather. I object to this.			*	

SCHEDULE of responses to public consultation 21 July to 28 September 2015

(compiled October 2015)

17	m	Plans suggest too much water run off on this site.			*	
18	m	Relatively little affect on existing houses, access good.	*			
19	m	Water Logged!!			*	
21	m	Revised for 15 houses-excellent. Ornamental lake will help run off B2118 alleviating flooding problems for SC.	*			
23	m	Good idea	*			
26	m	Good - Lake Helps Drainage, Not too big	*			
27	m	This land is undergoing restoration by new owner but regularly floods to a depth of over 2feet. London Road is on a causeway&is significantly higher than the land either side.			*	
28	m	OK.	*			
29	m	No.			*	
30	m	Suitable-Good use of land.	*			
31	m	Suitable for some housing.	*			
32	m	I would have no objection to this development.	*			
33	m	AGAINST. Why extend the village beyond existing boundaries? Impacts on surface drainage.			*	
39	m	Same as 7 above			*	
			11	1	13	1

REF:	CAT:	HP29 Land North of Oaklands - Comments	FOR	MAYBE	AGAINST	OTHER
1	m	Good use of redundant land-no flood risk.	*			
2	m	Not mentioned in report but actually the one area that could expand burial ground&churchyard of ChristChurch Sayers Common into.Future burial space limited in existing churchyard& Parish as a whole.				*
4	m	Good Option.Adjacent existing houing,preserves integrity of SC, reasonable development size close to rd.	*			
6	m	Concerns.Access only from North thru constricted bottleneck. Junction extremely congested at times, safety hazard.Already suffer from noise pollution, new development would add to this. Would need significant noise abatement measures to be within Govt Guidelines.Would diminish privacy to existing properites.Property already affected by existing watercourses which affect the clay soil.Concerned about affect on foundations, cellar waterproofing.			*	
11	m	Traffic access near bust roundabout dangerous, esp. in view of vehicles leaving A23.			*	
12	m	NO. The constant noise and fumes from the A23 are appalling, it has certainly affected my health.			*	
15	m	Seems a better choice.	*			

SCHEDULE of responses to public consultation 21 July to 28 September 2015

(compiled October 2015)

16	m	This seems OK	*			
17	m	Suitable	*			
18	m	Near to Church-but little impact on existing houses.	*			
19	m	A good site.	*			
20	m	Drainage a problem,Acorns gardens unable to use in winter months water not draining away. Drains from fields into gardens, cant grow plants.Access onto B2118 near roundabout a problem. Vehicles travelling too fast. Accident waiting to happen.			*	
21	m	No flood risk good use of redundant land.	*			
23	m	Access unsuitable.			*	
26	m	Good use of redundant land.	*			
27	m	This land is on a slope & has no access to London Rd.			*	
28	m	OK.	*			
29	m	NO.			*	
30	m	Not Suitable- too close to A23-would be noisy & polluted for residents.			*	
31	m	Totally unsuitable for homes. Too close to Motorway (A23).			*	
32	m	I would have no objection to this development.	*			
33	m	Sensible infill.	*			
			12		9	1
REF:	CAT:	HP30 Land North of Kingsland Laines Comments	FOR	MAYBE	AGAINST	OTHER
1	m	Too large - flood risk, dangerous access.			*	
2	m	Full &comprehensive comments on this site from villagers already on MSDC Planning Portal and should be taken into account.Existing plans out of scale for village. Issues of drainage,sewage&integrating possible new residents not properly addressed.Sewage issues southern end of site not sorted out. Meadowview still not connected to Mains Sewage & on sometimes failing Klargester discharging into stream on western boundary of this site.			*	
4	m	Medium option.In heart of village preserves integrity of sc,alongside existing houses, close to road, development too large.		*		
11	m	Up to 40 houses here will severely impact rural environment of villages well as adding to the drainage problems.			*	
12	m	NO			*	
14	m	Dangerous access opposite Berrylands Farm and Reeds Lane Roundabout.Will increase flooding in SC&problems with Pump Station.Heavy rain, 13th August caused foul water backing up into kitchens in Dunlop Close. Call out to Sthrn H2O to pump station.Foul H2O can end up in			*	

SCHEDULE of responses to public consultation 21 July to 28 September 2015

(compiled October 2015)

		watercourse across site. Light pollution from 24hr care home.				
15	m	Flood risk, poor choice.			*	
16	m	Too many houses for village.Dangerous access to B Rd,next to Reeds LaneRoundabout& Berrylands Farm.Bad floodPlain.Sewage already comes up to surface in bad weather.Too close to playground,horses on B Rd.Ecological damage.Not thought through-I strongly object.Impact on village disastrous.			*	
17	m	Not suitable. Too many houses.Poor drainage here already.Dangerous point of access onto main rd.			*	
18	m	Proposed development is too big for village. Flood issues significant affect on existing houses.			*	
21	m	So many objections-huge flood risk-bad access.			*	
23	m	Floods - unsuitable.			*	
26	m	Bit big on Flood Plain.			*	
27	m	This land regularly floods even during the summer.			*	
28	m	Bit Big * Reeds Lane.			*	
29	m	No.			*	
30	n	Not Suitable-land is very wet & needs to flood when rainfalls are high. No direct good access. Lowest point of the village.			*	
31	m	Too wet for large housing development. Small number of houses possible. Poor access to London Road.			*	
32	m	We are totally against this development as this area is terribly prone to flooding & is an incursion into the countryside. It is also overdevelopment of our village.They will not stick to 40 houses.			*	
33	m	AGAINST. Impact on surface drainage. We do not need this number of homes.			*	
				1	19	
REF:	CAT:	HP32 Land at Coombe Farm Comments	FOR	MAYBE	AGAINST	OTHER
1	m	Rather large development, east side of B2118 better for flooding problem than west side provided drainage & sewage is addressed on site.		*		
2	m	Parts of site have potential for development but not scale envisaged. A rural site could adversely extend area & boundary of village southwards into countryside.Against southern area Coombe Wood being developed-well used country footpaths across it, part of countryside path to Hurst enjoyed by villagers.Area north of Stonecroft potentially developed. Protect Sayers Common Wood&natural areas around it.Drainage careful consideration on site &affect on rest of village.Prevent private road, which leads to Langton Lane becoming a Rat Run. This sites impact on Langton Lane needs consideration.		*		

SCHEDULE of responses to public consultation 21 July to 28 September 2015

(compiled October 2015)

3	m	Pls note our grave concern. If this wooded area were to be developed would greatly detract from village rural feel, would exacerbate its strung out 'ribbony' effect.			*	
4	m	Worst Option. Separate from Sc fragments structure of village.Removes lg part surrounding countryside, change rural nature of SC.Building on green belt sets bad precedent for future.Too many houses o/s village.			*	
5	m	Worst Option.Part of strategic gap between sc & surrounding villages, not connected to exsiting housing -satellite development not part of village.Countryside used extensively by dog walkers & hikers amenity enhancing character of sc-key component of quality of life for those of us who live here.Would be ruined by future housing development.Surrounding woods home to Tawny Owls&Jays, both species in decline,would be driven out by proximity so much housing.			*	
7	m	Recent planning history provides well documented reasons against development. Relocation of development to South of site to reduce flooding&environmental impact would emphasise the discontinuity & encourage strip development along B2118 in strategic gap to Albourne.			*	
8	m	as 7 above.			*	
9	m	as 7 above.			*	
10	m	as 7 above.			*	
11	m	Any more than 30 dwellings here would be unacceptable.		*		
12	m	NO.			*	
15	m	Perhaps on a smaller scale would be OK.		*		
16	m	Density far too high.Potentially 400dwellingsmore than triples existing village.This is very pleasant scenic walk,lovely open space&should be kept.Agreeing to this potentially destroys SC. I strongly object to this.			*	
17	m	Too large a site-suggested 390 houses.This is a lovely open space.Insufficient local amenities. This would double the village.			*	
18	m	Huge, inappropriate. Effect on wildlife (owls etc)			*	
19	m	Would destroy the village.			*	
21	m	A little large I feel- if on east side better for flooding problem than west. Drainage&sewage must be resolved.		*		
23	m	Far too many houses.			*	
26	m	Big, but not a Flood Risk.		*		
27	m	This is grazing land.			*	
28	m	Big.			*	
29	m	NO.			*	
30	m	Suitable - Good access to B2118 & could incorporate large balancing ponds to slow down water	*			

SCHEDULE of responses to public consultation 21 July to 28 September 2015

(compiled October 2015)

		flow into village.				
32	m	I would object to this development as it is another incursion into the countryside.			*	
33	m	AGAINST. Extending village beyond existing boundaries, would impact surface drainage.			*	
39	m	Same as 7 above			*	
			1	6	19	
REF:	CAT:	HP33 Land South Furzeland Way, White Horse Lodge Comments	FOR	MAYBE	AGAINST	OTHER
1	m	Good small development, but Furzeland Way floods badly.		*		
2	m	Agree land has potential small scale development. Not unduly extend area of village, possible safe access to main rd due to its small size, flooding issues would be minimal providing land north Coombe down not adversely affected.	*			
4	m	Medium Option. Adjacent existing housing, close to rd, 6-8 reasonable size development but site is too big for this.	*			
7	m	As part of site in existing built up area appears suitable for low density development without much impact on street scene, site currently well screened from B2118. However creation of an entrance on B2118 would have significant impact. Access off B2118 requires substantial changes to traffic calming - there is an existing entrance off Furzeland Way street scene would be unaffected. Recent planning decisions allowed single storey only at adjoining properties, two storey development overlooking existing properties would have great impact on amenity of existing properties.			*	
8	m	as 7 above.			*	
9	m	as 7 above.			*	
10	m	as 7 above.			*	
12	m	NO.			*	
15	m	OK.	*			
16	m	Shame to lose Greenfield site, but small extension to existing housing. As long as does not cause flooding I do not object.		*		
17	m	Probably suitable.		*		
18	m	Small - acceptable development.	*			
23	m	Good idea.	*			
26	m	Good Limited Development, High Flood Risk.		*		
27	m	This land also floods - see HP28.			*	
28	m	Flood Risk.			*	
29	m	No			*	

SCHEDULE of responses to public consultation 21 July to 28 September 2015

(compiled October 2015)

30	m	Suitable - Good use of land.	*			
32	m	I would be for this development as it is within the village boundaries.	*			
33	m	AGAINST. Impact on surface drainage.			*	
39	m	Same as 7 above			*	
			7	4	10	
REF:	CAT:	HP34 Kings Business Centre Comments	FOR	MAYBE	AGAINST	OTHER
1	m	30 too many houses on site,add to awful traffic problems in Reeds Lane, flood risk to Reeds Lane.			*	
2	m	One of few industrial &source of employment sites in village,as such should not be changed to residential housing.			*	
4	m	Best Option. No damage to countryside,in keeping with character of SC, utility supplies already in place,close to rd,reasonable size development.	*			
11	m	Site lends itself to development without causing disruption to existing residences.	*			
12	m	NO.			*	
16	m	Shame to lose employment in village, but at least is Brownfield site not Greenfield site.Therefore do not object.	*			
17	m	Suitable if current industrial/business use is not required anymore.	*			
18	m	Replacing commercial space with dwellings?			*	
19	m	Still a need for business development & change to offices only.			*	
21	m	30 is too many houses also traffic problems in Reeds Lane already-flood risk.			*	
23	m	Reeds Lane already has major H2O issues, as houses in Meadow View cannot be connected to mains drainage system.			*	
26	m	Too big for Reeds Lane Traffic.			*	
27	m	So you'd remove what little employment opportunities are available in the village.			*	
28	m	Reeds Lane would not cope with the Traffic..			*	
29	m	NO.			*	
30	m	Suitable - Already has good access to Reeds Lane.	*			
32	m	I think building on this site would be ideal as it is a Brownfield site it is already in a built up area.	*			
33	m	AGAINST. As we are losing local employment opportunities.			*	
			6		12	
REF:	CAT:	HP35 Land North Kings Centre Comments	FOR	MAYBE	AGAINST	OTHER
1	m	Good use Brownfield Site provided housing occupies strip on southern boundary&northern spur	*			

SCHEDULE of responses to public consultation 21 July to 28 September 2015

(compiled October 2015)

		becomes a wetland nature site for public amenity then OK. The lakes and extensive wetland area will help alleviate bad flooding in Sayers Common.				
2	m	Land was formally part of Sayers Common Brick Yard. In 1947 land was zoned for surface working of minerals, clay. Former industrial site not fully examined & explained in report. Stream runs entire length eastern boundary, feeds ponds at north east of site which are result of former clay extraction. Ponds recently undergone conservation work. Furzefield Wood borders site, home to badger setts, deer & diversity of local wildlife, extensive spring flora. Scrub land adjacent home to many species butterfly & insects. This wildlife diversity needs consideration in planning decisions with buffers to protect wildlife. Land is heavy clay so drainage could be an issue. However, even with these restraints development on some parts of site should not be ruled out.		*		
4	m	Medium Option. Site too large, encroaches on woodland part of character of sc, close to rd.		*		
11	m	Site lends itself to development without causing disruption to existing residences.	*			
12	m	NO.			*	
16	m	Poor drainage issues here & bad sewage issues too. Reeds Lane too narrow for Traffic. Loss of ecology & local footpaths thru countryside. Boggy ground, run off causes flooding, sewage issues, I object.			*	
17	m	Poor drainage issues here & sewage issues. Reeds Lane too narrow for volume of traffic this would bring.			*	
18	m	Flood Risk! Development likely to be more than 30 dwellings & then not in keeping with village.			*	
19	M	The brick yard is a very good site for development.	*			
21	m	Good use of Brownfield site - the lakes and extensive wetland area will help alleviate bad flooding.	*			
23	m	Too many houses, floods / v. wet. Used to be ponds until they were all fill in.			*	
26	m	Too Big for Reeds Lane Traffic.			*	
27	m	This was originally the clay pits for the brick works & has been backfilled with demolition debris.				*
28	m	Reeds Lane would not cope with the Traffic.			*	
29	m	No.			*	
30	m	Suitable - Good use of land & already has areas to capture water.	*			
31	m	Probably too wet for housing.				*
32	m	I would be for this site as it is a Brownfield site it is already in a built up area.	*			
33	m	This is Brownfield land and development would not expand village.	*			
			7	2	8	2