

**Consultation comments on policy T1 – sustainable and active transport and travel**

- Support - 44
- Neither support of object - 27
- Object – 30

The changes to the supporting text and the Local Plan policies have not only been informed by the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation but they have also taken on board any additional feedback that has come out of discussions/meetings with statutory consultees and members in order to improve the clarity and understanding of the contents of the Local Plan.

<b>Comments in support of policy T1 – sustainable and active transport and travel</b>		
<b>Respondent number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKNP-8 Otterbourne Parish Council	All aspects of the Policy are commendable but the public's acceptance may not be easily achieved. All levels of ability of the public may find some aspects of the Policy difficult and perhaps onerous on a personal level.	<b>Comment noted and support welcomed</b>  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKQ5-G Curdridge Parish Council	It needs to be recognized that development in the rural two-thirds of the district cannot be truly sustainable, but should minimize impact.  One possible amelioration would be car-pooling areas close to access to the strategic road network, to minimize the number of one-occupant vehicles making long motorway journeys.	<b>Comment noted</b>  This is accepted and set out in the policy. This would need to be a land allocation unless it could be associated with park and rides around Winchester. Unfortunately this is outside of the remit of the Local Plan  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>

ANON-KSAR-NK1G-2	Horizon Leisure Centres supports sustainable and active transport as it would encourage residents to lead healthier, happier and more active lives and a reduction in transport emissions reduces the risk of respiratory and cognitive disease.	<b>Comment noted</b> <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKS3-G Bishops Waltham Parish Council	T1 Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel. Welcomed the proposals for the design of development so that is minimises the need to travel by private car and the concept of 15-minute neighbourhoods (used by the Working Group to assess SHEELA sites). Would request inclusion of the need to provide suitable pedestrian/cycle links to all schools (particularly relevant to BW where the catchment secondary school is in Swanmore).	<b>Comment noted and support welcomed</b> This is covered by Policy D1 <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKTH-6	More work needs to be done to make more, continuous, safe cycle routes. Consideration of small electric car shares for villages needs to be included.	<b>Comment noted</b> Agree and the policies have picked this up. Car share is unfortunately outside of the remit of the Local Plan. <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKBD-G	We need much better and cheaper public transport in Winchester. standards and reliability have dropped recently which makes me more car dependent.	<b>Comment noted</b> Unfortunately better and cheaper public transport is outside of the remit of the Local Plan <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKZU-S	The policy is supported in accordance with development proposals at SH26.	<b>Comment noted</b> <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-N8UV-2	There should also be something about inter-generational needs. Older people need different support/ways to travel than younger children. This city does NOT have safe ways for children to cycle and walk, so they	<b>Comment noted</b> The policy makes reference to all users and aims to reduce car use and

	grow up with the 'normal' being a car. It needs to include education, and provide alternatives that are easier than the polluting option.	promote non car travel. Refer to policy D1  <b>Recommended response: no change</b> <b>Comment noted</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKJ4-8	<p>Please see accompanying Representations</p> <p>Policy T1 – Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel</p> <p>5.11 Vistry Partnerships support this Draft Policy T1 and the inclusion of the 15-minute neighbourhood concept. The concept of a 15-minute neighbourhood is very interesting in promoting sustainable travel as it ensures new developments are located in sustainable locations close to existing infrastructure. This, in itself, encourages new and sustainable communities, which will help towards achieving the Council's overall vision and targets.</p> <p>5.12 The 15-minute neighbourhood concept is vital in ensuring low carbon development. Given the rural nature of Winchester District, the 15-minute neighbourhood is not directly applicable for the majority of the Winchester urban area. Priority should therefore be given to those sites which meet the 15-minute neighbourhood concept in terms of site assessment.</p> <p>5.13 There is no evidence, either within the draft Local Plan or the Development Strategy and Site Selection document that the location of the sites in terms of the 15-minute concept has been considered. This is disappointing, and our Vision Document indicates how the Pitt Vale site conforms with the 15-minute concept.</p>	<p>This is recognised in the policy. This is a concept that we want to encourage but unfortunately not possible to apply to all areas in the district as such it has not been included in the site selection process.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-NKYT-Q	Absolutely admirable approach but I can't see how it can be delivered without the active agreement and involvement of Hampshire County Council who will have to provide the right infrastructure to do so. I would also add caveats that cycling in general is a leisure activity and in some areas of the city which are or will be pedestrianised, it is not safe or desirable for these spaces to be shared with cyclists. Furthermore, unless/until the whole of central Winchester is car-free and the public	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>We will be working with HCC on the LCWIP. This is recognised in the policy and safe travel for all is emphasised. The needs of less mobile are taken into account in the policy and also policy D1</p>

	transport network of buses is improved, it will not be possible to wean people from using their cars. Nor, will the 15 minute walk rule be easy for people with young children or those with mobility problems to be able to walk or cycle in/out or across the central parts of the city, without using cars. Finally, until WCC decide where the majority of 'dwellings' which should be social housing/flats, are to be positioned, even working out where/how the supporting infrastructure for sustainable transport and active travel should be designed and provided.	We have proposed allocations and they are in the most sustainable places. Any transport / infrastructure needs will be picked up in the allocations policy.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-N8EJ-6	Please note that provision must be made for disabled and aging populations	<b>Comment noted</b>  Policy already includes reference to this in section T1iv.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKP7-H	I am in full agreement with the aims but they will never be achieved without a big reduction in motor traffic entering the city. The only way I can see of doing this is a congestion charge for all internal combustion vehicles coming in. It would need to be combined with expanded park and ride provision and improved bus services- preferably small electric buses not the massive diesel ones that drive around empty most of the time. Is it too much to hope that the City and County Councils might be able to exert some influence over bus companies?	<b>Comment noted</b>  This is beyond the scope of a local plan. HCC will be working with the bus companies and are progressing LCWIP's for the district.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-N8YF-P	Reducing car parking availability needs to work alongside encouraging more frequent, reliable public transport and walking routes need to be safe to use even in the dark winter months, in particular getting to bus stops from the train station, when folks are getting in mid to late evening	<b>Comment noted</b>  The local plan cannot address public transport issues as this is outside the remit of the Local Plan. The public transport providers have been contacted as part of the plan consultation process and can make suggestions about the locations of development etc.

		<b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-N85A-D	<p>[This response should be read in conjunction with the full copies of the 'Bishop's Waltham Representations to the Winchester Local Plan Regulation 18 representations OBO Crest Nicholson' representations submitted by email which includes the relevant figures, footnotes and appendices, with correct formatting]</p> <p>Crest Nicholson recognises the vital contribution providing a genuine choice of sustainable and active transport makes towards reducing the impacts of climate change and improving community health and wellbeing. As such, Crest Nicholson support the considerations of draft Policy T1 and note the inherent opportunity for the sustainable development of the Site. As outlined earlier in these representations and in the appended Vectos Transport Strategy Note (Appendix 2 - see email submission), the Site is sustainably located to access a range of services and facilities at Bishop's Waltham through sustainable transport modes. This is an approach endorsed by the LPP2 Inspector through their adoption of LPP2 with site allocations adjoining the Site.</p> <p>Therefore, future residents of the Site would not be reliant on the private car to meet their daily needs.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>This is a specific point against a site and this is not the only criteria on which site are assessed.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8MP-M	<p>[This response should be read in conjunction with the full copies of the 'North Whiteley Representations to the Winchester Local Plan Regulation 18 representations OBO Crest Nicholson' representations submitted by email which includes the relevant figures and appendices, with tables correctly formatted]</p> <p>Crest Nicholson recognises the vital contribution providing a genuine choice of sustainable and active transport makes towards reducing the impacts of climate change and improving community health and wellbeing. As such, Crest Nicholson supports the considerations of</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>This is a specific point against a site and this is not the only criteria on which site are assessed.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

	<p>Strategic Policy T1 and note the inherent opportunity for the sustainable development of the remaining land at the North Whiteley MDA. The land is adjacent to the recently constructed Cornerstone Primary School and is in close proximity to the services and facilities provided in the wider urban extension as well as those in the district centre to the south of the site.</p> <p>As outlined in the enclosed Vision Document for the additional land parcels at North Whiteley (Appendix 1, submitted separately via email), the development of this site will accord with the objectives of Paragraph 106 of the Framework through the connection of pedestrian and cycleways to the existing urban extension development to encourage future residents in to using active travel options and assist the Council in reducing the impacts of climate change and improving health and wellbeing.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8MB-6	<p>Sport England welcomes the policy and is supportive. Sport England acknowledges the benefits of promoting active travel both in terms of environmental sustainability; tackling inactivity and promoting movement. Sport England has produced in partnership with Public Health England (as it was then) its own Active Design Guidance (2015) which establishes a set of 10 principles for designing and planning spaces and places which promote active healthy lifestyles. The proposed policy and justification has a lot of synergy with our Active Design Guidance which recognises the importance of walkable and cyclable communities; good connections between walking; cycling and public transport; putting in place appropriate infrastructure to support physical activity; movement and sport.</p> <p>Sport England also recognises the importance of putting in place effective management and maintenance arrangements and systems to ensure that once designed and implemented these measures remain high quality and fit for purpose. Without it, and where connections; spaces; places are not well-maintained; fall into disrepair and no longer</p>	<p><b>Comment noted and support welcomed.</b></p> <p>Synergy with Sport England and PHE design guidance noted and supported.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: additional text added to supporting text will be included at the end of para 6.20 can be seen here:</b></p> <p>For further advice on this issue can be found on the Sport England website here:  <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design">https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design</a>.</p>

	<p>considered safe and secure there can be detrimental impact on take up of active travel modes.</p> <p>Sport England would welcome specific reference to our Active Design Guidance which can be found here:  <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design">https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design</a>.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N856-2	<p>Laudable though it is to promote active travel and sustainable transport in new developments, sadly this Local Plan does not address existing transport problems which are significant in many of the rural settlements eg. Wickham.</p> <p>I note that '6.4 Hampshire County Council is currently in the process of updating their Local Transport Plan which sets out its vision for future transport and travel infrastructure. The current Local Transport Plan (LTP3) was developed in 2011 but is no longer relevant to today's challenges and opportunities'. Whilst the HCC plan is being updated, and, faced with real current pressures on local lanes which discourage/prevent the use of sustainable travel by bike or foot due to danger and noise/air pollution, this Local Plan misses any awareness or proposed solutions to these pressing issues.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>As part of the preparation of the Local Plan a strategic transport assessment has been commissioned to assess the existing transport issues and what would be the transport implications of the site allocations and any mitigation that would need to come forward. We are working with HCC to complete this work</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8Q5-W	<p>In supporting this policy, we suggest adding reference to Green Infrastructure to para iv) eg "to the wider transport network and where appropriate integrated with the green / blue infrastructure networks..."</p> <p>Where new transport infrastructure is proposed, we encourage policies that explore its potential for delivery of major tree planting and woodland creation, the construction of wildlife bridges and green corridors and the restoration of damaged ancient woodland.</p> <p>We welcome the integration of tree planting into new walking and</p>	<p><b>Comment noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p><b>Recommended response: agree to additional wording to criteria iv. See changes to wording here:</b>  iv. Integrating sustainable and active travel routes into the layout with connections to the wider network <b><u>and where appropriate integrated with the green / blue infrastructure</u></b></p>

	cycling routes, to provide shelter and shade and to maximise the potential of these new green corridors for habitat connectivity.	<b>networks</b> , which must be made available and usable at all stages of development particularly on large or phased sites. v. Safe, attractive, secure and convenient ways that encourage all users, including those with disabilities and reduced mobility, to use more sustainable forms of transport such as walking, cycling or buses, at every stage of the development;
ANON-KSAR-N8WT-2	The policy should be widely applied: it's the application rather than the policy that's important. The whole road network was designed and built with private cars as the priority. Almost every junction in Winchester privileges cars over pedestrians. Cyclists are in conflict with motor traffic almost everywhere.	<b>Comment noted</b>  The policy aims to shift towards sustainable and active travel modes. We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will look at issues and opportunities like this.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
BHLF-KSAR-N8ZJ-U	Sovereign supports the objectives of Strategic Policy T1 which seeks to ensure that developments are in sustainable locations and that they encourage access by sustainable modes of travel.	<b>Comment noted and support welcomed</b>  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
BHLF-KSAR-N8ZF-Q	Dudsbury Homes supports in general the proposed transport policies in the Plan. In this context, it considers the land it control at School Lane, Denmead is sustainably located in the context of the 15 minute neighbourhood. Denmead is a village with a wide range of existing facilities, services and employment opportunities, and is situated about 4 km from the main urban area of Waterlooville with its wide range of high order provision. The land at School Lane is within range of local	<b>Comment noted</b>  This is a specific point against a site and this is not the only criteria on which site are assessed.



	services and facilities by walking and cycling, and the bus services stop nearby, providing routes to schools, colleges, Waterlooville and other larger settlements to the south.	The allocation of sites in this area is for the parish council by way of the Neighbourhood Plan.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
BHLF-KSAR-N8BF-Y	Support in principle for the concept of 'walkable neighbourhoods' or '15-minute neighbourhoods' . The Local Plan should clearly recognise however that this may not be feasible in all cases, including in rural villages, and that the NPPF#79 recognises that services in one village may support a cluster of surrounding villages and therefore allow for proportionate growth in those villages as well. Rigid application of the 15-minute concept would therefore be counterproductive in the rural area and threaten villages falling into the 'sustainability trap' and would not be consistent with NPPF#9, which requires the consideration of local circumstances. Policy is unreasonably weighted towards highly sustainable urban areas. Objectives set out in the policy will not always be deliverable in rural areas and could present a major obstacle to even modest growth.	<b>Comment noted</b>  This is recognised in the policy. This is a concept that we want to encourage but unfortunately not possible to apply to all areas in the district  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
BHLF-KSAR-N8BS-C	BSP support the proposed approach within Policy TP1 for development to promote sustainable and active transport and travel. The policy will encourage people to use other modes of transport and reduce the need for travel by car. One of the fundamental pillars of the plan that has been distilled within the vision is to develop 15-minute neighbourhoods and this concept should guide where development is located. Land east of Lovedon Lane is within proximity to an existing bus stop and the proposals seek to re-route the existing bus service to increase efficiency. The site is well related to existing pedestrian links which connect the site to Kings Worthy Primary School and the Local Centre (Springvale). The site also presents an opportunity to create new pedestrian cycle route to / from site and enhance the POS on offer, namely Eversley	<b>Comment noted</b>  This is a specific point against a site and this is not the only criteria on which site are assessed.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>

	<p>Gardens to the south of Lovedon Lane. These enhanced links will encourage active travel and minimise vehicular movements and therefore reduce carbon emissions.</p> <p>As part of the proposals, there will be provision for some mixed use within the site of circa 1,000m GIA which has the potential to support a new GP surgery, plus additional local services and facilities. The accessibility means that it complies with the 15-minute concept with direct connectivity to and from Winchester City and further afield.</p>	
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N8BX-H</p>	<p>Sustainable Transport and Active Travel Strategic Policy T1 T4</p> <p>The Trust supports SP T1. Offering genuine choice of sustainable and active travel modes will likely benefit our staff and some patients to access the hospital, with benefits from walking and cycling and the potential reduction in air pollution. However, the Trust will need the support where practicable, to move away from the use of cars when coming to site. Therefore, the focus on creating connected 15 minute neighbourhoods is supported and the Trust would like to strengthen dialogue around active travel corridors, increase walking and cycling and access to public transport services and infrastructure. The local park and ride bus service is well utilised by Trust staff and patients, and we welcome any further park and ride developments that may come through increased development in the local area. Our catchment being a mix of urban and rural communities, we recognise that access to public transport is not readily available to all.</p> <p>The Trust would be interested in working more closely with WCC to reduce our mutual carbon footprint. Presently there are no attractive, direct cycle routes to the hospital, therefore the Trust would welcome understanding more about the central LCWIP and also have involvement in the development of the wider district LCWIP. As an organisation with a large volume of deliveries throughout the working week, the Trust is considering options regarding 'last mile' delivery and</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>These comments are focussed on the hospital.</p> <p>We would welcome further discussions with the Trust regarding active travel corridors, increase walking and cycling and access to public transport services and infrastructure. We would encourage the trust to continue engage with HCC on the LCWIP and the Winchester Movement Strategy regarding park and ride sites</p> <p>We would encourage the Trust to engage with the transport team at WCC to discuss last mile delivery and vehicle hubs</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

	would be very interested in understanding more about the suggested implementation of 'vehicle hubs'.	
BHLF-KSAR-N8B3-C	<p>We support the aspirations of T1, and in particular we note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at i. that development should be “offering a genuine choice of sustainable and active transport modes of travel; prioritising walking, cycling and public transport, followed by car clubs, electric/hydrogen vehicles and lastly private fossil-fuelled vehicles”;</li> <li>• at ii. development should “minimise the need to travel by private car”;</li> <li>• at iii. we support the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods;</li> </ul> <p>In our view, Site CU39, with its excellent proximity to the centre of Botley and train station can support these aspirations.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>This is a specific point against a site and this is not the only criteria on which site are assessed.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
BHLF-KSAR-N868-5	<p>We support the aspirations of T1, and in particular we note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at i. that development should be “offering a genuine choice of sustainable and active transport modes of travel; prioritising walking,</li> </ul>	<p><b>Comment noted and support welcomed</b></p>

	<p>cycling and public transport, ..., electric/hydrogen vehicles and lastly private fossil-fuelled vehicles”;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at ii. development should “minimise the need to travel by private car”;</li> <li>• at iii. we support the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods;</li> </ul> <p>In our view, Site BW12, with its excellent proximity to the centre of Bishop’s Waltham can support these aspirations.</p>	<p>This is a specific point against a site in BW and is not the only criteria on which site are assessed.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
--	---	---

<b>Comments which neither support or object to policy T1 – sustainable and active transport and travel</b>		
<b>Respondent number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKBF-J	<p>Although the policy supports walking as a sustainable form of transport with health benefits, it pays insufficient attention to the impact of traffic on existing walking routes. Many pavements are too narrow and pedestrians are forced to walk close to fast moving and heavy traffic. Vehicles should not be travelling at more than 30mph, maximum, where they pass pedestrians on the pavement; it’s simply dangerous. It deters people from using some routes because they are frankly scary. Harestock Road is a prime example. Traffic needs to be slowed and the pavement widened.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>Existing routes are being looked at through the LCWIP etc. Infrastructure improvements will be picked up in allocations policy or via TA. Unfortunately speed limits and proximity to pavements are beyond the remit of the local plan.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-NKHA-K	<p>1. WRA wholeheartedly supports the principle of sustainable and low energy transport and making possible a greater degree of active travel modes 2. However, these laudable aims will not significantly improve the quality of life for the majority of people. It is so disappointing that there is no mention in the Plan of traffic management plans, infrastructure improvements and improvements in public transport. All of these are the highest scoring negatives in the Wickham survey conducted in 2019 and nothing has been done by the Parish Council, Hampshire County Council, Winchester City and</p>	<p><b>Comment noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>Comments specific to Wickham situation. No allocation at Wickham to support infrastructure improvements at the moment but these points could be taken on</p>

	District Councils to address these crucial, urgent concerns. The local plan now the subject of consultation totally ignores the subject. Residents of Wickham will see this omission as a failure of local government and undermine any positive aspects that the Plan contains. The Council is urged to address these matters as a matter of urgent priority.	board if an allocation or planning application came forward  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NK29-N	T1 – Need to specify requirements about levels of travel; little point quantifying impact if there are no minimum standards	<b>Comment noted</b>  Policy T1 is a strategic overarching policy and as such it is important to read the Local Plan as a whole as other policies go into further detail.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKJX-C	The infrastructure in the wider area in which the development is proposed simply cannot sustain 8,000 new homes. In particular, the train links into London are already hopelessly overstretched. Major changes/upgrades would be required. I strongly object to this development.	<b>Comment noted, this is not relevant to the policy.</b>  Unsure what this comment is referring to. We have not allocated 8,000 new homes under the new Local Plan.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NK2N-A	NATC supports a choice of sustainable and active transport & modes of travel: prioritising walking, cycling and public transport, followed by car clubs, electric vehicles. However, Alresford has a majority aging population so some compromise would be required for this town. Alresford is a 20minute town but is not flat to cycle and walk.	<b>Comment noted</b>  The needs of less mobile population is already in the policy and policy D1. Lighting and potential pollution from it is covered in policy D7. The plan

	<p>Street lighting is also important. Although we are keen to protect dark skies, people need lighting on footpaths to safely negotiate them at night.</p>	<p>should be read as a whole. These are key issues that can be addressed in your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NK1Z-N Shedfield Parish Council</p>	<p>Whilst the Parish Council would support this policy in principle, unfortunately it cannot be applied in rural villages due to the inadequacy of public transport and the lack of safe cycle routes or footpaths. There is currently limited sustainable infrastructure for new developments to integrate with. Furthermore facilities within a suitable walking/cycling distance are severely limited.</p> <p>Due to lack of investment in infrastructure over a number of years, whilst permitting disproportionate development, the rural villages cannot adhere to these idealistic policies.</p> <p>Intensifying the use of existing accesses can only result in reduced highways safety or significant traffic congestion or delays until the problems with the highways have been addressed.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>Plan and pre-ambles recognise the difficulties faced by the rural area. In the light of the climate emergency the policy needs to tackle the climate emergency. This is a concept that we want to encourage but unfortunately not possible to apply to all areas in the district as such it has not been included in the site selection process.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKUC-2</p>	<p>In-principle, Catesby supports Draft Policy T1 and the reference to the '15-minute neighbourhood' concept. More broadly, promoting walkability and sustainable access to local services is also consistent with the Plan's strategy for reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>9.2 However, Catesby are concerned that the concept of the 15-minute neighbourhood is not applied consistently in the Plan. For example, the proposed 'new' allocation at Wickham (as set out at Draft Policy WK4) is not actually located at Wickham, but is instead situated at Knowle.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>The concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods is prioritised however we understand that this is not always going to be possible. And this is not the only criteria by which sites are assessed. This site has already</p>

	<p>This is problematic, because Knowle is a lower-tier settlement, which lacks most local services and the services available with Wickham are not within practical walking distance.</p> <p>9.3 By comparison, Land South of Titchfield Lane is located within a 15-minute walk of the centre of Wickham. Yet, despite it being more locationally sustainable than the site being proposed for allocation at Knowle, Land South of Titchfield Lane was not even shortlisted for further consideration.</p>	<p>been granted planning permission.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8MW-U	<p>The local plan needs to consider implementing safe cycleways linking outlying villages such as Twyford, Colden Common, Fair Oak etc. with cycleways within the Winchester boundaries. It's all well and good designing cycleways within Winchester but they are useless without safe routes that cyclists can use to get to them.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>This will be covered in the district wide LCWIP</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8GT-J	<p>There is not enough emphasis on travel in the rural communities and Market towns.</p> <p>There is a brief mention of creating transport hubs . However with little or no access to heavy fixed public transport infrastructure in the area ,particularly in the south of the district, if the population is to be encouraged to leave their cars at home /or use them for part journeys serious investment of these hubs with provision for car parking is essential. These hubs could be sited to offer fast journey times to the main commercial centres places of employment and/or rail interchange points.</p> <p>The report by transport consultants is a damning history of the demise of public transport in rural Winchester and lack of vision and investment by Winchester District and this trend should be reversed .Many rural areas have overcome this lack of access to public transport by combining the needs of the communities with other agencies such as dial a ride ,post busses etc. There is no mention of Winchester working with the county to design a comprehensive transport plan for the district to satisfy the needs of rural</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Additional wording to be included to cover mobility hubs as well as to be included in the glossary.</b></p> <p><b>Add what a mobility hub is in para 6.20</b></p> <p><b>Mobility Hubs</b>  <b>A mobility hub is a place that brings together a range of sustainable transport options and can be tailored in terms of scale and type to suit any setting, from city centres or</b></p>

	<p>areas.</p> <p>The policy talks a great deal of putting the emphasis on developers of new sites to make provision for walking and cycling routes within these new developments. There is no mention of making policy to create safe walking and cycling routes in rural areas where traffic is driving at speed where there are no pavements and speed limits are not enforced.</p>	<p><b>new housing developments to existing market towns or villages. It allows for different transport options so people have the ability to switch transport modes between journeys making their journey easier and more accessible. They will also help to reduce the number and the length of journeys made by private vehicles. Mobility hubs can also be a place to provide communities with useful facilities and act as information points. Hampshire's LTP4 (still currently draft) supports 'mobility hubs which act as a focal point for public and shared transport'</b></p> <p><b>Mobility Hubs can include, electric charging facilities, car club parking bays, delivery lockers, cycle parking, information totems and bus stops.</b></p> <p><b>To be added to the glossary: Mobility Hubs A mobility hub is a place that brings together a range of sustainable transport options</b></p>
--	---	---



		<p>and can be tailored in terms of scale and type to suit any setting, from city centres or new housing developments to existing market towns or villages. Mobility Hubs can include, electric charging facilities, car club parking bays, delivery lockers, cycle parking, information totems and bus stops.</p> <p>Unfortunately speed limits are not within the remit of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: change to wording and inclusion of mobility hubs to policy and addition of definition to the glossary.</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8Q1-S	<p>Policy T1 proposed the need for planning applications to design development that minimises the need to travel by private car, and prioritise sustainable and active transport modes. Parts (iii) and (iv) of the policy in particular consider the need to explore the concept of a 15 minute neighbourhood and the incorporation of sustainable travel routes with connections to the wider network and are usable at all stages of development.</p> <p>Whilst we support the ambition of the policy in pursuing these sustainable transport principles, it is unclear how the current spatial strategy supports these aims. The spatial strategy identifies a dispersed, sub-urban development strategy, which seeks to place development on the edge of</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>This is a specific point against a site and this is not the only criteria on which site are assessed.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

	<p>existing locations. However, this intrinsically limits the ability of these areas to provide a ground up approach to delivering active transport networks and establishing the most efficient way of delivering these, as the sites effectively form a 'tack on' to existing sites which will inevitably lead to a greater reliance on car use.</p> <p>If the Council wishes to make the best use of the extant wider network, the Council should seek to identify strategic locations such as Micheldever Station which have a unique locational advantage with the presence of a railway station. The presence of such a strong public transport link enables the ability to plan from an early stage how best to incorporate sustainable transport at their core, and how to integrate that within a wider public transport focus, and promote a step change from private transport by car.</p> <p>The importance of doing so was highlighted in the removal of the Fair Oak Strategic Growth Option (SGO) from the Eastleigh Local Plan at the recommendation of the Inspector, who noted that the SGO would result in longest average travel distances by car, over and above other feasible development options which was seen as a 'fundamental drawback'.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8YM-W	<p>BSP recognise and support the need for new proposed development to promote sustainable and active travel modes and minimise the need for car use. Furthermore, the application of 15 minute neighbourhoods within Policy T1 is also acknowledged to be an important design principles to guide development coming forward in the district.</p> <p>The opportunity at Fairthorne Grange is considered closely aligned with the principles set out in Policy T1. The site is uniquely located to form part of the 15 minute neighbourhood model. Botley station is approximately 1,200m from the site, which equates to around 15 minutes walking or 5 minutes cycling, with connections then onto Fareham, Southampton, Winchester and beyond.</p> <p>In addition, the site is around 15 minutes walking distance of the proposed</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>This is a specific point against a site and this is not the only criteria on which site are assessed.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

	North Whiteley local centre. Whiteley Town Centre is located within a 15 minute cycle ride from the site, along a network of new segregated cycle routes.	
ANON-KSAR-NKAB-D	<p>BSP recognise and support the need for new proposed development to promote sustainable and active travel modes and minimise the need for car use. Furthermore, the application of 15 minute neighbourhoods within Policy T1 is also acknowledged to be an important design principles to guide development coming forward in the district.</p> <p>The opportunity at Land North of Rareridge Lane is considered well placed to achieve the principles set out in Policy T1. The site is within an approximately 15minute walk of the town centre, with regular bus services operating along nearby Hoe Road, which is a short walk to the south of the site, at the eastern edge of Rareridge Lane. These bus connections notably provide services to Winchester, Fareham and Eastleigh.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed.</b></p> <p>This is a specific point against a site and this is not the only criteria on which site are assessed.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N81Y-1	Our client is generally supportive of the aims of this draft policy. It is recognised that within the draft policy the Council is promoting the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods. However, given the nature of WCC, this may not practically be achievable. We would therefore request wording be added to this policy which states under point iii) “wherever possible” (or wording to that effect).	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>The LP understands this will not always be achievable for every site. The policy asks that it is prioritised, not a requirement</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8WJ-R	Again, clarity is required about how the policy is going to be enforced and monitored. Furthermore, the provisions of alternative modes of transport ( more buses, cycle routes, additional pavements etc) cannot be achieved without fundamentally altering the character of rural areas which runs contrary to other policies in this document. Who will assess the potential impact on road congestion and pollution of building a further 100 houses in any rural	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>Will be monitored and enforced throughout and after planning application stages with the enforcement team. A transport assessment and comprehensive</p>

	location and what are the intended limits for congestion and pollution in areas that have been identified for development?	modelling will be conducted as well as an Annual Average Daily Traffic Flow. This will determine whether we need to do any air quality assessment work.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKFQ-1 Upham Parish Council	The policy rationale behind T1 is to be welcomed but we believe the wording of the policy needs to be strengthened to make it clear that there is a presumption against development that cannot adequately satisfy all of the clauses i-vi. The NPPF contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development but this policy needs to define what sustainable development looks like in terms of active transport and travel. for instance clause iii simply states 'The concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods'. Does this mean that unless a development fits within the 15 minute city concept that it is unsustainable? We believe this is what is meant and it should be stated. In the light of the climate emergency and the frequently stated (in this section) fact that transport is one of the highest emitters of carbon in the district, it will be important that the plan is written in such a way that development only takes place in sustainable locations.	<b>Comments noted and support welcomed.</b>  The LP understands this will not always be achievable for every site. The policy asks that it is prioritised, not a requirement  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-N88X-7	The objectives of the policy are laudable, as is the specific focus on 15-minute neighbourhoods or communities. However, a clearer emphasis should be placed on the creation of well-designed and appropriately surfaced off-road paths for active travel (e.g. walking, cycling, scooting, skateboarding) and accessible personal transport (e.g. wheelchairs, mobility scooters).  The LCWIP currently focuses on on-road provision for cyclists and pedestrians, but many people - particularly children - would be better served by off-road provision, as this can be safer, healthier and more pleasant to use. Sometimes, off-road provision can provide more direct routes from A to B. For all these reasons, it is an excellent way to encourage active travel and	<b>Comment noted</b>  The LP does recognise this. Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>

	effect a modal shift, and the need for investment in off-road paths should be explicitly stated in the Local Plan.	
BHLF-KSAR-N8T1-V	Para 6.10 of the consultation plan states 'Given that there is a climate emergency, it is considered appropriate to embed the concept of 15 minute cities into the Local Plan and apply these principles in the parts of the district where this is achievable whilst recognising that the concept of 15 minute cities does not work for all of the district.' This should be reflected in the wording of criteria iii and amended to read 'The concept of 15-minute neighbourhoods, where achievable' Criteria iv may make some developments financially undeliverable where full travel networks need to be provided prior to phases of the development being delivered.	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The LP does recognise this. Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.</p> <p>We should be looking to allocate development in the most sustainable locations this doesn't mean that small, locally supported developments are completely precluded as there are other policies in the Local Plan which support community led housing schemes.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8TB-D	Parts of the transport policy elements are muddled and seem to be ideologically driven. Of course active transport such as walking and cycling make sense; increased use of public transport to reduce traffic and energy consumption are also logical. Those conurbations such as Winchester where people work, live, shop and find entertainment within easy reach can achieve this. But the antipathy towards the private car comes across as ideologically driven with grudging phrases such as " we cannot totally rule out use of the private car" in policy T1; and when it uses CO2 savings and emissions reductions as justifications for curbing their use, fails to recognise that by 2030 new cars will have to be electric and emissions from cars at least will fall. Even if people	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The LP does recognise this. Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.</p> <p>We should be looking to allocate development in the most sustainable locations this doesn't mean that small, locally supported</p>

	live in an urban setting or a 15 minute neighbourhood, where is the evidence that they will not want to use a private (probably electric) car for leisure, shopping and weekend use? And they will therefore want somewhere to keep it. For much of rural Winchester District, a private car will remain essential. To build policy on grounds that WCC has decided it is opposed to private car ownership seems to be going beyond WCC remit and is unworkable.	developments are completely precluded.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
BHLF-KSAR-N8R7-Z Colden Common Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council supports the statements on active travel and sustainable transport, but Colden Common has very poor public transport (noted in the current local plan) Bus provision has fallen by 40% further resulting in a two hourly bus service. It is not possible to get to Eastleigh for further education or employment before 8.30am which means that residents are highly reliant on car transport.</p> <p>Our proximity to the Itchen River and the railway line brings constraints that realistically make improving transport infrastructure physically very difficult and not cost effective due to road widths and low bridges. Existing bus provision is subsidised by HCC and, given the pressures that HCC has on its budgets, bus services are likely to experience further cuts. We cannot link Colden Common with regular commercial bus routes such as Otterbourne or Bishopstoke as no suitable roads are available for them to use. Living in Colden Common is almost impossible without using a car.</p> <p>We have no cycle route into Winchester or Eastleigh to encourage active travel and this needs addressing</p>	<p><b>Comment noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>The local plan cannot unfortunately address public transport issues. The public transport providers have been contacted as part of the plan consultation process and can make suggestions about the locations of development etc.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
BHLF-KSAR-N86T-1 Hampshire County Council (Transport)	<p>P115 – Sustainable transport and active travel Para 6.4</p> <p>It may be helpful here to explain that Hampshire County Council is the Local Highway Authority for the road network in Winchester with the exception of the Strategic Road Network (M3 and A34) which is managed by National Highways. Hampshire County Council is also the Transport Authority for the Winchester City Council administrative area. The Hampshire LTP4 is a statutory document, and it may be worthwhile explaining the relationship between the LTP and Local Plan.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p><b>This is covered by para 6.4</b></p> <p><b>Change to para 6.4 to include addition of the following text ‘Hampshire County Council is the Local Highway Authority for the road network in Winchester</b></p>

	<p>The County Council would welcome reference to the City Council and developers working collaboratively with Hampshire County Council and Transport for the South East (TfSE) to achieve carbon neutral growth in the district and support the delivery of the sustainable development and transport objectives in the Local Transport Plan 4.</p> <p>The County Council would welcome reference to development proposals in the district to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consistent with and contribute towards the objectives and delivery of the Local Transport Plan 4 or its successors and supporting any adopted transport strategies such as the Winchester Movement Strategy</li> <li>• consistent with and contribute towards the objectives and implementation of the TfSE Strategy and associated delivery plans</li> <li>• designed and delivered in accordance with the Hampshire County Council Highway and Traffic Technical Guidance documents and policies, unless otherwise agreed with the County Council at the time.</li> </ul> <p>Where mitigation measures or additional infrastructure under the control of the County Council as the Highway and Transport Authority are deemed necessary to make the development acceptable, the County Council will seek funding contributions via section 106 obligations or alternatively via section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.</p> <p>Para 6.10 The text references ‘15-minute cities’ – these concepts tend to more appropriate for large cities and urban areas. The emerging LTP4 references ‘20-minute neighbourhoods’ which are recommended by TCPA for large scale new greenfield developments in the UK and considered be more appropriate for a district like Winchester.</p> <p>Other guidance documents and strategies that could be useful to reference here include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking Standards</li> <li>- Development management standards and technical guidance</li> <li>- Transport for the South East Sub-national Transport Body and its strategy documents.</li> </ul>	<p><b>with the exception of the Strategic Road Network (M3 and A34) which is managed by National Highways.’</b></p> <p>at the end of Para 6.5 additional wording to be included:</p> <p><b>‘Development proposals in the district need to be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>• consistent with and contribute towards the objectives and delivery of the Local Transport Plan 4 or its successors and supporting any adopted transport strategies such as the Winchester Movement Strategy</b></li> <li><b>• consistent with and contribute towards the objectives and implementation of the TfSE Strategy and associated delivery plans</b></li> <li><b>• designed and delivered in accordance with the Hampshire County Council Highway and Traffic Technical Guidance documents and policies, unless otherwise agreed with the County Council at the time.’</b></li> </ul>
--	---	--

	<p>- Transport Decarbonisation Plan P119 Key Issues Bullet point iii) This would be a good section to mention that large developments and new settlements may be required to meet agreed transport outcomes such as ambitious mode share targets. These outcomes and targets will only be approved where the County and City Councils believe there are realistic opportunities to achieve a high sustainable transport mode share amongst new residents and/or shift existing residents from car to sustainable transport modes and they will be robustly monitored and managed through the travel plan process. Bullet point ix) The County Council supports this statement. Para 6.19 - S278/S106 contributions The County Council would welcome additional reference to shared mobility and shared transport infrastructure and operations. P124 – Strategic Policy T1 – Sustainable and active transport and travel The County Council query whether the reference to ‘Travel Assessment’ is an error and should instead say ‘Transport Assessment’.</p> <p>T1 iii) The County Council would welcome the inclusion of reference to ‘the principles’ as well as the ‘concept’ of ‘15-minute neighbourhoods’. Also suggest that the terminology ‘20-minute neighbourhoods’ may be more appropriate.</p> <p>T1 iv) The wording of this policy point is long and may work better if it is split into two bullet points. The County Council also note that ‘incorporating’ has been used here but ‘integrating’ was used in earlier text.</p>	<p>We appreciate there are minor differences between 15 and 20 minute neighbourhoods/cities but the concept and purpose is the same for what we are trying to achieve.</p> <p>Whilst reference to those documents listed could be helpful we feel it would not be appropriate to include in our Local Plan (as these will change in the future) it would be more appropriate for people to refer to the HCC website where these documents are held.</p> <p>This is an important point but this should come out when HCC are involved in planning applications</p> <p>Para 6.14 is not an exhaustive list, this issue can be raised if HCC comment on a planning application</p> <p>Wording has been changed to transport and not travel assessment</p> <p>We appreciate there are minor differences between 15 and 20</p>
--	---	---



	<p>The County Council would welcome the inclusion of reference to new developments being required to support or contribute towards the delivery of the LCWIP network across the district, and other transport schemes included within the Infrastructure Funding Statement, where appropriate.</p> <p>Appendix 4: Climate Change The County Council is pleased to see that the issue of climate change is being addressed via a range of policies to address strategic carbon neutrality and designing for low carbon infrastructure, alongside Policy T1 (Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel) and Policy T3 (Promoting sustainable travel modes of transport and the design and layout of parking for new developments) which consider transport issues.</p>	<p>minute neighbourhoods/cities but the concept and purpose is the same for what we are trying to achieve.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: change to wording of supporting text</b> includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria iv (full stop after 'phased sites')</li> <li>• New criteria v starts with 'safe, attractive, secure and convenient ways that encourage...'</li> <li>• We have changed the word to 'integrating' from 'incorporating'</li> </ul> <p>The importance of the LCWIP is already mentioned in paragraph 6.7 and 6.8 and would not be appropriate to include in policy T1</p> <p><b>Support welcomed and noted</b></p> <p><b>Comments noted</b></p>
BHLF-KSAR-N861-X	<p>It is important that plans and policies reflect the aspirations of Network Rail and the wider rail industry as far as they are known at this stage and provides suitable flexibility to support future growth of the railway for both passenger and freight services. The railway network is a vital element of the country's economy and a key component in the drive to deliver the Government's sustainable agenda.</p>	<p>If an individual site allocation is in close proximity to network railway infrastructure this can be picked up in the specific site allocation policy.</p>

	<p>The impact of new development on railway infrastructure such as railway stations and level crossing should be fully assessed. To ensure that Network Rail can continue to deliver a safe and efficient railway, Network Rail would expect financial contributions towards new or enhanced railway infrastructure to mitigate the impact of growth in the area. This could include funding towards improvement at stations such as cycle parking, improved customer information screens, new waiting shelters, lighting, platform extensions, new station entrances etc., and works such as new footbridges to enable level crossings to be closed. As part of Network Rail's license to operate and manage Britain's railway infrastructure, Network Rail have the legal duty to protect rail passengers, the public, the railway workforce, and to reduce risk at our level crossings so far as is reasonably practicable.</p> <p>New development can also have others impact on the railway. It is important that the risk to the railway from landslips and flooding are considered for safety and operational reasons, as well fencing, planting along the railway boundary, excavations etc. Please find attached some guidance from Network Rail's Asset Protection team.</p>	<p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N863-Z</p>	<p><u>Strategic Policy T1 Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel</u></p> <p>This Policy requires proposals to prioritise the 15-minute neighbourhood concept. Whilst is noted that the Glossary includes a brief explanation of this concept. However, a fuller explanation is required (particularly for those less familiar with planning), including what consideration's the Council will be take into account when assessing whether the 15-minute concept has adequately informed a development proposal.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>This concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods aims to achieve the accessibility for all in their day to day needs and to reduce the reliance on the private car and to encourage people to choose more sustainable modes of transport due to services and goods being within 15 minutes travel</p>

		<b>Recommended response: no change</b>
--	--	--

<b>Comments which object to policy T1 – sustainable and active transport and travel</b>		
<b>Respondent number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKY5-R	Winchester has a very poor range of cycle lanes compared with neighbouring councils. The plan will not address this. It lacks ambition and accountability by proposing improvements in "ten years or so" and the proposals ignore the need for residents to cycle safely outside of Winchester's City boundaries. Far too city-centric.	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>The policy aims to shift towards sustainable and active travel modes. We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will look at issues and opportunities like this.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-NK17-J	The policy doesn't address the issue of a proposed foot/cycle path from Bishops Waltham to Botley. The Botley Road (B3035) is very dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians, as it has no pavement and a large section that is 60mph with lots of blind corners. This gives fast driving motorists very little warning of slow moving people who are on foot or on bikes. As a keen cyclist I won't cycle or walk on that road as I feel it is far too dangerous. There are people who do walk and cycle that road and they would greatly benefit from a safe route. A safe route would promote sustainable and active transport and travel.	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>The policy aims to shift towards sustainable and active travel modes. We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will look at issues and opportunities like this.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-NKG5-6	Whist Crawley Parish Council supports WCC working towards a more eco friendly travel infrastructure, the Local Plan in its current form neglects the needs of residents who live outside of the city centre in rural villages. They	<b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b>

<p>Crawley Parish Council</p>	<p>may not be far in terms of miles, but the poor bus infrastructure makes residents rely on cars. Winchester remains a useful town and easy access to the city centre is essential.</p> <p>Currently, the car parks are full. WCC should not reduce the allocation, particularly for a four hour period stay. Park and Ride works for day trippers/tourists or for people working in the city centre, but for local residents in existing settlements it would make journey times into the centre unacceptable.</p>	<p>The local plan recognises the more rural settlements within the district but unfortunately public transport provision is beyond the remit of the LP</p> <p>Car parking provision in the city centre is being reviewed and the need for park and ride provision.</p> <p>Please see policy on allocation at Sir John Moore Barracks (W2)</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKRG-3</p>	<p>1 - The policy appears to ignore the Governments goal is stopping the sale of IC vehicles by 2030. Increasingly passenger vehicles will be electric or hybrid. This removes the issue around air pollution. In the outlying and rural areas of Winchester, public transport in its current form will not meet the travel needs of the people. An Electric Vehicle is a mode of sustainable transport</p> <p>2 - This plan appears to ignore the geography of the Winchester. It is extremely hilly in places and without an E bike, cycling is not an option. With an increasing ageing population walking is not much of an option for many either. Without a revolution in public transport (Such as self driving, on demand electric buses) the private vehicle will still be the prime transport option for the majority people living in the outlying districts of Winchester.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>1. As part of the design process and where the site is located we are trying to encourage more sustainable and active modes of transport. Whilst it is accepted that electric cars do not produce the same amount of pollution as a petrol car it is still adding to the congestion on the road network.</p> <p>2. The policy aims to shift towards sustainable and active travel modes. We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will</p>

	<p>3 - Priority needs to be given to constructing a park and ride to the north of the city. This needs to accommodate the public transport requirement of South Wonston, Wonston, Sutton Scotney and Worthy Down. At the very least a hard surface and well lit pedestrian and Cycling link to South Wonston and Worthy Down.</p>	<p>look at issues and opportunities like this.</p> <p>3. The Local Plan is prioritising park and ride provision and the SJMB site as this includes an additional park and ride. The LCWIP is looking at way to connect settlements via sustainable and active travel routes.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-NKT4-J	<p>I reject the assertions made in 6.1 above. The policy is based on political ideology and not on the actuality of how people live. The science of climate change is largely assertion, and the effect of the major changes proposed to people's lives in the UK is not supported by the facts world-wide. By requiring the cessation of private car use, which is the aim of these proposals, the lives of many will be irreparably blighted. One bus an hour, or every 2 hours, is not enough to off-set the loss of private car use. How do people get to the surgery or the pharmacy in Sutton Scotney without a car?</p> <p>Additionally, expecting secondary school-children and sixth-formers to walk 3 miles across fields, in all weathers, some carrying musical equipment is lunacy and again takes no account either of consultation or the way people actually live.</p> <p>This policy should be amended to take account of how people actually live and should be much more sceptical about the assertions on which it is based.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The local plan cannot address public transport issues. The public transport providers will however be contacted as part of the plan consultation process and can make suggestions about the locations of development etc.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-NK79-T	<p>The text says in the key issues: "As a result of the climate emergency and the recognition that transport is one of the highest emitters of carbon, the new Local Plan has a role to play in terms of reducing the carbon footprint of the district and ensuring that new development is directed towards areas where it</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The LP does recognise this.</p>

	<p>is fully integrated with existing sustainable infrastructure, services and is not designed around car-dependency with the aim of creating 15 minute communities where that is feasible."</p> <p>This does not go far enough, and is not even supported by the text in Policy T1 itself, which makes no real mention of the need to choose a sustainable location for new development. It just says that a choice should be offered. It should say that a site will not be allocated, nor permission granted, unless there is public transport already in existence, or can be provided in full.</p>	<p>Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.</p> <p>We should be looking to allocate development in the most sustainable locations this doesn't mean that small, locally supported developments are completely precluded.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-NKDH-P	<p>The opening statement is very true and supported in principle however until the council actively revolutionises its transport policy no changes will occur. The provision of public transport either bus or mono rail system to large residential areas particularly in south of region which should be subsidised to get people out of cars will only result in major change in commuting style. The funds to develop some of this could be supported by increase in daily parking cost to those reluctant to move to new transport strategy and continue to use private vehicles and park and ride as well as major increase in town centre parking cost.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The local plan cannot address public transport issues. The public transport providers will however be contacted as part of the plan consultation process and can make suggestions about the locations of development etc.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8EY-N	<p>It is vital the council recognise that to achieve the policy it must recognise real good and accessible public transport needs to be provided throughout the plan area. Furthermore not all residents can use the park and ride areas, especially if they live fairly close to the city centre but need to be able to access it by car due to limited mobility issues, or because they only need to go into the city for a short period to eg collect or deliver items. Remember those who are disabled or slightly disabled with less mobility. The recent</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>Unfortunately public transport is outside of the remit of the Local Plan</p>

	<p>experiences of buses being cancelled means more have to rely on their own cars so continuity of provision is extremely important. More traffic free cycleways need to be provided and dual use walking and cycling routes would assist.</p> <p>The council also needs to recognise access into the city from the Olivers Battery direction is already almost impossible at peak, and many other, times so any residential development using that route should be discouraged. Cycling and walking is also very difficult from those areas.</p>	<p>We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will look at issues and opportunities like this.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKJV-A</p>	<p>Bloor Homes recognises and supports the need for new proposed development to promote sustainable and active travel modes and minimise the need for car use. Furthermore, the application of 15-minute neighbourhoods within Policy T1 is also acknowledged to be an important design principle to guide development coming forward in the district.</p> <p>Sites such as that at Mill Lane, Wickham are within a 15-minute walking distance of the market square with retail facilities, the local primary school, health centre, community centre and playing fields. From the market square there are regular bus services to Winchester and Fareham. The site is also located immediately opposite the proposed recreation ground which is being brought forward by Wickham Parish Council. It is therefore ideally placed to provide opportunities for sustainable and active travel. The local plan should be looking to allocate development opportunities such as is afforded by this site to create accessible sustainable neighbourhoods within all the settlements in the district.</p> <p>In contrast, the Ravenswood development, which is located in Knowle, an adjoining parish to Wickham, and is proposed to be allocated in the emerging local plan, does not appear to meet all of the criteria set out in draft Policy T1. It's location, some distance from the centre of Wickham, with its limited range of services appears less accessible by sustainable modes of transport and will provide less opportunities to minimize travel by car.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>This is a specific point against a site in Wickham and this is not the only criteria which was used to determine sites selected for development</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-N8M8-V</p>	<p>Vistry and Taylor Wimpey endorse fully the rationale and reasoning advanced within the Draft Local Plan that supports the promotion of sustainable travel opportunities and reducing reliance on forms of transport that drive climate change. The background and supporting paragraphs within section 6 that precede Policy T1 are aligned fully with the representations made concerning all aspects of the Draft Local Plan and its strategy.</p> <p>There is clear recognition within the document that transport is a key contributor to climate change and therefore significant intervention is required to change travel behaviours and support the transition to less polluting and detrimental modes of travel. However, there is a glaring disconnect between the assessment of conditions that prevail currently and the actions that are required to implement positive and effective change.</p> <p>The logic that is articulated across paragraphs 6.1 to 6.23 of the Draft Local Plan would suggest that the Plan contains a clear spatial strategy founded upon focussing development at locations that dramatically reduce the need to travel and where access to public transport and non-polluting forms of transport is highest. However, the spatial strategy does not currently deliver against these ambitions and is fundamentally lacking in this area.</p> <p>On page 123 of the Plan the text box “What are we aiming to achieve?” captures succinctly the nature of the challenge – The strategic policy needs to enable a step change away from continued reliance on private cars as a main travel solution and promote the use of sustainable transport modes of travel...However, it then continues by stating that the rural nature of the district impedes this ambition and concentrates instead on suggesting that by creating attractive streets people will be persuaded away from using private cars. The ambition is paltry and fundamentally misses the critical point that is set up within the preceding paragraphs: A step change towards behavioural change and therefore achievement of carbon neutrality locally will be achieved only through adoption of a spatial strategy that concentrates growth</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support noted</b></p> <p>The policy aims to shift towards sustainable and active travel modes. We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will look at issues and opportunities like this.</p> <p>Sites have been allocated around the concept of 15 minutes neighbourhoods and encourage sustainable and active travel within this. The reasons for why sites have been selected is set out in detail within the site selection paper.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
-------------------------	---	--



	<p>in locations where all of the modal shift ambitions expressed within the chapter can be achieved. This necessitates focussed growth at Winchester Town as the defining principle of the new Local Plan. Without such a 'step-change' the Council's ambitions will not be realised.</p> <p>In this regard the policy is redolent of so much else in the Draft Local Plan; there is much rhetoric and positive intent but a profound lack of policy that will in any coherent or effective way tackle the considerable challenges that exist.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8MH-C	<p>I am highly SUPPORTIVE of the policy but would like to ADD and PARTLY AMEND IT thus :</p> <p>WDC to :</p> <p>a) develop a common repository of the key working resources required to successfully set up and run such clubs so that new and existing clubs do not have to painfully re-discover, re-develop and re-learn how to create and run their own club from scratch.</p> <p>Key resources here, would be expected to include not less than :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Illustrative cost / benefit data e.g. to encourage engagement</li> <li>- WhatIf typical travel scenario computations e.g. to encourage engagement</li> <li>- Operating Model</li> <li>- Commissioning process;</li> <li>- Financial model;</li> <li>- Initial Capital Support Options</li> <li>- Vehicle Booking Resource</li> </ul> <p>All seem better described as mandatory rather than expected.</p> <p>WDC to :</p> <p>b) strongly encourage re-use of an existing successful model operation such as the one already discovered being run by a village in Oxfordshire England.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan is supportive of and encourages car clubs, it is the responsibility of the individuals for the setting up and running of these. Click on the following link for more information on <a href="#">How to set up a Liftshare scheme</a></p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

	<p>Please either contact myself or WinACC for details in order to avoid overloading them with enquiries</p> <p>WDC to :</p> <p>c) maximise opportunities for local clubs to merge into multi-population centre car clubs to :</p> <p>i) increase economies of scale ii) enhanced division of labour</p> <p>WDC to :</p> <p>d) permit and encourage both electric / fossil fuel / mixed mode clubs to :</p> <p>i) maximise earlier and wider general engagement and behaviour change i.e. to make something tangible that HCC LTP4 previously asserted as "easy" which seems quite unlikely ii) strive to get the "best for most" in order to help set the stage for a wider and more progressive transition away from all fossil fuel vehicles</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NK3N-B	<p>1. Most residents of Winchester live in rural parts of the 240sq miles of the district. Sustainable travel as defined in this version of the Local Plan cannot be reconciled with the smaller allocation of sites in rural areas (that will not generate sufficient contributions to deliver sustainable travel options), where continued use of private cars will be essential for occupants of these new rural homes. This policy must be made more easily deliverable in rural areas to achieve the improvements in sustainable travel that are needed, e.g. leading to a reduction in commuting by provision of public shared transport. Development in rural areas should not be permitted where it will lead to an increase in unsustainable travel, such as where public transport cannot be improved as a result of the development proposed.</p> <p>2. On smaller development sites, no meaningful contribution towards infrastructure improvements or the achievement of sustainable travel arrangements can be expected. The Local Plan must be amended to fund improvements to travel arrangements in rural areas.</p> <p>3. S6.10. It is not clear what is intended to happen in parts of the district</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The LP does recognise this. Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.</p> <p>We should be looking to allocate development in the most sustainable locations this doesn't mean that small, locally supported developments are completely precluded.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

	<p>where the concept of 15 Minute cities does not work. Most residents of Winchester live in these parts of the district, so the Local Plan needs to cover these other areas.</p> <p>4. S6.20. South Wonston is a small community that has very limited public transport. If more housing is to be built here, we must increase access to public buses and cycle routes to ensure the net zero agenda is addressed. With the added developments proposed at the Sir John Moore Barracks on the Andover Road, it seems sensible to have improved public transport links with Winchester and ensure local bus companies include South Wonston within the Winchester city limits.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8GD-2	<p>As per my response to T4, I think all new developments should support permeability for pedestrians, Cyclists, and motability scooters. These routes must link to existing paths where available, or go in the right direction that it could be possible, remembering that active travel is best encouraged by direct routes rather than circuitous routes. Dropped kerbs should be made available to allow all these users to access these active travel links.</p> <p>If these links go through to a path or road that does not have a path that allows all these modes of travel, that is not a reason to limit them to just a footpath. It may be by work from others on the relevant stakeholders for the adjacent lands that those paths can be upgraded to support cycling, and motability scooters as well as pedestrians</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>This policy does achieve this through the design process</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8GR-G ANON-KSAR-N8VW-4	<p>Proposed change to the introduction to policy T1: "Planning applications for the development that would increase travel must be supported by a travel assessment, including mapping of key routes and destinations to quantify the amount and type of travel. They should prioritise;"</p> <p>Proposed change to the introduction to policy T1, section iv.: Remove the words "particularly on large or phased sites" and add reference to design codes and key route mapping. New wording as follows: "Incorporating sustainable and active travel routes into the layout with connections to the wider network, which must be made available and usable</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>Planning permissions will be assessed on a case by case basis and will look at a number of different factors of which transport and these policies are a part of.</p> <p>Additional criteria has been added to T2 additional text:</p>

	<p>at all stages of development in a way that results in a safe, attractive, secure and convenient way that encourage all users, including those with disabilities and reduced mobility, to use more sustainable forms of transport such as walking, cycling or buses, at every stage of the development. The proposed connectivity must adhere to the agreed design codes and align to key routes and local destination mapping; and"</p> <p>Proposed change to the introduction to policy T1, section v.: "The continued safe and efficient operation of the strategic and local road networks, including active travel routes;"</p> <p>Proposed change to section LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN, WINCHESTER MOVEMENT STRATEGY AND THE CITY OF WINCHESTER LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN</p> <p>Insert a new section between current sections 6.6 and 6.7 to reference the Winchester Walking Strategy:</p> <p>The Winchester Walking Strategy outlines the Vision and sets the context for Walking becoming the normal form of transport for many short journeys in preference to using the private car.</p>	<p>6.26</p> <p>As part of the design process, the location and treatment of car parking should be carefully assessed and it should be demonstrated through the Design and Access Statement. <b>The criteria for how the scheme is assessed will need to consider the following criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Where is the development located;</b></li> <li>• <b>Proximity of the site to public transport, services and facilities and whether they are within walking/cycling distance;</b></li> <li>• <b>Type of dwelling; and</b></li> <li>• <b>Any other factors such as the nature of provision, occupier and the needs of those with disabilities and reduced mobility</b></li> </ul> <p>This consultation is for the Local Plan. We cannot take proposed changes to another document such as the Local Transport Plan.</p>
--	---	--

Commented [BS1]: Have checked T2 and this is correct

		<p>The strategy is city based. The City and District LCWIPs will pick this up.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKDM-U Wonston Parish Council</p>	<p>The infrastructure to provide affordable public transport, safe cycle routes and park &amp; ride facilities (to the north of Winchester) needs to be in place before reliance on private cars can be reduced.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>This is what the Local Plan is aiming to achieve, with the development at Sir John Moore Barracks, and the addition of a park and ride to support this development. North Winchester would have the public transport links it needs to help to ease the reliance on private cars.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N81F-E</p>	<p>Bargate Homes recognise and support the need for new proposed development to promote sustainable and active travel modes and minimise the need for car use. Furthermore, the application of 15 minute neighbourhoods within T1 is also acknowledged to be an important design principle to guide development in the district, and Bargate Homes support this principle. The local plan should recognise however that this may not be feasible in all cases.</p> <p>To ensure consistency with the NPPG, the use of the standard terms of Transport Assessment and Transport Statement should be used rather than 'Travel Assessment.' This also applies to the standard thresholds for when</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p><b>Recommended response: wording in the policy has been changed from 'travel' to 'transport assessment'.</b></p>

**Commented [BS2]:** Has been done at bottom of doc

	the different levels of assessment are required. Only where there is a significant increase in travel should this information be requested.	
ANON-KSAR-N8XH-Q	A mixture of staggered working patterns and EVs are probably the most realistic way forward for a low density area like Winchester and its district. At least one EV charging space should be provided for each dwelling - this can then be used for secure cycle storage/charging or an EV - preferably both!	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>That is what the policy aims to achieve</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8XG-P	If there were more emphasis placed on promoting active travel and the integration of public transport over car use in any current/ future development, I would support would it.	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8GA-Y	<p>Preface to comments on T policies</p> <p>The need for quantitative active transport infrastructure requirements and explicit design guidance The support the plan gives to the principle that there should be an expansion of active travel and of public transport use is very welcome. Unfortunately it is a problem that developers will not know what to do about this, and could even cut corners, unless there are firm requirements in the plan that set out standards as precise as the LETI standards specified for buildings.</p> <p>These amendments therefore argue for a standard that requires allocated sites to contain at least 0.12 linear miles of a) mobility scooter / cycling and b) walking infrastructure per hectare of the allocation. This standard is based on the scale of what would be needed in slightly upgraded mobility scooter / cycling and walking infrastructure at Badger Farm. There should also be a requirement that developments be designed so that the primary (front door) access to all dwellings be from a footpath/cycleway (like St James's Terrace) and that car access will be secondary at the rear of dwellings. Car parking would be limited to parking spaces and spaces limited to 1.2 spaces per</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>Each sites need to be assessed on a site by site basis, and therefore a blanket approach like LETI would not be appropriate in this case. We do not have a requirement or standards for parking and this will need to be carefully thought through in the design stage of the site as to how parking is provided.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

	<p>dwelling.</p> <p>Sufficient infrastructure to enable direct cycle / mobility scooter / walking access from every dwelling to key local facilities and bus stops within 15 minutes' walk (¾ mile) should be a requirement of the design, and developers should be required to establish key essential local facilities that do not already exist. Requirements should be attached to each site reflecting local circumstances referring to links with specific local bus stops, schools, and shops etc. Where active travel infrastructure is poor within a 2-mile radius of the site, developers should be required to make a contribution (CIL, s106?) to its improvement.</p> <p>Strategic Policy T1 P124 Reducing emissions through promoting Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel</p> <p>It is good that the draft requires “a travel assessment to quantify the amount and type of travel” but it will be essential to indicate measurable minimum standards and quantify associated emissions. The assessment must demonstrate that developments will achieve the specified minimum standards. More detail of the standards required should be added to the list of six priorities.</p> <p>Tracked changes below</p> <p>Planning applications for the development that would increase travel must be supported by a transport and movement assessment to quantify the amount and type of travel <a href="#">and quantify the level of emissions associated with the increased travel</a>; and should prioritise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Offering a genuine <del>choice of</del><a href="#">encouragement for</a> sustainable and active transport modes of travel; <del>prioritising ranking as most</del> <a href="#">important</a> walking, cycling and public transport, followed by car</li> </ol>	
--	---	--

	<p>clubs, electric/hydrogen vehicles <del>and lastly</del> <u>and giving least priority to private fossil-fuelled vehicles;</u></p> <p>ii. Designing development so that it minimises the need to travel by private car; <u>and maximises the preference for active travel and public transport. The development should ensure that the primary access to the front door of all dwellings is via active travel routes, that all routes from dwellings to all essential local facilities will be shortest, and most direct along cycleways and footpaths, and that routes used by motor vehicles will be less direct. Cycling and walking networks should be designed so that they lead to hubs at all local public transport facilities.</u></p> <p>iii. The concept of <del>45-20</del> <u>20-minute</u> neighbourhoods <u>by ensuring the availability of all daily necessities within 20-minutes' walk of every accommodation unit with proposals to provide any that are missing – see Appendix XX for a list of necessities;</u></p> <p>iv. Incorporating <del>-sustainable</del> <u>and active</u> travel routes <u>compliant with TFL planning for walking toolkit and <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1/20">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1/20</a></u> into the layout with connections to the wider network, <del>which</del> <u>The routes</u> must be made available and usable at all stages of development particularly on large or phased sites, in a way that results in a safe, attractive, secure and convenient way that encourage all users, including those with disabilities and reduced mobility, to use more sustainable forms of transport such as walking, cycling or buses, at every stage of the development; and</p> <p>v. The continued safe and efficient operation of the strategic and local road <u>and active travel</u> networks;</p> <p>vi. Any proposed new accesses and intensified use of existing accesses onto the road network can demonstrate that they will not result in reduced highways safety or <del>a</del> <u>significant</u> traffic congestion/delays.</p>	
--	--	--



ANON-KSAR-N85N-T	<p>1. We can't all cycle and Romsey road is too difficult: steep, narrow, &amp; dangerous for most cyclists</p> <p>2. The best provision would be FREE ELECTRIC BUSES such as found in various national parks abroad eg Yosemite. Esp for learning disabled, physically disabled and elderly communities</p> <p>3. 15 minute neighbourhoods is a good idea, so long as the developer has to provide local food shops within each new build community</p> <p>4. Movement: Sarum road is fast and dangerously narrow with broken edges to the road surface. You have ignored this road.</p> <p>5. Use empty city centre premises for housing – include council housing – this will result in reduced travel and carbon emissions. Also for employment land</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The LP does recognise this. Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.</p> <p>We should be looking to allocate development in the most sustainable locations this doesn't mean that small, locally supported developments are completely precluded.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8W7-5	<p>The policy needs to be more radical</p> <p>There is no need for through traffic passing through winchester. The whole of winchester should be a 20 is plenty zone</p> <p>The Park and ride facilities should be a hub where there are electric bikes or vehicles available to access the city Center</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Speed limits are not within the remit of the Local Plan</p> <p>Mobility hubs are a part of this policy, which is a place that brings together a range of sustainable transport options and can be tailored in terms of scale and type to suit any setting, from city centres or new housing developments to existing market towns or villages. Mobility Hubs can include, electric charging facilities, car club parking bays,</p>

	<p>Any developments that generate income to develop infrastructure should have that money allocated to linking infrastructure - it is no good building segments of cycleways within developments as that does nothing to transform travel as they do not link together - for example if offices are built on bushfield camp then that development should generate money to get a cycle way built in the Colden common / Twyford corridor so that people who work in those offices have a commuting cycling option</p> <p>Hockley junction needs to be redesigned to work for cyclists There should be an aim in the document that all children who go to school or college in Winchester should have a safe option to cycle to school or college - there is a generation of teenage children who do not have the independence to travel without relying on being driven by parents - it should be an aim in the document to give teenagers the infrastructure to use the only mode of transport that is available to them to travel independent of all other modes of transport ie the bicycle</p> <p>The plan needs to include an aim to put in place electric bike hire infrastructure to allow commuting from adjacent villages that are within 15 mins for commuting on electric bikes such as Twyford and Colden common</p>	<p>delivery lockers, cycle parking, information totems and bus stops.</p> <p>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a new mechanism for raising funds for essential infrastructure from development. The levy is an amount that must be paid per square metre of qualifying development. More information on CIL can be found on our website here: <a href="#">Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - Winchester City Council</a></p> <p>We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will look at issues and opportunities like this.</p> <p>This is covered by mobility hubs as mentioned in previous comment.</p> <p>We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will look at issues and opportunities like this.</p>
--	--	--

	In the absence of cycling infrastructure there is now growing interest in setting up cycle buses as the only other interim solution to cycling on roads - there needs to be some accommodation for cycle buses in the document including the ability to change traffic lights and adopt routes that are identified as cycle bus routes	
ANON-KSAR-NKX6-R	Specifically to iii) concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods which may work for minor needs eg. local convenience stores, but not for wider needs eg. banks and other retail businesses which do not exist outside of the city. The policy should not be reducing access to or car parking within Winchester for local shoppers from surrounding villages and rural areas to access these facilities. It is an unrealistic expectation to travel via cycling or a car journey to the park and ride for an hour's shopping in Winchester and businesses and retailers within the city will suffer. Evidence Base Query: Winchester is next to the M3 so much of the carbon emission that falls on the city is unstoppable and emissions will become lower due to the greater use of electric vehicles. Promoting cycling as a major travel means is in contradiction to acknowledging an aging population.	<b>Comment noted</b>  The LP does recognise this. Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.  We should be looking to allocate development in the most sustainable locations this doesn't mean that small, locally supported developments are completely precluded.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
ANON-KSAR-NKQN-9	We strongly agree with the sentiments contained in policies T1-4; particularly the emphasis placed on normalising active modes of travel. However, we feel the policies lack clarity. For instance, it is unclear how the four policies relate to one another. Is there a hierarchy between T1-4 or are they all equally important? Why is T1 referred to as "strategic" and T2-4 not and what does this mean in practice?	<b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b>  It is important that the Local Plan is read as a whole. All the policies relate to one another. There are some policies which are 'strategic policies' and these are the overarching policies for that topic.

	<p>Will developers need to comply with all four policies, or can they pick and choose? We also noted the use of the phrase “travel assessment”: this is not a document recognised by government planning regulations.</p> <p>There are transport assessments, transport statements and travel plans. It’s important to use the correct terms in the policies. Should this be “transport assessment”?</p> <p>We also observe overlap between the different policies’ content. For instance, two policies are concerned with parking arrangements. We suggest consolidating these for clarity. We also observe overlap within the content of individual policies themselves and a lack of any hierarchy of the objectives / deliverables contained within them. We are concerned that this may introduce ambiguity. For instance, it is not clear how meeting the terms of one part of a policy would impact upon compliance (and the grant of planning permission) overall. We are concerned this introduces the possibility of partial compliance which then reduces the likelihood of development delivering the active travel infrastructure so badly needed.</p> <p>We feel there needs to be a clear checklist of requirements that are prioritised to reflect their relative importance. This should be prefaced by a clear statement that all developments of a defined minimum value and / or size need to deliver these as a condition of the award of planning permission. As part of this, we’d like to see stronger wording around the use of developer contributions (e.g. S106 / CIL), especially within the development site policies.</p> <p>Some suggested re-wording follows which consolidates active transport policies into three strategic policies (T1, T2 and T3) that make clear links to the Plan’s broader vision statements (e.g. Net Zero District by 2030). They also make reference to spatial strategies such as the City and District’s</p>	<p>All policies in the Local Plan must be adhered to, they cannot pick which they comply with.</p> <p>The change of wording of travel to transport assessment have now been made in the policy.</p> <p>Some policies will inevitably overlap and repeat some key points.</p> <p>Planning permissions will be assessed on a case by case basis and will look at a number of different factors of which transport and these policies are a part of.</p> <p>Additional criteria has been added to T2 additional text: 6.26 As part of the design process, the location and treatment of car parking should be carefully assessed and it should be demonstrated through the Design and Access Statement. <b>The criteria for how the scheme is assessed will need to consider the following criteria:</b></p>
--	---	---

	<p>LCWIPs, to which Plan policies need to expressly relate.</p> <p>Note that these suggestions borrow very heavily from Exeter City Council's draft Local Plan, which we recommend looking at:  <a href="https://exeterplan.commonplace.is/">https://exeterplan.commonplace.is/</a></p> <p>Our suggested amendment for policy T1 is:</p> <p>p.124, T1: Sustainable movement  To help achieve a net zero District by 2030, to support the sustainable growth of Winchester District and to improve accessibility, health and the environmental quality of the city and District, the following outcomes will be sought from all relevant planning decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delivering on the spatial strategy by supporting development in locations which reduce the need to travel and maximise walking, cycling and public transport for the majority of everyday journeys.</li> <li>2. Providing for mixed-use development which enables communities to access most of their daily needs within a 15 walk or cycle ride from their home.</li> <li>3. Supporting a healthy, active city through the transport hierarchy by delivering a prioritised and integrated network of active travel links to provide coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and attractive routes for pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair and mobility scooter users, and users of emerging modes of transport.</li> <li>4. Achieving a reliable, low-carbon, frequent and attractive standard of public transport within the city and District and to key destinations.</li> <li>5. Enhancing transport choices and alternatives to car ownership by expanding shared mobility and requiring its provision in all suitable developments.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Where is the development located;</b></li> <li>• <b>Proximity of the site to public transport, services and facilities and whether they are within walking/cycling distance;</b></li> <li>• <b>Type of dwelling; and</b></li> <li>• <b>Any other factors such as the nature of provision, occupier and the needs of those with disabilities and reduced mobility</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Recommended response:</b>  Change made to T2 policy requirements</p>
ANON-KSAR-N88D-K	<p>T1: Sustainable movement  To help achieve a net zero District by 2030, to support the sustainable growth of Winchester District and to improve accessibility, health and the</p>	<p><b>Comments noted:</b></p>

	<p>environmental quality of the city and District, the following outcomes will be sought from all relevant planning decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delivering on the spatial strategy by supporting development in locations which reduce the need to travel and maximise walking, cycling and public transport for the majority of everyday journeys.</li> <li>2. Providing for mixed-use development which enables communities to access most of their daily needs within a 15 walk or cycle ride from their home.</li> <li>3. Supporting a healthy, active city through the transport hierarchy by delivering a prioritised and integrated network of active travel links to provide coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and attractive routes for pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair and mobility scooter users, and users of emerging modes of transport.</li> <li>4. Achieving a reliable, low-carbon, frequent and attractive standard of public transport within the city and District and to key destinations.</li> <li>5. Enhancing transport choices and alternatives to car ownership by expanding shared mobility and requiring its provision in all suitable developments.</li> </ol>	<p>This is what the Local Plan is trying to achieve through the Transport policies and numerous other policies in the other topics in the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-NK6N-E	<p>Our objection to the policy as stated is not that it is wrong but that it is inadequate and does not reflect some of the most important elements of the preceding text on which it depends (para 6:15-23). This text itself depends on preceding text from para 6.1 and including the 'Key Issues' section. It is not clear within which of the policies T1-T4 the points below should be made, so we make them here.</p> <p>We note the following excerpts. Para 6.3: "The main transport issues relate to the need to reduce carbon emissions, road safety, accessibility, congestion</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>The policy aims to shift towards sustainable and active travel modes. We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will look at issues and opportunities like this. A new transport assessment is to be carried out.</p>

<p>and pollution to improve air quality”. (NB unless reducing road safety and accessibility are actual aims of the Plan this sentence needs rewriting). Para 6.6: “This is based around removing constraints to travel and transport around Winchester to enable growth... priorities – reduce city centre traffic... Invest in infrastructure to support sustainable growth”. Key issue ii): “the new Local Plan has a role to play in terms of reducing the carbon footprint of the district”. Key issue iii): “The stage one Transport Assessment has identified opportunities to encourage a shift to more sustainable transport usage”. Key issue ix): “The Local Plan can move away from the ‘predict and provide’ method of increasing the capacity of the road network to accommodate more cars”.</p> <p>Firstly there is some incoherence in these. It is not plausible to suppose that the Movement Strategy is compatible with overall carbon emission reduction within the District (Park and Ride increases overall car mileage), nor is it consistent with the need to move away from Predict and Provide, since that is exactly how the Strategy is currently presented (i.e. provision of extra parking to meet forecast growth of traffic). The Movement Strategy, as currently justified, is clearly also incompatible with LTP4.</p> <p>Secondly the policy T1, while it has distinct and laudable references to better ways of doing transport, actually contains nothing to suggest new developments will have to come net zero – i.e. they will be allowed to add carbon emission to the District’s total. It is therefore inconsistent with Key Issue ii) and para 6.3. The reference made to the Transport Assessment in key issue iii). This Assessment is subtitled as a Local Plan document, though it does not appear to sit among the documents on the Plan website. At paragraph 1.1.13: “It is recognised that, in order to achieve the stated aim of carbon neutrality in the timescales required, substantial reductions in emissions from transport compared to current levels will be required, and that this will represent a new challenge from a development perspective as new developments will not only be required to minimise their own carbon</p>	<p>15 minute neighbourhoods is a concept and not a rigid policy requirement. The Local Plan understands that the district has some very rural areas and that this is not achievable for all developments.</p> <p><b>Recommended response:</b> no change</p>
---	---

	<p>footprints, but also contribute to supporting real reductions elsewhere.” There is nothing in any of the Transport policies to reflect this requirement.</p> <p>“The concept of 15-minute neighbourhoods” at iii) seems to be rather thrown out as an idea rather than specified as a policy. It needs to be firmed up. Suggested amendments: 1) an additional paragraph to T1: “All new developments will be required to result in a reduction in the District’s overall transport emissions”. 2) A specific requirement that all facilities and access to public transport should be within 15 minutes walk of all houses in a development.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8SJ-M	<p>Overall: I welcome the focus on sustainable travel and in particular improved public transport, prioritising these over use of private car. I also welcome the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods. However I have to object to the policy and its impact on the Plan as it is not supported by robust, current evidence and would fail a test of meeting NPPF requirements.</p> <p>Issue: The Transport Assessment that underpins the entire Plan is based on 2020 data. There have been significant *reductions* in public transport provision since that assessment date. For example, it is noted that Xelabus provides commuter hours bus services to Bishop's Waltham and Saturday services. These services were withdrawn due to the HCC bus subsidy cuts and operator changes. The Transport Assessment for this Plan is therefore out of date.</p> <p>Impact: The National Policy Planning Framework requires Local Authorities to prepare their plans taking into account robust evidence of supporting transport infrastructure. This evidence is not in place. The Plan is therefore not to NPPF requirements as it would fail under broad areas of Section 9 Promoting Sustainable Transport and several subsections including 105 (actively managing patterns of growth) 106 b) aligning sustainable transport and development patterns 106 c) the need for robust evidence.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>A new transport assessment is to be carried out by Systra will provide up to date evidence on the proposed allocations and the impact on the transport infrastructure across the district.</p> <p>Provision of public transport is unfortunately outside of the remit of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>



	<p>The impact locally for the Market Towns is that they are most reliant on the minimum levels of public transport to offer any alternative to car use. As the service is *already* below the minimum necessary to offer a viable alternative, it is not reasonable to include the proviso 'Planning applications for the development that would increase travel' in policy T1. The evidence in the Transport Assessment does not support that the premise that there is a sound sustainable base level of transport options on which only new developments have to justify further travel measures. All development *including current and prior allocation* is already above the level of sustainable alternatives to private car use.</p> <p>Required Changes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Transport Assessment must be redone as of Dec 2022, using the current pattern of public transport provision. This reworked assessment must be clearer in its assessment of current vs required level of sustainable transport options and be clear on measures to address the gap</li> <li>2. WCC must engage with HCC on planned changes to the provision of bus services and overall bus strategy, particularly for the WCC Market Towns, to be compliant with the requirements of NPPF 106 b) in preparing the Transport Assessment to underpin the Plan</li> <li>3. Delete the proviso 'Planning applications for the development that would increase travel' from policy T1,</li> </ol> <p>Stuart Jones Swanmore Private resident and member of the HCC Bus Enhanced Partnership Forum</p>	
BHLF-KSAR-N8TZ-5	<p>Paragraph 6.19 refers to the use by the Council of section 278 and section 106 agreements towards improvements to cycling and walking routes and that contributions may take the form of enhancement to existing bridleways and footpaths. That the Council is taking steps through the Local Plan and planning applications towards the objective of reducing the level of car usage in new developments is commendable. Roads are increasingly dangerous</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>The policy aims to shift towards sustainable and active travel modes. We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will</p>

	<p>places for ridden and driven horses due to the volume and speed of traffic, with incidents and accidents continuing despite the recent changes to the Highway Code.</p> <p>The BHS collates statistics each year to understand the rate of incidents involving horses and riders on UK roads. Nationally, 2,943 road incidents involving horses were reported to the BHS during 2021. Of these, 66 horses were killed, 118 horses were injured and 126 people were injured. Research indicates that this is fewer than 2 in 10 actual incidents, i.e. some 80% are not reported to the Society. Of those reported, 80% of incidents occurred because a vehicle passed too fast or too close to the horse. In Hampshire, 85 road incidents were reported resulting in 1 horse being injured and 3 humans being injured during 2021.</p> <p>Equestrians and cyclists have access to only 28% of the public rights of way (RoW) network in Hampshire. This network is becoming increasingly fragmented as the rural roads that form essential links within the RoW network are absorbed by new development or become busier and/or are upgraded to provide major links for the new communities they support.</p> <p>Following Brexit and the associated changes to funding for farming practices, including that previously paid for public access, some permissive bridleways have been closed resulting in the network being reduced further. The draft LCWIP highlights a key principle that underpins LTN 1/20, that routes must join together. This is just as important for horse riders as it is for cyclists.</p> <p>Through new developments allocated or permitted by policies in the Local Plan, there is opportunity to improve provision for ALL vulnerable road users, including equestrians as well as walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>However, this should not be to the detriment of horse riders by surfacing bridleways with tarmac (see comment re surfacing under SP D5) and every opportunity needs to be taken to create new bridleway and other off-road links that can be shared by equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians especially where new development can contribute to making connections in the rights of way network where routes are fragmented and require the use of roads to get from one part of the network to the next. In the What we are aiming to</p>	<p>look at issues and opportunities like this.</p> <p>To include equestrians in the policy is too specific.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
--	---	---

	achieve box, 'other non-car users' includes equestrians therefore Policy T4 should state i. 'Prioritises the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, people with reduced mobility and equestrians, including safe and attractive routes to, from and within the site which connect to existing Public Rights of Way network outside the site boundary.	
BHLF-KSAR-N8BD-W	<p>Strategic Policy T1 - Promoting Sustainable and Active Travel</p> <p>Objections and comments</p> <p>This policy refers to "the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods". This is relatively new and the Trust questions whether the Glossary gives an adequate explanation of the implications of this for new developments. The inclusion of both cyclists and pedestrians creates uncertainty as one can travel much further than the other in that time. Greater clarity is needed. The Policy requires the incorporation of sustainable and active travel routes. To ensure the design and layout are of a good standard, guidance should be included indicating what would be approved, such as Transport for London's 2020 Planning for Walking Toolkit and the cycle infrastructure design note LTN 1/20 published by the government in 2020.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The LP does recognise this. Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.</p> <p>We should be looking to allocate development in the most sustainable locations this doesn't mean that small, locally supported developments are completely precluded.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
BHLF-KSAR-N86N-U	<p>Policy not consistent with the NPPG. Use of the standard terms of Transport Assessment and Transport Statement should be used rather than "travel assessment" and the standard thresholds for when the different levels of assessment are required. Only where there is significant increase in travel should this information be required.</p> <p>Support in principle for the concept of 15-minute neighbourhoods, otherwise known as 'walkable neighbourhoods'. The Local Plan should clearly recognise however that this may not be feasible in all cases, including in rural villages, and that the NPPF 79 recognises that services in one village may support a cluster of surrounding villages and therefore allow for proportionate</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The LP does recognise this. Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.</p> <p>We should be looking to allocate development in the most sustainable locations this doesn't mean that small, locally supported</p>

	growth in those villages as well. Rigid application of the 15-minute concept would therefore be counterproductive in the rural area and threaten villages falling into the 'sustainability trap' and would not be consistent with NPPF 9, which requires the consideration of local circumstances.	developments are completely precluded.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
--	--	--

<b>Comments which did not answer whether they support, object or neither support or object to policy T1</b>		
<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Answer</b>	
BHLF-KSAR-N8RJ-K	<p>9.1 In-principle, Catesby supports Draft Policy T1 and the reference to the '15-minute neighbourhood' concept. More broadly, promoting walkability and sustainable access to local services is also consistent with the Plan's strategy for reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>9.2 However, Catesby are concerned that the concept of the 15-minute neighbourhood is not applied consistently in the Plan. For example, the proposed 'new' allocation at Wickham (as set out at Draft Policy WK4) is not actually located at Wickham, but is instead situated at Knowle. This is problematic, because Knowle is a lower-tier settlement, which lacks most local services and the services available with Wickham are not within practical walking distance.</p> <p>9.3 By comparison, Land South of Titchfield Lane is located within a 15-minute walk of the centre of Wickham. Yet, despite it being more locationally sustainable than the site being proposed for allocation at Knowle, Land South of Titchfield Lane was not even shortlisted for further consideration.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>The LP does recognise this. Not seeking rigid adherence to 15 minute neighbourhoods. Asking for them to be prioritised.</p> <p>We should be looking to allocate development in the most sustainable locations this doesn't mean that small, locally supported developments are completely precluded. Location however is not the only assessment criteria, it is one of many different ways we have assessed sites put forward. Please see the site selection paper for more information on this.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

<p>BHLF- KSAR- N8RV-Y</p>	<p>5. Sustainability</p> <p>a) Traffic – Massive 21c development of countryside to the South and East of the parish have resulted in a huge increase in traffic on the rural lanes and narrow 'B' roads that serve the village. Road surfaces and roadside drains are poorly maintained. Additional development would exacerbate the situation still further and lead to fragmentation of the village community, greater roadside danger and added pollution.</p> <p>b) Highways - upgrades are essential, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A safe commuter cycle route</li> <li>➤ Increased street lighting</li> <li>➤ Improved roadside pavements</li> <li>➤ Safe, well lit, new road crossings into the village close to any new development</li> </ul> <p>Page 2 of 4</p> <p>c) Public Transport – Any future development must ensure a major upgrade to public transport in the village. The rural bus service is inadequate, disjointed and expensive, meaning essential travel to work, Doctors surgery in Twyford and hospital appointments must be made by private transport. Lack of bus shelters together with an unreliable timetable and climate change often mean long standing at stops in extreme weathers (amber alert heat, biting cold winds &amp; sudden storms).</p> <p>d) Services – Surgery, School, Electricity, Water and Sewage, are all at full capacity and require major upgrades before future development is considered. Internet and mobile phone connections are, at best, intermittent making working from home difficult.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>The policy aims to shift towards sustainable and active travel modes. We are currently working with HCC on the LCWIP which will look at issues and opportunities like this.</p> <p>Unfortunately public transport is outside of the remit of the Local Plan</p> <p>We are in communication with infrastructure providers such as the NHS, Southern Water, Network Rail as well as HCC with regards to education provision. An updated IDP (Infrastructure Delivery Plan) is being conducted to form an updated evidence base for the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N87Z-8</p>	<p>8.1 Vistry and Taylor Wimpey endorse fully the rationale and reasoning advanced within the Draft Local Plan that supports the promotion of sustainable travel opportunities and reducing reliance on forms of transport that drive climate change. The background and supporting paragraphs within section 6 that precede Policy T1 are aligned fully with the representations made concerning all aspects of the Draft Local Plan and its strategy.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p>We did consult on housing options in the Strategic Issues and</p>

<p>8.2 There is clear recognition within the document that transport is a key contributor to climate change and therefore significant intervention is required to change travel behaviours and support the transition to less polluting and detrimental modes of travel. However, there is a glaring disconnect between the assessment of conditions that prevail currently and the actions that are required to implement positive and effective change.</p> <p>8.3 The logic that is articulated across paragraphs 6.1 to 6.23 of the Draft Local Plan would suggest that the Plan contains a clear spatial strategy founded upon focussing development at locations that dramatically reduce the need to travel and where access to public transport and non-polluting forms of transport is highest. However, the spatial strategy does not currently deliver against these ambitions and is fundamentally lacking in this area.</p> <p>8.4 On page 123 of the Plan the text box “What are we aiming to achieve?” captures succinctly the nature of the challenge – The strategic policy needs to enable a step change away from continued reliance on private cars as a main travel solution and promote the use of sustainable transport modes of travel. However, it then continues by stating that the rural nature of the district impedes this ambition and concentrates instead on suggesting that by creating attractive streets people will be persuaded away from using private cars. The ambition is paltry and fundamentally misses the critical point that is set up within the preceding paragraphs: A step change towards behavioural change and therefore achievement of carbon neutrality locally will be achieved only through adoption of a spatial strategy that concentrates growth in locations where all of the modal shift ambitions expressed within the chapter can be achieved. This necessitates focussed growth at Winchester Town as the defining principle of the new Local Plan. Without such a ‘step-change’ the Council’s ambitions will not be realised.</p> <p>8.5 In this regard the policy is redolent of so much else in the Draft Local Plan;</p>	<p>Priorities consultation, where the responses of this consultation showed a clear support for option</p> <p>Four strategic alternatives for housing growth are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A development strategy based on the approach in the existing Local Plan of distributing development to a sustainable hierarchy of settlements;</li> <li>2) To focus development on Winchester itself and other larger and more sustainable settlements;</li> <li>3) A strategy that includes one or more completely new strategic allocations or new settlements</li> <li>4) A strategy of dispersing development around the district largely in proportion to the size of existing settlements</li> </ol> <p>The results of the consultation showed that approach 1 ) A development strategy based on the approach in the existing Local Plan of distributing development to a sustainable hierarchy of settlements was the approach selected by the most as for the spatial strategy for housing</p>
---	---

	there is much rhetoric and positive intent but a profound lack of policy that will in any coherent or effective way tackle the considerable challenges that exist.	We also want to ensure development is as sustainable as possible.
BHLF-KSAR-N86C-G	<p><b>Response to Draft Policy</b></p> <p>28. The University support the Policy prioritisation of offering a choice of sustainable and active travel. Additionally, it supports the principle of designing development so that it minimises the need for the private car. The University's campus and halls of residence are sustainably located, and any future developments will seek to prioritise the Policy priorities outlined, namely prioritising sustainable and active travel.</p> <p><b>Test of 'Soundness'</b></p> <p>29. Paragraph 35 of the NPPF outlines the test of 'soundness' for Local Plans. Policy T1 of the Local Plan encourages sustainable and active modes of travel, it includes an appropriate strategy for ensuring that developments are sustainable and that the need to travel by private car is minimised where possible. The strategy is phrased so that it will be implemented and delivered throughout the plan period. Chapter 9 of the Local Plan 'promoting sustainable transport', the principles outlined in Policy T1 reflect those included in the NPPF including the encouragement of opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport. The University consider that Policy T1 meets the test of 'soundness' outlined in the NPPF.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b></p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>

<b>Comments moved from other topics</b>		
<b>Respondent number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
ANON-KSAR-NK1Z-N Shedfield Parish Council	It is unlikely there will be further development in rural areas if these policies are to be met. Alternative modes of transport are currently unproven. The provision of developments without parking provision is unrealistic. Furthermore the success of working from home for many in the longer term, from both the employer and employee perspective is yet to be proven.	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>We understand that not all aspects of these Local Plan transport policies will be possible to achieve in all areas of our district, especially rural areas. However, we do want</p>

		<p>to make sure active travel promoted and prioritised where possible. While electric and hydrogen vehicles are better for the environment than petrol and diesel cars, they do not improve congestion or support active and health travel options for walking and cycling.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-N838-2	This is fine if you have a public transport system but Denmead does not.	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>Unfortunately public transport provision is outside of the remit of the Local Plan. Site allocations are assessed on their sustainability and accessibility in terms of the distance between them and public infrastructure such as bus stops, schools and convenience shops.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
ANON-KSAR-NKQN-9	<p>In line with our suggested amendments for policy T1, it would be desirable to monitor the extent to which the following outcomes (1-5) have been achieved through the award of all relevant planning decisions:</p> <p>1. Delivering on the spatial strategy by supporting development in locations which reduce the need to travel and maximise walking, cycling and public transport for the majority of everyday journeys.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy.</p>



	<p>2. Providing for mixed-use development which enables communities to access most of their daily needs within a 15 walk or cycle ride from their home.</p> <p>3. Supporting a healthy, active city through the transport hierarchy by delivering a prioritised and integrated network of active travel links to provide coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and attractive routes for pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair and mobility scooter users, and users of emerging modes of transport.</p> <p>4. Achieving a reliable, low-carbon, frequent and attractive standard of public transport within the city and District and to key destinations.</p> <p>5. Enhancing transport choices and alternatives to car ownership by expanding shared mobility and requiring its provision in all suitable developments.</p>	<p>Planning applications will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and will look at a number of different factors of which transport and these policies are a part of. The Authorities Monitoring Report requires criteria that can be calculated and the monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and this would be something that is not easily attainable</p> <p>Additional criteria has been added to T2 additional text: 6.26 As part of the design process, the location and treatment of car parking should be carefully assessed and it should be demonstrated through the Design and Access Statement. <b>The criteria for how the scheme is assessed will need to consider the following criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Where is the development located;</b></li> <li>• <b>Proximity of the site to public transport, services and facilities and whether</b></li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<p>they are within walking/cycling distance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of dwelling; and</li> <li>• Any other factors such as the nature of provision, occupier and the needs of those with disabilities and reduced mobility</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p><b>ANON-KSAR-NKUB-1</b></p>	<p>We need to make sure that this Policy has teeth! Promises of So many Developers just say things and then don't carry them through! Every development must have an Active Travel Plan and link to other Areas and not just say they are going to do it if they don't we need to Prosecute. Actually not allow them to build at all. Take a retainer and when the work is completed then return it! You would be amazed what then could be built! For every hectare there needs to be a Hierarachy of Transport.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>The Local Plan sets out the policy however the enforcement of these takes place outside of the remit of the plan.</p> <p>Planning applications will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and will look at a number of different factors of which transport and these policies are a part of.</p> <p>The Authorities Monitoring Report requires criteria that can be calculated and the monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and this would be something that is not easily attainable</p>

		<p>Additional criteria has been added to T2 additional text: 6.26 As part of the design process, the location and treatment of car parking should be carefully assessed and it should be demonstrated through the Design and Access Statement. <b>The criteria for how the scheme is assessed will need to consider the following criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Where is the development located;</b></li> <li>• <b>Proximity of the site to public transport, services and facilities and whether they are within walking/cycling distance;</b></li> <li>• <b>Type of dwelling; and</b></li> <li>• <b>Any other factors such as the nature of provision, occupier and the needs of those with disabilities and reduced mobility</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p><b>ANON- KSAR- NK1Z-N</b></p>	<p>Whilst the policy intent may be sound, it may be impossible at this stage to comply. Sustainable travel should always be a priority but distances in rural areas may make that impossible. Public Transport will require significant</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p>

<p><b>Shedfield Parish Council</b></p>	<p>improvement if it is ever to replace car use. Alternative fuel sources for vehicles are still evolving and are not wholly satisfactory at present. The concept of local food production and composting on residential development is laudable but unrealistic at any level that would make a difference. If it were an ideal world, broadband would be super-fast but at present that is just not the case</p>	<p>We understand that not all aspects of these Local Plan transport policies will be possible to achieve in all areas of our district, especially rural areas. However, we do want to make sure active travel promoted and prioritised where possible. While electric and hydrogen vehicles are better for the environment than petrol and diesel cars, they do not improve congestion or support active and health travel options for walking and cycling.</p> <p><b>Recommended response: no change</b></p>
<p><b><u>ANON-KSAR-NK1Z-N</u></b></p>	<p>Again it is unlikely any new development will take place in rural areas if these policies are to be met.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>We understand that not all aspects of the Local Plan policies will apply to all areas, especially rural areas. However, we do want to make sure active travel promoted and prioritised where possible. While electric and hydrogen vehicles are better for the environment than petrol and diesel cars, they do not improve congestion or support active and health travel options for walking and cycling.</p>

		<b>Recommended response: no change</b>
<a href="#">ANON- KSAR- N8GX-P</a>	We need to be assured that the lack of public transport will be a major consideration in granting any permissions.	<b>Comments noted</b>  Planning permissions will be assessed on a case by case basis and will look at a number of different factors of which transport and these policies are a part of.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
<a href="#">BHLF- KSAR- N878-6</a>	Also this is a good for reducing carbon dioxide emissions. c) Retention of the free one hour parking at the Leisure Centre to give us the opportunity to do the banking, post office business, collect parcels, etc d) Re-instatement of the half hour free parking by the statue/Guildhall. c) I would like the Local Parish to be given a budget to tackle street cleaning, storm drain debris removal and other small tasks like pond clearance up to £5K a year to supplement the scheduled Highways Agency timetable. d) Retention of Andover Road into the city centre without re-routing into the housing estate. e) No more polluting industries to be sited in the vicinity of Littleton/Harestock. f) Retention of the existing Littleton Development Boundary and existing settlement gap..	<b>Comments noted</b>  Unfortunately most of these points are outside of the remit of the Local Plan.  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>
<a href="#">BHLF- KSAR- N86T-1</a> Hampshire County	The County Council is pleased to see that the issue of climate change is being addressed via a range of policies to address strategic carbon neutrality and designing for low carbon infrastructure, alongside Policy T1 (Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel) and Policy T3 (Promoting sustainable	<b>Comments noted and support welcomed</b>  <b>Recommended response: no change</b>

Council (Transport)	<p>travel modes of transport and the design and layout of parking for new developments) which consider transport issues.</p> <p>The County Council's Climate Change Framework for Strategic Programmes (2020 – 2025) sets out the mitigation and resilience programmes which the County Council will be pursuing. These strategic programmes have been designed to deliver outcomes to reach the County Council's targets in 2050 and are therefore very long term and extensive in nature.</p>	
------------------------	---	--

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
Comments from SA/HRA	<p>Policy T1 could be strengthened by setting out an approach that considers not only the incorporation of sustainable and active transport modes and routes to encourage modal shift but also infrastructure that will support the use of these features by a range of users, including those with disabilities and older people. Sustainable and active transport modes and routes should be supported by the incorporation of features such as weatherproof shelters, benches, digital displays and appropriate signage.</p>	<p>Policy T1 now includes a criterion to support appropriate measures for active commuting to new or refurbished employment development such as showers, changing areas and lockers/storage. The supporting text of the policy is supportive of the provision of this type of infrastructure to meet the needs of people with disabilities. The supporting text also cross refers to the support provided in Hampshire's LTP4 for mobility hubs.</p>

Amendments to policy T1

Amendments to supporting text

New sentence at the beginning of 6.4

**Hampshire County Council is the Local Highway Authority for the road network in Winchester with the exception of the Strategic Road Network (M3 and A34) which is managed by National Highways.**

Additional bullet points at the end of 6.5

**Development proposals in the district need to be:**

- **consistent with and contribute towards the objectives and delivery of the Local Transport Plan 4 or its successors and supporting any adopted transport strategies such as the Winchester Movement Strategy**
- **consistent with and contribute towards the objectives and implementation of the TfSE Strategy and associated delivery plans**
- **designed and delivered in accordance with the Hampshire County Council Highway and Traffic Technical Guidance documents and policies, unless otherwise agreed with the County Council at the time.**

New paragraph after 6.18 in policy T1 where it is more appropriate:

**6.19 If cycle infrastructure (including cycle lanes, networks, junctions and parking facilities) is provided as part of the development this should follow the guidance set out by The Department for Transport's in LTN 1/20 or any successor document. [Cycle infrastructure design \(LTN 1/20\) - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/422222/cycle_infrastructure_design_ltn_1_20.pdf)**

Additional text in supporting text at end of para 6.20:

Active travel and sustainable transport are an essential consideration when developing a site and determine how the site will function in terms of travel patterns. To encourage the uptake and continued use of active and sustainable modes of transport, the location, design and layout of development will need to demonstrate significant prominence and priority being given to pedestrian and cycle movements and then to sustainable transport initiatives and lastly to private car use, maximising integration with bus or other public transport networks. **Active travel can be encouraged by providing appropriate facilities which make it easier for people to wash, change and store their equipment easily. Showers, changing areas, lockers/storage and drying facilities should be designed to a high standard and include facilities for people with disabilities.** For further advice on this issue can be found on the Sport England website on the active design section (<https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design>)

Additional supporting text (para 6.27)

Para 6.30 to move to after 6.27, new para 6.28 and move picture with it.

**6.30 The development of transport/delivery hubs in which enable “last mile” delivery by sustainable transport will be supported where the location is suitable in all other respects.**

Add what a mobility hub is in end of para 6.20

### **Mobility Hubs**

**A mobility hub is a place that brings together a range of sustainable transport options and can be tailored in terms of scale and type to suit any setting, from city centres or new housing developments to existing market towns or villages. It allows for different transport options so people have the ability to switch transport modes between journeys making their journey easier and more accessible. They will also help to reduce the number and the length of journeys made by private vehicles. Mobility hubs can also be a place to provide communities with useful facilities and act as information points. Mobility hubs are supported by Hampshire's LTP4 as they act as a focal point for public and shared transport'**

**Mobility Hubs can include, electric charging facilities, car club parking bays, delivery lockers, cycle parking, information totems and bus stops. More guidance on mobility hubs can be found on the COMOUK website.**

Add to Glossary

### **Last-mile Delivery**

**Last-mile deliveries represent the very final leg of the supply chain and include the delivery of goods (or a parcel) that come from the final sorting office or fulfilment centre (e.g. local warehouse) to the customer (e.g. retailer or end-consumer in case of online shopping/home deliveries). Journeys on local roads in vehicles no bigger than small vans.**

**Mobility Hubs: A mobility hub is a place that brings together a range of sustainable transport options and can be tailored in terms of scale and type to suit any setting, from city centres or new housing developments to existing market towns or villages. Mobility Hubs can include, electric charging facilities, car club parking bays, delivery lockers, cycle parking, information totems and bus stops.**

### **Amendments to Policy T1**

Planning applications for ~~the~~ development that would increase travel must be supported by a ~~travel~~ **transport** assessment to quantify the amount and type of travel and should prioritise:

- i. ~~Offering a~~ **A** genuine choice of sustainable and active transport modes of travel; prioritising walking, **wheeling**, cycling and public transport, followed by car clubs, electric/hydrogen vehicles and lastly private fossil-fuelled vehicles;



- ii. ~~Designing d-~~Development so that it **reduces** ~~minimises~~ **the number of trips made by need to travel by private car motor vehicle as well as maximising opportunities to walk and cycle in compliance with the Hampshire Movement and Place Framework and Healthy Streets approach as set out in the adopted LTP4;**
- iii. The concept of ~~45~~ **20**-minute neighbourhoods;
- iv. **Integrating** ~~Incorporating~~ sustainable and active travel routes into the layout with connections to the wider network **and where appropriate integrated with the green / blue infrastructure networks**, which must be made available and usable at all stages of development particularly on large or phased sites.
- v. **To ensure** ~~in a way that results in a s-~~**Safe, attractive, secure and convenient ways** that encourage all users, including those with disabilities and reduced mobility, to use more sustainable forms of transport such as walking, **wheeling**, cycling or buses, at every stage of the development; ~~and~~
- vi. The continued safe and efficient operation of the strategic and local road networks;
- vii. ~~Any proposed n~~ **New accesses and intensified use of existing accesses onto the road network that** can demonstrate that they will not result in reduced highways safety or significant traffic congestion/delays, **and**
- viii. **Proposals which include new or refurbished employment development will need to provide where appropriate measures such as showers, changing areas and lockers/storage to cater for employees wishing to engage in active travel.**