

D5 - Masterplan

- Support - 16
- Neither support of object - 13
- Object - 16

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.

Comments in support of D5- masterplan		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKS3-G Bishops Waltham Parish Council	D5 Masterplan. Welcome approvals but would add the need for affordable housing under point (e) “,,, providing for a mix of housing that addresses the range of local housing needs, including affordable housing...”	Agree further clarification could be helpful. Proposed response: Amend criterion v as follows – Plan for integrated development, providing for a mix of housing <u>types, sizes and tenures</u> that addresses the range of local housing needs, and encourages community cohesion;
ANON-KSAR-N8XY-8	Point xiv is I think a particular priority.	Noted.

ANON-KSAR-N81T-V Sparsholt Parish Council	Masterplans need to be developed and regularly reviewed. all neighbouring Parish need to be made aware of the Masterplans and involved in discussions.	Noted.
ANON-KSAR-N8U2-X	<p>We support the approach within Policy D5 to ensure that large scale development proposals deliver sustainable development and high quality place making. However, we have some detailed comments on Policy D5 which are geared towards ensuring that there are no conflicts between this policy and the site-specific policy (W2).</p> <p>As per our comments on Policy W2, the policy is not currently clear as to the mechanism by which this masterplan should be secured by the Local Planning Authority and we consider that wording should be added to clarify that this can be agreed through a planning application process in due course.</p> <p>We suggest the following amended wording is introduced:</p> <p>Any application for development is accompanied by a comprehensive and evidence based site wide masterplan which demonstrates how high quality design will be delivered for the whole site which has involved and engaged with stakeholders and interested parties before it is agreed by the local planning authority. This masterplan should be informed by pre-application engagement with the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>As per our comments on the site-specific policy for Sir John Moore Barracks (Policy W2), we also consider that part (o) of this policy should be reworded to ensure it is compliant with national and local policy as follows:</p>	<p>Since the regulation 18 plan was published for consultation, the Council has approved an Approach to Concept Masterplans, setting out the minimum the Council expects to be undertaken in the production of Concept Master Plans. No change proposed.</p>

	Demonstrate a good understanding and respect for the natural environment, its heritage assets and their setting both within the site and in the wider locality, whether designated or not, and include details of how the natural environment and heritage assets will be preserved, conserved or enhanced. Any applications should be accompanied by a heritage statement describing the significance of affected heritage assets and/or their settings, the degree and nature of impact upon that significance and how the proposals minimise or mitigate any harm.	
ANON-KSAR-N8Q5-W	In supporting the policy, we recommend adding explicit reference to trees and woodland in para xii).	It is considered this is not necessary as the current draft policy already refers to green infrastructure.
BHLF-KSAR-N8TG-J	We strongly support the requirement for a Masterplan for proposals for significant development on sites occupied by major landowners. Does there need to be a clear link to the need to make a positive contribution to the area, per Strategic Policy D1? Masterplans can equally have a role in development of smaller brownfield sites, for example redevelopment of the Dean in Alresford. Basic Design Principles apply to all developments – so why exclude “householder” applications and “change of use”?	There is no need to repeat D1. It would not be proportionate to require householder and change of use applications to be supported by a masterplan .
BHLF-KSAR-N87J-R Micheldever Parish Council	We support these strategic policies however we feel that it is important to establish the principle that development cannot be at a cost of a reduction in food producing farmland. In addition, we would support a principle that no large development should be able to be considered on greenfield sites until brownfield sites have been exhausted.	National Planning Policy already emphasises the values of the best and most versatile agricultural land, which is reflected in the emerging plan policies and development strategy. The approach to brownfield land is set out in policy D6.
BHLF-KSAR-N8BR-B	We support the approach within Policy D5 to ensure that large scale development proposals deliver sustainable development and high quality place making. However, we have some detailed comments on Policy D5 which are geared towards ensuring that there are no conflicts between this policy and the site-specific policy (W2).	Since the regulation 18 plan was published for consultation, the Council has approved an Approach to Concept Masterplans, setting out the minimum the Council expects to be undertaken in the

	<p>1.22 As per our comments on Policy W2, the policy is not currently clear as to the mechanism by which this masterplan should be secured by the Local Planning Authority and we consider that wording should be added to clarify that this can be agreed through a planning application process in due course.</p> <p>1.23 We suggest the following amended wording is introduced: Any application for development is accompanied by preceded by, and is consistent with, a comprehensive and evidence based site wide masterplan which demonstrates how high quality design will be delivered for the whole site which has involved and engaged with stakeholders and interested parties before it is agreed by the local planning authority. This masterplan should be informed by pre-application engagement with the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>1.24 As per our comments on the site-specific policy for Sir John Moore Barracks (Policy W2), we also consider that part (o) of this policy should be reworded to ensure it is compliant with national and local policy as follows: Demonstrate a good understanding and respect for the natural environment, its heritage assets and their setting both within the site and in the wider locality, whether designated or not, and include details of how the natural environment and heritage assets will be preserved, conserved or enhanced. Any applications should be accompanied by a heritage statement describing the significance of affected heritage assets and/or their settings, the degree and nature of impact upon that significance and how the proposals minimise or mitigate any harm.</p>	<p>production of Concept Master Plans. No change proposed.</p>
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N8BS-C</p>	<p>The approach distilled within this policy is built into BSP's DNA. BSP welcome the policy given that this promotes sustainable development, place-making and good design. If all developments adopt the approach distilled within this policy, then numerous benefits will ensue. Whilst BSP support the policy it is obvious that many of the proposed allocation within the Market Towns will be unable to comply with key criteria, for example, provision of employment and community facilities</p>	<p>The policy makes it clear that the requirements of the policy should be proportionate to the scale and location of the proposal.</p>

	(local shops, health facilities etc.). It is recommended that flexibility be built into the policy should certain sites be unable to comply with certain demands detailed within this policy.	
--	---	--

Comments which neither support nor object to D5- masterplan		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKZU-S	'Significant development' should be clearly defined within the context of national policy to outline how this relates to minor/major development and what the threshold of homes constitutes 'significant'.	The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.
ANON-KSAR-NKDG-N	Policy D5 we generally support this policy but the order of points (i) to (xv) is misleading. Existing point (vi), reducing the need for car use, should be point (i) of the policy Point (xiv), assessing potential for including renewable energy schemes, should be prioritised at a very early stage of masterplanning.	The number given to the policy criteria does not denote importance – all will be considered in the context of relevant applications.
ANON-KSAR-N8XZ-9 Denmead Parish Council	D5 vi "Reduce the need for car use and encourage sustainable modes of travel, including current provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways;" This needs much more clarity, what does "including current provision for public transport" actually mean?	Comments of frequency of bus services are noted, but it is considered that the aim of encouraging public transport should remain. The reference to <i>current</i> provision is in recognition that it may not always be likely that public

	<p>In Denmead our limited bus service does not operate in the evenings nor on a Sunday.</p>	<p>transport provision (eg frequency of services) will be increased as a result of development.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N8GX-P</p>	<p>Comment D5 vi Am not sure what 'including current provision for public transport etc' means. We have a very limited public transport system in Denmead which doesn't run everyday. If you work in Waterlooville and wish to commute by public transport you have to get to a bus stop before 8am to get you 2 miles down the road where you have to hang around until 9am to get into work - the same coming home and there is no evening bus service.</p>	<p>However, agree this policy should be clearer on transport issues.</p> <p>Proposed response:</p> <p>Revise criteria as follows –</p> <p>vi. Reduce the need for car use and encourage sustainable modes of travel, including current provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways; set out where appropriate in -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A street hierarchy and clear movement framework reflecting hierarchy of users, • A Transport Strategy for the masterplan that evidences how the development will achieve a high internalisation of trips and an ambitious active travel mode share, • A Parking and Servicing strategy that carefully consider levels of parking provision and how to discretely accommodate it in the public realm, • A Public Transport and mobility hub strategy that provides

		<p>for timely delivery of new bus, public transport and mobility infrastructure. vii. Create a network of permeable and interconnected streets and high quality public realm that is well integrated into the surrounding area; including current provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways and other Public Rights of Way;</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N81Y-1</p>	<p>Draft Policy D5 states that in the interests of sustainable development and good quality place-making in order to secure long term benefits for the district, when proposals come forward on larger sites that may be brought forward in phases the local planning authority will seek to ensure that the masterplan is developed and agreed for the site. Further clarity should be provided within draft Policy D5 as to how the masterplan process is to be progressed in conjunction with a site allocation. The masterplan process is not clear within the policy wording in terms of how this works as part of the planning application process or if sign off/approval is required and, if so, at what point in the process. We would request additional wording is included within the masterplan policy to provide certainty to applicants on this process and in particular clarification on whether Policy D5 applies to sites which are covered by a site allocation which also requires a masterplan to be produced. We also comment on this process under draft Policy W5 below. Draft Policy D5 point viii) currently states "Include measures to mitigate the traffic impacts of the proposed development on the strategic and local road networks;" Given the historic network in and around Winchester, and the trend away from 'predict-and-provide' of new highway capacity provision (e.g. para 6.14.ix), we suggest adding the following detail: "Include appropriate measures to mitigate the potential traffic impacts of the</p>	<p>Since the regulation 18 plan was published for consultation, the Council has approved an Approach to Concept Masterplans, setting out the minimum the Council expects to be undertaken in the production of Concept Master Plans. No change proposed.</p>

	<p>proposed development on the strategic and local road networks, recognising that the most appropriate measures may be those that reduce vehicle demand in favour of active travel and/or those which prioritise more effective use of existing highway capacity.”</p>	
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N8TZ-5</p>	<p>The heading in this section is ‘Market Towns and Rural Villages’, which suggests that the policy only applies to these locations, whereas it should apply across the Plan area. ‘Large’ (in the ‘What we are aiming to achieve’ box), ‘on larger sites’ and ‘significant development’ in the policy is not defined in terms of size or scale. This may be to retain flexibility in the policy but it doesn’t provide any certainty for developers or communities. Scale should be relative to the locality in which the development is proposed to be built.</p> <p>In the policy it states that, “any application for significant development is expected to achieve the following: vi. Reduce the need for car use and encourage sustainable modes of travel, including current provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.” The use of existing bridleways should not include a requirement to tarmac the surface as this would be to the detriment of equestrians. There are alternative materials which make the surface easier to use for pedestrians and cyclists and are much safer for use by equestrians, as tarmac is slippery and hard. The BHS provides advice on suitable surfaces; please go to this page https://www.bhs.org.uk/go-riding/leaflets-and-downloads/ and click on ‘Recommendations for standards and specifications for structures and surfaces’ to view the document entitled Surfaces (Jul-21). Or click on this link https://www.bhs.org.uk/media/mr2b1udi/surfaces-0721.pdf</p> <p>The policy, in paragraph xii. on the incorporation of a green infrastructure strategy providing an integrated network of green spaces, taking advantage of opportunities for off-site links to the countryside, SDNP and wider green network, should also include equestrian use. Every opportunity needs to be taken to join up the rights of way network and provide off road routes in compensation for the loss of green fields and increase in motorised traffic</p>	<p>Agree policy is incorrectly headed. The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.</p> <p>Detailed comments on surfacing are noted but policy D1 provides the appropriate framework for considering these issues.</p> <p>Proposed response:</p> <p>Amend heading at top of pages 96 and 97 - replace “Market Towns and Rural Villages” with “Masterplans”</p>

	which results from development, to the detriment of equestrians and other non-motorised users.	
BHLF-KSAR-N8T1-V	No definition has been given as to what is meant by 'larger sites' 'significant development' 'major landowners/users'	The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.
BHLF-KSAR-N8TB-D	policy D5 sounds reasonable for a stand alone large scale developments. However, the need for such a proposal to firstly consult with existing neighbouring areas, to address effects on changing landscape, flooding risks and to traffic management to the neighbours must be emphasised. Again, the widespread rejection of Royal Down was due to these factors not being considered.	These aspects are dealt with overall in emerging Policy D1. This policy aims to set out how relevant factors inform the production of a masterplan where necessary.
BHLF-KSAR-N8Z7-8 South Downs National Park Authority	(1) Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Beauty of the Area The landscape is the foundation for all other special qualities of the SDNP, including its setting, views, tranquillity, and unspoilt places and its distinctive towns and villages. With this in mind, the SDNP covers approximately 40% of Winchester District and a significant proportion of the remainder of the District is within the setting of the SDNP. Development within the setting of the SDNP must be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise any adverse impacts on the SDNP in line with Paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We welcome the emerging local plan's recognition for the need to protect and enhance landscape character. With this in mind, we recommend that the following policies are updated to include appropriate references to the need to avoid and/or minimise any potential adverse impacts on the SDNP, from development within its setting, in terms of landscape character, safeguarding views, tranquillity and dark night skies. These are; Policies D1 (High Quality, Well Designed and Inclusive Places), D2 (Design Principles for Winchester Town); D4 (Design Principles for Market Towns and Rural	The Plan should be read as a whole. It is considered that the emerging policies D2, D4 and NE8 sufficiently cover this point.

	Areas), D5 (Masterplan), NE12 (Equestrian Development), NE13 (Leisure and Recreation in the Countryside), and NE14 (Rural Character).	
BHLF-KSAR-N8BQ-A Historic Environment Link here	<p>Though not a heritage matter, our impression is that in many cases (in the policy and in the supporting text) reference to “The Masterplan” would be clearer if it read “A masterplan”</p> <p>In addition, criterion xv needs minor modification, to clarify that heritage assets are not a subset of the natural environment</p> <p>xv. Demonstrate a good understanding and respect for the natural environment, its natural and heritage assets and their setting both within the site and in the wider locality, whether designated or not, and include details of how the natural environment and historic environment heritage assets will be preserved, conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Full doc in SP for mark ups</p>	<p>Agress criterion xv should be amended.</p> <p>Proposed change –</p> <p>xv. Demonstrate a good understanding and respect for the natural <u>and historic</u> environment, its <u>heritage</u> assets and their setting both within the site and in the wider locality, whether designated or not, and include details of how the natural environment and heritage assets will be preserved, conserved and enhanced.</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N86T-1 Hampshire County Council (Transport)	<p>P97 – Strategic Policy D5 – Masterplans</p> <p>The County Council support this policy but would welcome reference to what the development size threshold for requiring a masterplan might be, plus the inclusion of these additional proposals to be adopted or considered when developing a masterplan for a large development or new settlement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Emerging Hampshire Movement and Place Framework and Healthy Streets Approach b) 20-minute neighbourhood principles to facilitate ‘Live Local’ concept c) Low traffic neighbourhood principles to discourage car usage within the development d) Reference to the whole PROW network rather than just bridleways in the text e) Residential streets generally designed to encourage a maximum vehicle speed of 20mph (or lower) 	<p>Agree this policy should be clearer on transport issues.</p> <p>Proposed response:</p> <p>Revise criteria as follows –</p> <p>vi. Reduce the need for car use and encourage sustainable modes of travel, including current provision for public transport, cycle routes,</p>

<p>f) A street hierarchy and clear movement framework reflecting hierarchy of users making it easier to walk, cycle or use public transport than drive a car</p> <p>g) A design code with clear street typologies and design characteristics that must remain a 'live' document to allow it to evolve as the design and build out of the development progresses and reflect changes in standards and policies.</p> <p>h) A Transport Strategy for the masterplan that evidences how the development will achieve a high internalisation of trips and an ambitious active travel mode share reflecting TCPA ambitions</p> <p>i) A Parking and Servicing strategy that carefully consider levels of parking provision and how to discretely accommodate it in the public realm</p> <p>j) New schools are designed with car free access points to remove the issue of school gate congestion issues and facilitate safe and comfortable journeys by active modes</p> <p>k) A Public transport and mobility hub strategy that provides for timely delivery of new bus, public transport and mobility infrastructure.</p> <p>l) An 'infrastructure first' approach towards public transport provision.</p> <p>Appendix 3: Waste Disposal Authority</p> <p>The Winchester City Council area is well served by four Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC): Winchester HWRC, New Alresford HWRC, Bishops Waltham HWRC and the new Waterlooville HWRC which although it primarily serves Waterlooville in Havant Borough, the site itself is located within the City Council's boundary.</p> <p>The County Council is pleased to see that there is an ambition to promote recycling and minimise waste within the Draft Local Plan and it is strongly encouraged that this is given enough emphasis in any future consideration of new or expanded developments, especially in respect of the masterplanning of large strategic sites.</p> <p>The County Council is also supportive of the specific reference to making sure there is adequate provision for recycling and refuse at student accommodation and gypsy, traveller and traveling showpeople sites.</p>	<p>footpaths and bridleways; set out where appropriate in -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A street hierarchy and clear movement framework reflecting hierarchy of users,</u> • <u>A Transport Strategy for the masterplan that evidences how the development will achieve a high internalisation of trips and an ambitious active travel mode share,</u> • <u>A Parking and Servicing strategy that carefully consider levels of parking provision and how to discretely accommodate it in the public realm,</u> • <u>A Public Transport and mobility hub strategy that provides for timely delivery of new bus, public transport and mobility infrastructure.</u> <p>vii. Create a network of permeable and interconnected streets and high quality public realm that is well integrated into the surrounding area; <u>including current provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways and other Public Rights of Way;</u></p>
---	---

	<p>The County Council takes this opportunity to reiterate that all Project Integra Partners, including the City Council, formally approved the Project Integra Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) in May 2022, and in doing so jointly endorsed the move to a twin stream recycling system that will see kerbside dry recycling being delivered in two different streams from 2025 onwards. The first stream will be a container mix (can, tins, plastic bottles, aerosols, pots, tubs, trays, cartons and glass) and the other a fibre mix (paper and card); this is to increase the segregation of materials that could contaminate each stream and lead to lower quality material be captured. In addition to this it is expected that all waste collection authorities will be required, by the Environment Act 2021, to provide a separate weekly food waste collection service to all properties and many will also offer a green garden waste collection. Therefore, consideration for the adequate and safe storage of waste containers at future housing sites should be considered as an important feature of their design and masterplanning. Hampshire County Council is available to discuss any waste disposal issues further with Winchester City Council if required. Please get in contact via waste.management@hants.gov.uk or alternatively contact planningconsultation@hants.gov.uk</p>	<p>The Table on page 71 of the draft plan refers to Waste Management guidelines. These were last updated in July 2023. Any further amendment or update to this will be picked up in further iterations of this document, and hence no change is considered necessary to the Plan.</p>
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N863-Z</p>	<p><u>Strategic Policy D5: Masterplans</u></p> <p>For the policy to be effective, and to assist with its interpretation by decision-makers/applications, 'significant development' and 'larger sites' requires defining in the Plan. The term 'Major landowners/users' also requires defining in the Plan, alongside justification for why a policy that targets specific applicants is needed. It is also noted that many of the design principles are reproduced in the overall design policy and/or in national guidance, and should not be repeated in Policy D5 for brevity.</p>	<p>The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.</p>

Comments which object to D5- masterplan		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKN8-G	I disagree with large sites being built ie.ones over 250 homes. As a newcomer to the area these larger developments are noticeably changing the culture, shape and environment and look completely out of place. They are also exacerbating the lack of local services incl but not limited to GP appointments, dentists and supermarket capacity	Comment noted. In some cases it is considered appropriate for larger developments to come forward and the emerging Plan seeks to provide an appropriate framework for that.
ANON-KSAR-NKDW-5 Littleton and Harestock Parish Council	<p>1. WCC are relying upon the preparation of masterplans to provide the detailed planning framework to deliver the strategic allocations of the Plan. The intention of WCC is that the masterplans will be prepared by landowners and developers with input from it and following community engagement. However, as currently drafted there is no specific reference or requirement for the promoters of the strategic sites to engage with the local community which is a serious omission. This despite the reference under the ‘What are we aiming to achieve?’ to the involvement and input from local people. The text of the second paragraph which precedes the criteria is poorly drafted with some text clearly missing. It should be consistent with the text in paragraph 12.23 of the Plan under Policy W2 which in turn should include a reference to the involvement of the local community.</p> <p>2. The reliance on landowners and developers to lead on the preparation of masterplans is of serious concern to Littleton and Harestock Parish Council as it hands control of the planning framework to them. If that is WCC’s preferred approach then the strategic policy and the specific site allocation policy ref Policy W2 should include much more detail particularly where there are land-use implications. As currently drafted both Policy D5 and W2 do not provide a robust framework for the delivery of strategic sites nor do they provide the necessary clarity in respect of</p>	<p>Policy D5 does require masterplans to be prepared and demonstrate how they have involved and engaged with stakeholders and communities. Since the regulation 18 plan was published for consultation, the Council has approved an Approach to Concept Masterplans, setting out the minimum the Council expects to be undertaken in the production of Concept Master Plans.</p> <p>The comments made are acknowledged. But overall it is considered that emerging policy W2, D5 and the subsequent Approach o concept masterplans provides an appropriate framework for guiding the development at Sir John Moore Barracks, given the progress made at this point in time.</p>

	<p>the impact on the parish of the redevelopment of the Sir John Moore Barracks (SJMB) .</p> <p>3. The Plan at paragraph 5.70 states that the masterplan could be prepared at the same time as the submission of development proposals. Littleton and Harestock Parish Council considers that the masterplan should be in place well before any application is submitted to ensure that it has lead the planning process and informed detailed proposals.</p> <p>4. The status of the masterplan is not at all clear. This is of major concern for Littleton and Harestock Parish Council. For large sites such as Sir John Moore Barracks (SJMB) it is reasonable to expect, at the very least, that the Plan should set out detailed requirements for the development of strategic sites. It is not good practice to rely upon other documents to set out the precise land-use implications of local plan policies. It also means that the local community when commenting on this local plan and future versions do not have a clear understanding of the implications of allocating the Sir John Moore Barracks (SJMB). Given the importance of the site and the scale of development proposed it should either be the subject of a detailed site allocation policy or be the subject of a separate site allocations development plan document. A more detailed masterplan could then be developed as supplementary guidance with all of them being subject of effective community engagement. The current approach leaves too many important decisions to an informal process which would be developer led and would carry little weight in the decision-making process when an application was submitted. These concerns cannot be overstated. Littleton and Harestock Parish Council objects to the policy.</p> <p>Object to Policy D5 as it relies upon the preparation of non-statutory planning documents to deliver the policies of the local plan in respect of strategic land allocations</p> <p>Object to Policy D5 as it relies upon landowners and developers to lead</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>the process of preparing a masterplan, that role should be undertaken by WCC</p> <p>Object to Policy D5. It should be redrafted to include a specific requirement that the preparation of a masterplan must include effective and inclusive engagement with the local community.</p> <p>Object to Policy D5. Paragraph 5.70 should be amended to state that masterplans must be in place before development proposals are submitted.</p>	
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKB4-Z</p>	<p>Comment in brackets</p> <p>CONTENTSBACK97WINCHESTER CITY COUNCILMARKET TOWNS AND RURAL VILLAGES</p> <p>•5In the interests of sustainable development and good quality place-making in order to secure long term benefits for the district, when proposals come forward on larger sites that may be brought forward in phases the local planning authority will seek to ensure that the masterplan is developed and agreed for the site. Proposals for significant development on sites occupied by major landowners/users will be permitted where they accord with the Development Plan and are consistent with a comprehensive and evidence based site wide masterplan which demonstrates how high quality design will be delivered for the whole site which has involved and engaged with stakeholders and interested. These should be agreed with the local planning authority and show how the wider implications or cumulative benefits of developing the site can be addressed.Any application for significant development on sites occupied by major landowners/users is preceded by, and is expected to achieve the following proportionate to the scale of the site and proposed development:</p> <p>•Strategic Policy D5 •Masterplan i.Include an indicative development layout and phasing and implementation plan;ii.Incorporate high standards of urban design and architecture that respects the character of the landscape, heritage, adjacent and nearby settlements and built development, reflecting the urban to rural transition</p>	<p>Providing access to cultivatable land is not always appropriate, for instance in larger town centre sites.</p>

	<p>with appropriate boundary treatment;iii.Make effective use of the site through the application of appropriate densities in terms of scale, height and massing, and its relationship to adjoining buildings and landscape;iv.Create a strong sense of place, ensuring the proposed development makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness;v.Plan for integrated development, providing for a mix of housing that addresses the range of local housing needs, and encourages community cohesion;vi.Reduce the need for car use and encourage sustainable modes of travel, including current provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways; (vii. Provide access to cultivateable land where gardens are not attached to properties.)</p>	
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F</p>	<p>The heading in this section is ‘Market Towns and Rural Villages’, which suggests that the policy only applies to these locations, whereas it should apply across the Plan area. ‘Large’ (in the ‘What we are aiming to achieve’ box), ‘on larger sites’ and ‘significant development’ in the policy is not defined in terms of size or scale. This may be to retain flexibility in the policy but it doesn’t provide any certainty for developers or communities. Scale should be relative to the locality in which the development is proposed to be built.</p> <p>In the policy it states that, “any application for significant development is expected to achieve the following: vi. Reduce the need for car use and encourage sustainable modes of travel, including current provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.” The use of existing bridleways should not include a requirement to tarmac the surface as this would be to the detriment of equestrians. There are alternative materials which make the surface easier to use for pedestrians and cyclists and are much safer for use by equestrians, as tarmac is slippery and hard.</p> <p>The BHS provides advice on suitable surfaces; please go to this page https://www.bhs.org.uk/go-riding/leaflets-and-downloads/ and click on ‘Recommendations for standards and specifications for structures and</p>	<p>Agree policy is incorrectly headed. The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.</p> <p>Detailed comments on surfacing are noted but policy D1 provides the appropriate framework for considering these issues.</p> <p>Proposed response:</p> <p>Amend heading at top of pages 96 and 97 - replace “Market Towns and Rural Villages” with “Masterplans”</p>

	<p>surfaces' to view the document entitled Surfaces (Jul-21). Or click on this link https://www.bhs.org.uk/media/mr2b1udi/surfaces-0721.pdf</p> <p>The policy, in paragraph xii. on the incorporation of a green infrastructure strategy providing an integrated network of green spaces, taking advantage of opportunities for off-site links to the countryside, SDNP and wider green network, should also include equestrian use. Every opportunity needs to be taken to join up the rights of way network and provide off road routes in compensation for the loss of green fields and increase in motorised traffic which results from development, to the detriment of equestrians and other non-motorised users.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKJV-A	<p>Policy D5 refers to the need for masterplans to be prepared on larger sites. However, the policy and supporting text is unclear on what comprises a larger site. This must be clarified. Accordingly, the policy as currently drafted is not justified or effective.</p>	<p>The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8M7-U	<p>The HBF recognise the benefits of masterplans for large and complex sites to identify and agree on the key development principles early in the decision-making process. However, the policy written could be clear as to when master plan will be necessary. At present the policy states that it should apply to larger sites that may be brought forward in phases. We would suggest that this amended to "... larger sites that are brought forward in phases". This would ensure that the master plans are only required on larger more complex sites and not applied where they are unnecessary.</p>	<p>The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8GP-E Denmead Parish Council	<p>vi what does 'including current provision for public transport' mean?</p>	<p>The reference to current provision is in recognition that it may not always be likely that public transport provision (eg frequency of services) will be increased as a result of development.</p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-NKJ1-5</p>	<p>Winchester College requests that further details are provided in the supporting text and Policy D5 to explain the process for Masterplans and how this will work in practice.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the City Council intends to consider the requirement for a Masterplan on a site-by-site basis and if so, what criteria would be used to determine the need and justification for the preparation of a Masterplan. Clarification is requested.</p> <p>Additionally, it is not clear whether a Masterplan will be required for all significant landholdings, even those where limited new built development opportunities exist, or which will largely rely on the repurposing of existing buildings. Clarification is requested.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.70 suggests that the Masterplan should be prepared before, or in conjunction with, the submission of development proposals. This is reiterated in draft Policy D5 which seeks to ensure that the masterplan is developed and agreed for the site in advance and has involved stakeholders and interested parties. This will significantly lengthen the process for obtaining planning consent and therefore it is important the Council provides more detail on the process and timescales for approval of a Masterplan and the circumstances upon which it can be revised.</p>	<p>The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.</p> <p>Since the regulation 18 plan was published for consultation, the Council has approved an Approach to Concept Masterplans, setting out the minimum the Council expects to be undertaken in the production of Concept Master Plans. No change proposed.</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-N81F-E</p>	<p>Bargate Homes support the principle of using master plans, at a proportionate level of detail, to guide large scale development. It would be helpful to have a guide as to what is likely to constitute large scale; for example, 10 or more homes (major development). It must also be clarified that not all of the criteria will relevant in every case, for example, criterion X (employment, local shops) would not be a feature of smaller scale (but major) residential developments. A management plan is not feasible at outline/master plan stage, but should be a requirement at reserved matters stage with the final detail to be conditioned.</p>	<p>The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.</p>

ANON-KSAR-N83B-C	<p>Point vi, reduce the need for car use etc, should be the first point in this policy.</p> <p>Point xiv, assessing potential for including renewable energy schemes, should be prioritised at a very early stage of master planning.</p>	The number given to the policy criteria does not denote importance – all will be considered in the context of relevant applications.
ANON-KSAR-N8VD-H	<p>Paragraph 5.68 of the plan states that “the masterplan will be sought to secure agreement on key development principles when development is proposed on large sites (our emphasis) that may be comprised of a number of different development interests and brought forward in phases”. However, policy D5 uses the phrases “larger sites”, “significant development” and “major landowners/users”, none of which are defined in either the supporting text or the policy leaving the policy open to subjective interpretation. As it is unclear which sites would be subject to this policy, there is considerable scope for future disagreement between an applicant and the council and the policy should therefore be written to provide clarity.</p> <p>The second paragraph of policy D5 needs to include the word “parties” after the word “interested”.</p> <p>Criterion (xiv) contains a requirement for any application for significant development to assess the potential for including renewable energy schemes, which suggests that provision is not mandatory if renewable energy provision is not feasible. This criterion seems to be at odds with criterion (iv) of policy CN3 which requires Onsite renewables to provide 100% of the energy consumption that is required by residential buildings, irrespective of whether it is feasible to do so or not.</p>	The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.
ANON-KSAR-N85N-T	<p>MASTER Plans for each development are vital and should include requirements for</p> <p>1. open spaces that are large enough for kicking a football, or rounders etc not just tiny play areas. This gives purpose and place to let off steam to teenagers and young children, improving mental health.</p>	The Council does require open space in accordance with policy NE3 which is underpinned by an Open Spaces Strategy which specifies the amount

	<p>2. private family gardens which are the safest places for children to play and provide relaxation for stressed adults plus absorb rainfall better than tarmac.</p> <p>3. mix of housing styles - to avoid the soulless 'million anonymous shoe boxes' that have been built just the north of Winchester which is building up trouble for the future.</p>	<p>and type of facilities available and any deficits.</p> <p>Emerging Policy D1 seeks to improve the design of development.</p>
ANON-KSAR-N88Q-Z	<p>Add to x.</p> <p>x. Provide for appropriate employment provision and community facilities to serve the new development (e.g. local shops (with food as essential retail), community halls, schools and health facilities)</p> <p>Add to xi.</p> <p>xi. Provide for accessible open space to meet identified local needs, including food growing opportunities, productive landscaping and composting point and/or increase accessibility to existing open spaces;</p>	<p>It is not possible for the masterplan process to secure a particular type of shop as part of a planning framework. But the process does seek to secure appropriate local facilities.</p> <p>Providing access to food growing opportunities is not always appropriate, for instance in larger town centre sites.</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8ZV-7	<p>Strategic Policy D5 Masterplan OBJECT</p> <p>Winchester College requests that further details are provided in the supporting text and Policy D5 to explain the process for Masterplans and how this will work in practice.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the City Council intends to consider the requirement for a Masterplan on a site-by-site basis and if so, what criteria would be used to determine the need and justification for the preparation of a Masterplan. Clarification is requested.</p> <p>Additionally, it is not clear whether a Masterplan will be required for all significant landholdings, even those where limited new built development opportunities exist, or which will largely rely on the repurposing of existing buildings. Clarification is requested.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.70 suggests that the Masterplan should be prepared before, or in conjunction with, the submission of development proposals. This is reiterated in draft Policy D5 which seeks to ensure that the masterplan is developed and agreed for the site in advance and has involved stakeholders and interested parties. This will significantly lengthen the</p>	<p>The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.</p> <p>Since the regulation 18 plan was published for consultation, the Council has approved an Approach to Concept Masterplans, setting out the minimum the Council expects to be undertaken in the production of Concept Master Plans. No change proposed.</p>

	<p>process for obtaining planning consent and therefore it is important the Council provides more detail on the process and timescales for approval of a Masterplan and the circumstances upon which it can be revised.</p>	
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N8BD-W</p>	<p>The heading at the top of the page “MARKET TOWNS AND RURAL VILLAGES” should be deleted. This policy should apply to the whole district and masterplans will predominantly be within Winchester.</p> <p>The Policy is too narrow in suggesting when masterplans will be required. It limits them to larger sites developed in phases and sites occupied by major landowners and users. Other significant sites that do not fall into these categories have in the past required masterplans; an example is the laundry site on Gordon Road (now Valentine’s Close) which won a design award.</p> <p>The Trust believes masterplans on two of the sites allocated for development in Winchester are required but are not included; these are St Peter’s Car Park and the Central Winchester Regeneration area. Second Paragraph:</p>	<p>Agree this applies to the whole Plan area. This is a typological error, as demonstrated by the requirements for new or amendments to existing masterplans for sites proposed to be allocated in Winchester and the South Hampshire Urban Areas.</p> <p>Recommended Response:</p> <p>Delete heading “MARKET TOWNS AND RURAL VILLAGES” at the top of pages 96 and 97.</p> <p>Masterplans are not appropriate in all circumstances. For allocations, the emerging Plan states if a masterplan will be expected. For windfall sites, emerging Policy D5 sets out criteria for assessing when a masterplan is required.</p> <p>It is not considered that St Peter’s Car Park warrants a masterplan by virtue of its scale and complexity. The CWR site already has a Supplementary Planning Document setting out the Council’s expectations, which reduces the need for a masterplan in that</p>

	<p>We suggest this be reworded as follows: After “stakeholders” add: “, the community” After “local planning authority” add: ”prior to the submission of a planning application” Third paragraph: We suggest this be reworded as follows: “Masterplans should include the following and demonstrate through the submission of an accompanying contextual site analysis and urban design statement that high design standards will be achieved. Masterplans will be expected to:” Paragraph i: We suggest this be reworded as follows: “Be accompanied by an urban design framework, an indicative development layout, a phasing and implementation plan and a public realm strategy;”</p>	<p>instance.</p> <p>The proposed amendments add clarity.</p> <p>Recommended response:</p> <p>Amend second paragraph of policy D5 as follows: <i>“...which has involved and engaged with stakeholders and <u>interested communities.</u>”</i></p> <p>Amend third paragraph of policy D5 as follows: <i>“...is preceded by a <u>masterplan which</u> , and is expected to achieve the following...”</i></p>
<p>BHLF- KSAR- N86N-U</p>	<p>Support for the principle of using master plans, at a proportionate level of detail, to guide large scale development. It would be helpful to have a guide as to what is likely to constitute large scale; for example, 10 or more homes (major development). It must also be clarified that not all of the criteria will relevant in every case, for example, criterion X (employment, local shops) would not be a feature of smaller scale (but major) residential developments. A management plan is not feasible at outline/master plan stage, but should be a requirement at reserved matters stage with the final detail to be conditioned.</p>	<p>The Plan states that the LPA will consider whether the requirement for a masterplan is justified and necessary on a site by site basis unless stipulated by a site allocation in the Plan.</p> <p>It is considered that the final sentence of the third paragraph of this policy make sit clear that a proportionate approach will be taken to its application.</p>

ANON-KSAR-NKN8-G	<p>I disagree with large sites being built ie.ones over 250 homes. As a newcomer to the area these larger developments are noticeably changing the culture, shape and environment and look completely out of place. They are also exacerbating the lack of local services incl but not limited to GP appointments, dentists and supermarket capacity</p>	<p>Comment noted. In some cases it is considered appropriate for larger developments to come forward and the emerging Plan seeks to provide an appropriate framework for that.</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKDW-5	<p>1. WCC are relying upon the preparation of masterplans to provide the detailed planning framework to deliver the strategic allocations of the Plan. The intention of WCC is that the masterplans will be prepared by landowners and developers with input from it and following community engagement. However, as currently drafted there is no specific reference or requirement for the promoters of the strategic sites to engage with the local community which is a serious omission. This despite the reference under the ‘What are we aiming to achieve?’ to the involvement and input from local people. The text of the second paragraph which precedes the criteria is poorly drafted with some text clearly missing. It should be consistent with the text in paragraph 12.23 of the Plan under Policy W2 which in turn should include a reference to the involvement of the local community.</p> <p>2. The reliance on landowners and developers to lead on the preparation of masterplans is of serious concern to Littleton and Harestock Parish Council as it hands control of the planning framework to them. If that is WCC’s preferred approach then the strategic policy and the specific site allocation policy ref Policy W2 should include much more detail particularly where there are land-use implications. As currently drafted both Policy D5 and W2 do not provide a robust framework for the delivery of strategic sites nor do they provide the necessary clarity in respect of the impact on the parish of the redevelopment of the Sir John Moore Barracks (SJMB) .</p> <p>3. The Plan at paragraph 5.70 states that the masterplan could be prepared at the same time as the submission of development proposals.</p>	<p>Policy D5 does require masterplans to be prepared and demonstrate how they have involved and engaged with stakeholders and communities. Since the regulation 18 plan was published for consultation, the Council has approved an Approach to Concept Masterplans, setting out the minimum the Council expects to be undertaken in the production of Concept Master Plans.</p> <p>The comments made are acknowledged. But overall it is considered that emerging policy W2, D5 and the subsequent Approach o concept masterplans provides an appropriate framework for guiding the development at Sir John Moore Barracks, given the progress made at this point in time.</p>

	<p>Littleton and Harestock Parish Council considers that the masterplan should be in place well before any application is submitted to ensure that it has lead the planning process and informed detailed proposals.</p> <p>4. The status of the masterplan is not at all clear. This is of major concern for Littleton and Harestock Parish Council. For large sites such as Sir John Moore Barracks (SJMB) it is reasonable to expect, at the very least, that the Plan should set out detailed requirements for the development of strategic sites. It is not good practice to rely upon other documents to set out the precise land-use implications of local plan policies. It also means that the local community when commenting on this local plan and future versions do not have a clear understanding of the implications of allocating the Sir John Moore Barracks (SJMB). Given the importance of the site and the scale of development proposed it should either be the subject of a detailed site allocation policy or be the subject of a separate site allocations development plan document. A more detailed masterplan could then be developed as supplementary guidance with all of them being subject of effective community engagement. The current approach leaves too many important decisions to an informal process which would be developer led and would carry little weight in the decision-making process when an application was submitted. These concerns cannot be overstated. Littleton and Harestock Parish Council objects to the policy.</p> <p>Object to Policy D5 as it relies upon the preparation of non-statutory planning documents to deliver the policies of the local plan in respect of strategic land allocations</p> <p>Object to Policy D5 as it relies upon landowners and developers to lead the process of preparing a masterplan, that role should be undertaken by WCC</p> <p>Object to Policy D5. It should be redrafted to include a specific requirement that the preparation of a masterplan must include effective and inclusive engagement with the local community.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Object to Policy D5. Paragraph 5.70 should be amended to state that masterplans must be in place before development proposals are submitted.</p>	
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKB4-Z</p>	<p>Comment in brackets</p> <p>CONTENTSBACK97WINCHESTER CITY COUNCILMARKET TOWNS AND RURAL VILLAGES•5In the interests of sustainable development and good quality place-making in order to secure long term benefits for the district, when proposals come forward on larger sites that may be brought forward in phases the local planning authority will seek to ensure that the masterplan is developed and agreed for the site. Proposals for significant development on sites occupied by major landowners/users will be permitted where they accord with the Development Plan and are consistent with a comprehensive and evidence based site wide masterplan which demonstrates how high quality design will be delivered for the whole site which has involved and engaged with stakeholders and interested. These should be agreed with the local planning authority and show how the wider implications or cumulative benefits of developing the site can be addressed.Any application for significant development on sites occupied by major landowners/users is preceded by, and is expected to achieve the following proportionate to the scale of the site and proposed development:•Strategic Policy D5 •Masterplan i.Include an indicative development layout and phasing and implementation plan;ii.Incorporate high standards of urban design and architecture that respects the character of the landscape, heritage, adjacent and nearby settlements and built development, reflecting the urban to rural transition with appropriate boundary treatment;iii.Make effective use of the site through the application of appropriate densities in terms of scale, height and massing, and its relationship to adjoining buildings and landscape;iv.Create a strong sense of place, ensuring the proposed development makes a positive contribution to local character and</p>	<p>Providing access to cultivatable land is not always appropriate, for instance in larger town centre sites.</p>

	distinctiveness;v.Plan for integrated development, providing for a mix of housing that addresses the range of local housing needs, and encourages community cohesion;vi.Reduce the need for car use and encourage sustainable modes of travel, including current provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways; (vii. Provide access to cultivateable land where gardens are not attached to properties.)	
--	---	--

Comments from other topics		
ANON-KSAR-NK1Z-N Shedfield Parish Council	Implementing these policies is dependent on resources and on knowledge of the location. Decisions should not override local opinion particularly when determined from afar. The availability of infrastructure and community facilities would garner more support for development if it were provided before housing.	Typically, infrastructure is provided when it is required and may not be welcomed by the service provider before then as it can be inefficient (eg school places before they are required).
ANON-KSAR-N8GX-P	What does 'including current provision for public transport' etc mean?	The reference to current provision is in recognition that it may not always be likely that public transport provision (eg frequency of services) will be increased as a result of development.
ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S	There is no clear evidence of how Policies D1 to D5 will be assessed for net zero or lowest minimal impacts on the Climate and Biodiversity crises. This includes optimal Nature-based solutions plus Local Nature Recovery Strategies.	The Plan should be read as a whole. These aspects are dealt with by relevant policies in the Climate Change and Natural Environment chapters.

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA	<p>5.79 The following recommendations for the policy text are included to help mitigate any negative effects and strengthen any positive effects identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Policy D5 could be further strengthened by including the approach for master plans at larger development schemes to 	It is important to read the LP as a whole as all of these issues are included in separate LP policies.

	support a more strategic approach to the preservation, enhancement and connecting of existing habitats and new provisions schemes might deliver. This approach would likely help to improve habitat connectivity in the area.	
Comments from HRA	None	

Strategic Policy D5 Masterplan

Amendments to policy

In the interests of sustainable development and good quality place-making in order to secure long term benefits for the district, when proposals come forward on larger sites that may be brought forward in phases the local planning authority will seek to ensure that ~~the~~ **a** masterplan is developed and agreed for the site.

Proposals for significant development on sites occupied by major landowners/users will be permitted where they accord with the Development Plan and are consistent with a comprehensive and evidence based site wide masterplan which demonstrates how high quality design will be delivered for the whole site which has involved and engaged with stakeholders and ~~interested~~ **communities**. These should be agreed with the local planning authority and show how the wider implications or cumulative benefits of developing the site can be addressed.

Any application for significant development on sites occupied by major landowners/users is **should be** preceded by, and is expected to achieve the following **objectives** proportionate to the scale of the site and proposed development:

- i. Include an indicative development layout and phasing and implementation plan;
- ii. Incorporate high standards of urban design and architecture that respects the character of the landscape, heritage, adjacent and nearby settlements and built development, reflecting the urban to rural transition with appropriate boundary treatment;
- iii. Make effective use of the site through the application of appropriate densities in terms of scale, height and massing, and its relationship to adjoining buildings and landscape;

- iv. Create a strong sense of place, ensuring the proposed development makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness;
- v. Plan for integrated development, providing for a mix of housing **types, sizes and tenures** that addresses the range of local housing needs, and encourages community cohesion;
- vi. Reduce the need for car use and encourage sustainable modes of travel, **and active travel infrastructure and facilities** ~~including current provision for public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways;~~ set out where appropriate in -
- **A street hierarchy and clear movement framework reflecting hierarchy of users,**
 - **A Transport Strategy for the masterplan that evidences how the development will achieve a high internalisation of trips and an ambitious active travel mode share,**
 - **A Parking and Servicing strategy that carefully consider levels of parking provision and how to discretely accommodate it in the public realm,**
 - **A Public Transport and mobility hub strategy that provides for timely delivery of new bus, public transport and mobility infrastructure.**
- vii. Create a **layout that encourages walking and cycling, with a clear** network of permeable and interconnected streets and high quality public realm that is well integrated into the surrounding area; **including current provision for access to public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways and other Public Rights of Way;**
- viii. Include measures to mitigate the traffic impacts of the proposed development on the strategic and local road networks;
- ix. Provide for timely delivery of physical infrastructure, including sewage connections and fibre optic broadband to accord with the agreed phasing of development and legal agreements;
- x. Provide for appropriate employment provision and community facilities to serve the new development (e.g. local shops, community halls, schools and health facilities);
- xi. Provide for accessible open space to meet identified local needs and/or increase accessibility to existing open spaces;
- xii. Incorporate a green infrastructure strategy, providing an integrated network of green spaces, taking advantage of opportunities for off-site links to the countryside, South Downs National Park where applicable and wider green network, and where necessary providing alternative recreational space to mitigate potential environmental impacts of development;

xiii. Provide appropriate measures to mitigate flood risk and ensure that the development is resilient to the potential impacts of climate change (Policy NE6);

xiv. Assess the potential for including renewable energy schemes (Policy CN5); and

xv. Demonstrate a good understanding and respect for the natural **and historic** environment, its ~~heritage~~ assets and their setting both within the site and in the wider locality, whether designated or not, and include details of how the natural environment and heritage assets will be preserved, conserved and enhanced.

A management plan must be produced as part of the master planning process to demonstrate how infrastructure and community assets will be maintained and managed following completion of development.

Additional Changes

Amend heading at top of pages 96 and 97 - replace “Market Towns and Rural Villages” with “Masterplans”

Add the following to glossary starting on page 541 –

Mobility Hub - A place where people can switch from one mode of transport to another, including community facilities such as cycle parking and cycle/ebike hire.