

Consultation comments on policy T4 – access for new developments

- Support - 20
- Neither support of object - 11
- Object – 8

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 policy T4 – access for new developments		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comments
ANON-KSAR-NKS3-G Bishops Waltham Parish Council	T4 Access for New Developments. Generally welcome the proposals within this policy but would request the inclusion of a review of speed limits where new developments are proposed to ensure that they are suitable and that any cumulative impact on the highway is considered	Comment noted Review of speed limits is not within the scope of the Local Plan. Recommended response: no change
ANON-KSAR-NKBD-G	In remembering those with reduced mobility please also think of those who use a car at night because it feels safer than walking, cycling or using public transport (which may not be available anyway)	Comment noted The policy does specifically state those people with reduced mobility Recommended response: no change

ANON-KSAR-NKZU-S	The policy is supported in accordance with development proposals at SH26.	<p>Comment noted and support welcomed</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKDW-5	The policy sets out a requirement for new or changes to existing accesses to development to support non-car modes of transport and to provide safe and attractive routes to, from and within a site. How a site is integrated with the local environment in terms of transport is a key issue. Littleton and Harestock Parish Council supports the policy. Support Policy T4	<p>Comment noted and support welcomed</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8YF-P	Plans for car pooling/clubs, access to public transport, should not only be in the planning stage, but ensuring it happens must be a priority	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Enforcement of the policy shall be carried out with the enforcement team and during the planning application stages.</p> <p>Recommended response:</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKXV-R	<p>As a community first responder, often first on scene before an ambulance to an emergency in our area, I find that the newer estates are extremely poor in terms of design for the emergency services with few areas to pull in and limited manoeuvring space for ambulances. I imagine fire services would be extremely hampered in the event of them needing access. I am not convinced that part iii of the policy gives sufficient regards to the needs of the emergency services and this requirement could be strengthened.</p> <p>Because these homes and estates are designed with insufficient space for parking, residents park on pavements and hamper access. Of course in an ideal world, we would like to reduce car usage - but in rural areas with poor provision of public transport, cars are regrettably an essential part of life.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Recommended response: strengthen criteria iii as below: Allows for access to, and movement within, the site in a safe, low speed -and effective manner, having regard to the amenities of occupiers of the site, and adjacent land and to the requirements of the emergency services and service providers, including turning facilities and</p>

		<u>manoeuvrability for emergency vehicles</u> as appropriate; and
ANON-KSAR-N8GX-P	Support the policy provided that my comments in T2 are taken into account.	Comment noted and support welcomed Recommended response: no change
ANON-KSAR-N856-2	The original proposed development by the parish council of floodlit 3G football pitches (which initially features a stand for 1000 spectators) at Mill Lane, Wickham, beyond the settlement boundary and accessed only by narrow lanes, would contravene this policy in many respects.	Unsure of how this is related to the Local Plan Recommended response: no change

Comments which neither support or object to policy T4 - access for new developments		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NKQ5-G Curdrige Parish Council	I would support the policy if you add a requirement for alternative access for emergency vehicles on developments of more than (say) 30 dwellings.	Comments noted Unfortunately this is outside of the remit of the Local Plan. Hampshire County Council Highways will comment on the need for emergency access during the planning applications stages. Recommended response: no change

ANON-KSAR-N8YM-W	BSP's approach to development accords with the principles of Policy T4, notably prioritising the needs of pedestrians and cyclists connecting both into and through development. This is reflected in the proposals at Fairthorne Grange, which will directly connect with and benefit from the new active movement corridor adjacent to Botley Road and the new Whiteley Way ensuring convenient access for both pedestrians and cyclists to the site.	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Promotion of a site</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKAB-D	<p>BSP's approach to development accords with the principles of Policy T4, notably prioritising the needs of pedestrians and cyclists connecting both into and through development.</p> <p>This is reflected in the proposals at Land North of Rareridge Lane, which will include pedestrian and cycle connections, within easy access of Bishop's Waltham town centre.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Promotion of a site</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>
ANON-KSAR-NK6N-E	We do not know what is legally possible, but we feel that the dead hand of the highways engineer does not augur well for good quality design. In iv), for example, "visibility splays" suggests the engineering of the space for cars rather than for people. Is there no room for compromise here? If the 15-minute place has been made more specific , as we suggest under T1, then i) does not need further qualification. If not, then i) needs to be bound specifically by the 15-minute neighbourhood criterion.	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Do agree with this but we can achieve 15 minute neighbourhoods in the district and also we can't ignore safety so don't think that the policy should be amended here.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N87J-R Micheldever Parish Council	We feel that is important to include the principle that any development should not significantly increase the through traffic on adjacent residential roads.	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>This can't be incorporated in the policy. This will be a consideration at DM stage when applications are received. Also allocations will</p>

		<p>be tested to make sure that there are no adverse impacts on the highways or if there are then they are adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8BF-Y	<p>Policy T4 should be amended so that access is designed to be appropriate for the type, scale and location of the development. It should clarify what exemptions apply, e.g. householder development and some changes of use.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Recommended response changes to policy T4 below: New development, <u>excluding householder applications</u>, will be permitted where it accords with the development plan and where it:</p> <p>Policy could not exclude changes of use though as many of them can be traffic generators.</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N86T-1 Hampshire County Council (Transport)	<p>P132 – Policy T4 – Access for New Developments T4 iv) The County Council supports this policy but would welcome specific reference to Hampshire County Council Highway Technical Guidance Notes and need to comply with them. Technical guidance notes and Manual for Streets Hampshire County Council (hants.gov.uk) The County Council would welcome additional text referencing the requirement for sites that are likely to generate large numbers of HGV movements needing to be in reasonable proximity to Major Road Network or the Strategic Road Network.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Recommended response: additional wording New para under 6.37 Hampshire County Council have produced technical guidance notes and Manual for Streets Hampshire. These detail what the adoptable standards are within Hampshire. These</p>

		<p>documents form part of the framework of the material use policy and commuted sum policy. This aims to ensure appropriate use of materials and minimising long term maintenance costs. The guidance informs developers of what Hampshire County Council will accept on the highway network early in the design proposal stage.</p> <p>New criteria v Any sites that are likely to generate large numbers of HGV movements need to be in reasonable proximity to Major Road Network or the Strategic Road Network.</p>
--	--	---

Comments which object to policy T4 - access for new developments		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
ANON-KSAR-NK2Z-P	I feel there is inadequate acceptance of the current traffic bottlenecks approaching and leaving the city at rush hours or an acknowledgement that any increase in planned private car use would blight resident's lives and air quality for pedestrians and cyclists	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Air quality and capacity of roads and junctions is covered in the TA and will also be</p>

		<p>covered in the next iteration of the TA.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NKZK-F</p>	<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 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. 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. 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. Through</p>	<p>Comments noted</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>To include equestrians in the policy is too specific.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>

	<p>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 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.'</p>	
ANON-KSAR-NKJV-A	<p>Bloor Homes supports the need to provide for access for pedestrians, cyclists and those with mobility issues and have sought to accommodate these users, as far as possible, within the masterplan at Mill Lane, Wickham. The site is located in proximity to a network of public rights of way, including footpaths and cycle paths that provide access into the South Downs National Park.</p>	<p>Comment noted and support welcomed</p> <p>Promotion of site</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8GD-2	<p>While I support the policy, I think it could go further. All sites should be built to be permeable for Pedestrians, Cyclists and motability scooters. There should be dropped kerbs conveniently placed so that those on wheels can easily pass through. The routing should link to existing or planned future cycle routes. e.g. in Kings Worthy, the proposed site for development could link to the proposed cycle route from the cart & Horses junction towards Winnall. If the permeability link goes outside the site through to a path that is limited to pedestrian access only, the path within the site should still be specified as being a shared path for Walkers, Cyclists and motability scooters.</p>	<p>Comment noted and support welcomed</p> <p>Recommended response: Addition to criteria ii: <u>including the provision of dropped kerbs at appropriate locations</u></p>

ANON-KSAR-N81F-E	<p>Bargate Homes' approach to development accords with the principles of Policy T4, notably prioritising the needs of pedestrians and cyclists connecting both into and through the development.</p> <p>The site benefits from good links to the surrounding road network and would have direct access on to Stockbridge Road that leads to the city centre and Winchester rail station. A crossing at Stockbridge Road will be provided, as well as a walking link through to Salter's Lane enabling pedestrians to access Winchester without having to cross Harestock Road.</p> <p>Bargate Homes however consider that the policy wording should be amended so that access is designed to be appropriate for the type, scale and location of the development. It should clarify what exemptions apply, e.g. householder development and some changes of use. There is also no need to refer to compliance with the rest of the development plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Promoting a site near Stockbridge Road</p> <p>The policy allows for this</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>

<p>ANON-KSAR-N8GA-Y</p> <p>WINNAC</p>	<p>New development will be permitted where it accords with the development plan and where it:</p> <p>i. Prioritises Ranks the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, people with reduced mobility above all other needs, including safe and attractive routes to, and from all essential facilities within a 20 minute walk and within the site, which They should connect to all existing Public Rights of Way networks within half a mile outside the site boundary and and the nearest all public transport stops within 15-minute's walk of any dwelling, minimising the scope for conflicts between all users and compliant with TfL planning for walking toolkit and https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120: Within the site, dedicated main active transport routes for disability scooters / cycling and walking shall be provided to provide unmediated direct access to / from every dwelling. Dedicated infrastructure for each mode should be provided for a distance of at least 0.12 linear miles of (a) disability scooter / cycling and, (b) walking infrastructure per hectare of development or more if the design means that access to each dwelling makes this necessary. [This ratio is based on the length of the segregated networks that would be necessary (6 / miles each) to serve the current distribution of dwellings and shops at Badger Farm (approximately 49 hectares)]</p> <p>ii. Addresses the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;</p> <p>iii. Allows for access to, and movement within, the site in a safe and effective manner, having regard to the amenities of occupiers of the site and adjacent land and to the requirements of the emergency services and service providers, including turning facilities as appropriate; and</p> <p>iv. Makes provision for access to the site in accordance with any highway requirements on the grounds of safety, including the provision of gateways, visibility splays, access to adopted highways and accompanying signage that may be required.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>No evidence for development having to be within 15 minutes of any transport stop. This would not be achievable across the district in rural areas</p> <p>Cannot apply over the whole district, 15 minute neighbourhoods is a concept and this will unfortunately not be achievable in rural areas within the district.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N8BD-W</p>	<p>Policy T4 - Access for New Developments</p> <p>Objections and comments</p> <p>In larger developments where shops and other facilities are being provided or where existing facilities are accessible by active travel, the policy should include active travel routes to both of these.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>The policy allows for this</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p>

BHLF-KSAR-N86N-U	Policy T4 should be amended so that access is designed to be appropriate for the type, scale and location of the development. It should clarify what exemptions apply, e.g. householder development and some changes of use. There is no need to refer to compliance with the rest of the development plan.	Comments noted The policy allows for this Recommended response: no change
ANON-KSAR-NKSU-J	I would like to strengthen the policy by adding a new bullet to the policy after iii: "On new developments, designing for 20 mph or lower speed limits by default on residential roads"	Comment noted Recommended response: wording of policy has been amended could be amended to include reference to low speed travel.

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA/HRA	No recommendations provided	N/A

Amendments to policy T4

New development, **excluding householder applications**, will be permitted where it accords with the development plan and where it:

- i. Prioritises the needs of **walking, wheeling and cycling** ~~pedestrians, cyclists, people with reduced mobility, including (as set out in LTN 1/20)~~ safe and attractive routes to, from and within the site which connect to existing Public Rights of Way network outside the site boundary and the nearest public transport stop, minimising the scope for conflicts between all users;
- ii. Addresses the needs of people with disabilities, **children** and **those with** reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; **including the provision of level access at appropriate locations**

- iii. Allows for access to, and movement within, the site in a safe, **low speed** and effective manner, having regard to the amenities of occupiers of the site, and adjacent land and to the requirements of the emergency services and service providers, including turning facilities **and manoeuvrability for emergency vehicles** as appropriate **in accordance with the most current guidance**; and
- iv. Makes provision for access to the site in accordance with any highway requirements on the grounds of safety, including the provision of gateways, visibility splays, access to adopted highways and accompanying signage that may be required.
- v. **Any sites that are likely to generate large numbers of HGV movements need to be in reasonable proximity and accessible to Major Road Network or the Strategic Road Network.**

New para under 6.37

6.37 Any new or amended site access must in accordance with any highway requirements on the grounds of safety, including the provision of gateways, visibility splays, access to adopted highways and accompanying signage that may be required. This is essential for the safety of all users.

Hampshire County Council have produced technical guidance notes and Manual for Streets Hampshire. They can be accessed here: [Technical guidance notes | Hampshire County Council \(hants.gov.uk\)](https://www.hants.gov.uk/technical-guidance-notes) These detail what the adoptable standards are within Hampshire. These documents form part of the framework of the material use policy and commuted sum policy. This aims to ensure appropriate use of materials and minimising long term maintenance costs. The guidance informs developers of what Hampshire County Council will accept on the highway network early in the design proposal stage.