

Missing policy - Sustainable transport and active travel

Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
<a href="#">ANON-KSAR-N8QS-U</a>	<p>There is no Infrastructure Delivery Plan or clear articulation of policy across the plan area, or for specific allocations, that demonstrates how a substantially greater use of sustainable modes will be facilitated by the plan. This seriously prejudices achieving many of the plan's strategic objectives with respect to carbon mitigation and transport in particular.</p> <p>We consider that significant further work need to be done to ensure that the Evidence Base is properly and demonstrably able to establish the factors that should be steering the spatial strategy as well as site identification. At this stage, Stagecoach considers that the suite of documents obscures more than it reveals in terms of the opportunities for public transport and active travel. As such, it appears to be intended to justify a pre-existing strategy that has little if any regard to directing patterns of development in pursuit of the objectives in paragraphs 103-105 of NPPF.</p> <p>This is still the more important if significant additional development need to be identified to meet the need of the adjoining authorities within PfSH to the south, which we believe is highly likely. With the exception of the rail line between Eastleigh and Fareham, which does not well serve existing settlements across the south of the District, there is very scant public transport provision. As it is, even before any consideration is made of the</p>	<p>A draft IDP has been published on the website and this will be updated before the LP examination.</p> <p>The transport policies in the Local Plan have been assessed and have now incorporated changes recommended by Active Travel England and HCC Highways.</p> <p>Public transport provision is not within the control of the city council and we would hope that Stagecoach would work closely with HCC Highways to improve public transport provision in light of the proposals that have been included in the Local Plan. The LP has strengthened the need for new development to consider as part of the Design Process the role and the importance of planning for public transport provision</p>

	<p>longer-term development needs of PfSH in the plan area, high levels of committed development in Winchester and adjoining parts of Eastleigh Borough and Fareham justify an radical uplift in bus service provision, including bus priority, across a broad belt stretching from Winchester south to Eastleigh and Hedge End; and south east towards Fareham. This is likely to start to suggest ways in which consolidation of the pattern of development could lead to further radical improvements in public transport connectivity and attractiveness.</p> <p>However, thus far, there is no clear alignment with Draft LTP4, or any other supporting sustainable transport strategies. The evidence base of the plan needs to tie in to these, and also both inform and be informed by the Hampshire Bus Service Improvement Plan. This would then properly inform an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), and policies that will be require to secure appropriate developer funding for investments needed to support specific allocations as well as the plan strategy as a whole.</p>	<p>and making this an attractive option as part of the design of the development.</p> <p>The wording of the policies in the Reg 19 LP has now been updated in light of recommendations from HCC Transport now that LTP4 has been adopted by HCC and recommendations from Active Travel England. If there are specific improvements or plans for any upgrades to the public provision please can you make sure that you submit these as part of your Regulation 19 consultation response so that we can incorporate them into the IDP.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No Change</p>
<p><a href="#">ANON-KSAR-N856-2</a></p>	<p>This section of the policy deals with development of sustainable transport and active travel in the future ONLY, which enables it to be tied in with other policies in the Local Plan on climate change, housing etc.</p> <p>However - there are CURRENTLY urgent issues with congested and dangerous roads and lanes which are not mentioned. I appreciate that these come under HCC, but the two bodies need to liaise to solve these</p>	<p>Points noted. A Strategic Transport Assessment is available on the LP website which has been prepared in consultation with HCC Highways and National Highways. This has considered and assessed the impact of proposed site allocations and the mitigation that would be required to bring forward the sites in the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No Change</p>

	<p>problems.</p> <p>I live in Wickham at the junction of two major roads, A32 &amp; A334 which are both dangerous and congested at times. The future growth of Wickham (200 houses), Knowle (200 houses) and Welborne 2 miles south (6000 houses) will far exceed the capacity of these roads to cope and will greatly reduce the quality of life and road safety will increase the levels of noise and air pollution in Wickham.</p> <p>I would welcome your comments on this urgent issue.</p>	
<p><a href="#">BHLF-KSAR-N8TT-Y</a></p>	<p>Omissions: transport. About a third of carbon emissions come from travelling. The draft plan makes heroic assumptions about how the travel demands from new development will be managed but is generally silent on the travel desires from existing development. This is a common theme in the Plan with its emphasis on controlling the new. At the end of the Plan period the majority of development will be what we can see today: new development will only be a small incremental addition. So why is the plan virtually silent about managing development and change in these areas?</p> <p>The public's love affair with the private car and the freedom it provides will only be cooled when they begin to realise the economic costs involved. Why should are public highways, paths and verges provide free parking. Where are the policies covering traffic management in existing urban areas?</p> <p>The authors of the Local Plan are obviously well versed in drafting policies. Many though are very wordy to the</p>	<p>See above comments.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No Change</p>

	extent that it is sometimes not easy to envisage what spatial outcomes are being targeted.	
<a href="#">ANON-KSAR-NKQ5-G</a>	<p>Provision of parking in rural developments.</p> <p>Many workers in rural areas use a van or pickup for their work, and use it rather than a separate car to travel from home. This means that parking provision needs to be adequate for some vehicles larger than a private car.</p> <p>This could be covered by an addition to policy T2, as it is a general issue that cannot be dealt with on a case-by-case basis (developers are unlikely to request this without a policy, as it requires them to dedicate more land on such sites).</p>	<p>Points noted. A key change with the policies in this LP is that we want developers to consider the need for car parking as part of the Design Process. This information will need to accompany a planning application and will vary on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No Change</p>

Move from other comments

<a href="#">ANON-KSAR-NKUQ-G</a>	<p>The plan is good but is not bold enough in recognising the urgency of the climate emergency. For instance there seems to be little on taking traffic out of the city.</p> <p>Section 5.5-5.61 provides plan diagrams which are incomprehensible without keys which is a big problem.</p> <p>The plan and the consultation are incompatible. I have the plan up on screen and find it nigh on impossible to navigate back to be in line the structure of the consultation document structure. I read the document and took notes by paragraph re many comments only to find that on the consultation I am asked to comment by heading and subheadings. For example, if I want to</p>	<p>Points noted. The Reg 19 LP does include a number of policies on the climate emergency and how this key issue needs to be considered as part of Design Process.</p> <p>The consultation has been designed so that you can review the text on the screen before you comment on a policy. You can also view hard copy of the Reg 19 Local Plan at the deposit points if you don't want to look at a screen.</p> <p><b>Recommended Response:</b> No Change</p>
----------------------------------	--	--

	<p>comment on para 5.5 I can't using the consultation document other than make this comment in this current section on what is missing. I suggest that the consultation should be ended and rescheduled until such time as the plan can be commented upon using the paragraph headings which is surely the standard practice in these matters.</p>	
--	--	--