

Details of Representations Received to the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Reg19) January 2025

Sustainable Transport and Active Travel

This document has been prepared to provide details of the representations received to the Proposed Submission Plan and the Council's response. It draws upon information contained within the submitted documents SD07b [Regulation 22 Statement of Consultation Part 2 \(November 2024\)](#) and SD16 [Regulation 20 representations \(November 2024\)](#). It is not considered that this document contains information which is substantially different to that set out within those submitted documents, but it has been prepared to assist in navigating and considering the representations received and Council Response.

For each plan policy or associated document, it sets out some key information from the regulation 22 statement regarding the number of representations received, representation numbers, an overall summary of responses made, and a list of the main issues raised by the representations. It then contains all of the representations recorded against that Plan policy or document, along with links to supporting documents. Finally, it sets out the Council's response to the representations made for that Plan policy or document, and any changes the Council now recommends are made to the Plan policy or document, alongside any other relevant information.

Local Plan Reference or document	Policy T1 Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel	
Total Number of Representations received	38	
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	Yes	No
Legally Compliant	27	3
Sound	17	15
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	24	3
<p>Summary of Representations General support for the aim to reduce car dependency and promote active travel.</p> <p>Representations refer to the inconsistencies with national guidelines and inadequate references to cycling and walking infrastructure and ambiguous/vague policy language with the need for more specific and measurable policies to meet carbon targets.</p> <p>Concern that the concept of the 20-minute neighbourhood is not consistently applied across the plan in relation to site selection and nor is this applicable to the more rural areas of the district. There is support for co-locating homes with employment to reduce travel but concerns over inconsistent site selection and the spatial strategy that has been taken forward in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Many comments refer to the fact that given the rural nature of the district, there will still be a reliance on car use and for this to change there needs to be substantial investment in public transport infrastructure.</p>		
<p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BYS-T/1/T1 ANON-AQTS-3B8J-G/1/T1 ANON-AQTS-3BJD-V/5/T1 ANON-AQTS-3BPF-4/1/T1 ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T/63/T1 ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/37/T1 ANON-AQTS-32GC-8/10/T1 ANON-AQTS-32GG-C/9/T1 ANON-AQTS-32NS-Y/8/T1 ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/30/T1 ANON-AQTS-32UU-8/6/T1 ANON-AQTS-32G7-V/12/T1 ANON-AQTS-3BQA-Z/17/T1 ANON-AQTS-32TV-8/1/T1 ANON-AQTS-3BX4-T/10/T1</p>		

ANON-AQTS-32FT-R - New Alresford Town Council/8/T1

ANON-AQTS-32F2-P/3/T1

ANON-AQTS-32TW-9/6/T1

ANON-AQTS-32F7-U/1/T1

ANON-AQTS-32ND-G/2/T1

ANON-AQTS-32Z2-A/3/T1

ANON-AQTS-322X-8 - Upham Parish Council/2/T1

ANON-AQTS-32Z7-F - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/15/T1

ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/10/T1

BHLF-AQTS-3265-9 - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/15/T1

BHLF-AQTS-326U-9 - Active Travel England/1/T1

BHLF-AQTS-32YH-Y - Network Rail/4/T1

BHLF-AQTS-328Y-F/9/T1

BHLF-AQTS-3289-F/5/T1

BHLF-AQTS-3288-E/5/T1

BHLF-AQTS-328Q-7/13/T1

BHLF-AQTS-328X-E/14/T1

BHLF-AQTS-3286-C/15/T1

BHLF-AQTS-3284-A/11/T1

BHLF-AQTS-328G-W/14/T1

BHLF-AQTS-328N-4/2/T1

BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/15/T1

BHLF-AQTS-32QF-N - National Highways/3/T1

Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation

- Application of 20 minute neighbourhoods in a rural district and its use in site selection;
- Continued/unavoidable reliance on the private car given lack of alternatives in rural areas;
- inadequate references to cycling and walking infrastructure; and
- policy needs clarity to avoid ambiguous/vague language to be able to be applied consistently.

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	martin larcombe
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BYS-T
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BYS-T/1/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	I think the idea to close the Andover Road and divert traffic through Abbots Barton is obviously wrong
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	charles crossley
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8J-G
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8J-G/1/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>This is a very vague set of word, full of what can be called "buzzword expressions". It has a few problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. there seems no consideration of areas outside Winchester (thanks for forgetting us). 2. the need for updates to the road infrastructure to cope with all these new developments must be considered and studied. In this instance the planners must look at the number of developments on the Winchester Road from Wickham to Winchester via Bishops Waltham, Colden Common and Twyford. There has been a substantial number of new dwellings built in the last 5 years, with a similar number scheduled for the next 5 years. I cannot cross that road in Bishops Waltham using a zebra crossing. The level of traffic is increasing as people move about for work. It won't decrease as claimed in this document, simply because the number of people on the route is increasing. So at least consider road safety along the whole route. It should be a developers requirement to pay for the new crossings.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>Edit this to:</p> <p>vii. New accesses and intensified use of existing accesses onto the road network that can demonstrate that they will not result in reduced highway safety or significant congestion/delays; With the provision of crossings where necessary to enable pedestrian, disabled and cyclist access.</p>
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	<p>Edit this to:</p> <p>vii. New accesses and intensified use of existing accesses onto the road network that can demonstrate that they will not result in reduced highway safety or significant congestion/delays; With the provision of crossings where necessary to enable pedestrian, disabled and cyclist access.</p>
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information?	No

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Christine Gardner
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BJD-V
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BJD-V/5/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	T1 v "encourages those with reduced mobility to use more sustainable forms of transport". Many old & disabled people cannot cycle or walk long distances or even wait long periods for a bus. They need to be brought to Winchester in private cars, which then need parking space. Don't take away Winchester car parks, especially Cattle Market & St Peter's. NOTE 6.37: "Private car parking for such will be supported", but how, if you stop private cars in the city, or price them out?
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Have a form of blue badge system for over-75s. Keep the Winchester car parks & don't overprice them. Many old people come into Winchester for the many facilities and social clubs in private cars/minibuses, e.g. to Parchment Street, Swan Lane and Jewry Street. Don't stop them. 12.34 suggests a "Quiet Way" along Swan Lane, but cars must still be allowed for residents, the funeral parlour & the Baptist church hall where many activities for the old & disabled take place every week.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Stress 6.37 to support firmly the needs of the old, & those with reduced mobility. Many old people are not disabled enough to need a blue badge, but still need help to come to Winchester as they can't cycle or walk long distances, or even wait long periods for a bus. Allow private cars and parking for them with no penalty.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	No

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Sylvia Ann Bailey
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BPF-4
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BPF-4/1/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	Once the plan has been finalised and passed . That's with all interested parties in agreement. There should be no late objections or diluting of the plan.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Rob Edgecock
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T/63/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	Cars still have a large carbon footprint, so it is essential that transport has a high priority in any developments undertaken.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Debbie Harding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/37/T1
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	<p>T1 i - Referring to policy SP2, existing residents and residents of the sites allocated in this plan do not have a genuine choice of sustainable and active travel modes of travel.</p> <p>T1 - ii, development in Colden Common will not reduce reduce number of trips made by private motor vehicles</p> <p>T1 - iv, Sustainable and active travel incorporated in the layout of sites allocated to Colden Common will lead to nowhere once they leave the site, as Colden Common has poor bus provision and no cycle paths to either Winchester or Eastleigh which is the nearest Towns.</p> <p>T1 vii - S106 payments to reduce the impact of the last development in Colden Common were paid to Hampshire County Council in 2017 and still have not resulted in any transport improvements in Colden Common to reduce the effects of the development. Highlighted congestion and traffic caused by the previous local plan has still not be addressed. This makes further development unsound.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>SP2 allocations in Colden Common does not align with policy T1.</p> <p>The Parish Council supports the Policy, however, in order to make the plan sound it needs sustainable transport to make it work and that means investment in sustainable transport (buses).</p>
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information?	No

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Mandy Owen (Boyer) on behalf of Vistry Partnerships
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32GC-8
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32GC-8/10/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>Vistry Partnerships support this Draft Policy T1 and the inclusion of the 20-minute neighbourhood concept. The concept of a 20-minute neighbourhood is very interesting in promoting sustainable travel as it ensures new developments are located in sustainable locations close to existing infrastructure. In itself, this encourages new and sustainable communities which will help towards achieving the Council's overall vision and targets.</p> <p>The 20-minute neighbourhood concept is vital in ensuring low carbon development. Given the prevailing rural nature of Winchester District, the 20-minute neighbourhood is not directly applicable for the majority of the Winchester urban area. Priority should therefore be given to those sites which meet the 20-minute neighbourhood concept in terms of site assessment.</p> <p>Indeed, the concept of the 20-minute neighbourhood is fundamental in the context of promoting sustainable transport when undertaking site selection decisions. However, there is no evidence, either within the draft Local Plan or the Development Strategy and Site Selection document that the location of the sites in terms of the 20-minute neighbourhood concept has been considered. This omission is disappointing. Vistry Partnerships consider this should be an important, and evidenced, consideration in the site selection process. Land at Pitt Vale, Winchester and the 20-minute Neighbourhood Concept</p> <p>Land at Pitt Vale, Winchester is controlled by Vistry Partnerships and is a good example of a site which can exhibit the features of, and support delivery of a 20-minute neighbourhood.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>The emphasis on the Climate Emergency and the 20-minute neighbourhood is, in principle, fully supported by Vistry Partnerships. However, the 20-minute neighbourhood is being undermined when it appears not to have been considered as part of the site selection process evidence.</p> <p>The site selection process should take into account the 20-minute neighbourhood concept otherwise achieving the content of draft Policy T1 is likely to be undermined in practice.</p>
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Vistry Partnerships has no specific changes to the wording of the policy but rather seek to ensure the content of the Policy is entrenched throughout the Local Plan and its supporting evidence base.

<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base - includes tables) Supporting document 1 (Affordable Housing Statement) Supporting document 2 (Vision Document 1 - Pitt Vale) Supporting document 3 (Vision Document 2) Supporting document 4 (Landscape and Visual Technical Note) Supporting document 5 (Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Report)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Mark Behrendt
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32GG-C
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32GG-C/9/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	Part ii requires development to be in compliance with Hampshire Movement and Place Framework. The Council should not be conferring the status of a local plan policy on other guidance that is established outside of the plan making system. The policy should be amended so that development has regard to the Hampshire Movement and Place Framework.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (copy of form - refers to letter) Letter (Commenting on policies and evidence base)

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Catesby Estates
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32NS-Y
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32NS-Y/8/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Catesby supports Draft Policy T1 and the reference to the '20-minute neighbourhood' concept. More broadly, promoting walkability and sustainable access to local services is consistent with the Plan's strategy for reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>However, Catesby is concerned that the 20-minute neighbourhood concept is not consistently applied in the Plan. In this regard, Land South of Titchfield Lane is approximately 10 minutes' walk from the centre of Wickham. Yet, Land South of Titchfield Lane was not even shortlisted for further consideration.</p> <p>As noted in our response to policies SP2 and H3, the spatial and distributional strategy needs to be revisited alongside the proposed housing requirement in Policy H1. Additional sites should be allocated throughout the settlement hierarchy but consistent with 20-minute neighbourhood principles. Wickham is a sustainable 'Larger Rural Settlement', as set out in the proposed settlement hierarchy and is the fifth most sustainable settlement in the Plan Area (as indicated in the Settlement Hierarchy Review 2024). The settlement can accommodate additional development sites, not least Land South of Titchfield Lane (site ref WI19).</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Catesby supports the 20-minute neighbourhood concept and the general emphasis on sustainable and active travel. However, there is inconsistency in how this has been applied through site selection, and, in any case, there is a clear need for additional allocations to future-proof the Plan.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Catesby seeks no specific amendments to the text of Policy T1.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information?	Yes Supporting document 1 (Location Plan - Land off Titchfield Lane, Wickham)

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

[Supporting document 2 \(Vision Framework\)](#)

[Supporting document 3 \(Concept Plan\)](#)

[Supporting document 4 \(Integrated Impact Assessment comments\)](#)

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Bloor Homes Limited (River Reach, Unit 7 Newbury Business Park, London Road, Newbury, Berkshire, RG14 2PS)
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Q-8
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/30/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>In order to ensure consistency with the NPPG, the use of the standard terms of Transport Assessment and Transport Statement should be used rather than 'Travel Assessment.' This also applies to the standard thresholds for when the different levels of assessment are required. Only where there is a significant increase in travel should this information be requested.</p> <p>Bloor Homes recognises and supports the need for new proposed development to promote sustainable and active travel modes and minimise the need for car use. Furthermore, the application of 20-minute neighbourhoods within Policy T1 is also acknowledged to be an important design principle to guide development coming forward in the district.</p> <p>The draft allocation under Policy WK5, Land at Mill Lane, Wickham is conveniently located within a 15-minute walking distance of the market square which features essential amenities such as retail facilities, a local primary school, a health centre, a community centre and playing fields. This accessibility aligns with and even exceeds the ambition for 20-minute neighbourhoods. Additionally, the market square provides regular bus services to Winchester and Fareham, enhancing connectivity. It is therefore ideally placed to provide opportunities for sustainable and active travel.</p> <p>Given these factors, we would argue that the local plan should consider allocating additional housing at this site beyond the current draft allocation of 40 units. Specifically, we propose that Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which is part of the original masterplan previously promoted, is included in the draft allocation. This would increase the total number of houses delivered on the site from 40 to around 100 and would assist in further maximising the accessibility and sustainability potential of the site.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>In order to ensure consistency with the NPPG, the use of the standard terms of Transport Assessment and Transport Statement should be used rather than 'Travel Assessment.' This also applies to the standard thresholds for when the different levels of assessment are required. Only where there is a significant increase in travel should this information be requested.</p> <p>Bloor Homes recognises and supports the need for new proposed development to promote sustainable and active travel modes and minimise the need for car use. Furthermore, the application of 20-minute neighbourhoods within Policy T1 is also acknowledged to be an important design principle to guide development coming forward in the district.</p>

	<p>The draft allocation under Policy WK5, Land at Mill Lane, Wickham is conveniently located within a 15-minute walking distance of the market square which features essential amenities such as retail facilities, a local primary school, a health centre, a community centre and playing fields. This accessibility aligns with and even exceeds the ambition for 20-minute neighbourhoods. Additionally, the market square provides regular bus services to Winchester and Fareham, enhancing connectivity. It is therefore ideally placed to provide opportunities for sustainable and active travel.</p> <p>Given these factors, we would argue that the local plan should consider allocating additional housing at this site beyond the current draft allocation of 40 units. Specifically, we propose that Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which is part of the original masterplan previously promoted, is included in the draft allocation. This would increase the total number of houses delivered on the site from 40 to around 100 and would assist in further maximising the accessibility and sustainability potential of the site.</p>
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	<p>In order to ensure consistency with the NPPG, the use of the standard terms of Transport Assessment and Transport Statement should be used rather than 'Travel Assessment.' This also applies to the standard thresholds for when the different levels of assessment are required. Only where there is a significant increase in travel should this information be requested.</p> <p>Bloor Homes recognises and supports the need for new proposed development to promote sustainable and active travel modes and minimise the need for car use. Furthermore, the application of 20-minute neighbourhoods within Policy T1 is also acknowledged to be an important design principle to guide development coming forward in the district.</p> <p>The draft allocation under Policy WK5, Land at Mill Lane, Wickham is conveniently located within a 15-minute walking distance of the market square which features essential amenities such as retail facilities, a local primary school, a health centre, a community centre and playing fields. This accessibility aligns with and even exceeds the ambition for 20-minute neighbourhoods. Additionally, the market square provides regular bus services to Winchester and Fareham, enhancing connectivity. It is therefore ideally placed to provide opportunities for sustainable and active travel.</p> <p>Given these factors, we would argue that the local plan should consider allocating additional housing at this site beyond the current draft allocation of 40 units. Specifically, we propose that Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which is part of the original masterplan previously promoted, is included in the draft allocation. This would increase the total number of houses delivered on the site from 40 to around 100 and would assist in further maximising the accessibility and sustainability potential of the site.</p>
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>

<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Letter (commenting on policies, policies map and evidence base) Vision document (Land At Mill Lane, Wickham)</p>
---	---

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Crest Nicholson Partnerships and Strategic Land
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32UU-8
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32UU-8/6/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>[Please see formatted submission sent by email - tracked changes cannot be shown in Citizenspace or in this Excel spreadsheet)</p> <p>Crest Nicholson recognises the need to provide a genuine choice of sustainable and active transport options that reduce the impacts of climate change and improve community health and wellbeing. As such, Crest Nicholson supports the considerations of Strategic Policy T1 and note the inherent opportunity for the sustainable development of the remaining land at the North Whiteley MDA. The land is adjacent to Cornerstone Primary School and is in close proximity to the services and facilities provided in the wider urban extension as well as those in the district centre to the south of the site.</p> <p>As outlined in the Design and Access Statement which will support the planning application, the development of this site will accord with the objectives of Paragraph 110 of the Framework through the connection of pedestrian and cycleways to the existing urban extension development to encourage future residents to use active travel options and assist the Council in reducing the impacts of climate change and improving health and wellbeing.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	No changes.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	No changes.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session

<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>Supporting document 1 (commenting on policies and evidence base)</u><u>Supporting document 2 (Policy SP1 comments)</u><u>Supporting document 3 (Policy CN1 comments)</u><u>Supporting document 4 (Policy CN3 comments)</u><u>Supporting document 5 (Policy D1 comments)</u><u>Supporting document 6 (Policy D3 comments)</u><u>Supporting document 7 (Policy T1 comments)</u><u>Supporting document 8 (Policy NE5 comments)</u><u>Supporting document 9 (Policy H5 comments)</u><u>Supporting document 10 (Policy SH2 comments)</u><u>Supporting document 11 (Integrated Assessment (Sustainability Appraisal))</u>
---	---

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32G7-V
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32G7-V/12/T1
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	<p>Bargate Homes recognise and support the need for new proposed development to promote sustainable and active travel modes and minimise the need for car use. Furthermore, the amendment to the policy from 15 minute neighbourhoods to 20 minute neighbourhoods is welcomed.</p> <p>We would like to reiterate that to ensure consistency with the NPPG, the use of the standard terms of Transport Assessment and Transport Statement should be used rather than 'Travel Assessment.' This also applies to the standard thresholds for when the different levels of assessment are required. Only where there is a significant increase in travel should this information be requested.</p> <p>The opportunity at Salters Lane is considered closely aligned with the principles set out in Policy T1. The site is well placed to form part of the 20 minute neighbourhood model, benefitting from good public transport accessibility with bus services to the centre of Winchester within a short walking distance on Stockbridge Road and Winchester Train Station. Furthermore, the site is within close proximity to a number of shops and services at the Stoney Lane local centre.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Clarification on the differentiation of a transport assessment and statement, and when these are required for certain types and scales of development.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Clarification on the differentiation of a transport assessment and statement, and when these are required for certain types and scales of development.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information?	No

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Abigail Heath (Savills UK LTD) on behalf of Bloor Homes
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BQA-Z
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BQA-Z/17/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>PLEASE REFER TO PROVIDED REPRESENTATIONS TITLED – 131024 MANOR PARKS REGULATION 19 WCC CONSULTATION REPRESENTATION [FINAL] AND EXTRACTED TEXT BELOW.</p> <p>Bloor supports the location of development in the most sustainable locations with the greatest opportunities for active and low carbon travel and delivery of 20-minute neighbourhoods. Noting this, Bloor do not consider that the spatial strategy and subsequent allocations in the R19 LP as drafted meet this ambition, bringing question to the plan's soundness. Comments regarding the spatial strategy are set out in Section 4. Manor Parks offers an optimal opportunity for WCC to deliver a site with these credentials as per the information provided at Section 5 to ensure that the R19 LP can be deemed sound. See Appendix 3 for further detail. The flawed and incomplete assessment process undermines the Plan's sustainability claims and casts doubt on its alignment with its own emerging policies and Plan objectives, but also of national policy and net-zero objectives. These issues go to the heart of soundness and significant further evidence is required – and potential refinement of the strategy – are needed to resolve the weakness. Bloor express that the highway modelling evidence identifies increased park & ride demand occurring in the southern part of Winchester Town which is of the same order of magnitude as anticipated in the northern part of the town. However, whilst the patronage changes in the northern part of the town will be accommodated (and indeed created) by a proposed new park & ride facility to be delivered as part of the Sir John Moore Barracks allocation, no new infrastructure has been identified to accommodate the change in demand in the southern part of the town. This is considered to be inappropriate, as highway modelling evidence identifies increased park & ride demand occurring in the southern part of Winchester Town which is of the same order of magnitude as anticipated in the northern part of the town. However, whilst the patronage changes in the northern part of the town will be accommodated (and indeed created) by a proposed new park & ride facility to be delivered as part of the Sir John Moore Barracks allocation, no new infrastructure has been identified to accommodate the change in demand in the southern part of the town. Further justification for this need is set out in Appendix 3. Bloor propose that propose that Manor Parks is the optimal location to facilitate this required park and ride as set out in Section 5.</p>

	<p>Based on the above, Bloor do not consider that policies T1 Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel, SP2 Spatial Strategy and Development Principles and H1 Housing Provision can be deemed sound. Bloor therefore object to these policies. As above, further justification for Bloor’s objection to SP2 and H1 is provided at Section 4.</p>
<p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p>	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response PLEASE REFER TO PROVIDED REPRESENTATIONS TITLED – 131024 MANOR PARKS REGULATION 19 WCC CONSULTATION REPRESENTATION [FINAL] AND EXTRACTED TEXT BELOW.</p> <p>Bloor supports the location of development in the most sustainable locations with the greatest opportunities for active and low carbon travel and delivery of 20-minute neighbourhoods. Noting this, Bloor do not consider that the spatial strategy and subsequent allocations in the R19 LP as drafted meet this ambition, bringing question to the plan’s soundness. Comments regarding the spatial strategy are set out in Section 4. Manor Parks offers an optimal opportunity for WCC to deliver a site with these credentials as per the information provided at Section 5 to ensure that the R19 LP can be deemed sound. See Appendix 3 for further detail. The flawed and incomplete assessment process undermines the Plan’s sustainability claims and casts doubt on its alignment with its own emerging policies and Plan objectives, but also of national policy and net-zero objectives. These issues go to the heart of soundness and significant further evidence is required – and potential refinement of the strategy – are needed to resolve the weakness. Bloor express that the highway modelling evidence identifies increased park & ride demand occurring in the southern part of Winchester Town which is of the same order of magnitude as anticipated in the northern part of the town. However, whilst the patronage changes in the northern part of the town will be accommodated (and indeed created) by a proposed new park & ride facility to be delivered as part of the Sir John Moore Barracks allocation, no new infrastructure has been identified to accommodate the change in demand in the southern part of the town. This is considered to be inappropriate, as highway modelling evidence identifies increased park & ride demand occurring in the southern part of Winchester Town which is of the same order of magnitude as anticipated in the northern part of the town. However, whilst the patronage changes in the northern part of the town will be accommodated (and indeed created) by a proposed new park & ride facility to be delivered as part of the Sir John Moore Barracks allocation, no new infrastructure has been identified to accommodate the change in demand in the southern part of the town. Further justification for this need is set out in Appendix 3. Bloor propose that propose that Manor Parks is the optimal location to facilitate this required park and ride as set out in Section 5.</p> <p>Based on the above, Bloor do not consider that policies T1 Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel, SP2 Spatial Strategy and Development Principles and H1 Housing Provision can be deemed sound. Bloor therefore object to these policies. As above, further justification for Bloor’s objection to SP2 and H1 is provided at Section 4.</p>
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response PLEASE REFER TO PROVIDED REPRESENTATIONS TITLED – 131024 MANOR PARKS REGULATION 19 WCC CONSULTATION REPRESENTATION [FINAL] AND EXTRACTED TEXT BELOW.</p>

	<p>Bloor supports the location of development in the most sustainable locations with the greatest opportunities for active and low carbon travel and delivery of 20-minute neighbourhoods. Noting this, Bloor do not consider that the spatial strategy and subsequent allocations in the R19 LP as drafted meet this ambition, bringing question to the plan's soundness. Comments regarding the spatial strategy are set out in Section 4. Manor Parks offers an optimal opportunity for WCC to deliver a site with these credentials as per the information provided at Section 5 to ensure that the R19 LP can be deemed sound. See Appendix 3 for further detail. The flawed and incomplete assessment process undermines the Plan's sustainability claims and casts doubt on its alignment with its own emerging policies and Plan objectives, but also of national policy and net-zero objectives. These issues go to the heart of soundness and significant further evidence is required – and potential refinement of the strategy – are needed to resolve the weakness. Bloor express that the highway modelling evidence identifies increased park & ride demand occurring in the southern part of Winchester Town which is of the same order of magnitude as anticipated in the northern part of the town. However, whilst the patronage changes in the northern part of the town will be accommodated (and indeed created) by a proposed new park & ride facility to be delivered as part of the Sir John Moore Barracks allocation, no new infrastructure has been identified to accommodate the change in demand in the southern part of the town. This is considered to be inappropriate, as highway modelling evidence identifies increased park & ride demand occurring in the southern part of Winchester Town which is of the same order of magnitude as anticipated in the northern part of the town. However, whilst the patronage changes in the northern part of the town will be accommodated (and indeed created) by a proposed new park & ride facility to be delivered as part of the Sir John Moore Barracks allocation, no new infrastructure has been identified to accommodate the change in demand in the southern part of the town. Further justification for this need is set out in Appendix 3. Bloor propose that propose that Manor Parks is the optimal location to facilitate this required park and ride as set out in Section 5.</p> <p>Based on the above, Bloor do not consider that policies T1 Sustainable and Active Transport and Travel, SP2 Spatial Strategy and Development Principles and H1 Housing Provision can be deemed sound. Bloor therefore object to these policies. As above, further justification for Bloor's objection to SP2 and H1 is provided at Section 4.</p>
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or</i></p>	<p>Yes Letter (commenting on Policies & Evidence Base) Supporting document 1 (South Winchester Vision Document) Supporting document 2 (Response to the delivery of housing)</p>

allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

[Supporting document 3 \(Technical Note 1 - Sustainability & Transport\)](#)

[Supporting document 4 \(Technical Note 2 - Transport Feasibility Report\)](#)

[Supporting document 5 \(Statement of Common Ground between Bloor Homes & Stagecoach \(South\) Ltd\)](#)

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Caroline Dennis
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32TV-8
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32TV-8/1/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	I would like to object to the proposed movement of the Central Bus Station to the Railway Station. I live near the Railway Station and there is no room for a bus station. I would further add that before any major decision to move or not to move the bus station is made the problem of traffic circulation in that area should be confronted. The congestion and build up of traffic at the Carfax Junction is horrendous. In the future there will be more traffic coming down the Andover Road from expanding King's Barton and possibly the John Moore Barracks site. The traffic problem impacts on local residents, it must be addressed and any relocation or development in that area be placed in a wider context of traffic movement and control.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided</i>	No

*may contain additional details,
such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Tony Clements
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BX4-T
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BX4-T/10/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>Vistry and Taylor Wimpey endorse fully the rationale and reasoning advanced within the Draft Local Plan that supports the promotion of sustainable travel opportunities and reducing reliance on forms of transport that drive climate change. The background and supporting paragraphs within section 6 that precede Policy T1 are aligned fully with the representations made concerning all aspects of the 2040 Local Plan and its strategy. There is clear recognition within the document that transport is a key contributor to climate change and therefore significant intervention is required to change travel behaviours and support the transition to less polluting modes of travel. However, there is a glaring disconnect between the assessment of conditions that prevail currently and the actions required to implement positive and effective change. The logic that is articulated across paragraphs 6.1 to 6.25 of the 2040 Plan suggests that the Plan contains a clear spatial strategy founded upon focussing development at locations that dramatically reduce the need to travel, where access to public transport and non-polluting forms of transport is highest. Vistry and Taylor Wimpey endorse the observations and sentiments that are set out. However, as set out in submissions to Policy CN1, which refer to the findings of the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), the evidence is not followed. The IIA makes clear that Winchester city is the most sustainable location in the district in transport and travel terms and has the greatest propensity to drive sustainable travel behaviours. Despite acknowledging this the spatial strategy does not act upon the evidence and fails to focus development at Winchester proportionately in ways that would drive sustainable travel behaviours.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>Vistry and Taylor Wimpey endorse fully the rationale and reasoning advanced within the Draft Local Plan that supports the promotion of sustainable travel opportunities and reducing reliance on forms of transport that drive climate change. The background and supporting paragraphs within section 6 that precede Policy T1 are aligned fully with the representations made concerning all aspects of the 2040 Local Plan and its strategy. There is clear recognition within the document that transport is a key contributor to climate change and therefore significant intervention is required to change travel behaviours and support the transition to less polluting modes of travel. However, there is a glaring disconnect between the assessment of conditions that prevail currently and the actions required to implement positive and effective change. The logic that is</p>

	<p>articulated across paragraphs 6.1 to 6.25 of the 2040 Plan suggests that the Plan contains a clear spatial strategy founded upon focussing development at locations that dramatically reduce the need to travel, where access to public transport and non-polluting forms of transport is highest. Vistry and Taylor Wimpey endorse the observations and sentiments that are set out. However, as set out in submissions to Policy CN1, which refer to the findings of the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), the evidence is not followed. The IIA makes clear that Winchester city is the most sustainable location in the district in transport and travel terms and has the greatest propensity to drive sustainable travel behaviours. Despite acknowledging this the spatial strategy does not act upon the evidence and fails to focus development at Winchester proportionately in ways that would drive sustainable travel behaviours.</p>
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Letter (commenting on policies) Supporting Document (Planning for South Hampshire)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Richard Doughty
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32FT-R - New Alresford Town Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32FT-R - New Alresford Town Council/8/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	We support policy T1 that gives priority to 'walking, cycling, wheeling and public transport'. However, Alresford has an ageing population that depends on cars, and the businesses depend on local villages for trade. Bus services are being cancelled rather than increased which negates this policy. The plan runs until 2040 - by then a different mentality that is not so car obsessed might have evolved. This requires emphasis on public transport.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	No

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Three Maid LLP
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32F2-P
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32F2-P/3/T1
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Hampshire County Council is the Local Highways Authority with responsibility for the road network across the district (apart from the M3 and A34). We understand that they are currently in the process of preparing the Local Transport Plan 4 but that it will be clear that development should be consistent with and contribute to adopted transport strategies such as the Winchester Movement Strategy. Priority 1 of the strategy is to reduce city centre traffic, including the introduction of more out of centre park and ride options.</p> <p>At present the only option being put forward for the north of Winchester through the proposed submission local plan is a 200 space Park and Ride at Kings Barton and a large facility at St John Moore Barracks. Both would come forward within the wider allocations for residential development.</p> <p>We are concerned that this does not address the current need identified for new park and ride facilities as it will not come forward until the later stages of the plan, towards the end of the developments lifespan. Our clients site would offer an opportunity to deliver a park and ride immediately in a location adjacent to the strategic network and in a key location for easy access into Winchester city.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information?	Yes Letter (commenting on Policies and Evidence Base)

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Judith Anne Polak
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32TW-9
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32TW-9/6/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The concept of a 20 minute neighbourhood cannot possibly apply to a rural location where it is impossible to complete a weekly shop without using a motor vehicle. Village shops carry limited stock but are expensive. Access to leisure centres and entertainment in in Winchester is a 40 minute bus ride away with such a limited service that it is impossible to get a return bus home in the evening. School buses are limited and do to serve all of the secondary schools to which local children are allocated.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	No

such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Caroline Dennis
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32F7-U
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32F7-U/1/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	I really feel you should provide abovec an option for 'Don't Know'. I objet strongly to the idea of moving the Central Bus Station to the Railway Station. Firstly, it is well positioned where it is in the centre of town. Secondly, there is not enough space in the vicinity of the Railway Station for a bus station, where on earth could it be placed? Thirdly, the area around the Railway Station is unable to cope with the present volume of traffic. The Carfax crossroads is usually blocked with traffic coming from 4 major roads into the city and with the addition of more houses at King's Barton plus a possible development at John Moore Barracks, it is likely there could be complete gridlock. No development or movement of the bus station should go ahead without WCC addressing the problem of traffic.I live in the area and every day am forced to face the congestion and pollution arising from too many vehicles, private and over sized vehicles attempting to enter the city. Planners seem to be oblivious of these problems.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Don't know
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Don't know
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or</i>	No

allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	John Boyes
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32ND-G
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32ND-G/2/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	Public transport in Colden Common is at best erratic. The 61 bus which serves Eastleigh and Winchester hospital is likely to be withdrawn due to removal of HCC funding. The current earliest 61 bus service arrives in Eastleigh at 8.38AM, too late for many workers and students to get to their destination on time. Removal of the 61-bus service will result in a 3-mile bus trip to Eastleigh taking around one hour each way, and having to go via Fair Oak, and change buses. Likewise, a trip to hospital will have to go via Winchester centre and involve a change of bus. This will inevitably create an increase in car usage due to lack of alternative transport.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Bus services need to be maintained. Develop alternative means for transport. A network of cycleways/pedestrian thoroughfares needs to be developed linking Colden Common with Winchester and Eastleigh along with ongoing links to Southampton and further. These new routes must provide access to surrounding villages and be separate
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided</i>	No

*may contain additional details,
such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Brian Welch
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z2-A
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z2-A/3/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>The Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan LCWIP sets out a proposed network of 13 walking routes and 9 cycling corridors. My view is that the LCWIP is based on a misconception that an increase in cycling is the key to Winchester's traffic issues. The 20 minute Neighbourhood It's a nice idea but seems to be a concept invented to address long term plans such as this consultation without much other relevance. The Winchester population encompasses a wide range of high value skills and needs which are rarely confined to a 20 minute reach. Some commuters who work in London, live within the 'Golden Triangle' close to the railway station, but a much larger number live in Harestock & Littleton, Barton Farm, Badger Farm, Winchester Village, the Itchen Valley, and further away such as Stockbridge and its surrounding villages. There is a long standing relationship between the cost of travel to London, and the relatively lower cost of housing in Winchester, which makes Winchester an attractive commuting location. People often choose to live in Winchester because of its proximity to good rail routes, and roads in all directions. The secondary schools attract children from further away, and arrange coach travel for that purpose. Peter Symonds College is only within a 20 minute walking radius for a very small number of students, but is the leading Sixth Form College in Hampshire attracting students from a much wider radius, although most of those longer distance students generally use public transport.</p> <p>Winchester City centre is more than a 20 minute walk from my home, and the existing policies are already partially successful for my family as we probably only now visit the city centre about once a month. Although we shop locally, we regularly travel to Basingstoke and Southampton for larger purchases, even though we would prefer to support local suppliers. The Winchester Sports and Leisure Centre, which I visit 3 times a week, is more than 20 minutes away by bicycle, over an hour by foot and public transport would take even longer. It was built by the City based on ambitious user levels which appear to be correct.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	

What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Upham Parish Council
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-322X-8 - Upham Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-322X-8 - Upham Parish Council/2/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>As noted in the submission from the Southern Parishes, to which we subscribe and which we support, this is an unsound document based on incorrect data and a flawed approach which does not follow the MoHCLG guidance. Despite significant developments which have recently taken place here, the Southern Parishes have been left with a shrinking bus service network. This is destined to be even further reduced with the withdrawal of funding being proposed by HCC cabinet on the 14th October. The sites around Bishops Waltham proposed for the new housing the village is to receive, are all on the periphery of the village. This is inevitable and in the nature of plans, but these new developments will require a strong public transport network to support their residents if they are not to become totally car dependent. the Strategic Transport Assessment, the HCC LTP4 and the HCC's BSIP, all offer fine aspirations for a comprehensive public transport network which if implemented would do much to deliver the zero carbon aspirations at the heart of the plan. LPT4 notes (p25) 'However, we recognise that there are still parts of our transport system that could work better, or differently. Transport and land use planning is not integrated as well as it could be. This is partly because transport decisions are largely the responsibility of the County Council, while planning decisions are made by the districts and the boroughs (the local planning authorities). Over recent decades the location of new housing, employment, and shops has led to increased travel distances for many residents, and has often meant that driving is their only realistic option to get around. A more joined up approach is required to ensure that new development reduces the need to travel and provides people with a choice of high quality travel options.' This clearly identifies the need for strategic thinking and funding to develop a network that suits existing and projected development. The Strategic Transport Assessment, despite its name, does not do this. The STA is reliant in turn on the BSIP. As noted in the Southern Parishes joint response, the BSIP fails to take the opportunity to create a network serving the recently developed housing, as well as the established communities, in the Southern Parishes. Instead it concentrates on a small number of existing routes that, on the current business model, are commercially viable or can be made so with restricted amounts of support. Even to meet those limited objectives, the BSIP notes (at 5.7)</p>

	In other words, the ability of WCC to deliver the amount of housing that MoHCLG targets require, that meets the Zero carbon aspirations of the local plan, is dependent on funding being forthcoming from DoT. There is no guarantee that this will occur. In the current situation of budget constraints it is not even a likelihood.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	We suggest that there is a solution to squaring this circle and delivering the new housing that Winchester needs whilst meeting the WCC's laudable objectives in combatting the climate crisis. This is to take a much more robust approach in this plan to ensuring that new developments pay their way, not only in terms of providing new services to link to new developments, but also to ensure that the existing network, on which these new developments will depend, remain supported and fully functional. This will enable the plan to be found sound at EiP. We suggest that the Strategic Transport Assessment needs to be re-drafted to reflect the need for development and continuing support for the public transport network, the infrastructure delivery plan needs to incorporate this requirement, and policies such as SP2 need to be more explicit in their requirements for this commitment to funding.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	to be agreed. Too complex to be summarised here!
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z7-F - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z7-F - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/15/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>The Trust continue to support SP T1. Offering genuine choice of sustainable and active travel modes remains likely to benefit our staff and some patients to access the hospital, with benefits from walking and cycling and the potential reduction in air pollution. The Trust wish to restate that they will need the support where practicable, to move away from the use of cars when coming to site.</p> <p>The previous focus in the Regulation 18 Local Plan on creating connected 15-minute neighbourhoods was supported by the Trust. The Trust remain enthusiastic to work with WCC on the updated 20-minute neighbourhood focus. The Trust would like to continue to strengthen dialogue around active travel corridors, increase walking and cycling and access to public transport services and infrastructure. The local park and ride bus service is well utilised by Trust staff and patients, and we continue to welcome any further park and ride developments that may come through increased development in the local area.</p> <p>The Trust's catchment being a mix of urban and rural communities, we recognise that access to public transport is not readily available to all, it is therefore welcomed that the policy now requires that sustainable and active travel routes be suitable for those with disabilities and reduced mobility.</p> <p>The Trust remain interested in working more closely with WCC to reduce our mutual carbon footprint. Presently there are no attractive, direct cycle routes to the hospital, therefore the Trust would welcome understanding more about the central LCWIP and also have involvement in the development of the wider district LCWIP. As an organisation with a large volume of deliveries throughout the working week, the Trust is considering options regarding 'last mile' delivery and would be very interested in further discussion about the suggested implementation of 'vehicle hubs'.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	-
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	-

Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Phil Gagg
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/10/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>Policy T1 (like T2, T3 and T4) is not sound: they are not positively prepared; they fail to ensure delivery at a proportionate scale the carbon emissions reductions required by the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan referenced in policy CN1 and are accompanied by supporting paragraphs that contain serious errors. Together policies T1 TO T4 do not take sufficient advantage of the opportunities offered by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to deliver the targets in the district’s Carbon Neutrality Action Plan. In that the local plan has failed to make sufficient use of the NPPF to tackle the problem of excessive emissions it has identified, it is not consistent with national policy. Even without the changes currently under consultation, the NPPF encourages detailed sustainable transport policies to reduce emissions, but also allows for them to be robustly quantitative if that is the only way of reducing transport emissions sufficiently, as it is in Winchester District. The Reg 19 draft lacks the detailed guidance necessary to apply these paragraphs in a way that will deliver the Carbon Neutrality plan targets. The NPPF has a presumption in favour of sustainable development and has as an objective for sustainable</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	The words quoted above should be replaced with words that would not depend so heavily on interpretation.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	<p>Planning applications for development that would increase travel must demonstrate how the development will make a proportionate contribution to reducing transport emissions in the district to a level that will allow Winchester to achieve its target of net zero emissions by 2030 and ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sufficient infrastructure for sustainable and active transport modes of travel (walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport), that will make these modes of transport the default choice, followed by infrastructure for cars with, first, infrastructure for car clubs, and battery-electric vehicles and only then for private fossil-fuelled vehicles; ii. A plan for on-site and off-site walking, cycling, and vehicle networks that reduces the number of trips made by private motor vehicle as well as maximises the number of trips made by walking cycling and public

	<p>transport in compliance with the Hampshire Movement and Place Framework and Healthy Streets approach as set out in the adopted LTP4;</p> <p>iii. The lifestyle benefits of 20-minute neighbourhoods;</p> <p>iv. The primacy of sustainable and active travel routes in the layout with connections to the wider network and where appropriate integrated with the green / blue infrastructure networks, which must be made available and usable at all stages of development particularly on large or phased sites;</p> <p>v. A route-length of at least 0.12 miles per hectare for both cycling/wheeling paths and footpaths on-site and contributions to address gaps in routes off-site providing links from the site to facilities (shops, parks, bus stops, railway stations, schools, doctors' surgeries, community centres) within 3 miles of the development. Developers would need to demonstrate that their route design would provide safe, attractive, secure and convenient ways that encourage all users, including those with disabilities and reduced mobility, to use more sustainable forms of transport such as walking, wheeling, cycling or buses, at every stage of the development;</p> <p>vi. The continued safe and efficient operation of the strategic and local road networks;</p> <p>vii. New accesses and intensified use of existing accesses onto the road network that can demonstrate that they will not result in reduced highway safety or significant congestion/delays; and</p> <p>viii. Facilities in any new or refurbished employment developments to cater for employees wishing to engage in active travel, to include showers, changing areas and lockers/storage.</p>
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>No</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Shirlene Oh
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3265-9 - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3265-9 - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/15/T1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>Full response on website Strategic Policy T1 T4</p> <p>The Trust continue to support SP T1. Offering genuine choice of sustainable and active travel modes remains likely to benefit our staff and some patients to access the hospital, with benefits from walking and cycling and the potential reduction in air pollution. The Trust wish to restate that they will need the support where practicable, to move away from the use of cars when coming to site.</p> <p>The previous focus in the Regulation 18 Local Plan on creating connected 15-minute neighbourhoods was supported by the Trust. The Trust remain enthusiastic to work with WCC on the updated 20-minute neighbourhood focus. The Trust would like to continue to strengthen dialogue around active travel corridors, increase walking and cycling and access to public transport services and infrastructure. The local park and ride bus service is well utilised by Trust staff and patients, and we continue to welcome any further park and ride developments that may come through increased development in the local area.</p> <p>The Trust's catchment being a mix of urban and rural communities, we recognise that access to public transport is not readily available to all, it is therefore welcomed that the policy now requires that sustainable and active travel routes be suitable for those with disabilities and reduced mobility.</p> <p>The Trust remain interested in working more closely with WCC to reduce our mutual carbon footprint. Presently there are no attractive, direct cycle routes to the hospital, therefore the Trust would welcome understanding more about the central LCWIP and also have involvement in the development of the wider district LCWIP. As an organisation with a large volume of deliveries throughout the working week, the Trust is considering options regarding 'last mile' delivery and would be very interested in further discussion about the suggested implementation of 'vehicle hubs'.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	

What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (Commenting on policies)

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Graham Grant
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-326U-9 - Active Travel England
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-326U-9 - Active Travel England/1/T1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>This letter sets out how Active Travel England (ATE) has worked with Winchester City Council on the development of the Winchester local plan.</p> <p>As context, ATE is a statutory consultee for planning applications above certain thresholds. It is not a prescribed body for local plan making. To inform any future approach, ATE undertook a local plan pilot project running from December 2023 to April 2024. The pilot sought views on how we could assist local planning authorities in the preparation of local plans, to secure the best possible outcomes for active travel and associated planning objectives (e.g. health, wellbeing and the environment). In some cases, ATE provided suggestions on how draft local plans could be improved in terms of active travel considerations, while explaining to local planning authorities that this was to draw matters and other information to their attention, but did not represent ATE's formal position on the local plan.</p> <p>I can confirm that the planning policy team in ATE has worked with officers from Winchester City Council as part of the pilot project, and I am grateful for their assistance to us in this project.</p> <p>As part of the project, ATE provided feedback on the Regulation 18 Winchester Local Plan policies. Officers from Winchester provided information to ATE through the course of the project and worked with us on completing a survey, discussing their requirements in a meeting with us and attending a workshop with other pilot authorities.</p> <p>ATE provided suggestions on where polices could be strengthened, and where the links between active travel and other planning objectives could be improved on 22 December 2023, which were discussed in a call on 4 January 2024. ATE provided more information on 11 January.</p> <p>Winchester City Council requested ATE to respond to the regulation 19 consultation, that was launched on 29 August 2024. As the pilot project has now completed, ATE is unable to undertake a detailed review of the draft regulation 19 plan and provide a response to the consultation.</p> <p>However, I did want to place on record that much of the feedback provided by ATE on the Regulation 18 Local Plan policies have resulted in changes to the policies in the new plan, which place a stronger emphasis upon active travel and securing the best outcomes for active travel and associated planning objectives.</p> <p>To illustrate this, the draft regulation 19 plan:</p> <p>Includes stronger wording around safe and accessible active travel throughout the Local Plan</p>

	<p>Prioritises the needs of walking, wheeling and cycling as set out in LTN 1/20 and creates safe and attractive routes to public transport. Improves references on active travel routes to key services, towns and village centres and railway stations, such as in strategic policy D2 (Design Principles for Winchester Town); and D4 (Design Principles for Market Towns and Rural Villages) Has enhanced wording around the delivery of specific cycling and walking infrastructure secured through the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan and the Winchester Movement Strategy. Includes definitions of the terms 'active travel' and 'mobility hubs' to improve the clarity and specificity of policies. I have therefore provided this letter to demonstrate that Winchester City Council has worked closely with ATE on making amendments to the regulation 18 policies, which strengthens the consideration of active travel and its associated benefits.</p>
<p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p>	
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Letter (commenting on policy)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Craig Hatton
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32YH-Y - Network Rail
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32YH-Y - Network Rail/4/T1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>Full response on website</p> <p>This Policy is not sound in its current form as it fails to be consistent with national policy, specifically para 108 of the NPPF. The Policy does not consider transport networks as whole which should include the railway rather than just be limited to the road network. o address this, Network Rail suggest the following additions (in italics):</p> <p>v. Safe, attractive, secure and convenient ways that encourage all users, including those with disabilities and reduced mobility, to use more sustainable forms of transport such as walking, wheeling, cycling, buses or the rail network, at every stage of the development;</p> <p>vi. The continued safe and efficient operation of the strategic and local road networks and the rail network</p> <p>The application of the above changes would be sufficient to make the Policy sound.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>v. Safe, attractive, secure and convenient ways that encourage all users, including those with disabilities and reduced mobility, to use more sustainable forms of transport such as walking, wheeling, cycling, buses or the rail network, at every stage of the development;</p> <p>vi. The continued safe and efficient operation of the strategic and local road networks and the rail network</p> <p>The application of the above changes would be sufficient to make the Policy sound.</p>
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	<p>v. Safe, attractive, secure and convenient ways that encourage all users, including those with disabilities and reduced mobility, to use more sustainable forms of transport such as walking, wheeling, cycling, buses or the rail network, at every stage of the development;</p> <p>vi. The continued safe and efficient operation of the strategic and local road networks and the rail network</p> <p>The application of the above changes would be sufficient to make the Policy sound.</p>
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	

Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies)

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	YMCA Fairthorne Manor Group Philipa Spicer
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Y-F
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Y-F/9/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>We support the concept of 20 minute neighbourhoods.</p> <p>We agree, it could do, but in our view, there is a definite mis-match between the policy aspirations of the Local Plan and the reality. Using the largest ‘new’ housing allocation in the Local Plan as an example, we see that the Sir John Moore barracks is not located in a sustainable location at all, and it appears to be an allocation chosen due to its status as a brownfield site rather than location. As shown below, Google mapping advises the walking distance from the barracks entrance to the high street is 2.5 miles, a 55 minute walk. It is therefore difficult to envisage how the site would help to deliver a 15 minute city or indeed a 20 minute neighbourhood. We consider that there are better options for more sustainable patterns of development, including on land at Fairthorne Manor which has such excellent proximity to a strategic cycle network (on its northern boundary), connectivity to Botley train station and good connectivity to Botley, a higher order settlement with a good range of facilities and services. Fairthorne Manor can accommodate growth and can help achieve the Local Plan aims of 20 minute neighbourhoods with unrivalled existing social infrastructure integrated within the site. Whilst reviewing the proposed allocation for the Sir John Moore Barracks, it is also important to note that the housing delivery table advises that the site can deliver 900 dwellings, but the allocation itself refers to 750 to 1,000. The text of the allocation also sets out the constraints of the site which include trees, contamination, a SINC, groundwater and flooding to name a few. Paragraph 12.15 appears to acknowledge that the vague and imprecise nature of the allocation stems from the fact that masterplanning of the site is still at very early stages, it states: “The site is defined in a broad way, to enable a comprehensive approach to be taken regarding the future development of the land, which will be subject to a master planning process. This does not mean therefore that all of the site included in the plan is proposed or suitable for built development. Part of the site comprises ‘previously developed land’ so it is important to make the full use of the site’s potential, within the existing constraints. Therefore, a working assumption has been made that the site could accommodate about 900 dwellings” (underlining is our emphasis). Whilst we support the allocation overall, we consider that the Local Plan needs to allocate more sites, principally smaller sites that are quicker to bring forward, to provide more choice and alternatives because the timetable for delivery of the barracks will slip and development will be delayed. Barton farm, for example, which is a ‘rollover’ allocation in the Local</p>

	Plan had a very long and tortuous planning history which started with a Scoping Opinion in 2009 and the first dwelling was not completed until April 2017. The Local Plan advises that 1,541 dwellings remained to be developed at April 2023. This equates to a poor 459 dwellings completed over the six-year build period, or just 76 dpa. Lichfield's 'Start to Finish' paper cites numerous examples of major sites stalling. This Local Plan will need to allocate more sites to be sound.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (Table of policies) Letter (commenting on Policies and Evidence Base - includes vision document)) Supporting document 1 (Vision Document) Supporting document 2 (Vision Document)

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Bellway Strategic Land Daniel Poole
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3289-F
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3289-F/5/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>We support the concept of 20 minute neighbourhoods.</p> <p>We agree, it could do, but in our view, there is a definite mis-match between the policy aspirations of the Local Plan and the reality. Using the largest ‘new’ housing allocation in the Local Plan as an example, we see that the Sir John Moore barracks is not located in a sustainable location at all, and it appears to be an allocation chosen due to its status as a brownfield site rather than location. As shown below, Google mapping advises the walking distance from the barracks entrance to the high street is 2.5 miles, a 55 minute walk. It is therefore difficult to envisage how the site would help to deliver a 15 minute city or indeed a 20 minute neighbourhood. We consider that there are better options for more sustainable patterns of development, principally around Bishop’s Waltham which is a highly sustainable and high order settlement with an excellent range of facilities and services, as identified in the Settlement Hierarchy Report of November 2022 and is ranked Tier 1 on the settlement hierarchy. Bishop’s Waltham is very compact, and can accommodate more growth and can help achieve the Local Plan aims of 20 minute neighbourhoods. Whilst reviewing the proposed allocation for the Sir John Moore Barracks, it is also important to note that the housing delivery table advises that the site can deliver 900 dwellings, but the allocation itself refers to 750 to 1,000. The text of the allocation also sets out the constraints of the site which include trees, contamination, a SINC, groundwater and flooding to name a few. Whilst we support the allocation overall, we consider that the Local Plan needs to allocate more sites to provide more choice and alternatives because the timetable for delivery of the barracks will slip and development will be delayed. Specifically, more small greenfield sites like our client’s site should be allocated as part of a buffer and to help bolster supply.</p> <p>Barton farm, for example, which is a ‘rollover’ allocation in the Local Plan had a very long and tortuous planning history which started with a Scoping Opinion in 2009 and the first dwelling was not completed until April 2017. The Local Plan advises that 1,541 dwellings remained to be developed at April 2023. This equates to a poor 459 dwellings completed over the six-year build period, or just 76 dpa. Lichfield’s ‘Start to Finish’ paper cites numerous examples of major sites stalling. This Local Plan will need to allocate more sites to be sound.</p>

<p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p>	
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Form (with table) Letter (commenting on policies - includes tables and pictures) Supporting document 1 (Vision Document - Botley Road, Bishops Waltham) Supporting document 2 (pre-application advice from Historic England)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes Jonathan Quarrell
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3288-E
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3288-E/5/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>This comment has been summarised – see supporting information for full response</p> <p>We support the concept of 20 minute neighbourhoods.</p> <p>We agree, it could do, but in our view, there is a definite mis-match between the policy aspirations of the Local Plan and the reality. Walking distance between Sir John Moor Barracks and the High Street</p> <p>Using the largest ‘new’ housing allocation in the Local Plan as an example, we see that the Sir John Moore barracks is not located in a sustainable location at all, and it appears to be an allocation chosen due to its status as a brownfield site rather than location. As shown below, Google mapping advises the walking distance from the barracks entrance to the high street is 2.5 miles, a 55 minute walk. It is therefore difficult to envisage how the site would help to deliver a 15 minute city or indeed a 20 minute neighbourhood.</p> <p>We consider that there are better options for more sustainable patterns of development, including around Waltham Chase is a sustainable location and a higher order settlement with a good range of facilities and services, as identified in the Settlement Hierarchy Report of November 2022. Waltham Chase is very compact, and can accommodate more growth and can help achieve the Local Plan aims of 20 minute neighbourhoods. Whilst reviewing the proposed allocation for the Sir John Moore Barracks, it is also important to note that the housing delivery table advises that the site can deliver 900 dwellings, but the allocation itself refers to 750 to 1,000. The text of the allocation also sets out the constraints of the site which include trees, contamination, a SINC, groundwater and flooding to name a few. Whilst we support the allocation overall, we consider that the Local Plan needs to allocate more sites to provide more choice and alternatives because the timetable for delivery of the barracks will slip and development will be delayed. Furthermore, the potential for affordable housing provision at the barracks site is more limited, and could result in very little, if any, so while the site has potential for housing, we consider it is skewed towards private housing at the expense of affordable housing, particularly rental products, leaving a huge need for affordable homes in an already unaffordable district. Barton farm, for example, which is a ‘rollover’ allocation in the Local Plan had a very long and tortuous planning history which started with a Scoping Opinion in 2009 and the first dwelling was not completed until April 2017. The Local Plan advises that 1,541 dwellings remained to be developed at April 2023. This equates to a poor 459 dwellings completed over the six-year build period, or just 76 dpa.</p>

	Lichfield's 'Start to Finish' paper cites numerous examples of major sites stalling. This Local Plan will need to allocate more sites to be sound.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (commenting on policies and evidence base) Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base - includes pictures and tables) Supporting document 1 (Map of site - Land at Winchester Road) Supporting document 2 (Briefing note - Winchester Settlement Gap)

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Georgina Cox
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Q-7
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Q-7/13/T1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>Gladman support the requirement for planning applications for development to prioritise a genuine choice of sustainable and active travel modes, alongside the reduction of the reliance on cars. Private cars are the least sustainable form of transport and by promoting more sustainable methods of travel this will help reduce the carbon footprint within the district.</p> <p>The site being promoted by Gladman as shown in Appendix 1 sits within an intermediate rural settlement 'Otterbourne'. Many rural areas lack the option of regular public transport and sustainable travel options therefore relying on private cars as stated in Policy T1. Otterbourne however, is a sustainable rural area that provides a regular bus service every 15 minutes into Winchester City Centre with a journey total of 23 minutes from the site into the centre.</p> <p>The above policy states the Local Plan is to 'focus new development in the most sustainable locations with high quality infrastructure to promote active travel and access to public transport, buses and trains.' Gladman supports this policy, and the allocation made at Otterbourne for 55 dwellings. However, we suggest the removal of the site from Policy H2 which prevents the development coming forward until 2030 as the settlement has the infrastructure to provide sustainable methods of travel and take on the needed growth in the short term to medium term.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	

Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (refers to letter) Supporting information (commenting on policies and proposed site)

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Wates Developments Ltd
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328X-E
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328X-E/14/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Wates broadly supports this policy.</p> <p>6.2 The policy for sustainable travel and connectivity, should refer to the overall spatial strategy which includes both locating and promoting development that can reduce the need to travel and promote a genuine choice of transport modes, whilst also investing appropriately in supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>6.3 Wates considers that a successful strategy of co-locating new homes and jobs can make a significant contribution to producing a sustainable and active transport network, reducing the need to travel long distances (and promoting the idea of a 20-minute neighbourhood).</p> <p>6.4 Whilst reducing the need to travel by vehicle makes a significant contribution to creating an active transport network, the Local Plan will need to take account of the comparatively poorer transport connections in the more rural areas of Winchester – as recognised by paragraph 105 of the NPPF.</p> <p>6.5 Accordingly, a key part of transitioning towards a sustainable transport network, whilst maintaining sustainable growth, is locating development adjacent to existing or proposed major routes that can accommodate sustainable forms of travel – including cycle lanes, bus routes or by train and where possible, co-locating major housing and employment-generating development.</p> <p>6.6 The spatial strategy in the Local Plan supports active travel, and Wates is committed to supporting active travel choices on sites which it promotes.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	

Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (refers to letter) Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base)

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Wates Developments Ltd. ('Wates')
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3286-C
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3286-C/15/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Full response on website.</p> <p>Legally compliant Yes</p> <p>Positively prepared Yes</p> <p>Sound Yes</p> <p>Justified Yes</p> <p>Compliant with the duty to cooperate Yes</p> <p>Effective Yes</p> <p>Compliant with national policy Yes</p> <p>6.1 Wates broadly supports this policy.</p> <p>6.2 The policy for sustainable travel and connectivity, should refer to the overall spatial strategy which includes both locating and promoting development that can reduce the need to travel and promote a genuine choice of transport modes, whilst also investing appropriately in supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>6.3 Wates considers that a successful strategy of co-locating new homes and jobs can make a significant contribution to producing a sustainable and active transport network, reducing the need to travel long distances (and promoting the idea of a 20-minute neighbourhood).</p> <p>6.4 Whilst reducing the need to travel by vehicle makes a significant contribution to creating an active transport network, the Local Plan will need to take account of the comparatively poorer transport connections in the more rural areas of Winchester – as recognised by paragraph 105 of the Framework.</p> <p>6.5 Accordingly, a key part of transitioning towards a sustainable transport network, whilst maintaining sustainable growth, is locating development adjacent to existing or proposed major routes that can accommodate sustainable forms of travel – including cycle lanes, bus routes or by train and where possible, co-locating major housing and employment-generating development.</p> <p>6.6 The spatial strategy in the Local Plan supports active travel, and Wates is committed to supporting active travel choices on sites which it promotes.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the	

<p>policy legally compliant or sound?</p>	
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Form (refers to letter) Letter (Commenting on policies)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Andy Key
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3284-A
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3284-A/11/T1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>Fails on being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. The policy requirements here are too vague and ambiguous to be effective. It is not enough for the developer to include a transport assessment that quantifies these things: it must show how the development will achieve them.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>Para ii is especially ambiguous: it should be made clear that the phrase “reduces the number of trips made by private motor vehicle” means a reduction compared to the levels prior to the development. As currently worded it would allow developers to create an initial prediction of large traffic increases, then produce a revised transport assessment that makes the increase slightly smaller and claim that they have fulfilled the terms of the policy. This has happened in developments under the current Local Plan; the revised Local Plan does nothing to strengthen or clarify the requirement. (Example: McDonalds drive-in development, Winnall.)</p> <p>Para iii is also ambiguous and ineffective. “Prioritising the concept of 20-minute neighbourhoods” means nothing in practice. See below for suggested wording.</p> <p>Para iv needs to refer explicitly to the city and district LCWIPs, as without this the definition of “wider network” is open to abuse.</p> <p>Para vii: is inconsistent with para ii. To be consistent, this needs to demonstrate that the use of new or existing accesses will not lead to an increase in the overall level of motor traffic. This is not the same as “significant congestion/delays”, a term which focuses entirely on the effect on motor traffic to the exclusion of other forms of transport.</p> <p>Para viii needs to mention secure, covered storage for cycles explicitly (including non-standard pedal vehicles such as cargo bikes and trikes). This is the top priority for encouraging cycle travel. The phrase “lockers/storage” could be interpreted as meaning simply storage for clothing. The use of the phrase “where appropriate” is also a hostage to fortune as developers will simply claim that it’s not appropriate in their case, as happens at present. (Example: recent development application at Three Maids Hill, where active travel access and facilities were dismissed as irrelevant while providing detailed plans for car parking.) Active travel access is always appropriate, including in rural areas.</p>

<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	<p>Para ii should be unambiguous: “Development so that it reduces the number of trips made by private motor vehicle compared to current levels as well as maximising opportunities to walk and cycle...” Para iii: At the very least, expand this to add “... by demonstrating how residents or workers in the development will be able to reach a range of retail, leisure and service facilities within 20 minutes using active travel means.” Para iv: “Integrating sustainable and active travel routes into the layout with connections to the wider network as outlined by the Winchester City and District LCWIP network plans...” Para vii: ...of existing accesses onto the road network that can demonstrate that they will not lead to an increase in the overall level of motor vehicle traffic in the area...” Para viii: “...will need to provide where appropriate secure, covered cycle storage for employees and sufficient visitor cycle parking space (as defined by the parking standards) for visitors and customers., as well as measures such as showers, changing areas and lockers/storage to cater for employees...”</p>
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Form (commenting on policies) Letter (commenting on policies)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Wates Developments Ltd. ('Wates')
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328G-W
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328G-W/14/T1
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Full response on website.</p> <p>Legally compliant Yes</p> <p>Positively prepared Yes</p> <p>Sound Yes</p> <p>Justified Yes</p> <p>Compliant with the duty to cooperate Yes</p> <p>Effective Yes</p> <p>Compliant with national policy Yes</p> <p>6.1 Wates broadly supports this policy.</p> <p>6.2 The policy for sustainable travel and connectivity, should refer to the overall spatial strategy which includes both locating and promoting development that can reduce the need to travel and promote a genuine choice of transport modes, whilst also investing appropriately in supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>6.3 Wates considers that a successful strategy of co-locating new homes and jobs can make a significant contribution to producing a sustainable and active transport network, reducing the need to travel long distances (and promoting the idea of a 20-minute neighbourhood).</p> <p>6.4 Whilst reducing the need to travel by vehicle makes a significant contribution to creating an active transport network, the Local Plan will need to take account of the comparatively poorer transport connections in the more rural areas of Winchester – as recognised by paragraph 105 of the NPPF.</p> <p>6.5 Accordingly, a key part of transitioning towards a sustainable transport network, whilst maintaining sustainable growth, is locating development adjacent to existing or proposed major routes that can accommodate sustainable forms of travel – including cycle lanes, bus routes or by train and where possible, co-locating major housing and employment-generating development.</p> <p>6.6 The spatial strategy in the Local Plan supports active travel, and Wates is committed to supporting active travel choices on sites which it promotes.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the	

<p>policy legally compliant or sound?</p>	
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Form (refers to letter) Letter (Commenting on policies)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Mrs Anne Collins
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328N-4
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328N-4/2/T1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	The STA submitted as supporting evidence for the Draft Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation fails to address the requirements for such assessments and therefore fails to support delivery of Policies SP2 and T1 in the draft Local Plan. It not enough for WCC to state that public transport will be considered at individual development plan stage. NPPF and WCC Plan Policy T1 clearly state that it will be considered 'at every stage of the development'. See further detail in supporting document.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	Yes Form (Copy of form - refers to letter) Letter (Commenting on policy and evidence base)

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Neil Massie
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/15/T1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>see PDF for mark ups and additional info</p> <p>Hampshire County Council, in its role as Local Highway Authority, has recently adopted a new Local Transport Plan (LTP4) for the county. This document sets out the vision intended outcomes, guiding principles and policies for planning and delivering transport in Hampshire in the period up to 2050. Key objectives within this document are the encouragement of modal shift, decarbonising the transport system and the need to plan more effectively for people and places. The text in paragraph 6.4 refers to LTP3 as being the current transport plan should be update to LTP4. Criteria iii) The County Council recommend that this would be an appropriate section to reference that: large developments and new settlements may be required to meet agreed transport outcomes such as ambitious mode share targets. These outcomes and targets will only be approved where the County Council and City Council believe there are realistic opportunities to achieve a high sustainable transport mode share amongst new residents and/or shift existing residents from car to sustainable transport modes and they will be robustly monitored and managed through the travel plan process. Criteria ix) The County Council supports this statement. iii) To strengthen the policy wording, the County Council recommend the inclusion of reference to 'the principles' as well as the 'concept' of '20-minute neighbourhoods'.</p> <p>iv) To Strengthen the policy wording, the County Council recommend the inclusion of reference to new developments being required to support or contribute towards the delivery of the LCWIP network across the district, and other transport schemes included within the Infrastructure Funding Statement, where appropriate.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	

Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes <u>Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base)</u>

Policy/Evidence base document	T1
Name of respondent (or client)	Patrick Blake
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32QF-N - National Highways
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32QF-N - National Highways/3/T1
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	National Highways welcomes the aim of this policy which is to ensure that new developments are positively designed for sustainable modes of travel, promoting the modal hierarchy in the recently updated Highway Code. The promotion of development in locations where travel can be minimised and sustainable modes catered for is in line with DfT Circular 01/22. We welcome the explicit requirement of the policy for new development to continue the safe and efficient operation of the strategic and local road networks (T1,vi). This policy also contains the requirement for proposed developments to include a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, which are essential to enable us to determine the impact of development proposals on our network. We would add that where a development is likely to place a significant number of trips through any SRN junction, early engagement with us at the scoping stage is recommended.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been</i>	No

*included in the representation.
However, the links provided
may contain additional details,
such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

No changes apart from:

[Proposed Modifications](#) to respond to representations from Network Rail (criterion v and vi of Policy T1) and Hampshire County Council (criterion iii of Policy T1).

Local Plan Reference or document	Policy T2 Parking for New Developments	
Total Number of Representations received	16	
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	Yes	No
Legally Compliant	11	5
Sound	6	11
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	10	5
<p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>Concern about the approach to parking standards and sustainable transport objectives.</p> <p>Respondents refer to the policy’s flexibility in parking provision for new developments and that these might not adequately reflect the reality of car dependency, especially in areas of the district which lack public transport infrastructure and options for alternative sustainable travel solutions.</p> <p>Concerns about the consequences of lack of parking in a new development in relation to increases in on-street parking, exacerbated congestion and safety issues in adjoining areas.</p> <p>Request for clear, adaptable parking standards, the proposed abandonment of parking standards offers little clarity to developers or master planners designing a proposed development, particularly for schemes in rural areas where alternatives to car use are more limited.</p> <p>Some respondents request that flexibility is built into the policy, to provide a balance between movement, necessity and placemaking. There is acknowledgement that even if a development is planned with little/no parking provision there is still the need for visitor parking and being able to deal with service vehicles.</p> <p>Respondents refer to the need for alignment with national standards and the inclusion of guidelines to support active travel, as well as provisions for disabled parking and vehicle charging infrastructure.</p>		
<p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BEW-A - Littleton and Harestock Parish Council/76/T2</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BJD-V/8/T2</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T/99/T2</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/53/T2</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32GC-8/14/T2</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32NS-Y/12/T2</p>		

ANON-AQTS-32G7-V/18/T2

ANON-AQTS-32FT-R - New Alresford Town Council/11/T2

ANON-AQTS-32TW-9/9/T2

ANON-AQTS-32Z2-A/4/T2

ANON-AQTS-323A-J/9/T2

ANON-AQTS-3BB1-1/3/T2

ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/18/T2

BHLF-AQTS-3284-A/21/T2

BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/34/T2

BHLF-AQTS-32QF-N - National Highways/4/T2

Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation

- Need for a flexible policy which includes parking standards to give guidance to those designing new developments;
- Impact of lack of parking/under provision of parking in new developments in terms of congestion, safety and on street parking in adjoining areas; and
- Reality of lack of alternatives to the car in a rural area and the need for parking to be included in new developments.

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Lisa Fielding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BEW-A - Littleton and Harestock Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BEW-A - Littleton and Harestock Parish Council/76/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>The policy sets out a new approach whereby rather than set standards for parking provision to be complied with and any reductions to be justified by the developer, WCC now propose that it is for developers to make the case for the number of spaces provided. The intention is to seek a reduction in parking provision in favour of more sustainable forms of transport. The Parish Council is very concerned that this new approach will not deliver the outcomes intended by WCC. By setting standards for parking in a local plan all developers know what is required, should they choose to bring forward a site. The new policy could encourage developers to promote sites with lower parking provisions and to reflect that approach in any agreements with landowners. In those instances where WCC did not accept a lower standard, it would now be for it to justify its decision which would most likely generate more work for officers. It could also be more difficult to increase the number of parking spaces given the commercial decisions taken by the developer who may seek to minimise any cost implications at the expense of other policy requirements. The implications of insufficient parking on a new development can have a significant impact on adjoining areas. The Parish Council is concerned that the approach is likely to create parking issues for existing and new residents. WCC is basing the approach on the availability of alternative means of travel particularly public transport, over which it has no control and consequently a serious weakness for the Plan. The Parish Council objects to the policy. Object to Policy T2. The policy is likely to deliver schemes where the lack of parking becomes a serious design and social issue.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Amend the Policy to include the required standard of parking for all types of development.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Amend the Policy to include the required standard of parking for all types of development.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	

If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies)

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Christine Gardner
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BJD-V
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BJD-V/8/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	6.13 seeks to reduce parking. Even if new homes, e.g. for the elderly, are built without car parking, they still need parking for visitors & trade deliveries. No parking may mean residents have fewer visitors & lonelier lives.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Allow some parking space on all new developments, even if they are intended for non-drivers.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Allow some parking space on all new developments, even if they are intended for non-drivers, for visitors, emergencies and trade deliveries.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Rob Edgecock
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T/99/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The policy is well thought-out.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Debbie Harding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/53/T2
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	T2 - ii - It is concerning that no minimum standards / guidelines are defined for parking Villages such as Colden Common which has such poor infrastructure means that residents are very dependant on cars. The policy does not differentiate between parking requirements in town centre, market towns and in larger rural settlements with poor infrastructure. No framework is offered to ensure adequate parking in our community at application stage.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Offer a minimum parking standard for those settlements which have very poor facilities and public transport.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	No

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Mandy Owen (Boyer) on behalf of Vistry Partnerships
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32GC-8
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32GC-8/14/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>The supporting text for this policy sets out that there is a focus on development within sustainable settlements and it may therefore be possible to see a reduction in the number of car parking spaces provided per dwelling. Paragraph 6.26 also notes that developers will need to justify why they are planning for the number of parking standards proposed.</p> <p>Vistry Partnerships support the premise of this, but it is important new developments are still designed to accommodate satisfactory levels of parking to ensure safety and attractiveness within developments and reduce the potential for unallocated on-street parking. Both of which would detract from placemaking objectives.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Whilst Vistry Partnerships appreciate the policy is based on new parking standards, it is recommended some degree of flexibility is built into the policy. This is required to ensure flexibility in the application of the standard to provide a balance between movement, necessity and placemaking.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Whilst Vistry Partnerships appreciate the policy is based on new parking standards, it is recommended some degree of flexibility is built into the policy. This is required to ensure flexibility in the application of the standard to provide a balance between movement, necessity and placemaking.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base - includes tables) Supporting document 1 (Affordable Housing Statement) Supporting document 2 (Vision Document 1 - Pitt Vale) Supporting document 3 (Vision Document 2) Supporting document 4 (Landscape and Visual Technical Note)

However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

[Supporting document 5 \(Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Report\)](#)

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Catesby Estates
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32NS-Y
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32NS-Y/12/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Catesby understands and supports the shift in emphasis from planning for the private car to planning for active and sustainable travel modes. However, the draft policy (and its associated wording in paragraphs 6.26 to 6.32) suggests that the Council will no longer maintain general parking standards but will instead consider parking bay provision on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>This is problematic, as the abandonment of parking standards offers little clarity to developers or master planners designing a proposed development. Moreover, in the absence of standards, there is likely to be tension (in the development management process) between a proposed 'low car parking scheme', which may find endorsement at officer-level but may not meet the aspirations of Members when applications are heard at the Planning Committee.</p> <p>There is a need for balance, and revised parking standards should be prepared, but on a basis that is consistent with active and sustainable travel principles and with relevant flexibility embedded. This clarity would benefit all parties involved. This is necessary to avoid unnecessary conflicts and delays during the development management process and, therefore, to promote the effectiveness of the Plan as a matter of soundness.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Catesby considers that revised parking standards should be prepared to provide clarity to applicants and those involved in the design process. Policy T2 should be revised to make reference to the Parking Standards SPD and its expected successor. The supporting text in paragraphs 6.26 to 6.32 should be modified to confirm that new parking standards will be prepared.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Catesby considers that revised parking standards should be prepared to provide clarity to applicants and those involved in the design process. Policy T2 should be revised to make reference to the Parking Standards SPD and its expected successor. The supporting text in paragraphs 6.26 to 6.32 should be modified to confirm that new parking standards will be prepared.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	

Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Supporting document 1 (Location Plan - Land off Titchfield Lane, Wickham) Supporting document 2 (Vision Framework) Supporting document 3 (Concept Plan) Supporting document 4 (Integrated Impact Assessment comments)

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	West Waterlooville Developments Limited (Grainger PLC)
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B5G-A
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B5G-A/7/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	<p>West Waterlooville Developments Limited (WWDL) support the principle of promoting sustainable travel with a defined travel hierarchy which seeks to move away from the dependence on private car travel. The practicality of being able to successfully implement this approach without a clear programme for the delivery of supporting infrastructure is questioned. West Waterlooville Developments Limited (WWDL) look forward to understanding more about how the delivery of wider infrastructure across the District will be implemented in order to support the Council's ambitions for sustainable travel.</p> <p>It will be necessary for the Council to update the parking standards SPD in tandem with the Local Plan review in order to ensure that forthcoming development proposals can appropriately assess parking requirements during the initial site appraisal and viability stages of the development process. For the avoidance of doubt, clear guidance on the level of information required within the travel plan/supporting documents as part of the planning submissions to justify the proposed parking provision should be set out within the supporting text of the policy.</p>
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or</i>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Supporting Document (Site Delivery Statement - Berewood)</p>

allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32G7-V
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32G7-V/18/T2
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	Bargate homes welcome the slight clarification in when the applicant is required to provide a Design and Access Statement, Transport Assessment and the Travel Plan to show how the needs of sustainable transport modes have been prioritised in the design process and provide justification for the level of car parking provided on the site. However, this is contradictory as per the Winchester Local Validation List which only requires a DAS and Transport Assessment on major development, excluding minor developments.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	The policy should be reworded to remove reference to the specific reports to account for minor development, or additional text should clarify this.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	New development, excluding householder development, will only be permitted where: i. The applicant can demonstrate in their application (Design and Access Statement, Transport Assessment and the Travel Plan,) how the needs of sustainable transport modes have been prioritised in the design process and provide justification for the level of car parking provided on the site. (Text in brackets to be deleted)
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided</i>	No

*may contain additional details,
such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Richard Doughty
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32FT-R - New Alresford Town Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32FT-R - New Alresford Town Council/11/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	Whilst we understand that in the city itself, it may be acceptable for homes to be built without provision for car parking, the reality of life in the market towns is such that most households generally need a car. Therefore, this element of the policy should be limited to the city itself.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Judith Anne Polak
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32TW-9
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32TW-9/9/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	Recent development in Sutton Scotney has allowed just 2 parking spaces per household. This has resulted in an increase in on road parking in the village. Those living in rural areas have to rely on a car to access work, school or other facilities so additional parking space must be allowed.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Brian Welch
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z2-A
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z2-A/4/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Parking for New Developments</p> <p>Parking near to homes has been a constant problem in Winchester for decades. When the Weeke and Winnall Estates were build there was little or no provision for off street parking, because car ownership was not widespread, which has led to wide verges and roads overcrowded with residents cars.</p> <p>That mistake is now being repeated with planning approval granted for limited garage and parking places for households even though they might have up to 4 or more working adults each travelling in different directions daily.</p> <p>The answer is surely not to pretend that those adults will not want to use cars and that their behaviour can be changed by restricting parking spaces.</p> <p>The difference between 1930s planning and today is that there is less space between houses and non-existent verges.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information?	No

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Steven Favell
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-323A-J
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-323A-J/9/T2
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	T2 section 3. Where no parking is provided there should not be provision for on street parking. While WCC has an aim for reducing private car use, this is not realistic in today's world. While a reduction in private car use may well be achievable, ownership levels are likely to remain static or increase in line with the population. Electric and alternative fuels are constantly being developed and the Green argument will diminish.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Is the survey here to invite comment or to discuss purely whether the submission is legal? Being legal does not make it right.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Where no parking is provided on new developments, to avoid circumvention, HCC and WCC will not provision parking permits for residents or visitors to that address.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Charles William Bone
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BB1-1
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BB1-1/3/T2
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	I cannot comment on the legality of the proposals as i am not a lawyer. The proposals at T2 para 6.26 to enable a 'step change' is not feasible. The reverse must be applied. The car is a fundamental asset of individuals. It provides freedom of travel and connections around the country and overseas. Local public transport does not facilitate this.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Instead the plan should make positive proposals for the parking and/or garaging of cars belonging to residents and visitors. All parking should be in garages or in off road parking sites to avoid congestion and to ensure safety for other road users. Parking areas should be constructed with porous surfaces to avoid water run off, a conservation measure. Properties should be equipped with technology to support fast car battery charging. Multi home buildings must have adequate parking for each residence and underground garaging should be considered.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	The developer must propose sufficient parking and /or garage facilities to ensure that residents and visitors do not need to park on the public roads. The number of parking places per residence must be assessed in accordance with the type of accommodation. For example affordable properties may only require on parking site and several such homes may need to share a number of visitor parking places. A larger property may require a double garage and parking for an additional 3 vehicles. The parking places should be constructed of porous material to prevent water run off. Properties should be equipped with Fast charging electric infrastructure to facilitate the private connection of charging points for battery driven vehicles.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or</i>	No

allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Phil Gagg
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/18/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	T2 is not positively prepared. It fails to ensure delivery at a proportionate scale the carbon emissions reductions required by the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan referenced in policy CN1. The supporting paragraphs that contain serious errors.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Policy T2 is the only T policy that refers to Travel Plans, It would be more effective to have a policy specifically about travel plans, since these should be at the heart of all aspects of how the developer will influence and encourage sustainable travel behaviour, not just parking. The presentation of travel plans here does nothing to prevent the nominal inconclusive nature of most developer travel plans in the district so far.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	New development, excluding householder development, will only be permitted where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The applicant can demonstrate in the Design and Access Statement, Transport Assessment and the Travel Plan, that sustainable transport modes have been maximised in the design process and that the level of car parking proposed is unavoidable; ii. The parking provision on residential development including for visitors shall take account of local circumstances including the layout of the development, the mix of dwellings, the character of the local area and the proximity of public transport; iii. Residential development proposed with no car parking provision will be encouraged where it is located in walking distance of a range of services and facilities, or there is appropriate access to non-car based modes of transport, and it is demonstrated that the lack of provision will not be to the detriment of the surrounding area or the need of those with limited mobility; iv. Secure parking for cycles, e-mobility, mobility scooters or any other form of non-car transport must be provided in a safe and convenient location and should be integral to the building where possible, and if this is not possible should be undercover, with charging points designed according to the relevant standard or locally specific demand and any health and safety requirements; and v. Parking for commercial uses will be considered on a case by case basis.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	

Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	YMCA Fairthorne Manor Group Philipa Spicer
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Y-F
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Y-F/12/T2
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (Table of policies) Letter (commenting on Policies and Evidence Base - includes vision document)) Supporting document 1 (Vision Document) Supporting document 2 (Vision Document)

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Andy Key
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3284-A
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3284-A/21/T2
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	<p>Fails on being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Para i has a problem with the ambiguous use of “prioritised”. . While a layperson reading this might assume it means “give them top priority” it’s not what the word actually means.</p> <p>To prioritise is just to place a number of things in priority order. A developer or transport consultant could claim “Yes, we prioritised cycling and walking along with everything else and it came out at number 9 in our priority list, just below ‘extra-big parking spaces for SUVs’.” Here and wherever “prioritise” is used, it needs to be made clear that active travel should be given the highest priority, not just a priority.</p> <p>Para iv is ineffective without a standard for the quantity of cycle parking, with levels set for both resident and visitor parking. The council does not have a comprehensive standard for this, and it needs one. At the moment WCC has only a car parking SPD approved in 2009 which does not meet NPPF requirements, only mentions cycle parking very briefly, and relies on a long-obsolete Hampshire County council policy from 2002 that HCC itself no longer recognises.</p> <p>We suggest referring to a cycle parking standard here and ensuring that a comprehensive, up-to-date one is in place by the time this plan is approved. Note that the lack of a suitable parking standard indicates a failure to co-operate effectively with the county council on this topic..</p> <p>Para v is ineffective without some kind of guidance. As it stands, it is a loophole that would</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>Para 1: clarify “prioritised”</p> <p>Para iv: Refer to a cycle parking standard and ensure that one is created, agreed with the highway authority and approved as soon as possible.</p> <p>Para v: Set some parameters for this to avoid creating a policy loophole.</p>
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	<p>Para i: “...sustainable transport modes have been prioritised given top priority in the design process...”</p> <p>Para iv: “Secure parking for e-mobility, mobility scooters or any other form of non-car transport must be provided in conformance with the council’s cycle parking standards...” – and ensure that robust valid standards exist.</p> <p>Para v:</p>

	Car parking for commercial uses will only be considered where adequate parking provision has been made for customers and visitors arriving by active travel means (see (iv) above) and will be considered on a case by case basis.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (commenting on policies) Letter (commenting on policies)

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Neil Massie
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/34/T2
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>The County Council would recommend clarifying the policy position regarding what residential parking standards the City Council will expect applicants to consider prior to the new Residential Parking Standards SPD being adopted in case there is a delay in the timetable for approving the new standards. The County Council is concerned that there could be a policy void between the old standards and the new one being adopted, so including a reference to what the parking standard is would be useful for developers.</p> <p>T2 ii) The County Council suggest that there should be somewhere in the policy or the associated text referencing how car parking demand for a new development is assessed and calculated, and what information is expected from the applicant to evidence this. The County Council will also welcome additional information setting out how the applicant should assess 'on street parking stress' in the vicinity of the proposed site if there is a risk that parking associated with the development will impact on street parking. The County Council would welcome reference to parking and loading requirements for operational vehicle activities such as delivery vans, servicing vehicles, refuse and recycling vehicles and fire appliances. It is noted that there is also no reference to disabled parking provision and standards and it may be worthwhile clarifying the policy position. In the case of large development sites particularly where lower parking provision is sought and there may be impacts on the highway network then, a requirement for an approved Car Parking Management Plan should be considered.</p> <p>T2 iii) This policy does not consider how the potential impacts on the highway resulting from developments with no car parking or limited parking might be managed. Does the policy need to reference that residents of these developments may be restricted from applying for on street resident parking permits and/or on street parking restrictions may need to be reviewed. The current wording is a good catch-all but the lack of detail could cause issues in the future or mean developments with no or limited car parking development is difficult to deliver.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the	

policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes <u>Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base)</u>

Policy/Evidence base document	T2
Name of respondent (or client)	Patrick Blake
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32QF-N - National Highways
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-32QF-N - National Highways/4/T2
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	Policy T2 adjusts the approach to parking for new developments away from one with strict adherence to parking standards to a more flexible approach where the number of car parking spaces must be justified after active travel has been catered for. National Highways supports this approach as it can help lead to lower car parking levels and therefore trip generation at suitable sites. This policy also requires that all new development is supported for a Design & Access Statement, Transport Assessment and Travel Plan which demonstrates that the needs of sustainable transport modes have been prioritised in the design process and provides a justification for the level of car parking on the site.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided</i>	No

*may contain additional details,
such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

None.

Local Plan Reference or document	Policy T3 Enabling Sustainable Travel Modes of Transport and the Design and Layout of Parking for New Developments		
Total Number of Representations received	15		
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	Yes	No	
Legally Compliant	11	2	
Sound	7	7	
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	9	3	
<p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>General agreement on the necessity for integrating sustainable travel initiatives, sympathetically tailored to local needs, but concern that this is not reflective of a rural district where there is high car dependency in the rural areas due to lack of alternatives.</p> <p>Concern that the policy requirements are unlikely to be achievable for all types / scales of development to which the policy applies.</p> <p>A number of responses express concern about the adequacy of the policy in addressing sustainability and carbon neutrality goals. Request for clearer policy language, with the need for precise definitions, regarding terms like “active and e-mobility travel, car clubs”, and the need for parking standards for these forms of mobility.</p>			
<p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T/37/T3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/22/T3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32NR-X/7/T3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/16/T3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32Z2-A/2/T3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-323A-J/2/T3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32Z7-F - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/8/T3</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/7/T3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-3265-9 - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/8/T3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-328X-E/9/T3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-3286-C/9/T3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-3284-A/9/T3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-328G-W/9/T3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/10/T3</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-328K-1/8/T3</p>			
Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation			

- Need clear definitions of terms used and what scale and locations of development the policy would be applied to given the rural nature of the district; and
- Policy lacks clarity in terms of addressing sustainability and carbon neutrality goals.

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Rob Edgecock
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T/37/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The policy is well thought-out.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No


Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Debbie Harding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/22/T3
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	We support this policy but feel that it not address the high car dependency in settlements such as Colden Common.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Ed Flood (Agent on behalf of Sparsholt College)
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32NR-X
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32NR-X/7/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Sustainable travel measures appropriate to the context, i.e. taking into account local circumstances, should be the objective (consistent with NPPF paragraph 9). Priority parking for active and e-mobility travel (which is not defined) and car clubs may not be appropriate for all development proposals, as this will depend on the scale of the development or constraints on the site.</p> <p>The college do not think it appropriate that planning applications for new classrooms and education infrastructure should be required to provide EV charging points – particularly when the College can demonstrate a sustainable Travel Plan which limits the reliance on the private car.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>The following proposed amendment to the text is requested;</p> <p>New development, will only be permitted where: i. Priority is given for active and e-mobility travel and car clubs (where appropriate) (underline indicates additional text)</p>
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided</i>	No

*may contain additional details,
such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Bloor Homes Limited (River Reach, Unit 7 Newbury Business Park, London Road, Newbury, Berkshire, RG14 2PS)
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Q-8
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/16/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The broad ambition of this policy is supported overall; whilst greater clarity has been provided in the amended policy as to what scale of development it would be applicable to, the policy requirements are unlikely to be achievable for all types / scales of development to which the policy applies. The policy continues to contain jargon including “active and e-mobility travel and car clubs” which isn’t clearly explained in the accompanying supporting text.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	The broad ambition of this policy is supported overall; whilst greater clarity has been provided in the amended policy as to what scale of development it would be applicable to, the policy requirements are unlikely to be achievable for all types / scales of development to which the policy applies. The policy continues to contain jargon including “active and e-mobility travel and car clubs” which isn’t clearly explained in the accompanying supporting text.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	The broad ambition of this policy is supported overall; whilst greater clarity has been provided in the amended policy as to what scale of development it would be applicable to, the policy requirements are unlikely to be achievable for all types / scales of development to which the policy applies. The policy continues to contain jargon including “active and e-mobility travel and car clubs” which isn’t clearly explained in the accompanying supporting text.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies, policies map and evidence base) Vision document (Land At Mill Lane, Wickham)

However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.



Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Brian Welch
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z2-A
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z2-A/2/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>The Proposed Closure of the Andover Road</p> <p>If there is a reduction in the use of private cars by 2040, the plan should respond to it at the time, but it is premature to use road closures to change social behaviour.</p> <p>The prime example is the proposed closure of the ancient Roman road into Winchester – the Andover Road. The alternative proposed route through the new development – Barton Farm is hardly wide enough for two busses to pass, and certainly not articulated lorries,</p> <p>The closure will turn adjoining roads in Harestock and Weeke into ‘rat runs’, and when a traffic fatality occurs on Winchester Avenue in Barton Farm, everyone – planners, Council Officials and Councillors will blame each other.</p> <p>The overwhelming view of the local population is against the closure but there is no desire on the part of City and County Councillors, or their officials to engage with the community and to accept that this is dangerous and premature.</p> <p>They each blame the original planning approval of the Barton Farm development which in the early 2000s over-estimated the reduction of traffic 25 years ahead, but there is no desire anywhere in the City or County Councils to accept that this is a step too far.</p> <p>It might be appropriate in 2040, but certainly not in the next 10 years.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	

Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Steven Favell
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-323A-J
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-323A-J/2/T3
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	Private car travel is moving towards becoming more sustainable with EVs and alternative fuels being developed. Is the reduction of private car use based on sustainability only? Adequate provision for parking private vehicles for both residents, visitors, service and delivery vehicles is required on new developments. I have already seen evidence of pavement parking on Barton Farm before it is even finished. Private car usage and ownership are different issues.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Is the survey here to invite comment or to discuss purely whether the submission is legal? Being legal does not make it right.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Parking space at a level of two vehicles per property shall be provided.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	No

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z7-F - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z7-F - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/8/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The Trust continue to support the principles of this policy, including prioritising 'parking' for active and e-mobility travel as well as the provision for charging of plug in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations. The Trust support provision of measures for people with reduced mobility and will look to mitigate inequality of access to all modes of travel for people with disabilities and reduced mobility.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	-
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	-
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	No

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Phil Gagg
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/7/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Policy T3 is not positively prepared; it fails to ensure delivery at a proportionate scale the carbon emissions reductions required by the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan referenced in policy CN1.</p> <p>Policy T3 asks that applicants “demonstrate through the design process the need for parking.” It is difficult to know how design will demonstrate the need for parking. Without clarity on this, there is no certainty that this policy will help deliver policy CN1. We would like you to Add the criteria that should be used to assess whether applicants “demonstrate through the design process the need for parking.” and the rationale that would be necessary for applicants to meet the criteria.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Stronger direction on what needs to be done to deliver the targets of the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan. The policy needs explicit criteria to be used to assess whether applicants “demonstrate through the design process the need for parking.” and the rationale that would be necessary for applicants to meet the criteria.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	<p>New development, excluding householder development, will only be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The applicant can demonstrate in the Design and Access Statement, Transport Assessment and the Travel Plan, that sustainable transport modes have been maximised in the design process and that the level of car parking proposed is unavoidable; ii. The parking provision on residential development including for visitors shall take account of local circumstances including the layout of the development, the mix of dwellings, the character of the local area and the proximity of public transport; iii. Residential development proposed with no car parking provision will be encouraged where it is located in walking distance of a range of services and facilities, or there is appropriate access to non-car based modes of transport, and it is demonstrated that the lack of provision will not be to the detriment of the surrounding area or the need of those with limited mobility; iv. Secure parking for cycles, e-mobility, mobility scooters or any other form of non-car transport must be provided in a safe and convenient location and should be integral to the building where possible, and if this is not possible should be undercover, with charging points designed according to the relevant standard or locally specific demand and any health and safety requirements; and v. Parking for commercial uses will be considered on a case by case basis.

Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Shirlene Oh
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3265-9 - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3265-9 - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/8/T3
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>Full response on website Strategic Policy T3 T4 The Trust continue to support the principles of this policy, including prioritising 'parking' for active and e-mobility travel as well as the provision for charging of plug in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations. The Trust support provision of measures for people with reduced mobility and will look to mitigate inequality of access to all modes of travel for people with disabilities and reduced mobility.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided</i>	Yes Letter (Commenting on policies)

*may contain additional details,
such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	YMCA Fairthorne Manor Group Philipa Spicer
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Y-F
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Y-F/5/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (Table of policies) Letter (commenting on Policies and Evidence Base - includes vision document)) Supporting document 1 (Vision Document) Supporting document 2 (Vision Document)

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Wates Developments Ltd
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328X-E
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328X-E/9/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	Wates supports this policy, and it chimes with its own design and layout philosophies. The 'hierarchy' of streets is a well understood principle, and developers / developments are becoming better at providing for active travel and promoting pedestrian and cycle safety. 6.8 The need to promote public transport options as early as possible in new developments is also understood and supported.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	Yes Form (refers to letter) Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base)

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Wates Developments Ltd. ('Wates')
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3286-C
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3286-C/9/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Full response on website.</p> <p>Legally compliant Yes</p> <p>Positively prepared Yes</p> <p>Sound Yes</p> <p>Justified Yes</p> <p>Compliant with the duty to cooperate Yes</p> <p>Effective Yes</p> <p>Compliant with national policy Yes</p> <p>6.7 Wates supports this policy, and it chimes with its own design and layout philosophies. The 'hierarchy' of streets is a well understood principle, and developers / developments are becoming better at providing for active travel and promoting pedestrian and cycle safety.</p> <p>6.8 The need to promote public transport options as early as possible in new developments is also understood and supported.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate

<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Form (refers to letter) Letter (Commenting on policies)</p>
---	--

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Andy Key
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3284-A
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3284-A/9/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	Fails on being effective. This appears to be referring only to car (and other motor vehicle) parking. Despite its title it doesn't address the need to favour sustainable travel modes at all and therefore fails to meet NPPF requirements.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Either (a) make it clearer that this policy is entirely about car parking, or (b) ensure it includes guidance about designing new developments to put active travel routes at a higher priority level than car parking. (b) would be preferable. Ironically, the requirements stated in para vi are almost exactly the requirements stated for walking and cycling paths (not for car parking!) in the PCPI Secured By Design standards, so a simple wording change in this paragraph would fulfil the active travel brief. The supporting text should reference the Secured By Design standards.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	“In order to prioritise sustainable and active modes of travel planning applications (excluding householder applications) will be required to demonstrate through the design process that they are giving high priority to active travel, and are thereby minimising the need for parking provision.” [...] “ vi. The design provides attractive, landscaped and safe parking areas active travel routes which are overlooked by dwellings or other areas of active public use providing surveillance and are accompanied with associated long term maintenance plans. Car parking facilities will only be permitted when the design also fulfils the active travel route requirements.”
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information?	Yes Form (commenting on policies)

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

[Letter \(commenting on policies\)](#)

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Wates Developments Ltd. ('Wates')
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328G-W
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328G-W/9/T3
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Full response on website.</p> <p>Legally compliant Yes</p> <p>Positively prepared Yes</p> <p>Sound Yes</p> <p>Justified Yes</p> <p>Compliant with the duty to cooperate Yes</p> <p>Effective Yes</p> <p>Compliant with national policy Yes</p> <p>6.7 Wates supports this policy, and it chimes with its own design and layout philosophies. The 'hierarchy' of streets is a well understood principle, and developers / developments are becoming better at providing for active travel and promoting pedestrian and cycle safety.</p> <p>6.8 The need to promote public transport options as early as possible in new developments is also understood and supported.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate

<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Form (refers to letter) Letter (Commenting on policies)</p>
---	--

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Neil Massie
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328R-8 - Hampshire County Council/10/T3
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	T3 i) The County Council support the reference to priority parking for active and e-mobility travel and car clubs however, it is noted that there is no specific policy or signposting in the document to guidance as to the number of bays that should be provided or expected according to the size, scale, location and use of the development.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies and evidence base)

Policy/Evidence base document	T3
Name of respondent (or client)	Winchester College
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328K-1
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328K-1/8/T3
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>Previous Representation made by Winchester College – Regulation 18 consultation</p> <p>Winchester College support the principle of the City Council's approach to promote sustainable travel modes in Policy T3. However, for clarification, the College requests that the wording of the policy is amended to take account of the fact that priority parking for active and e-mobility travel (which is not defined) and car clubs may not be appropriate for all development proposals, as this will depend on the scale of the development or constraints on the site, for instance where heritage assets may be affected.</p> <p>The College therefore requests that the policy is amended as follows (suggested additional text is underlined):</p> <p>(i) “Where appropriate provides priority parking . . . and car clubs.”</p> <p>WCC Officer Comments in relation to the Regulation 18 consultation</p> <p>Comments noted and support welcomed</p> <p>We understand that not all aspects of the Local Plan policies will apply to all areas, especially rural areas. However, we do want to make sure active travel promoted and prioritised where possible.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>The policy sets out a hierarchy but they will not all be appropriate in all cases.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> <p>Representation made by Winchester College – Regulation 19 consultation</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Policy T3 has been updated to recognise that the list of criteria is only applicable to new development - ‘New development will only be permitted where...’ which would therefore not include change of use.</p> <p>The Council’s response acknowledges that active travel should be promoted and prioritised but this has not been reflected in Policy T3. The policy as currently drafted is therefore not effective and should be reworded to promote active travel.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the	The Council’s response acknowledges that active travel should be promoted and prioritised but this has not been reflected in Policy T3. The policy as currently drafted is therefore not effective and should be reworded to promote active travel.

policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	At the start of the Policy T3 it should be made clear that active travel should be promoted and prioritised.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (commenting on policies) Supporting information (Map - Blackbridge Yard)

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

None.

Local Plan Reference or document	Policy T4 Access for New Developments	
Total Number of Representations received	12	
Number of respondents who confirmed they consider the policy is –	Yes	No
Legally Compliant	11	1
Sound	5	7
Complies with Duty to Cooperate	9	2
<p>Summary of Representations</p> <p>The majority of comments suggest that Policy T4 needs more specific guidance on connecting new developments to public transport, cycling, and walking routes, including reference to LCWIP, plus emphasising support for active travel and accessibility for people with disabilities – the needs of those with reduced mobility must not be overlooked.</p> <p>There is concern that the vague language and lack of alignment with national guidelines undermines equitable access to travel options. Sustainable and active travel is encouraged, but feedback highlights a need for a site access to be designed to be appropriate for the type, scale and location of the development.</p> <p>Development and infrastructure challenges are referred to by a number of respondents in terms of narrow footpaths and old infrastructure, which raises issues of accessibility and policy consistency. Comments in relation to safety and environmental considerations stress the importance of clear guidance and designing developments for safe, convenient, and sustainable access, with collaborative efforts to reduce carbon footprints and improve active travel routes.</p>		
<p>Representation Numbers (Statutory consultees in bold and named)</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BEW-A - Littleton and Harestock Parish Council/23/T4 ANON-AQTS-3BJD-V/2/T4 ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T/34/T4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-3BFT-8 - Crawley Parish Council/5/T4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/20/T4 ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/14/T4 ANON-AQTS-32G7-V/6/T4 ANON-AQTS-32TW-9/2/T4</p> <p>ANON-AQTS-32Z7-F - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/6/T4 ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/5/T4</p> <p>BHLF-AQTS-3265-9 - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/6/T4 BHLF-AQTS-3284-A/8/T4</p>		
Main issues raised in representations received in regulation 19 consultation		

- Policy needs greater clarity on connecting new developments to public transport, cycling, and walking routes and to be inclusive to all users;
- Need to reflect narrow pavement and old infrastructure in many locations which impacts accessibility; and
- Need clear guidance for designing developments for safe, convenient, and sustainable access as appropriate for the type, scale and location of the development.

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Lisa Fielding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BEW-A - Littleton and Harestock Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BEW-A - Littleton and Harestock Parish Council/23/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	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. The Parish Council supports the policy. Support Policy T4
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies)

*may contain additional details,
such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Christine Gardner
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BJD-V
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BJD-V/2/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	Agree with 6.37 that "the needs of those with reduced mobility must not be overlooked." THEY MUST BE PROVIDED FOR. "Private car parking for such users will be supported." This includes undercover parks in Winchester city for mobility scooters please. If you want to encourage more tourists, jobs & economic activity in city centre, those people will need parking or at least covered cycle parks. Don't reduce car parking in Winchester.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Extend a form of blue badge parking for over-75s and those with disabilities. Provide undercover parking for mobility scooters etc. Don't reduce car parking in Winchester. Stop building houses in the Winchester area, especially on car parks. There has been too much building already.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	Extend a form of blue badge parking for over 75s and those with disabilities. Provide undercover parking for mobility scooters etc. To encourage more tourists, jobs & economic activity, allow private cars into Winchester as now.
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details,</i>	No

*such as images, tables, or
tracked changes, if applicable.*

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Rob Edgecock
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BSY-T/34/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The policy is well thought-out.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Henrietta Boucher
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BFT-8 - Crawley Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3BFT-8 - Crawley Parish Council/5/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The policy needs to more strongly assert that any application must be supported by a travel plan alongside good access for any new development. Also the policy as it stands, recognises more people working from home - not sure this now wholly accurate as more and more are being asked to return to the office. Winchester is a commuter town.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	The policy needs to more strongly assert that any application must be supported by a travel plan alongside good access for any new development. Also the policy as it stands, recognises more people working from home - not sure this now wholly accurate as more and more are being asked to return to the office. Winchester is a commuter town.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Debbie Harding
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32CD-5 - Colden Common Parish Council/20/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	No comment but could not skip through this section
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Bloor Homes Limited (River Reach, Unit 7 Newbury Business Park, London Road, Newbury, Berkshire, RG14 2PS)
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Q-8
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-329Q-8/14/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Bloor Homes supports the need to provide for access for pedestrians, cyclists and those with mobility issues. The masterplan for Mill Lane, Wickham submitted in relation to the Regulation 18 consultation made every effort to accommodate these users.</p> <p>Proposed allocation WK5 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. In light of this, we consider that further supports the expansion of the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham to include the adjacent Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which is part of the original masterplan proposal submitted to the Council.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>Bloor Homes supports the need to provide for access for pedestrians, cyclists and those with mobility issues. The masterplan for Mill Lane, Wickham submitted in relation to the Regulation 18 consultation made every effort to accommodate these users.</p> <p>Proposed allocation WK5 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. In light of this, we consider that further supports the expansion of the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham to include the adjacent Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which is part of the original masterplan proposal submitted to the Council.</p>
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	<p>Bloor Homes supports the need to provide for access for pedestrians, cyclists and those with mobility issues. The masterplan for Mill Lane, Wickham submitted in relation to the Regulation 18 consultation made every effort to accommodate these users.</p> <p>Proposed allocation WK5 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. In light of this, we consider that further supports the expansion of the draft allocation for Land at Mill Lane, Wickham to include the adjacent Land at the junction of Mill Lane, Wickham (WI06), which is part of the original masterplan proposal submitted to the Council.</p>
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	

Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Letter (commenting on policies, policies map and evidence base) Vision document (Land At Mill Lane, Wickham)

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Bargate Homes
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32G7-V
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32G7-V/6/T4
Legally compliant?	No
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	<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. There is also no need to refer to compliance with the rest of the development plan.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	Remove the need to refer to compliance with the rest of the development plan and insert more clarity on access for different types and scales of development.
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	<p>New development, excluding householder applications, will be permitted (where it accords with the development plan and) where it:</p> <p>...</p> <p>New wording: Access should be designed to be appropriate for the type, scale and location of the development.</p> <p>(Wording in brackets to be deleted)</p>
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information?	No

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Judith Anne Polak
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32TW-9
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32TW-9/2/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	The proposed access for the allocation in Sutton Scotney SU01 will not encourage walking or cycling. The adjacent footpaths are narrow and pedestrians will need to cross a busy main road to access village facilities. The proposed new footpath could not be built as the verge area is too narrow and there is an old railway bridge preventing widening. Anyone living on this new development will be forced to travel by car.
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	No, I don't want to take part in a hearing session
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z7-F - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-32Z7-F - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/6/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Offering genuine choice of sustainable and active travel modes remains likely to benefit our staff and some patients to access the hospital, with benefits from walking and cycling and the potential reduction in air pollution. The Trust wish to restate that they will need the support where practicable, to move away from the use of cars when coming to site.</p> <p>The previous focus in the Regulation 18 Local Plan on creating connected 15-minute neighbourhoods was supported by the Trust. The Trust remain enthusiastic to work with WCC on the updated 20-minute neighbourhood focus. The Trust would like to continue to strengthen dialogue around active travel corridors, increase walking and cycling and access to public transport services and infrastructure. The local park and ride bus service is well utilised by Trust staff and patients, and we continue to welcome any further park and ride developments that may come through increased development in the local area.</p> <p>The Trust's catchment being a mix of urban and rural communities, we recognise that access to public transport is not readily available to all, it is therefore welcomed that the policy now requires that sustainable and active travel routes be suitable for those with disabilities and reduced mobility.</p> <p>The Trust remain interested in working more closely with WCC to reduce our mutual carbon footprint. Presently there are no attractive, direct cycle routes to the hospital, therefore the Trust would welcome understanding more about the central LCWIP and also have involvement in the development of the wider district LCWIP. As an organisation with a large volume of deliveries throughout the working week, the Trust is considering options regarding 'last mile' delivery and would be very interested in further discussion about the suggested implementation of 'vehicle hubs'.</p> <p>The Trust continue to support the principles of prioritising 'parking' for active and e-mobility travel as well as the provision for charging of plug in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations. The Trust support provision of measures for people with reduced mobility and will look to mitigate inequality of access to all modes of travel for people with disabilities and reduced mobility.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	-

What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	-
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Phil Gagg
Personal reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K
Full reference number	ANON-AQTS-3B8M-K/5/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	Yes
Policy/Document comment	<p>Policy T4 is not sound: it is not positively prepared; it fails to ensure delivery at a proportionate scale the carbon emissions reductions required by the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan referenced in policy CN1. Policy T4 appears too weak to achieve more than a nominal contribution to policy CN1. Sub-policy i requires connection with “the nearest” public transport stop and seems to preclude connections with other public transport stops, even if they are more useful.</p> <p>We welcome the aspirations of the Reg 19 draft to develop sustainable transport. They are in introductory passages, non-site-specific policies and site-specific policies. However, without the support of quantitative requirements, it is probable that developers will underestimate the scale of the innovation necessary, planning committees will become confused, and/or appeals will proliferate, and ultimately the local plan will fail to deliver the greenhouse gas reductions that the plan’s climate policies require.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>More closely tailored site-specific requirements within site-specific policies would be more likely to achieve the aims of policy CN1. Local Plans elsewhere often provide outline plans of connections across the whole area for walking and cycling, and specify how each development will be expected to link in. This can often supplement any overall reference to an LCWIP, indeed as is the case here.</p>
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	<p>New development, excluding householder applications, will be permitted where it accords with the development plan, and where it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Proposes a network of safe and attractive routes for walking, wheeling and cycling (built to the standards set out in LTN 1/20) to, from and within the site which connect to existing Public Rights of Way network outside the site boundary and all local public transport stops, minimising the scope for conflicts between all users (where there is a lack of significant public transport routes in the vicinity additional public transport should be proposed) and good enough to attract a modal shift from cars. 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 appropriate crossings 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

	<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>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.</p>
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	No

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Shirlene Oh
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3265-9 - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3265-9 - Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust/6/T4
Legally compliant?	
Sound?	
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	<p>Full response on website Strategic Policy T1 T4</p> <p>The Trust continue to support SP T1. Offering genuine choice of sustainable and active travel modes remains likely to benefit our staff and some patients to access the hospital, with benefits from walking and cycling and the potential reduction in air pollution. The Trust wish to restate that they will need the support where practicable, to move away from the use of cars when coming to site.</p> <p>The previous focus in the Regulation 18 Local Plan on creating connected 15-minute neighbourhoods was supported by the Trust. The Trust remain enthusiastic to work with WCC on the updated 20-minute neighbourhood focus. The Trust would like to continue to strengthen dialogue around active travel corridors, increase walking and cycling and access to public transport services and infrastructure. The local park and ride bus service is well utilised by Trust staff and patients, and we continue to welcome any further park and ride developments that may come through increased development in the local area.</p> <p>The Trust's catchment being a mix of urban and rural communities, we recognise that access to public transport is not readily available to all, it is therefore welcomed that the policy now requires that sustainable and active travel routes be suitable for those with disabilities and reduced mobility.</p> <p>The Trust remain interested in working more closely with WCC to reduce our mutual carbon footprint. Presently there are no attractive, direct cycle routes to the hospital, therefore the Trust would welcome understanding more about the central LCWIP and also have involvement in the development of the wider district LCWIP. As an organisation with a large volume of deliveries throughout the working week, the Trust is considering options regarding 'last mile' delivery and would be very interested in further discussion about the suggested implementation of 'vehicle hubs'.</p> <p>Strategic Policy T3 T4</p> <p>The Trust continue to support the principles of this policy, including prioritising 'parking' for active and e-mobility travel as well as the provision for charging of plug in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations. The Trust support provision of measures for people with reduced mobility and will look to mitigate inequality of access to all modes of travel for people with disabilities and reduced mobility.</p>

<p>What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?</p>	
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	
<p>Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i></p>	<p>Yes Letter (Commenting on policies)</p>

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	YMCA Fairthorne Manor Group Philipa Spicer
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Y-F
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-328Y-F/4/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	Yes
Complies with duty to co-operate?	
Policy/Document comment	
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	
What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?	
Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?	
If no, please explain	
Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?	Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate
Have you submitted supporting information? <i>All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.</i>	Yes Form (Table of policies) Letter (commenting on Policies and Evidence Base - includes vision document)) Supporting document 1 (Vision Document) Supporting document 2 (Vision Document)

Policy/Evidence base document	T4
Name of respondent (or client)	Andy Key
Personal reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3284-A
Full reference number	BHLF-AQTS-3284-A/8/T4
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Complies with duty to co-operate?	No
Policy/Document comment	<p>Fails on being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Para i: First sentence doesn't make sense. It needs rewriting. It needs to reference the city and district LCWIPs explicitly as guidance. Without this there is no clear definition of what routes "to, from and within the site" means, so the policy cannot be effective. It should also add "through" the site to that list to be compliant with national policy; new developments are often an opportunity to improve permeability for active travel between nearby destinations (e.g. the Sir John Moore Barracks redevelopment, which has the potential to unlock active travel between Littleton, Harestock and Weeke). Again this policy uses the ambiguous word "prioritises" without making it clear that this means prioritising cycling, walking and wheeling above other modes of transport. Para v is far too ambiguous to be effective. It needs to define "reasonable". For example it could specify that such sites should have direct access onto a trunk or 'A' road, with access via 'B' and 'C' roads only to be considered if the road in question has not been identified as an active travel route. Unclassified roads should never be an acceptable access route for large numbers of HGVs. This is especially important in rural and semi-rural areas. To be consistent with para i it also needs to specify that site design should ensure that safe, convenient and segregated active travel access into the site is provided in a situation where there are many HGV movements.</p>
What modification(s) are necessary to make the policy legally compliant or sound?	<p>Fails on being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Para i: First sentence doesn't make sense. It needs rewriting. It needs to reference the city and district LCWIPs explicitly as guidance. Without this there is no clear definition of what routes "to, from and within the site" means, so the policy cannot be effective. It should also add "through" the site to that list to be compliant with national policy; new developments are often an opportunity to improve permeability for active travel between nearby destinations (e.g. the Sir John</p>

	<p>Moore Barracks redevelopment, which has the potential to unlock active travel between Littleton, Harestock and Weeke).</p> <p>Again this policy uses the ambiguous word “prioritises” without making it clear that this means prioritising cycling, walking and wheeling above other modes of transport.</p> <p>Para v is far too ambiguous to be effective. It needs to define “reasonable”.</p> <p>For example it could specify that such sites should have direct access onto a trunk or ‘A’ road, with access via ‘B’ and ‘C’ roads only to be considered if the road in question has not been identified as an active travel route.</p> <p>Unclassified roads should never be an acceptable access route for large numbers of HGVs. This is especially important in rural and semi-rural areas.</p> <p>To be consistent with para i it also needs to specify that site design should ensure that safe, convenient and segregated active travel access into the site is provided in a situation where there are many HGV movements.</p>
<p>What is your suggested wording or text for the policy?</p>	<p>Para i: “Gives to top priority to Prioritises the needs of walking, wheeling and cycling by providing (as set out in LTN 1/20) safe and attractive LTN 1/20 compliant routes from, through and within the site which connect to the existing active travel network as defined by the City and District LCWIPs Public Rights of Way network outside the site boundary and the nearest public transport stop, minimising the scope for conflicts between all users; [This would be better and clearer if it were written in multiple sentences rather than one long one, but that means changing the wording of the whole section.]</p> <p>Para v: “Any sites that are likely to generate large numbers of HGV movements need to be in reasonable proximity and accessible to the Major Road Network or the Strategic Road Network. ‘Reasonable proximity’ generally means direct access onto a trunk or ‘A’ road. Access via ‘B’ or ‘C’ roads will only be considered if the road in question has not been identified as an active travel route, is not regularly used by cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians, and is not a designated road under the Quiet Lanes and Home Zones (England) Regulations 2006. HGV access via unclassified roads will only be considered where it serves an existing facility such as a farm.”</p>
<p>Do you agree with how the policy will be monitored?</p>	
<p>If no, please explain</p>	
<p>Do you want to participate in hearing sessions for this policy?</p>	<p>Yes, I want to take part in a hearing session if I am invited to by the Inspector to participate</p>
<p>Have you submitted supporting information?</p>	<p>Yes Form (commenting on policies)</p>

All relevant information related to the specific policy or allocation has already been included in the representation. However, the links provided may contain additional details, such as images, tables, or tracked changes, if applicable.

[Letter \(commenting on policies\)](#)

WCC Response.

Comments noted.

WCC Recommended Changes arising from representations:

None.