

Matter 16 Tuesday 3 June AM

Answers to inspector's questions on W5 - Bushfield Camp (Winchester)

2. Given site constraints, including its location within a settlement gap, close to the South Downs National Park, its open green qualities, current use by the community, biodiversity and natural habitats and transport impacts, how has the developable area been defined (approximately 20 hectares)? Should this be included within policy?

There are fundamental problems with this site being allocated for flexible business use and employment space, an innovative hub and creative industries. It is unlikely the site will be deliverable within the constraints identified.

- The proposals for such a development currently being considered in the concept masterplan have so far not satisfied National Highways. The developers have not yet been able to demonstrate that vehicle access to the development (forecast at 4,542 vehicles per day) will not create excessive congestion and/or they have not been prepared to fund considerable transport infrastructure to prevent the congestion anticipated by National Highways.
- Even if developers were to propose extensive infrastructure that would satisfy National Highways the subsequent increase in traffic would create an increase in transport emissions that would be in conflict with policy CN1; the target for the policies referred to in CN1 of net zero emissions by 2030 will be denied by the increase in traffic predicted. To achieve net zero emissions by 2030 in the district there will have to be cumulative reductions of 67 KtCO₂e in transport emissions each year until 2030.
- The requirements for this site are not sufficiently rigorous to guarantee the aspirations of policy T1. Sub policy v requires only good design intentions such as 'putting people and places at the forefront' and 'enabling sustainable modes of transport.' It will be not good enough to 'enable'.

To achieve policies CN1 and T1 it will be necessary to 'ensure high levels of sustainable transport', specify a required mode share for sustainable transport use, and quantify the sustainable transport infrastructure (in terms of quantity and design). Taking into account the location of this site remote from central Winchester policy W5 does not include sufficient requirements to guarantee that this site deliver necessary social, economic or environmental development.

Answers to inspector's questions on W6 – Winnall (Winchester)

4. Would criteria adequately address the need to improve connectivity and accessibility in terms of pedestrian, cycle, and public transport links?

The preface to W6v should be deleted. Active travel infrastructure should as policy T4 suggests, always be appropriate, and it is the developer's responsibility to make it feasible. The need to create modal shift is so urgent that we cannot allow developers to underperform. There is a need for a site-specific specification of the scale and nature of the infrastructure required to achieve a modal shift towards active travel and public transport.

Answers to inspector's questions on W11 University of Winchester / Royal Hampshire County Hospital (Winchester)

2. Would the criteria be justified and are they clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

The criteria are insufficient until policy W11iv includes specific requirements on active and public transport detailing the extent and nature of infrastructure required to support the T and CN policies and improve access to and permeability of the site, specifying good access to the major bus stop on Romsey Road, and identifying walking and cycling through routes