

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

10.1. General Comments

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
CHAP10	1449/1	Brian Eastoe
CHAP10	206/3	Compass Roadside Ltd
CHAP10	327/1	Esso Petroleum Co Ltd
CHAP10	307/4	Roadchef

ISSUES

- 1 Should the adopted Plan proposal for a Motorway Service Area (MSA) at Whiteley be readmitted to the Plan Review? (327/1, 1449/1)
- 2 Should a policy on the allocation of land for MSAs be included? (206/3, 307/4)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.1.1 The Council indicates that the Structure Plan provides for planning permission to be granted for additional roadside facilities serving the Strategic Road Network subject to there being a demonstrated need. Whilst the adopted Local Plan allocates a service area at Whiteley, to serve the M27, this has not been carried through to the Review as no overriding evidence of need has been adduced. In this particular case, the nearest services on the M27 (Rownhams) is 12 miles distant, while the nearest on the M3 (Winchester) is about 24 miles. Government policy on the spacing of motorway service areas (MSAs) in Circular 1/94 prescribes desirable spacing as 30 miles, with an absolute minimum of 15 miles. As the Whiteley site would fall below the minimum recommended distance, I agree with the Council that it should not remain as a Plan proposal.

10.1.2 Notwithstanding that conclusion, the Council advised that this locality is the only potential opportunity in the District for a MSA. I am satisfied that if the objectors could produce evidence to support a demonstrable need, a planning application for a MSA could be considered on its merits having regard to the Government advice on such facilities and Structure Plan Policy T23. Hence, I do not consider the Plan would be materially deficient by the omission of an express policy provision for this use.

RECOMMENDATION

10.1.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.2. Transport - Introduction (paragraphs 10.1 - 10.5)

OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
10.1	298/4	Network Rail

ISSUE

Have constraints to development near railways been sufficiently taken into account? (298/4)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.2.1 The objector set out various guidelines that should be taken into account regarding development on land adjacent to railways. These include restrictions on foundations, fencing, altered ground levels, landscaping and drainage arrangements. Railtrack also discourage the provision, creation or development of open, recreational spaces adjacent to the railway. Furthermore, they indicate that any additional crossings should be provided in the form of a footbridge and not a level crossing. However, as the Council indicates, such considerations are detailed development control matters that would be taken into account when considering development proposals in the vicinity of a railway.

RECOMMENDATION

10.2.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.3. New Development - Development Location (paragraphs 10.7 - 10.9, Proposal T.1)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
10.7	1303/1	Alexander Garfath
10.7	1302/3	Barbara Garfath
10.7	1301/3	Henry Garfath
10.7	1300/2	Lydia Garfath
10.9	1446/2	Chris Gillham
T.1	342/1	A. J. Waldegrave
T.1	174/2	Ann Gosling
T.1	336/1	C. J. York
T.1	1446/1	Chris Gillham
T.1	1246/1	J Burrows
T.1	340/1	J. McKinley
T.1	1247/1	John Burrows
T.1	339/2	Keith Temple
T.1	339/1	Keith Temple
T.1	1252/4	Mark Miller
T.1	338/1	P Roperick
T.1	97/4	P. B. Sparke
T.1	337/1	Paula Sydney
T.1	1111/1	Sarah Burrows
T.1	175/13	Save Barton Farm Group

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1002	138/8	John Hayter
RD1004	138/5	John Hayter

ISSUES

- 1 Does the development of a Major Development Area (MDA) at Winchester City (North) conflict with Proposal T.1 (342/1, 174/2, 336/1, 1246/1, 340/1, 1247/1, 339/1, 339/2, 1252/4, 337/1, 1111/1, 175/13, 338/1, 1303/1, 1302/3, 1301/3 and 1300/2)
- 2 What measures are in place to ensure that developers have to provide adequate public transport and how can the local authority ensure that new developments will adequately be served by bus routes in the future? (1446/1, 97/4)
- 3 Is the term 'minimise' in Proposal T.1 meaningless? (1446/2)
- 4 Is the reference to 'Work Place Travel Plans' inconsistent with HCC terminology of 'Company Travel Plans' and should the terminology 'Work Place Travel Plans' be changed to 'site travel plans' as they are usually based on a site? (138/5, 138/8)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 10.3.1 The topic of the Winchester City (North) Reserve MDA is covered in Chapter 12, but I would agree with the Council that I can see no conflict in principle with this policy.
- 10.3.2 In issue two, the text explains that Travel Plans are increasingly being made a requirement of development schemes. In addition, contributions are sought from developers via legal agreements to contribute towards infrastructure provision. The Council also has the ability to appraise designs and layouts to ensure they afford convenient access to or are permeable by public transport.
- 10.3.3 The objector in issue three perceives that approvals for conversion of former agricultural buildings in the countryside for commercial uses are not for local need and invariably are served only by car. Although the objector thus considers this to demonstrate the policy has not been pursued thus far and that the aim to minimise travel demand is meaningless, the Council disagrees. I consider the policy accords with the sustainability principles upon which the Plan has been based and reflects Government guidance and insofar as a Plan relating to land use can, it seeks to highlight and facilitate the reduction of need for car travel in this and other policies.
- 10.3.4 Finally, in issue four, the objector questions the terminology used in connection with *Work Place Travel Plans*. The Council indicates that there are indeed various ways of describing them and PPG13 indicates that they can vary according to whom they are aimed. The Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards refers to company and school travel plans. Hence, I agree with the Council that the objector's suggested alternative is neither necessary nor beneficial to the comprehension of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

- 10.3.5 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.4. Development Access (paragraphs 10.10 - 10.12, Proposal T.2)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
T.2	1253/2	A. M Apsimon
T.2	336/2	C. J. York
T.2	138/12	John Hayter
T.2	1300/1	Lydia Garfath
T.2	1252/3	Mark Miller
T.2	175/14	Save Barton Farm Group

ISSUES

- 1 Is the wording of T.2(ii) unclear and its meaning unnecessarily vague? (1253/2)
- 2 Does the proposed development at Winchester City (North) conflict with T.2 as it may exacerbate transport problems within the City? (336/2, 175/14, 1300/1)
- 3 Is T.2 already covered by T.3 and T.4 and should reference to requiring developer contributions be added to paragraph 10.10? (138/12)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 10.4.1 In the first issue, the objector suggests policy criterion (ii) should be divided into two parts. However, the Council disagrees and I too can see no particular purpose for that especially as it would remove the intended linkage.
- 10.4.2 The second issue is allied to the objectors' opposition to that proposal in principle and matters relating to the Winchester City (North) Reserve MDA are covered in Chapter 12.
- 10.4.3 In the third issue, the Council dispute the assertion that this sequence of policies is repetitive and highlight that they respectively deal with access, layout and parking provision, while T.5 deals with developer contributions. I agree and consider that no modification is necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

- 10.4.4 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.5. Development Layout (paragraphs 10.13 - 10.14, Proposal T.3)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
T.3	138/11	John Hayter
T.3	266/6	House Builders Federation (Southern Region)
T.3	324/4	Town Planning Consultancy Ltd

ISSUES

- 1 Should the policy and text be amended to refer to provision for the disabled? (138/11)
- 2 Is it acceptable to expect developers to provide bus stops, shelters and information systems? (266/6)
- 3 Should Proposal T.3 emphasise that the site layout needs to be appropriate to bring about the efficient operation of the car park itself and should the operation of a car park and its effect upon the highway network also be a consideration? (324/4)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 10.5.1 The Council do not consider specific reference to disabled should be included here as to do so would suggest that it should be repeated for a whole tranche of policies. I agree and am satisfied that the matter it is dealt with in the Design Chapter. Although the objector further suggests contributions should cover all non-car modes of transport, this is addressed in para 10.17.
- 10.5.2 The objector in issue two asserts that as bus services are provided by private companies, they should be responsible for the associated street furniture. However, the Council consider that if the facility is directly related to a development proposal, it is entirely appropriate to require its provision by the developer. Whilst I consider it is unlikely that such provision would be justified in respect of small scale proposals, I

agree with the Council's stance where large scale schemes are involved. On balance therefore and having regard to the safeguards relating to developer contributions that are enshrined in Circular 1/97, I consider it is appropriate to retain the references.

10.5.3 Finally, although the objector in the third issue maintains the policy provides guidance on the site layout of car parks, the Council indicate that it is principally aimed at ensuring layouts cater for non-car modes of transport. I agree and regard the objection as misplaced.

RECOMMENDATION

10.5.4 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.6. Parking Standards (paragraphs 10.15 - 10.16, Proposal T.4)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
10.16	1446/3	Chris Gillham
T.4	254/1	Ann Rich
T.4	211/13	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
T.4	212/22	Bishops Waltham Society
T.4	1205/1	David Bolton
T.4	345/7	Hugh Watson
T.4	346/1	Iain Fleming
T.4	264/3	IBM United Kingdom Limited
T.4	344/1	J Cooper
T.4	138/16	John Hayter
T.4	452/10	NHS Estates South East
T.4	1245/5	P. H. Radcliffe
T.4	1118/2	Rolf Stahel
T.4	313/6	St Giles Residents' Association
T.4	343/1	Stephenson
T.4	324/5	Town Planning Consultancy Ltd
T.4	1251/5	W. G. Pollock

OBJECTIONS TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1008	138/4	John Hayter
RD1008	2312/30	Kingfisher Housing Association

ISSUES

- 1 Is the aim of minimising car parking appropriate as most people own a car and expect to use it? (1205/1)
- 2 Should provision be decided on individual assessments of the parking requirements? (452/10, 264/3)
- 3 Should the policy mention lorry parking and loading/unloading facilities and the supporting text refer to standards for turning facilities? (212/22, 211/13)
- 4 Should the policy seek contributions to on-street parking controls to avoid parking in neighbouring residential streets? (138/16)
- 5 Is T.4 is contrary to PPG13 as it is inappropriate for a local authority to seek commuted payments based purely around the lack of parking on site. (324/5)
- 6 Is the inclusion of a reference to the Hampshire County Parking Standards appropriate? (2312/30/REVDEP)

- 7 Should preservation of character of the area be a reason to provide adequate off street parking? (254/1, 313/6, 343/1, 1251/5, 1245/5, 346/1, 344/1, 345/7, 1118/1)
- 8 Does para 10.16 contain a ludicrous contradiction? (1446/3)
- 9 Should it be made clear that *improving access* includes *on-street parking controls*. (138/4/REVDEP)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 10.6.1 Although the objector in the first issue considers public transport will not replace the car and that parking in rural areas should be maximised and parking facilities be provided, the policy accords with PPG13 advice of setting maximum parking standards, thereby restricting available parking and reducing car use.
- 10.6.2 In the second issue, the objectors consider the parking standards should be modified to recognise differing needs of provision for different uses such as in hospital related developments and question whether parking allocation should be measured by the amount of floor space in developments as this penalises companies who use their floor space more efficiently. However, the Council indicates the County Parking Standards have not been devised for universal application, but rather that they will be applied flexibly to take account of individual circumstances and accessibility to public transport. Nevertheless, I consider that the second part of the policy refers to matters that should be within the text as it refers to Government guidance and Supplementary Planning Guidance. However as the content of that section is already contained in paras 10.15 and 10.16, I am content that it can be deleted in its entirety.
- 10.6.3 The matters of loading and unloading referred to in the third issue are not proper considerations for a parking policy, but rather are concerned with traffic management. With regard to lorry parking, the Council advises that these are subject to a County-wide review related to commercial vehicle routeing and a freight strategy. They also indicate that the County standards deal with matters of turning facilities.
- 10.6.4 In issue four, on-street parking is controlled through Traffic Regulation Orders.
- 10.6.5 The objector in issue five questions the appropriateness of seeking commuted payments based purely around the lack of parking on site, contrary to advice in PPG13 para 86. However, the Council state that they are not commuted payments but reasonable contributions towards an integrated transport strategy. Although the Council sought to clarify this in the Revised Deposit by the addition of a reference to: reduced levels of car parking provision *in accordance with Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards*, I regard that as having further confused the matter and has led to the objection in issue six.
- 10.6.6 Although the objectors regard the policy as being contrary to advice in PPGs 3 and 13, the latter does provide for contributions towards improvements to public transport, walking and cycling, where such measures would be likely to influence travel patterns to the site involved either on their own or as part of a package of measures. Proposal 3b of the approved County Standards contains a similar provision. However, this is already set out in the text and my recommendation above to delete the final clause of the policy would overcome the difficulty arising from the ambiguity in the wording of its final sentence and also remove the repetition that now exists.
- 10.6.7 In acknowledgement that on-street parking can impact upon the character of an area, mention of this was added to address issue seven at the Revised Deposit stage. Whilst some considered adequate on-site resident and visitor parking should be allowed to minimise on-street parking, the standards are intended to be applied flexibly and will need to take account of other factors such as the feasibility of doing so, the area's degree of accessibility and encouragement of non-car travel modes.
- 10.6.8 The objector in issue eight considers para 10.16 contains contradictory sentiments in that they regard Park and Ride as a pretext for additional parking, a car trip would still

be involved to access it and the journey length would not be significantly shortened. However, as the Council states, the Park and Ride strategy is to reduce traffic in the centre of Winchester and the road corridor between it and the Park and Ride facility.

10.6.9 Finally, in issue nine, the Revised Deposit alterations both refer to contributions to area transport strategies and whilst this may include measures to control parking, the management of parking is generally not the subject of contributions.

RECOMMENDATION

10.6.10 That the Plan be modified by deleting the second clause of the policy.

10.7. Off-Site Transport Contributions (paragraphs 10.17, Proposal T.5)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
T.5	468/69	Cala Homes (South) Ltd
10.17	266/7	House Builders Federation (Southern Region)

ISSUES

- 1 Is the term *appropriate* acceptable in Proposal T.5? (468/69)
- 2 Does Paragraph 10.17 go too far and is it excessive? (266/7)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.7.1 The first issue concerns the policy wording and in particular the use of the word *appropriate*. The Council points to the examples of the types of measures that may be required that are set out in the text and despite the objector's concern regarding the word *appropriate* I consider it is suitably qualified later in the sentence by the word *necessary* and thereby complies with Circular advice.

10.7.2 Whilst the objector in the issue two considers the policy has suitable wording such as *satisfactory* and *necessary* they consider the text goes further and does not reflect Circular 1/97 guidance regarding planning obligations. The developer should only be expected to make contributions that relate fairly and reasonably to the development. The Council refers to the sentence within the accompanying text that links the contribution to the *travel needs generated by the development*. I am satisfied that highlights the appropriate nexus between the two.

RECOMMENDATION

10.7.3 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.8. Transport Related Development – Integrated Transport Infrastructure (paragraphs 10.18, Proposal T.6)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
T.6	81/4	C. J. Webb
T.6	336/3	C. J. York

T.6	1300/3	Lydia Garfath
T.6	97/5	P. B. Sparke
T.6	175/15	Save Barton Farm Group

ISSUES

- 1 Does Winchester's public transport need improving before car parking can be reduced and should it be made clear that public transport (particularly buses) will be dramatically improved through buses entering the City and internal bus routes with more frequent services? (97/5)
- 2 Should Winchester's railway station be improved to create a seamless interchange? Does the current road system preclude buses running from the station to St. Cross via Southgate Street, adding to congestion? (81/4)
- 3 Will the proposed Winchester City (North) MDA increase train passenger congestion? Railtrack has already identified a capacity constraint on the Southampton to Basingstoke stretch and trains are at capacity in the rush hour. Should commuter parking be provided on brownfield sites within walking distance of the station or should Park and Ride be provided? Should any increase in in-migration be discouraged due to the lack of rail capacity and car parking? (336/3, 1300/3)
- 4 Is there capacity within the City to facilitate bus or cycle lanes in the area affected by a new development at Winchester City (North)? Is it impractical to provide bus priority measures on seriously overloaded and congested city roads? Will the existing road network accommodate this? (175/15)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.8.1 The Council has identified all these issues as mainly relating to objections to the proposed Winchester City (North) Reserve MDA at First Deposit stage. This allocation and its accessibility are addressed in Chapter 12.

RECOMMENDATION

10.8.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.9. Public Transport (paragraphs 10.19 - 10.26, Proposal T.7)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
10.20	1252/5	Mark Miller
10.23	1303/2	Alexander Garfath
10.23	1302/4	Barbara Garfath
10.23	1301/4	Henry Garfath
10.23	298/1	Network Rail
10.24	1446/4	Chris Gillham
10.26	1446/5	Chris Gillham
T.7	211/14	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
T.7	212/23	Bishops Waltham Society
T.7	81/3	C. J. Webb
T.7	347/1	Terence Jones

OBJECTION TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
RD1013	2010/1	David Wilson
RD1017	2083/1	Chris Price
RD1017	2011/1	Colin Shaw

OBJECTION TO PRE INQUIRY CHANGE

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
PIC1001	212/11	Bishops Waltham Society

ISSUES

- 1 Is the rail network already at capacity and would 2000 extra houses at Winchester City (North) place even more strain on the rail network. Should Winchester City (North) MDA be removed? (1252/5, 1303/2, 1302/4, 1301/4)
- 2 Can Park and Ride provide a dual role in settlements outside Winchester and should it include car and cycle transfer points onto direct and rapid bus routes and facilitate car sharing? Should Paragraph 10.26 be amended to refer to the role of park and ride in settlements outside Winchester? (211/14, 212/23)
- 3 Should further emphasis be placed on the importance of railway parking, especially at Winchester Station? (298/1)
- 4 Should paragraph 10.24 suggest that car parking at rail stations could be increased or should there be encouragement for as much of the journey as possible to be made by public transport? (1446/4 & 5)
- 5 Should the Council recognise that many City residents commute to London on the train and provide for the need to improve commuting conditions by planning for additional track, trains changing rolling stock and other methods? (347/1)
- 6 Should the spur of the old railway line to Alresford at Kingsworthy/ Springvale be retained/safeguarded? This would make a useful turn around terminus off the main line and improve transport into Winchester. (81/3)
- 7 Should the dismantled railway line running from Springvale via Winnall be included so the line is safeguarded for future uses? (2010/1 & 2/REVDEP)
- 8 Should the proposal and supporting text be amended to allow development on parts of the disused rail network that are no longer suitable for sustainable transport purposes or which have little prospect of being used for future transport purposes? (2083/1/REVDEP, 2011/1/REVDEP)
- 9 Should paragraph 10.23 be altered to read 'are ~~generally~~ mainly served by stopping ~~local~~ services.' (212/11/PIC) (212/23)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 10.9.1 Proposal T7 was deleted and incorporated in T6 at Revised Deposit stage. The Council has identified all the first issue as mainly relating to objections to the proposed Winchester City (North) Reserve MDA at First Deposit stage. This allocation and its accessibility are addressed in Chapter 12.
- 10.9.2 In issue two, the Council indicate that Park and Ride proposals for settlements outside Winchester are highly unlikely to be financially viable and I am content that such proposals and allied initiatives should be concentrated on the city, at least initially.
- 10.9.3 In the third and fourth issues the importance of car parking at stations is recognised in para 10.24. Although an objector questions how this fits with the statement in paragraph 10.26 that Park and Ride in Winchester is designed to alleviate town centre traffic problems, the Council states that any additional parking provision at stations should be dedicated to rail users to facilitate public transport use. I consider this is a balanced approach which reflects the fact that ultimately such decisions are a personal choice based on matters such as cost, time, convenience etc.
- 10.9.4 Issue five relates to matters that are within the purview of train operators rather than land use policies in the Local Plan, although para 10.25 does recognise railway widening may be required to provide necessary improvements.
- 10.9.5 The Council introduced alterations into the Revised Deposit Plan to address the need to safeguard disused railway lines including a new policy and text and plan showing them. Although the plan shows the section mentioned in issue six, the Council

concedes that the section mentioned in issue seven was omitted. They advanced a Pre-Inquiry Change to the Map (PIC10.02) to include that section of disused railway from Bushfield to Kings Worthy and to alter the section east of New Alresford from *disused* to *in use*. I accept those changes in the interest of accuracy.

10.9.6 Although the objectors in the issue eight generally support the new policy advanced in the Revised Deposit Plan (RD10.17), they seek a fall back clause to allow development if there is no prospect of transport use in respect of some of these sections of disused railway line. I consider the fact that the final sentence refers to the Council having regard to the immediate and longer term potential adequately takes account of the situations envisaged by the objectors.

10.9.7 Finally, issue nine concerns a counter objection to PIC10.01, which the Council introduced to address the objector's initial observation that the trains referred to in para 10.23 were not necessary *local*, but rather *stopping* services. I agree with the Council that the counter objection has no substance that warrants further modification of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

10.9.8 That the plan be modified in accordance with PIC10.01 and PIC10.02.

10.10. Cycling, Walking, and Bridleways (paragraphs 10.27 - 10.29, Proposal T.8)

OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
T.8	1250/2	John Pilkington

OBJECTION TO REVISED DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
T.8	1250/1	John Pilkington

ISSUE

Is Proposal T.8 too weak and should it be strengthened? (1250/2, 1250/1/REVDEP)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.10.1 Although the Council introduced alterations in the Revised Deposit Plan to address the objection, the objector considered it should state *actively pursued* instead of *permitted*. I do not regard the objector's suggested wording confers more strength or provides improved comprehension, especially in the absence of any definitive schemes.

RECOMMENDATION

10.10.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.11. Freight (paragraphs 10.30 - 10.32, Proposal T.9)

OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
T.09	298/2	Network Rail

ISSUE

Should the policy promote alternative development of sites that are surplus to requirements as they can contribute to regeneration of brownfield sites and transport objectives?

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.11.1 The objector supports the policy but considers alternative forms of development should be encouraged where they are surplus to requirements of railway and freight operators. I regard the policy as being in conformity with Government guidance and if the circumstances alluded to by the objector were to materialise, the Council have indicated they would consider alternative proposals in the light of this and other Plan policies.

RECOMMENDATION

10.11.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.12. Traffic Management (paragraphs 10.33 - 10.34, T.10)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
10.33	1446/6	Chris Gillham
T.10	211/15	Bishops Waltham Parish Council
T.10	212/24	Bishops Waltham Society
T.10	308/1	Shedfield Parish Council
T.10	328/7	Twyford Parish Council

ISSUES

1. Is paragraph 10.33 unclear? (1446/6)
2. Should Proposal T.10 be deleted as it is unnecessary and duplicates matters covered by other proposals? (211/5) (212/24)
3. Should Proposal T.10 cover other principal roads and cycle routes within Twyford and include Sustrans and safe routes? (328/7)
4. Is the "corridor" approach aimed at attracting development? Is cycling impractical because the area is too hilly and public transport is too expensive compared to running a car? T.10 is impractical and will lead to a "ribbon town". (308/1)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.12.1 Alterations were incorporated in the Revised Deposit Plan to provide greater clarity in respect of matters raised by the objector in the first issue.

10.12.2 In the second issue the objectors regard the policy as duplicating matters covered elsewhere in the Plan or that it refers to topics unrelated to planning. I am satisfied that it highlights a broad tranche of measures that will be promoted along this corridor through the Transport Strategy in respect of which developer contributions may be sought. As such I am content that it serves a useful planning purpose.

10.12.3 With regard to the third issue, Twyford PC considers the policy should be extended to cover other routes and SUSTRANS. However, as the Council indicates, this is the only corridor strategy included in the Plan and it would be inappropriate to include mention of other routes and proposals in respect of which separate initiatives may or could apply.

10.12.4 Finally, in issue four, the corridor strategy, which extends between Winchester and Wickham, is intended to promote transport improvements aimed at improving travel choice. There is no intention to encourage ribbon development, or indeed any other forms of development not prescribed by Plan policies, but merely to encourage implementation of transport measures that will make non-car modes of travel more attractive.

RECOMMENDATIONS

10.12.5 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.13. Road Schemes (paragraphs 10.35 - 10.37, Proposals T11 & T.12)

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
T.11	1446/7	Chris Gillham
T.11	349/1	Ian White
T.12	213/6	Bovis Homes LTD
T.12	1446/8	Chris Gillham
T.12	65/1	Derek Oswald
T.12	314/1	Grove Farms (Hampshire) Ltd
T.12	322/6	North Whiteley Consortium
T.12	330/7	The Wildlife Trusts

ISSUES

1. Does Proposal T.11 become meaningless if Winchester City (North) remains in the Plan as it would create environmental/safety problems and require new road building to ameliorate them? (349/1)
2. Are Proposals T.11 and T.12 mutually incompatible? (1446/7, 1446/8)
3. Will the T12 proposals damage environmentally important areas? (65/1, 330/7)
4. Should Proposal T.12 or paragraph 10.37 mention the possibility of enabling development at North Whiteley, which could bring forward the completion of Whiteley Way? (213/6, 314/1, 322/6)

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.13.1 The first issue arises from an objection in principle to the Winchester City (North) Reserve MDA proposal, which as the Council indicates arises from the Structure Plan and is covered in Chapter 12.

10.13.2 Whilst the objector in issue two considers road building is very unlikely to be justified environmentally, the Council indicates that T11 promotes road building only where the problem cannot be resolved by traffic management measures. The two schemes

mentioned in T12 are County Highway proposals considered to be the only means of ameliorating identified environmental or safety problems in those particular localities.

10.13.3 The objectors in the third issue are concerned about the T12 road proposals causing damage to environmentally sensitive areas such as the Hamble Valley. However, the Council indicates that any planning application for these road schemes would be required to submit an environmental impact assessment to enable the Council and consultees to gauge what harm may arise and measures that are needed to mitigate any impacts. I am satisfied that is the case and that the policy serves to safeguard the proposed routes from other forms of development.

10.13.4 Finally in issue four the objectors suggest that further development should be allocated and permitted at Whiteley as enabling development to fund the completion of Whiteley Way or as an alternative to Winchester City (North) MDA. However, the possibility of an MDA in this location was assessed as part of the Structure Plan Review and rejected. As the Council indicates, the allocation of land for development solely to achieve the implementation of a road scheme would not be appropriate and furthermore such a proposal would render the Local Plan out of general conformity with the Structure Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

10.13.5 That no modification be made to the Plan.

10.14. Trunk road improvements (paragraphs 10.38 - 10.39)

OBJECTION TO DEPOSIT PLAN

Proposal/ Paragraph	Rep Number	NAME
10.38	1446/9	Chris Gillham

ISSUE

Are the multi-modal studies referred to in paragraph 10.38 excuses for road building?

INSPECTOR'S CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.14.1 Despite the objector's cynicism, the Council indicates that the text has been included purely to document that the study is being undertaken. I am content that is the case and as the text states, the Highways Agency has responsibility for Trunk Roads and the County Council recognises the need to address existing congestion problems in the vicinity of Junction 9 on the M3.

RECOMMENDATION

10.14.2 That no modification be made to the Plan.