

**Winchester District Local Plan Review**  
**Analysis of Representations on the Revised Deposit Plan**

**Issue: 10.1 (Deposit 10.3)**  
**RD10.02-RD10.04**  
**Proposal T.1**

**Representation:**

**Support/resolved/withdrawn:**

**J Hayter (138/8)**

Support for the replacement of 10.7 and 10.8 with RD10.02.

**Change sought**-none.

**GOSE (261/37)**

Support the change in RD10.02

**Change sought**-none.

**Objection:**

**J Hayter (138/5)**

Added text about 'work place travel plans' is inconsistent with HCC, who call them 'company travel plans' (although they are usually based on a site and could be called 'site travel plans')

**Change sought**-use wording 'site based travel plans' for clarity.

**City Council's response to representation**

The support is welcomed.

According to PPG13, travel plans may have a variety of names and these describe who they are aimed at. The accepted terminology is now 'Work Place Travel Plan'. Although the Hampshire Local Transport Plan does refer to 'Company Travel Plans', they have begun to use the term 'Work Place Travel Plan, and they have a Work Place Travel Plan co-ordinator to advise businesses.

Although this type of travel plan is frequently based on a site, it would be misleading to refer to them as site-based travel plans, and this may even discourage their use. It is possible that only one company from a multiple-occupancy site wishes to do a plan, and this is to be welcomed. It is only on new developments that travel plans for all companies can be a condition of development. In this case collective 'Work Place Travel Plans' can also be produced. Therefore, it is considered that the term 'Work Place Travel Plan' is appropriate.

**Change Proposed - none.**

---

**Issue: 10.2 (Deposit 10.10)**  
**RD10.08-10.09**  
**Proposal T.4**

**Representations:**

**Support/resolved/withdrawn:**

**GOSE (261/38)**

Support the change in RD10.02

**Change sought**-none.

**Objections:**

**Kingfisher Housing Association (2312/30)**

The inclusion of a reference to the Hampshire County Parking Standards is inappropriate as they conflict with the principles of PPG3 and PPG13 and have been subject to many objections.

**Change sought**-amend wording to reflect above objection.

**J Hayter (138/4)**

It is made clear that contributions called for by T.4 are to improve access by non-car modes, but it is not clear that 'improving access' includes on-street parking controls.

**Change sought**- add 'contributions may also be sought towards on-street parking controls.

The remainder of the comment is not duly made as it relates to comments on the Deposit Plan and the Councils responses

**City Council's response to representation**

The support is welcomed.

County Parking Standards have been subject to consultation and are now adopted by the Highway Authority. The parking standards are designed to be a guide to all Hampshire's districts. It is therefore appropriate for the Plan to refer to them.

RD10.08 and RD10.09 of proposal T.4 both mention contributions to area transport strategies. Although this may include parking controls, the way that parking is managed is not generally the subject of contributions. For larger developments the Transport Assessment would be expected to show how parking can be minimised without causing undue impact on the nearby highway network. Demand for parking should be dealt with on site and parking standards state that parking provision can be lower where there is good access to non-car modes and thus less demand for parking. Developments that would require a lot of on-street parking are usually discouraged, and therefore contributions to non-car modes may be necessary.

The response in the previous Representation Document merely states that any specific references to the nature and scope of contributions to the relevant area transport strategy might become out of date. There was no qualification that the Hampshire Parking Strategy would become out of date or may be abandoned.

An implicit element of providing parking spaces is that there is room for vehicles to access them and also that there is appropriate turning space.

Parking Standards do refer to HCV parking provision (e.g. Table 2, note 2; notes for table 7), which should be made on the basis of individual proposals. To be more specific would be unrealistic and too prescriptive.

**Change Proposed – none.**

**Winchester District Local Plan Review**  
**Analysis of Representations on the Revised Deposit Plan**

to them, rather than a change in the Revised Deposit:  
There is now a reference to the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards but with a statement in the response document that any more detailed a reference would become out of date if the strategy of little or no parking on some sites was abandoned.

**Bishop's Waltham Society (212/14)**

Although supporting changes in RD10.09, there are still outstanding objections to policy RD10.08. Lorries are not included in the list of vehicles that should have parking provision. Also, the proposal refers to standards for 'turning facilities' but the supporting text refers only to parking standards that do not include this aspect. The currently adopted Highway Authority parking standards' do not cover turning circles within sites and it would be contrary to PPG13 if they did, as this requires case-by-case determination.  
**Change sought**-no new suggestions specified.

---

**Issue: 10.3 (New issue)**  
**RD10.10 and RD10.13 – RD10.17**  
**Proposal T.6 and T.7**

**Representation:**

**Support/resolved/withdrawn:**

**J Hayter (138/25 and 138/22)**

Resolved objection due to the merging of T.6 and T.7.

**Change sought**-none.

**East Hampshire AONB Office (2283/11)**  
**N Knollys (2005/1)**

A number of representations have been received in support of proposal T.7 of the Deposit Plan following the changes made, specifically for the RD numbers listed above.

**Change sought** –none.

**Objections:**

**C Shaw (2011/1)**

The intent of the proposal is commendable, but the proposal is too inflexible due to a failure to acknowledge that some parts of the identified routes have been filled in or developed to the extent that restoration is no longer possible.

**Changes sought** – addition of 'normally' to 'routes will not be permitted' in proposal 10.17. Also, add after paragraph 10.18 'proposals for new development on those parts of the disused railway network that are no longer practical for sustainable transport purposes due to severance, in-

**City Council's response to representation**

The support is welcomed.

Policy RD10.17 does state that 'when considering development proposals on and adjacent to former railway lines, the Local Planning Authority will take into account the potential for the line to be used for sustainable transport or recreational purposes, in both the immediate future and the longer term'. This statement gives some scope for new development if it is considered that the site has become unusable for recreation or current or future sustainable transport use.

The map in RD10.13 is entitled 'existing and former railway lines in the Winchester District' and is used to show the lines that should be considered under the following proposals. The line via Winnall has been developed in parts and there is no bridge that crosses the river at Winnall. However, the new proposal in RD10.17 is designed to safeguard current or potential future uses. Some of this line is still intact and so should be included on map RD10.13.

**Change Proposed - addition of the disused railway line that runs via Winnall to King Worthy. Also amend map RD10.13 to show that the line east of New Alresford is in use, not a 'former' railway line.**

**Winchester District Local Plan Review**  
**Analysis of Representations on the Revised Deposit Plan**

*filling or other reasons may be permitted provided they accord with other relevant policies in the plan’.*

**Network Rail (2083/1)**

The proposal should acknowledge that there might be exceptional circumstances for development of redundant railway land, which sometimes constitutes important brownfield sites, especially if there is no prospect for future transport use.

**Change sought** –*add to the end of RD 10.17: ‘This is unless the site offers an overwhelming regeneration benefit and there is little prospect of future transport use.’*

**D G Wilson (2010/1) and (2010/2)**

The figure in RD10.13 omits the dismantled railway south of Springvale via Winnall so the possibility of upgrading and completing the entire route into a walking/cycling path is not considered in proposal RD 10.17.

**Change sought** –*none specified.*

---

**Issue: 10.4 (Deposit 10.16)**

**RD10.19**

**Proposal T.8**

**Objection:**

**RD 10.19**

**J Pilkington (1250/1)**

The wording in RD 10.19 is too weak and should be strengthened to suggest pursuit of this policy, rather than support.

**Changes sought** – *none specified.*

***City Council’s response to representation***

This policy is designed only to show general support for any such proposals. The Local Plan is designed to deal with safeguarding matters; transport policy is dealt with at county level. There is more scope for active pursuit of policies in the case of new developments, and proposal T.3 states a need for cycling and walking networks in new developments. It is considered that this policy is suitably worded.

**Change Proposed - none.**