

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 10.1 **Chapter 10 (General)**

Representation:

Sparsholt College (353/20)

Support this Chapter (Proposals T.1 – T.12 and paragraphs 10.1 – 10.39).

Change sought - none.

Road Chef (307/3)

Support the non-allocation of the Meon Valley Motorway Service Area and the rationale for not doing so.

Change sought - none.

Esso Petroleum Co Ltd (327/1)

Proposal T.13 in the adopted Plan should be carried forward as a need is shown for the M27 (Meon) service area.

Change sought - reinstate Proposal T.13 of adopted Winchester District Local Plan.

Compass Roadside Ltd. (206/3, 206/7)

Chapter 10 fails to consider the need for road-related service facilities. New proposals should be added permitting trunk road service areas in the open countryside subject to various criteria.

Change sought - suggest new Proposals allowing for trunk road service areas and associated development subject to various criteria (detailed wording suggested).

Road Chef (307/4)

Object to the failure of the Plan to include a policy for motorway service areas.

Change sought - include new criteria-based policy setting out tests for new MSAs.

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

The current (1998) Local Plan allocated an area of land at Whiteley for a motorway service area to serve the M27. This was not carried forward into the Local Plan Review as, at the time the Deposit Plan was drafted, no overriding evidence of need had been put forward. Although since then some evidence of need has been produced (in connection with a current planning application), this is not considered decisive at this time. Also, Government policy on the spacing of MSAs, which the latest version of PPG13 was supposed to clarify, remains unclear.

Accordingly, it is concluded that a proposal for an MSA at Whiteley should not be reintroduced at this stage. This situation may need to be reviewed if overriding evidence of need is produced, although the current planning application process would enable permission to be granted if this proves to be the case.

Given current and expected Government advice on the spacing of MSAs and their distribution within the District, it is considered that the possible Meon MSA at Whiteley is the only such opportunity in the District. There is, therefore, considered to be no need for a general criteria-based proposal on MSAs.

The omission of a criteria-based proposal for Trunk Road Service Areas reflects the lack of need for such facilities in the area and the significant environmental constraints. It has also been concluded, in relation to objections to the application of countryside policies (see Issue 4.3), that it would not be appropriate to remove countryside policies in order to allow for such development.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 10.2 **Proposal T.1**

Representation:

A Gossling (174/2), Save Barton Farm Group (175/13, 175/14, 175/15), C J York (336/1, 336/2), P Sydney (337/1), P Roderick (338/1), K Temple (339/1,

City Council's Response to Representation

The Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) requires local plans to identify sites for the 'reserve' housing requirements in policy H4, which includes Winchester City (North). All large new developments are likely to generate traffic but the aim will be to minimise the impact of an MDA by the implementation of measures for non-car modes.

Consideration of a number of possible locations for an MDA at Winchester City (North) has indicated that Area 4 (Barton Farm/South of A34) offers the greatest potential to minimise car journeys.

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. ***Change sought.***

City Council's Response to Representation ***Change Proposed***

339/2), A J Waldegrave (342/1), M Miller (1252/4)

The development of an MDA at Winchester City (North) would conflict with Proposal T.1 and result in a major increase traffic and pollution and exacerbate the transport and parking problems in and around the City. Winchester is already congested in the rush hour and residents are unlikely to walk or cycle because it is up hill from the town centre. There is inadequate capacity on the rail network and at the station car park to accommodate the additional passengers likely to be generated. There is no evidence that siting the MDA in Area 4 will minimise travel demand.

Change sought - delete Winchester City (North) MDA.

J McKinley (340/1), J McKinley (341/1), S Burrows (1111/1), J Burrows (1246/1), J Burrows (1247/1)

Object to the development of an MDA at Winchester City (North) as it would result in increased traffic and pollution. There is no space for a bus lane and residents are unlikely to walk or cycle because it is up hill from the town centre. The trains are already at capacity.

Change sought - drastically reduce the number of houses proposed or site them near to roads and rail services that can cope.

Locations nearer to the city centre are expected to support walking and cycling journeys, while bus journeys could be fully integrated into the network. Any major development will generate car journeys but the issue is how to minimise the impact of traffic and manage flows in the most appropriate manner. Similarly, air quality forecasting will be required to assess the potential impact of additional traffic.

The transport impact of Winchester City (North) will be assessed, including a full assessment of all transport implications. Winchester City (North) has potential for walking and cycling routes and potential developers will be expected to demonstrate how bus services will be provided, including priority measures as appropriate. Any developer of a potential MDA will also be required to demonstrate how access to the railway station will be provided in terms of non-car modes.

Capacity on the railway network and car parking at stations is a matter for train operators and Railtrack. However, residents of an MDA travelling to London would be expected to access the railway station by non-car modes to avoid further congestion on the road network. Detailed transport assessments will be required. Further work has been undertaken on the Winchester City (North) MDA, including on transport issues. This is reported in more detail in response to objections to Proposal NC.3 (Chapter 12).

Change Proposed – none.

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 10.3 **Proposal T.1**

Representation:

Trustees of H H Jenkins (51/2)

Support Proposal T.1. Land allocated by Proposal S.9 is efficiently served by public transport.

Change sought - none.

GOSE (261/66)

Travel plans should be submitted alongside planning applications in accordance with PPG13.

Change sought - not specified.

P B Sparke (97/4)

Not all development can be located on bus routes and these change over time, or near shops/city centres, or relying on walking/cycling as future occupants may be elderly/disabled.

Change sought - delete T.1.

C Gillham (1446/1)

It is not clear what 'could be served by public transport' means in T.1 and it doesn't commit developers to anything.

Change sought - not specified.

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/65)

Proposal T.1 effectively rules out development in rural locations thus, possibly compromising the ability of the Urban Capacity Study sites to come forward.

Change sought – not specified.

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

It is agreed that travel plans should be submitted alongside planning applications in accordance with PPG13. The PPG refers to such plans being required for developments that have 'significant transport implications'. It is accepted that the Proposal could usefully be clarified by the addition of similar wording.

While bus routes can change over time, key transport corridors can still provide a focus for development. Alternatively, larger developments may be required to improve accessibility, for example by funding bus services and facilities. The needs of mobility impaired people is taken into account although normally the number of mobility impaired people requiring access to a development will be relatively small.

Proposal T.1 and its supporting text sets out the principles with which development should comply. The Local Transport Plan includes targets for transport and an appropriate modal share would need to be demonstrated by any potential developer. This would require agreement on developer contributions, particularly for walking and cycling infrastructure, bus facilities and bus services.

Proposal T.1 supports developments that offer sustainable transport options. In doing so, substantial free-standing rural developments will not be permitted. This is fully in line with Structure Plan guidance. In producing the Local Plan, an assessment was undertaken of the sustainability of the District's settlements. A number of settlements were excluded from the provisions of Proposals H.2 and H.3 because of their lack of facilities, services and public transport. Nevertheless, it would be inappropriate and unrealistic to prevent all development in rural settlements, despite the fact that facilities and public transport may be relatively limited. These settlements have in the past made a significant contribution to urban capacity and are likely to continue to do so.

Change Proposed – Proposal T.1:

~~.... Where appropriate~~ *For developments that have significant transport implications, a ~~Green~~ Travel Plan will be required to support planning applications.*

Issue 10.4 **Proposal T.1/Paragraphs 10.7 – 10.9**

Representation:

J Hayter (138/15)

In the last sentence of T.1, 'where appropriate' and 'green travel plan' are not defined. The requirements for them are set out in Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2001.

City Council's Response to Representation

Paragraph 10.7 of the Plan discusses transport assessments but these are different to Green Travel Plans, which are discussed in paragraph 10.8. There is not, therefore, significant overlap between paragraphs 10.7 and 10.8.

It is, however, accepted that additional supporting text could be included in paragraph 10.7, cross-referencing to Proposal T.4 and its explanatory text, which deals with parking standards. Paragraph 10.8 could also be amended to provide further explanation of travel plans. It is proposed that the word 'Green' be deleted from Proposal T.1, as

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. *Change sought.*

City Council's Response to Representation *Change Proposed*

Paragraph 10.8 contains significant repetition of 10.7.

Change sought – delete 'Green' from last sentence of T.1. Replace 10.7 and 10.8 with text which better explains the parking standards and requirements for Travel Plans (wording suggested).

C Gillham (1446/2)

The term 'minimise' in paragraph 10.9 is meaningless. This policy has not been pursued so far.

Change sought – not specified.

suggested by the respondent (see Issue 10.3 above).

The reference to 'minimise' in paragraph 10.9 summarises the aims of the countryside proposals, particularly C.16. Further detail is provided by Proposal C.16 and it is proposed that an additional requirement be added to C.16 referring to traffic generation (see Issue 4.32). No further change is considered necessary, therefore, within paragraph 10.9.

Change Proposed – paragraph 10.7:

Where appropriate, development will need to be accompanied by an assessment of the transport/ sustainability impact, giving details of the modes of travel to be used and parking provision proposed (see Proposal T.4)....

Change Proposed – paragraph 10.8:

~~Green~~ Travel Plans are becoming an essential requirement for many developments. These ensure that the occupier of the site takes positive measures to maximise the proportion of journeys made by public transport, walking and cycling. Work Place Travel Plans encourage employers and employees to recognise and take responsibility for the social and environmental impact that their organisations create, in terms of transport and travel issues. The Plans describe how employers can introduce measures that discourage unnecessary business and commuter journeys through home working and the use of new technologies, as well as reducing the impact of necessary trips by using more environmentally friendly means than the sole car journey where possible.

Issue 10.5 **Proposal T.2**

Representation:

A M Apsimon (1253/2)

The wording of T.2 (ii) is not clear and its meaning unnecessarily vague.

Change sought – revised wording suggested.

City Council's Response to Representation

The respondent suggests that T.2(ii) should be divided into two criteria, relating firstly to the need to avoid adverse impact and secondly to the need to meet highway standards. It is, however, considered that the Proposal is sufficiently clear as it stands and no change is proposed.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 10.6 **Proposal T.2**

Representation:

M Miller (1252/3), L Garfath (1300/1), H Garfath (1301/3), B Garfath (1302/3), A Garfath (1303/1)

The Winchester City (North) MDA would conflict with Proposal T.2(i) and (ii) and increase traffic. There is already severe congestion around Winchester at peak

City Council's Response to Representation

Major development at Winchester City (North) would generate additional traffic although significant improvements to non-car modes will be required. These measures will aim to ameliorate the impact of any development and add to measures proposed through the Winchester Movement and Access Plan.

Any prospective developer of an MDA will be required to demonstrate how travel demand will be accommodated and how traffic impact on existing communities will be alleviated. This includes analysis of junctions and links that would be affected including access onto the A34 (T) and M3 at Junction 9.

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. ***Change sought.***

City Council's Response to Representation ***Change Proposed***

<p>times.</p> <p><i>Change sought</i> – delete Winchester City (North) MDA.</p>	<p>Proposal T.2 refers to access from development to the strategic road network rather than the impact of North Winchester MDA on the local road network. Any major development would be required to provide appropriate measures to minimise the impact of traffic and the inclusion of viable alternatives to car use.</p> <p><i>Change Proposed</i> – none.</p>
<p><u>Issue 10.7</u> <u>Proposal T.2/Paragraph 10.10</u></p> <p>Representation:</p> <p>J Hayter (138/12) Proposal T.2 is already covered by T.3 and T.4. Reference to requiring developer contributions should be added to paragraph 10.10.</p> <p><i>Change sought</i> – delete T.2. Add to paragraph 10.10: “where off-site measures are required to ensure safe access then appropriate contributions will be required”.</p> <p>Mr & Mrs A M Apsimon (1253/3) Paragraph 10.10 omits reference to Hampshire County Council's 'Movement and Access in Residential Areas' document and parking standards.</p> <p><i>Change sought</i> – add reference to various guidance documents (detailed wording suggested).</p>	<p>City Council's Response to Representation</p> <p>It is not accepted that Proposals T.2, T.3 and T.4 are repetitive. Proposal T.2 deals with road access and the effect of development on the road network, T.3 deals with site layout, and T.4 deals with parking provision. The issue of developer contributions is already dealt with in Proposal T.5 and its explanatory text and it is not considered necessary to refer to it in paragraph 10.10.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.10 already refers to Government guidance and, in general terms, to the County Council's standards. 'Roads in Residential Areas' and the earlier parking/highway standards have been superseded by the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2001, which are referred to in paragraph 10.15 and 'Movement, Access, Streets and Spaces'. It is not, therefore, considered necessary to include the additional references sought by the respondent.</p> <p><i>Change Proposed</i> – none.</p>

<p><u>Issue 10.8</u> <u>Proposal T.3/Paragraph 10.14</u></p> <p>Representation:</p> <p>Town Planning Consultancy (324/4) Proposal T.3 does not emphasise that layout can bring about efficient operation of the car park. The operation of a car park and effect upon the surrounding highway network should be a major consideration and may outweigh T.3 requirements.</p> <p><i>Change sought</i> – not specified.</p> <p>J Hayter (138/11) Proposal T.3 and paragraph 10.14 do not mention the disabled and should be</p>	<p>City Council's Response to Representation</p> <p>The layout of developments as set out in Proposal T.3 provides priority for non-car modes. It is not considered that efficient design of car parks necessarily precludes car journeys. Proposal T.3 relates mainly to the efficient operation of development layouts for public transport, which is considered a perfectly legitimate requirement. It is also reasonable for developers to be expected to provide appropriate public transport infrastructure, including bus stops, etc, just as it has long been accepted that they should provide on- and off-site highway works associated with development.</p> <p>There are many types of development that should make proper provision for the disabled and Proposal DP.4 seeks to ensure that this is done. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to include specific reference to provision for the disabled in Proposal T.3 and to do so would suggest a need for similar references in many other policies. It is agreed that contributions should cover all types of transport modes and Proposal T.5 and paragraph 10.17 make it clear that these will be sought where appropriate.</p>
---	--

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. ***Change sought.***

City Council's Response to Representation ***Change Proposed***

amended to refer to provision for the disabled. Contributions should cover all forms of non-car transport modes.

Change sought – T.3, amend to read: 'safe and convenient routes for cyclists, pedestrians and the disabled'. Paragraph 10.14, amend to read: 'establishing bus services in, and linking pedestrian, cycle and disabled routes to the development'.

Change Proposed – none.

House Builders Federation (266/6)

Whilst it may be reasonable to require highway layouts to facilitate access by bus (paragraph 10.14), it is not reasonable to expect developers to provide bus stops, shelters and information systems. Bus services are provided by private companies, which should provide street furniture.

Change sought – delete last sentence of T.3 and associated sentence in paragraph 10.14.

Issue 10.9 **Proposal T.4**

Representation:

D Bolton (1205/1)

Object to the aim of minimising car parking, most people own a car and expect to use it. Public transport will not replace the car. Parking in rural areas should be maximised and parking facilities be provided.

Change sought – not specified.

NHS Executive SE Region (452/10)

Object to proposal T.4, a flexible approach is needed for car parking as part of new hospital developments. Many NHS Trusts have, or are, preparing Travel Plans. These assessments can better inform car parking requirements than 'rigid' standards.

Change sought – modify the standards to recognise the need to assess the level of provision in hospital related developments.

IBM UK Ltd (264/3)

It is inappropriate for car parking to be measured by the amount of floorspace as this penalises intensive space users.

City Council's Response to Representation

Proposal T.4 reflects clear Government advice that parking standards should be reduced and set so as to limit the amount of parking provision. Maximum standards have been adopted by the Highway Authority, as referred to in paragraph 10.15. These allow for standards for particular sites to be reduced, if appropriate, when individual applications are determined.

Parking standards have not been determined for universal application. Instead the accessibility of each site will be taken into consideration. Developer contributions towards the relevant integrated transport strategy will be sought in support of non-car access to particular sites. Therefore, the parking standards are flexible to accommodate particular circumstances, taking into account accessibility by public transport. Work place travel plans will also influence the levels of parking that is permissible.

Parking standards take into account accessibility by public transport, which may influence the levels of car ownership. On-street parking controls can ensure that inappropriate parking is not permitted. Paragraph 10.16 indicates the criteria to be considered in conjunction with parking standards including the need to take account of on-street parking controls.

The parking standards do require each site to be considered on its individual merits based on accessibility criteria, but there needs to be a clear starting point for calculating likely requirements.

Paragraph 10.16 states that the parking standards are maximum standards. Loading/unloading facilities are not included, as they do not form part of the parking standards, instead of being a matter of

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. ***Change sought.***

City Council's Response to Representation ***Change Proposed***

Each case for additional car parking should be considered on its own merits.
Change sought – consider each case on its own merits.

Cala Homes (South) Ltd. (468/66)

Proposal T.4 conflicts with the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2001 and infers that provision below the County standards may be sought. Object to the 'blanket requirement' for contributions towards the integrated transport strategy.
Change sought – not specified.

Bishops Waltham Parish Council (211/13)

Object to the lack of mention of lorry parking. Parking provision should be made to the maximum levels allowed by the HCC standards. PPG3 seeks on-street restraint measures to complement reduced parking. The supporting text should include reference to turning facilities to be consistent with T.4.
Change sought – detailed wording changes suggested.

Bishops Waltham Society (212/22)

Object to the lack of mention of lorries and loading/unloading facilities. Parking provision should be made to the maximum levels allowed by the HCC standards.
Include lorry standards and loading/unloading facilities and requirement for on-street parking restraint measures to complement reduced parking standards.
Change sought – detailed wording changes suggested for T.4 and paragraph 10.15.

traffic management. Parking standards to cover commercial vehicles will be reviewed as part of County-wide consideration of commercial vehicle routing and freight strategy. The explanatory text (paragraph 10.15) refers to the County Council's standards, which also deal with matters such as turning facilities. Therefore, these do not require specific reference in the Local Plan.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 10.10 **Proposal T.4**

Representation:

GOSE (261/67)

There is little discussion of developer contributions to transport investment. Government policy suggests contributions should be sought where appropriate, but the development plan

City Council's Response to Representation

Proposal T.4 includes requirements for contributions to the relevant transport strategy. The principle of commuted payments needs to be considered in the context of the wider transport strategy i.e. reconciling land use with a balanced transport strategy that promotes non-car modes in particular. Parking provision in new developments, as determined by parking standards, takes into account accessibility by public transport on an individual basis. PPG13 promotes reductions in travel demand and encourages the use of non-car modes and this is reflected in Proposal T.4.

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. *Change sought.*

City Council's Response to Representation *Change Proposed*

should state the likely nature and scope of contributions.

Change sought – *not specified.*

J.Hayter (138/16)

Proposal T.4 should seek contributions to on-street parking controls to avoid parking in neighbouring residential streets.

Change sought – *add reference to seeking contributions to on-street parking controls in paragraph 10.16.*

Town Planning Consultancy (324/5)

T.4 is contrary to PPG13, it is inappropriate for a local authority to seek commuted payments based purely around the lack of parking on site.

Change sought – *remove this reference.*

It is entirely legitimate and logical to seek contributions to non-car transport provision where parking standards are reduced to reflect the accessibility of a site to such provision. Paragraph 10.16 makes clear that contributions would be towards measures proposed in the relevant transport strategies for the area. It is likely that any more specific references to the nature/scope of contributions would soon become out of date if they were to be included in the Local Plan. However, it is proposed that Proposal T.4 should refer specifically to the County Council's latest parking standards, published in the document 'Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards'.

Change Proposed – Proposal T.4:

.... Contributions will be sought towards the relevant integrated transport strategy, where appropriate, particularly where the development has reduced levels of car parking provision in accordance with 'Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards'.

Issue 10.11 **Proposal T.4**

Representation:

A Rich (254/1), H Mycock (313/6), Mr & Mrs Stephenson (343/1), W G Pollock (1251/5), P H Radcliffe (includes petition of 31 other signatures) (1245/5)

Street parking can destroy the character and experience in some of the semi-rural suburbs of the City. T.4 does not allow preservation of character of the area as a reason to provide adequate off-street parking. Adequate resident and visitor parking should be allowed on-site to minimise on-street parking.

Change sought – *add additional text to allow adequate parking where on-street parking would detract from the character of the area and to seek contributions to landscaping and traffic calming from developers (detailed wording suggested).*

I Fleming (346/1)

Off-street parking should not be reduced as it will not encourage less cars but will create more on-street parking and create traffic congestion. Parking provision needs to be made to keep cars out of sight. Traffic congestion could be tackled by other means.

City Council's Response to Representation

On-street parking is taken into consideration when parking standards are applied. On-street parking does not necessarily have negative impacts, although it is accepted that it can do, particularly in environmentally sensitive areas. The provision of off-street parking as a substitute for on-street parking is unlikely to be promoted by the highway authority on the grounds that this is not a priority in encouraging non-car modes, has capital and maintenance costs and does not represent a good use of land.

Parking standards apply to development sites and take into account the possible impact of on-street parking in the vicinity of sites. In certain circumstances, on-street parking can help reduce traffic speeds and is not necessarily a safety problem.

Paragraph 10.16 indicates the criteria to be considered in conjunction with parking standards. It refers to the need to take account of controls over on-street parking, but it is accepted that additional wording could be added take into account the local character of an area.

Change Proposed – paragraph 10.16:

....The County-wide parking standards will be applied as a maximum and sympathetic consideration will be given to development proposals with reduced levels of parking provision and/or shared provision between different land use types. ~~taking~~ aAccount will be taken of any existing or potential controls over on-street parking and the need to maintain the character of the area. In these circumstances, contributions towards the relevant Area Transport Strategy may be sought to improve access by non-car based transport modes....

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Change sought – not specified.

J. Cooper (344/1)

Not enough off-street parking is allowed for, as house owners will not reduce their car ownership if there is less space. On-street parking will destroy the character of the area and some roads are not suited to on-street parking.

Change sought – not specified.

H Watson (345/7)

Street parking is a safety hazard and leads to a deterioration of the appearance and cleanliness of the street, erosion of verges and threat to trees. Proposal T.4 should acknowledge the character of an area as a reason to ensure enough off-street parking.

Change sought – add text to paragraph 10.16 allowing for sufficient parking to reduce on-street parking and seeking contributions from developers (detailed wording suggested).

Issue 10.12 **Paragraphs 10.15-10.16**

Representation:

Cala Homes (South) Ltd (468/67, 486/68)

Paragraphs 10.15 and 10.16 conflict with the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2001, inferring that provision below the County standards may be sought. Object to the 'blanket requirement' for contributions towards the integrated transport strategy.

Change sought – not specified.

C Gillham (1446/3)

Park and Ride involves car trips. It is a contradiction to take money from developers to provide Park and Ride, especially in Winchester where Park and Ride is a pretext for additional parking.

Change sought – not specified.

City Council's Response to Representation

Paragraph 10.15 reflects current national and local policy on car parking standards in that maximum standards are set, below which standards for particular sites will be determined. The standards are not applied in a blanket fashion as the accessibility of each site will be taken into consideration. Developer contributions towards the relevant integrated transport strategy will be sought in support of non-car access to particular sites.

Parking standards will ensure that excessive parking is not provided at development sites. Contributions towards Park and Ride support the removal of traffic from central Winchester as part of the overall transport strategy, which also includes reducing long-stay parking provision as set out in Chapter 11 of the Plan. Paragraphs 11.37 and 11.38 of the Plan make it clear that it is not the intention of Park and Ride to increase the stock of parking in Winchester.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 10.13 **Proposal T.5**

City Council's Response to Representation

Paragraph 10.17 supports proposal T.5 and indicates some of the

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. ***Change sought.***

City Council's Response to Representation ***Change Proposed***

Representation:

House Builders Federation (266/7)

Whilst Proposal T.5 is not unreasonable, the explanatory text goes further and is excessive. The developer should only be expected to make contributions that relate fairly and reasonably to the development.

Change sought – add 'in accordance with the scale, nature and location of the development proposed' after 'contributions' in paragraph 10.17.

Cala Homes (South) Ltd (468/69)

T.5 is vague, object to "appropriate off-site transportation measures". The Proposal should be amended to better reflect Circular 1/97.

Change sought – not specified.

possible off-site measures that may be sought. These will be determined through the relevant integrated transport strategies, taking into account measures which are required as a direct consequence of a particular development, in line with Circular 1/97 or any subsequent guidance. Both the Proposal and its explanatory text are clear that the measures that may be sought are what would be needed to enable a development to be permitted by overcoming transport objections to it.

More recent guidance such as PPG13 and local transport plans indicates that the integration of measures associated with development sites and the relevant transport strategy will aim to minimise the transport impact of such developments.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 10.14 **Proposal T.6**

Representation:

Grainger Trust Plc (214/14), J Pilkington (1250/1)

Support the development of an integrated transport network.

Change sought – none.

P B Sparke (97/5)

Winchester's public transport needs improvement before car parking can be reduced.

Change sought – make it clear that public transport (particularly buses) will be dramatically improved through buses entering the City and internal bus routes with more frequent services.

J Hayter (138/13)

Proposals T.6 and T.7 overlap considerably.

Change sought – combine T.6 and T.7 to avoid unnecessary overlap.

C J Webb (81/4)

Winchester's railway station should be improved to create a seamless interchange. The current road system

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Paragraphs 10.18 to 10.22 set out possible improvements to public transport and how these could be achieved. However, public transport provision is a matter for private sector concerns beyond the scope of local plans. This is, however a matter for the Local Transport Plan and the relevant area transport strategies, to which the text of the Local Plan refers. Detailed issues of bus routing are not appropriate for consideration in the Local Plan.

It is accepted that there is some overlap between Proposals T.6 and T.7. It is proposed that the Proposals be merged, along with the two sections of explanatory text that accompany them.

Appropriate links by non-car modes would be sought in conjunction with any development of the MDA at Winchester City (North). Additional demand for travel that would be generated by development should be accommodated by non-car modes, particularly at peak times. Bus priority measures are not only bus lanes, for which space is limited, but could be accommodated with reductions in traffic flows resulting from the wider transport strategy. While access roads to service the proposed MDA will be required, no major capacity increases on the road network are anticipated as set out in paragraph 10.35.

Change Proposed – ***Proposal T.6:***

Proposals to assist the development of an integrated transport network, a choice of transport modes and the operation of efficient public transport will be permitted, provided they accord with other relevant proposals of this Plan including:

(i) new or improved rail stations, including better interchange

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. *Change sought.*

City Council's Response to Representation *Change Proposed*

precludes buses running from the station to St Cross via Southgate Street, adding to congestion. Change sought – not specified.	(ii) <u>facilities with other modes;</u> (iii) <u>measures to improve the capacity of the rail network;</u> (iv) <u>interchange and park and ride facilities; and</u> <u>off highway bus priority measures, where this accords with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.</u>
C J York (336/3) The rail network in the Local Plan area is focussed on the Waterloo/Weymouth main line. The proposed Winchester City (North) MDA will 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. Change sought – provide commuter parking on brownfield sites within walking distance of the station or provide park and ride. Any increase in in-migration to Winchester should be discouraged due to the lack of rail capacity and car parking.	Delete sub-heading 'Public Transport' after paragraph 10.18. Change Proposed – Proposal T.7: In order to assist the development of an integrated transport network, planning permission will be granted for: (i) new or improved rail stations, including better interchange facilities with other modes; (ii) measures to improve the capacity of the rail network; (iii) interchange and park and ride facilities; and (iv) off highway bus priority measures, where this accords with Proposal DP.3 and other relevant proposals of this Plan.
L Garfath (1300/3), H Garfath (1301/4), B Garfath (1302/4), A Garfath (1303/2) The proposed Winchester City (North) MDA will increase train passenger congestion. Rush hour trains are already at capacity and this cannot be increased. The station car parks are full so 'drop-off' traffic would increase. Change sought – delete Winchester City (north) MDA proposal.	

Issue 10.15 **Proposal T.7/Paragraphs 10.19-10.26**

Representation:

P A Warner (1249/21)
Support Proposal T.7, an integrated transport network, particularly by enhancing rail services and interchange facilities, is to be applauded. There is scope for a significant Mid-Hampshire Park and Ride station (Parkway) at Micheldever.
Change sought – none.

Bishops Waltham Parish Council (211/14), Bishops Waltham Society (212/23)

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed. However, a potential parkway facility at Micheldever Station may be considered within the Central Hampshire Rural Transport Strategy at an appropriate time. This rural location could encourage longer car journeys and/or more traffic on the rural highway network.

Most of the representations on this Issue are either supportive of T.7 or concern the explanatory text, rather than the Proposal itself. It is proposed, in response to Issue 10.14, that proposal T.7 be deleted and merged into a revised version of T.6. Its explanatory text should, however, be retained and would still be relevant to the new combined Proposal.

Provision for car shares and cyclists will be considered for inclusion in Park and Ride schemes but is a matter for the relevant transport strategy rather than the Local Plan. However, there may be scope to consider the need for and viability of park and ride sites as part of the emerging route management strategies, such as the B2177 route strategy (see Proposal T.10) or other route strategies as they are

Winchester District Local Plan Review

Analysis of Representations on the Deposit Plan

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. ***Change sought.***

City Council's Response to Representation ***Change Proposed***

Park and Ride can provide a dual role in settlements outside Winchester and should include car and cycle transfer points onto direct and rapid bus routes and facilitate car sharing.

Change sought – Amend paragraph 10.26 to refer to the role of park and ride in settlements outside Winchester (detailed wording suggested).

Railtrack PLC (298/1)

Welcome the reference to interchange facilities and additional parking at railway stations (paragraphs 10.23-10.24).

Railway parking facilitates sustainable travel by encouraging people to use the rail network. Railway parking should not be subject to the same stringent parking policies as commercial development.

Change sought – place further emphasis on the importance of railway car parking, especially at Winchester Station.

C Gillham (1446/4)

Object to the suggestion in paragraph 10.24 that car parking at rail stations could be increased. There should be encouragement for as much of the trip as possible to be by public transport.

Change sought – not specified.

C Gillham (1446/5)

Disagree with the statement in paragraph 10.26 that Park and Ride in Winchester is designed to alleviate town centre traffic problems.

Change sought – not specified.

T Jones (347/1)

The Council should 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.

Change sought – not specified.

C J Webb (81/3)

The spur of the old railway line to Alresford at Kings Worthy/Springvale should be retained/safeguarded. This would make a useful turn around/terminus off the main line and improve public transport into Winchester.

developed.

The Plan recognises the concept of sustainability, particularly in relation to increasing demands for travel. In doing so, increasing the number of journeys is not encouraged but emphasis is placed on supporting public transport and other non-car modes. This is explained in paragraph 10.24.

Parking at railway stations can provide a useful role, provided that additional car trips are not generated. Additional parking has revenue potential for train operators but may create substantial additional traffic in the vicinity of stations such as Winchester and so is not likely to be considered as a priority. The potential for additional parking at stations will be considered within the relevant integrated transport strategy. Paragraph 10.24 of the Local Plan Review makes it clear that, while additional parking at stations could be considered, this should be dedicated for rail passenger use. Until this is done with existing station parking provision, there is unlikely to be any case for allowing further increases in parking provision at stations.

Whilst respondent 1446's comment about Winchester Park and Ride is noted, it is an opinion which is not accepted. Park and Ride is intended to reduce traffic levels in the central area.

Capacity improvements on the rail network and trains is a matter for Railtrack and train operators and not the Local Plan.

A North Winchester MDA could generate increased demand to and from the railway station but provision would need to be made for appropriate links by modes other than the car. An MDA would be intended to accommodate the needs of local people rather than London commuters and a significant proportion would be affordable housing aimed at local people in housing need. While capacity on the main line is limited, Railtrack and train operators are investigating possible improvements.

Change Proposed – none (but see Issue 10.14 where it is proposed that Proposal T.7 be deleted).

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Change sought – not specified.

M Miller (1252/5)

The rail network is already at capacity and 2000 extra houses at Winchester City (North) will place even more strain on the rail network.

Change sought – remove Winchester City (North) MDA and encourage people to stay in cities not move to country towns.

Issue 10.16
Proposal T.8

Representation:

Southern Tourist Board (87/8)

Support Proposal T.8, the commitment to improve and extend existing cycleways is welcomed.

Change sought – none.

C Sealey (348/1)

Proposals to promote cycling and walking and improve pedestrian and cycle routes are very welcome and are strongly supported. Opportunities were overlooked in Jewry Street and greater commitment is required in future.

Change sought – none.

Ramblers Association, Winchester Group (1254/1)

Support Proposal T.8 and would like to be consulted on the improvement and extension of the footpath and bridleway and quiet roads initiatives.

Change sought – none.

AONB Project Officer (1248/11)

Support Proposal T.8. In the interests of providing a more integrated access network, opportunities to improve and extend the footway, footpath, cycleway and bridleway network should be encouraged. Reference should be made to the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000.

Change sought – none.

J Hayter (138/14)

Object to Proposal T.8 as it duplicates RT.8 but is less comprehensive.

City Council's Response to Representation
The support is welcomed.

Whilst there is a significant degree of overlap between Proposal RT.8 and T.8, Proposal T.8 focuses on utility walking and cycling journeys while proposal RT.8 focuses on recreational journeys, each requiring their own consideration and funding arrangements. It is not, therefore, proposed that either Proposal be modified in response to this representation.

It is accepted that Proposal T.8 could be worded in a more positive way to try to encourage improvements to the footpath, cycleway, etc network. It is, therefore, proposed that Proposal T.8 be reworded.

Change Proposed – Proposal T.8:

In order to promote cycling and walking, proposals to improve and extend the footway, footpath, cycleway and bridleway network will be permitted, where they accord with other relevant proposals of this Plan.

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Change sought – delete Proposal T.8.

J Pilkington (1250/2)

Object to T.8 as it is too weak and should be strengthened.

Change sought – change the word "permitted" to read "actively pursued".

Issue 10.17 **Proposal T.9**

Representation:

Eastleigh Borough Council (1427/1)

Support Proposal T.9.

Change sought – none.

Railtrack PLC (298/2)

Welcome the proposals to safeguard railfreight facilities at Micheldever and Botley, but the policy should promote alternative development of sites that become surplus to requirements. Such sites can contribute to regeneration of brownfield sites and to transport objectives.

Change sought – actively promote alternative forms of development on surplus railfreight sites.

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Proposal T.9 deals with the safeguarding of existing rail freight facilities and the approach to new facilities. The principle of developing existing rail freight facilities for other uses would be resisted by Proposal T.9. This is consistent with PPG12. If, however, the planning and transport authorities were satisfied that a facility was surplus to requirements, any alternative development would be considered against the Plan's general proposals.

In the case of the rail freight facilities at Micheldever and Botley, both are subject to the Plan's countryside policies and would, therefore have limited development potential. Given this, and as the emphasis of T.9 is on the retention of rail freight facilities not their replacement, it is not proposed that any changes be made to T.9 in response to this representation.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 10.18 **Proposal T.10**

Representation:

Eastleigh Borough Council (1427/2)

Support Proposal T.10.

Change sought – none.

J Pilkington (1250/3)

Support the commitment in Proposal T.10 (ii) to improve facilities for cyclists and pedestrians in the B3354/B2177 corridor between Winchester and Wickham.

Change sought – none.

Bishops Waltham Parish Council (211/15), Bishops Waltham Society (212/24)

Proposal T.10 should be deleted as it is unnecessary and duplicates things

City Council's Response to Representation

The support is welcomed.

Proposal T.10 specifically identifies the Winchester to Wickham corridor thus reinforcing rather than repeating the more general proposals. It refers to 'the B3354/B2177 corridor', and is intended to cover the adjacent transport links, especially to the railway network between Fareham and Winchester. Cycling and public transport improvements are expected to provide benefits.

The corridor approach in Proposal T.10 relates to transport improvements and is particularly aimed at controlling the rate of growth in car use. The Proposal does not promote ribbon development or any other form of development, which would be dealt with by other proposals of the Plan. These are no more promotional of development in the B3354/B2177 corridor than anywhere else.

Paragraph 10.33 refers to measures that 'could be considered' because, at the time of publishing the deposit Plan, consultation was underway on the possibilities. The Revised Deposit Plan can be more specific to reflect the outcome of that consultation and a change is proposed accordingly.

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. ***Change sought.***

City Council's Response to Representation ***Change Proposed***

covered by other proposals.

Change sought – delete Proposal T. 10.

Twyford Parish Council (328/7)

This proposal should also cover other principal roads and cycle routes within the village and include Sustrans and safe routes.

Change sought – not specified.

Shedfield Parish Council (308/1)

Object to the “corridor” approach, which seems aimed at attracting development. Cycling is 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”.

Change sought – delete Proposal T. 10.

C Gillham (1446/6)

Object to paragraph 10.33, which is unclear. What does ‘could be considered’ mean. It will result in nothing except silly bits of road engineering. Road safety should be improved by making speed limits low and enforcing them.

Change sought – not specified.

The Local Transport Plan deals with a range of issues that do not fall within the consideration of the Local Plan, such as road safety, speed limits and their enforcement.

Change Proposed – paragraph 10.33:

.... A wide range of measures have ~~could~~ been considered to achieve these objectives and, following consultation, including, for example, speed reduction measures, new pedestrian crossing facilities and pedestrianisation are examples of schemes that will be promoted through the relevant area transport strategy.

Issue 10.19 **Proposal T.11**

Representation:

I White (349/1)

Proposal T.11 becomes meaningless if Winchester City (North) remains in the Plan, as it would create environmental/safety problems and require new road building to ameliorate them. Why create the problem in the first place?

Change sought – delete Winchester City (North) MDA.

C Gillham (1446/7)

Proposals T.11 and T.12 are incompatible, as road building is very unlikely to be environmentally justified. It almost always results in increased traffic, reducing accessibility for the car-less and less well-off.

Change sought – not specified.

City Council's Response to Representation

Proposal T.11 seeks to avoid permitting road construction to meet capacity constraints. Where development is promoted, such as Winchester City (North), access will need to be provided to that site by way of roads and other transport infrastructure. The reserve MDA is required by the Structure Plan (Review) and the Local Plan must, therefore, plan for the possibility of it being developed.

Proposal T.11 makes it clear that road building is effectively the last resort in terms of relieving environmental and/or safety problems. In the cases where new road building is proposed by the Local Plan (see Proposal T.12), it has been concluded that it is the most appropriate way to address the issues involved. It is not, therefore, accepted that Proposals T.11 and T.12 are incompatible.

Change Proposed – none.

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed

Issue 10.20
Proposal T.12/Paragraph 10.38

Representation:

Eastleigh Borough Council (1427/3)
Support Proposal T.12.
Change sought – none.

Bovis Homes Ltd (213/5), Fareham Borough Council (1423/3)
Support Proposal T.12(ii), the safeguarding of land to secure the construction of Whiteley Way.
Change sought – none.

Trustees of H H Jenkyns (51/4)
Support Proposal T.12(i), the proposal to safeguard land for the Botley Bypass.
Change sought – none.

C Gillham (1446/8)
Proposals T.11 and T.12 are incompatible, as road building is very unlikely to be environmentally justified. It almost always results in increased traffic, reducing accessibility for the car-less and less well-off.
Change sought – not specified.

C Gillham (1446/9)
The multi-modal studies referred to in paragraph 10.38 are excuses for road building. The desire to see the A34 study progressed is simply to get more road building at M3 Junction 9.
Change sought – not specified.

City Council's Response to Representation
The support is welcomed.

Proposal T.11 makes it clear that road building is effectively the last resort in terms of relieving environmental and/or safety problems. Where Proposal T.12 provides for new road building it has been concluded that it is the most appropriate way to address the issues involved. It is not, therefore, accepted that Proposals T.11 and T.12 are incompatible.

Respondent 1446's objection presumes the outcome of a multi-modal study for the A34(T) which has yet to commence. Paragraph 10.38 identifies problems at M3 Junction 9 but does not presume that major road construction will be the solution to the problem.

Change Proposed – none.

Issue 10.21
Proposal T.12

Representation:

D Oswald (65/1)
Object to the proposed Botley Bypass as it will cause damage to the environmentally important Hamble Valley and increase car traffic.
Change sought – do not build the bypass or failing that a full independent environmental impact assessment is needed followed by a public inquiry.

City Council's Response to Representation

Proposal T.12 reflects the Structure Plan (Review)'s retention of two road schemes, one of which, Whiteley Way, is the completion of an unfinished link (see Local Plan paragraph 10.37). The other, Botley Bypass, would relieve traffic and environmental difficulties in Botley.

Respondent 330 is not specific about which of the schemes proposed in T.12 they are concerned about. The environmental and traffic impacts of the proposed Botley Bypass will be evaluated when the scheme is promoted. This is likely to involve the submission of an environmental impact assessment and bodies such as the Wildlife Trust are already consultees on the Local Plan and would be consulted on any planning application.

The possibility of major development at North Whiteley was evaluated

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation. ***Change sought.***

City Council's Response to Representation ***Change Proposed***

Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust (330/7)

The route of T.12 includes land recognised as being of importance to nature conservation. The Plan does not contain sufficient detail to determine whether damage can be reduced to an acceptable level.

Change sought – not specified.

Bovis Homes Ltd (213/6)

The Plan should recognise that residential or mixed use development at North Whiteley would support the completion of Whiteley Way.

Change sought – allocate land at North Whiteley for residential or mixed use development.

Grove Farms (Hampshire) Ltd. (314/1)

Object to the omission of 'North Whiteley'. The adopted District Local Plan envisaged that Whiteley would continue to be developed beyond that Plan period: object to the failure to carry this commitment forward. Additional development should be allowed so that Whiteley Way can be completed, enabling M27 Junction 9 to be relieved.

Change sought – allocate land at North Whiteley for further development to provide for the completion of Whiteley and Whiteley Way.

North Whiteley Consortium (322/6)

Neither Proposal T.12 nor paragraph 10.37 mentions the possibility of enabling development at North Whiteley, which could bring forward the completion of Whiteley Way. Land at North Whiteley should be allocated as a reserve housing site instead of Winchester City (North).

Change sought – add reference to the enabling development of a reserve housing site at North Whiteley.

through the process of adoption of the Country Structure Plan (Review). It was rejected in favour of other sites and the Structure Plan (Review) does not provide for the area's development. In reaching this decision, the strategic planning authorities had the opportunity to take account of the possible benefits in terms of facilitating the completion of Whiteley Way, but chose not to provide for the development of the area.

Development at North Whiteley has not, therefore, been included in the Local Plan in accordance with the adopted County Structure Plan (Review). It is not for the Local Plan to decide which MDAs should be developed or to add new MDAs or swap one for another. The inclusion of development at North Whiteley within the Local Plan would involve a scale of development that would take the Plan out of general conformity with the Structure Plan. In an event, Whiteley Way was proposed to access the existing area of Whiteley and it has been concluded that the Local Plan makes adequate provision for housing and that no further greenfield allocations or settlement boundary extensions should be promoted.

Change Proposed – none.

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

CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT

Summary of Representation.
Change sought.

City Council's Response to Representation
Change Proposed
