

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

1 APRIL 2011

LDF INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Contact Officer: Zoe James Tel No: 01962 848420

Email: zjames@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

[CAB2063](#)(LDF) - LDF Draft Infrastructure Study – 06 October 2010

[CAB 2040](#)(LDF) – Local Development Framework Update – 22 July 2010

[CAB 1983](#)(LDF) – Core Strategy Preferred Option – Feedback on Consultation (Chapters 7-16) – 12 March 2010

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The draft Infrastructure Study was published for consultation in November 2010 and set out in broad terms the range of social and physical infrastructure that may be required to support development proposals contained within the Core Strategy of the emerging Winchester District Local Development Framework (LDF). The Study considered the development proposals contained in the Preferred Option version of the Core Strategy, but acknowledges that some of these are under review following the revocation of the South East Plan. It does not cover the South Hampshire Strategic Development Areas in detail as these are subject to their own delivery studies and Eastleigh Borough Council has resolved not to progress the Hedge End SDA through its LDF.

Once completed, the Study will form part of the evidence base for the LDF. Consultation on the draft Infrastructure Study took place between 15 November and 7 January 2011 as agreed in [CAB2063](#)(LDF). It is recommended that the evidenced local infrastructure information provided through the consultation by service providers, Council members, and the local community is used to update the Study where appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1 That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning to make the amendments set out in Appendix 1 of this report (including removal of the sections on Strategic Allocations), make any further minor factual and editorial changes to the Study if required and to publish the revised Study. Any further significant changes which may be needed prior to publication should be agreed in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Winchester and Surrounds and the Portfolio Holder for the Rural Areas and Market Towns.
- 2 That a detailed delivery plan is developed for inclusion in the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy, including any strategic site allocations.

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

1 APRIL 2011

LDF INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY

REPORT OF HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

DETAIL:

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Infrastructure Study will form part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework (LDF) and will be important for the wider delivery strategy of the LDF Core Strategy. The Study sets out in broad terms the range of social and physical infrastructure that may be required to support development, based on the proposals contained within the 'Preferred Option' version of the Core Strategy (published in 2009). It considers the strategic allocations proposed in the Preferred Option of the Core Strategy but acknowledges that some of these are under review following the revocation of the South East Plan. It does not address the infrastructure needs of the South Hampshire Strategic Development Areas in detail.
- 1.2 The Study provides a summary of current and future infrastructure requirements using information supplied by infrastructure providers during research carried out between July and September 2010. It also sets out the estimated delivery of infrastructure needed for the Core Strategy's proposed Strategic Allocations using information provided by the agents/developers promoting the sites.
- 1.3 Consultation on the draft Infrastructure Study took place alongside the 'Blueprint' exercise. Blueprint and further technical studies and consultation will lead to a revised Core Strategy and this may result in changes to the Preferred Option's development strategy for the District and/or the Strategic Allocations previously identified. Therefore, it is proposed that the information in Section 4 and Appendix 1 related to the Strategic Allocations or other site-specific work is removed from the Infrastructure Study and instead developed in more detail through a delivery plan for the next version of the Core Strategy (the Pre-Submission document). The sites will still be referenced within the Study to provide guidance on the type and scale of infrastructure considered necessary while making clear that this information derives from the Preferred Option.
- 1.4 The need to provide the necessary social and physical infrastructure identified in the Infrastructure Study in a timely manner will inform the process of determining the District's development requirements, in order that where development is permitted it is supported by the delivery of the necessary infrastructure. The Study therefore may help to inform the development of

Section 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedules, which will be instrumental in informing future development decisions.

- 1.5 It will also provide evidence to support on-going discussions with the local community and service providers following the 'Blueprint' consultation exercise to identify what social and physical infrastructure the District may require over the next 15 years.
- 2 What the Study includes/excludes
- 2.1 The draft Study collated the plans and proposals of relevant organisations and service providers which have a bearing on the social and physical infrastructure across the District. It also used information provided directly by service providers and, for the proposed Strategic Allocations, by the agents/developers promoting the sites.
- 2.2 It is recommended that the detailed site information in Section 4 and Appendix 1 should be removed from the Study as the development strategy for the District is under review following the Blueprint exercise and in anticipation of the abolition of regional strategies. It is proposed that any site-specific infrastructure needs will be established in a delivery plan which will form part of the next version of the Core Strategy (the Pre-Submission document), when any Strategic Allocations are established. As it stands, the site information included in the draft Study to date has not been finalised and is subject to on-going work.
- 2.3 The information included in the Study is not exhaustive and much of the information is given on a wider area scale. The information in the Study will need to be kept up-to-date as funding streams and policies change and management plans are developed. Therefore the Study may need to be reviewed and updated in due course.
- 2.4 The areas covered by the Study include:-
- Transport covering Strategic and Local Road Networks, Parking, Public Transport, and Footpaths/Bridleways and Cycle Tracks.
 - Green Infrastructure, Sports, Open Space and natural green space
 - Housing - Affordable Housing including extra care housing
 - Education provision covering from nursery to higher and further education
 - Health facilities and social services including primary and acute care
 - Social Infrastructure including creative industries, arts and culture including community halls
 - Emergency Services - Police Service, Ambulance Service

- Utilities Services - Gas and Electricity Provision, Communications, Waste and Resource Management, Water Management - Fresh Water Abstraction and Foul Water Discharge, Flood defences, Renewable Energy
- Communications

3 Summary of Consultation Issues and Proposed Response

- 3.1 The Study demonstrates that there are a number of geographic areas where current infrastructure provision is deficient, and further development will worsen the situation unless the appropriate infrastructure is put in place at an early stage of the development process.
- 3.2 Although it may be expected that economic conditions will move through more than one economic cycle over the next 15 years, infrastructure provision will prove particularly challenging over the first few years of the LDF, as developers will be expected to fund the majority of infrastructure requirements directly related to their development with limited public sector support even for strategic infrastructure. Therefore innovative ways of securing the required levels of infrastructure will need to be explored to ensure that development is possible.
- 3.3 The comments made during the consultation mainly provided factual amendments and updates to the information in the Study. However, there were a number of issues raised that warrant more than factual amendments to the draft Study. Most significant is the way the Strategic Allocations are addressed in the Study. There is ongoing work on the infrastructure needed for some of these sites and some are subject to planning applications / appeals and negotiations of S106 obligations. Concern was raised by some respondents that the removal of Barton Farm and Bushfield Camp as Strategic Allocations was inappropriate, or pre-judging the outcome of work on the Core Strategy. Given the comments and the fact that work is currently ongoing regarding development needs, it is recommended that the infrastructure needed for the delivery of any Strategic Allocations should be considered and detailed in a Delivery Plan for the Core Strategy policies. Objections to the principle of focusing development on some of the sites were also submitted as part of the consultation on the Infrastructure Study and the recommended removal of the Strategic Allocations from the Study means that no response is made to these.
- 3.4 Many service providers responded to the consultation and provided very helpful updates or factual amendments to the Study. A few organisations also responded, raising concerns about how the Council should be looking to provide infrastructure in future. These comments are summarised in the Appendix to this report, but the response recommends that some of the issues raised are best addressed through other strategies and should not be addressed through this Study. The full responses are available to view on

the Council's website at:

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/General.asp?nc=8KOG&id=26589>

- 3.5 Many of the comments submitted relate to the chapter on transport. A number of responses considered that the Council should push for transport initiatives which would produce a modal shift away from car use. There was particular concern that there was a lack of information on bus provision and that the description of the state of the cycle network provision was inaccurate. Some updates to the Study have been proposed following these comments and some further work has been undertaken on bus provision which should be included in the Study, however this information is still limited and in many cases is subject to decisions by commercial operators.
- 3.6 The chapter on Green Infrastructure also generated many comments. These reiterated the Council's duty to undertake the necessary assessments of the impacts to nature conservation sites prior to making planning decisions which may affect a protected site. The Council is aware of the different hierarchy of protected sites across the District and the assessments required through legislation, as well as the Councils own policies; work has already commenced on some of these assessments in consultation with the relevant authorities.
- 3.7 The networks of open space, countryside and outdoor recreation provision known as 'green infrastructure' is increasingly recognised for its role in improving the quality of life of communities, and also for its role in mitigating any adverse impacts on environmentally sensitive sites caused through development pressure.
- 3.8 Notwithstanding the consultation responses, the main deficiencies in infrastructure remain the same as reported in the draft Study ([CAB2063\(LDF\)](#)). These are not surprisingly around highways and transport infrastructure and the strategic road network is particularly stressed at times. Although it will be possible to put in place various mitigation measures, for example, junction improvements and traffic management, it will not be possible to 'build our way out' of the problems currently facing the District, and 'smarter choices' will be required to reduce the demand for travel by the private car.
- 3.9 The capacity of education facilities, especially primary education, is currently an issue in certain parts of the District, particularly in the Winchester town area. New development will be expected to meet its own requirements in this respect, but significant improvements in areas which are not facing development pressures are unlikely.
- 3.10 Where secondary education capacity is limited, particularly around the Whiteley area, development will be expected to contribute towards provision to ensure that the situation is not worsened. Public funding for new and improved school buildings to address existing problems is likely to be scarce for some time to come.

- 3.11 There are issues for the City Council to address in securing appropriate 'cutting edge' infrastructure to adapt to the challenges of climate change, and ensure that the District remains competitive into the 21st century. This again will require the Council to implement new policies in the areas of renewable energy and communications technology.
- 3.12 Viability will need to be assessed as masterplanning proceeds and this Study does not seek to address viability issues in detail. Nevertheless, there would not appear to be any significant items of infrastructure required to bring forward the strategic sites that cannot be funded and provided in a timely fashion. This includes a new primary and secondary school at North Whiteley, and the completion of the Whiteley Way. However, as noted above, it is recommended that the Strategic Allocations be removed from the Study and subject to further work for inclusion in a delivery plan.
- 3.13 The Study will inevitably need to be up-dated and revised as a consequence of changing funding opportunities, consultations and community engagement which will be undertaken as the Core Strategy is developed, and new opportunities and deficiencies are identified. Further detailed work on infrastructure will also be required if and when the Council decides to implement the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Infrastructure Study therefore provides a comprehensive overview of infrastructure issues and this important topic will be subject to further work through the production of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Core Strategy and any Charging Schedules for the CIL.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

4 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CORPORATE CHANGE PLANS (RELEVANCE TO):

- 4.1 This Study will benefit the wider corporate business schemes and implementation and the work of other Council officers. It demonstrates links with the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and will provide information to help deliver the objectives of the SCS through the Local Development Framework.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The existing LDF budget includes adequate resources for the production of the Study. The Study highlights the need for investment in key areas of infrastructure and enables this to be planned for and for developer contributions to be sought where possible and justified. It should, therefore, help to ensure that the majority of infrastructure costs are met by new development and utility companies, rather than by public funding.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 6.1 The Infrastructure Study will be a key part of the LDF evidence base and will inform the emerging Core Strategy and Development Management and

Allocations DPDs. The information will also have links with Section 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedules which will be instrumental in securing infrastructure contributions from future development. The production of the Study does not involve any significant risks to the Council and will help to avoid the risk of inadequate infrastructure being provided for new development, or of the Council having to fund shortfalls.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

[LDFCAB 2040](#)

APPENDICES:

Due to its size, Appendix A is attached for Members of the Committee and Group Leaders only. A copy is also available in the Members' Library and can be viewed on the Council's Website via the following link:

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/ElectedRepresentatives/Committees/CommitteeMeeting.asp?id=SX9452-A78596C7&committee=15084>

Appendix A: Draft Infrastructure Study - Summary of Responses

CAB2150(LDF) Appendix A

Draft Infrastructure Study - Summary of Responses

Consultation Responses and Assessment

Infrastructure providers, stakeholders, groups and individuals have made a number of detailed comments on the draft Infrastructure Study. Many of the comments support the preparation of the Study, but make factual corrections to the information that has been included.

Officers recommend that these factual amendments/clarifications and updates are made, and that the Study is used as the baseline to develop the Delivery Plan for the Core Strategy Policies as they are developed, as set out in CAB2150 (LDF).

Index to Comments

General comments	3
WCC Community Planning Manager	3
Cllr Margot Power	3
Friends of the Earth	3
Sites	5
Adams Hendry on behalf of Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments	5
Savills on behalf of Grainger plc.	6
Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England	7
WCC Community Planning Manager	8
Curbridge Preservation Society	8
Transport	11
Hampshire County Council	11
Highways Agency	15
Natural England	16
Cllr Robert Hutchison	17
Cllr Margot Power	18
Cllr Jacey Jackson	18
WinACC Transport Group	19
Friends of the Earth	25
Phil Gagg	30
Green Infrastructure	34
Natural England	34
WCC Community Planning Manager	38
Hampshire County Council	38
Forestry Commission	39
Friends of the Earth	40
Housing, affordable and specialist housing including extra care	40
Hampshire County Council	40
Friends of the Earth	43
Education	43
The University of Winchester	43

Friends of the Earth	43
Health facilities and social services	44
NHS Hampshire Primary Care Dental Services	44
Cllr Margot Power	44
Social Infrastructure: Creative Industries, Arts and Culture incl. Community Halls	44
WCC Economy and Arts Officer	44
WCC Community Planning Manager	44
Theatres Trust	46
Emergency Services - Police Service	46
Hampshire Constabulary	46
WCC Community Planning Manager	47
Emergency Services - Fire Service	47
Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service	47
Utilities Services: Gas and Electricity Provision	48
Friends of the Earth	48
Renewable Energy	48
Natural England	48
Cllr Margot Power	48
Friends of the Earth	48
Utility services – Waste and Resource Management	49
Hampshire County Council	49
Water Management - Fresh Water Abstraction and Foul Water Discharge	49
Environment Agency	49
Portsmouth Water	53
Southern Water	54
Cllr Margot Power	55
Flood defences	55
Natural England Comments on Flood Defences	55
Utilities Service: Communications	55
WCC Economy and Arts Officer	55
Cllr Power	56
Glossary	56

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
General comments		
WCC Community Planning Manager	<p>Table 1 (pages 19-20)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add information on the Compton & Shawford or West Meon Parish Plans. There may be issues with noise from the M3 and parking at the railway station and issues related to safety on the A32 at West Meon. 	<p>Agree - this information should be added. <u>Proposed action</u> The table should be amended accordingly.</p>
Cllr Margot Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure Study will need to be revisited when have results of Blueprint exercise and as the LDF nears finalisation. 	<p>Agree - information on Infrastructure requirements needs to be kept up to date. <u>Proposed action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
Friends of the Earth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are many areas where alternative action to infrastructure provision would be the wiser course for the benefit of society e.g. §3.1.28, improved bus networks (which can hardly be construed as infrastructure), or at various points in the document there is reference to demand management. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question mindset that should still be looking for developer to build or contribute old-fashioned infrastructure. Infrastructure has costs and benefits that need to be weighed. 	<p>Comments noted - The Council is aware of the issues around bus provision particularly in the rural areas of the District (this was also highlighted through the Blueprint process) and the Council supports appropriate measures that would produce a modal shift away from car usage. Many bus services are provided on a commercial basis and funding to subsidise other services is limited. The Study can help to identify where developer contributions may be warranted to help provide/improve bus services. <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend Study to provide further information on bus provision. Work on bus service provision relating to specific sites should be dealt with in the Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted. The Council is aware of the different approaches needed to deliver infrastructure in the changing climate. Most of the infrastructure included in the Study is considered to provide for primary needs and other areas are included to take account of changing technology (renewables, communication for e.g.). <u>Proposed Action</u></p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>• Housing infrastructure has some immediate justification, but question the demographics. Suggest the southwards migration has partly been a self-fulfilling prophecy created by planners. Predicted trend towards smaller households may not be economically realistic.</p> <hr/> <p>2.1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not understand why PUSH figures are retained with the change in circumstances in regional planning. There should be bottom up analysis of housing need in the PUSH area. • Consideration of housing need should be a study of need and not demand and the Council should not make provision for housing that represents a perception of a trend in demand. Therefore the Council should not provide for a growing population resulting from population drift nor should it presume to understand economics to the extent that it supposes a population growth might be an economic benefit for the existing population. <hr/> <p>2.3.17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not see that a Prosperous Economy is a meaningful objective of the Sustainable Community Strategy. Elected representatives should not intervene in the economic activity in a complex economy such as Winchester. Can not talk about a balance between environment and economy such as road traffic seen as an economic good and environmental harm. For Winchester Town economic good is more likely to come from restricting road transport. <hr/> <p>2.4.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are FoE 'key partners' in the process of collaborating how funding gained through incentivised community development is used to meet 	<p>No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - This is not an issue that can be addressed in this Study. This is to be considered when assessing housing need and targets. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - This is not an issue that can be addressed in this Study. This is to be considered when assessing housing need and targets. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - This is not an issue that can be addressed in this Study. This is to be considered through the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The Winchester District Strategic Partnership who set the SCS is a partnership of many different organisations including those involved in the economic sector. Council decisions can also strongly influence and help shape the local economy and therefore consider it relevant to include this reference. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - Until further details on the New Homes Bonus are set out, unable to confirm who key partners are in the process. The local</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>local infrastructure requirements? Understand that infrastructure of national or regional importance will not be imposed on local communities, but that those communities will enjoy a benefit from accepting what they would otherwise resist.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear that local authorities will use the incentive system of the ‘Big Society’ to fund ‘pet projects’. Risk that communities which are meant to benefit from the incentives could be disadvantaged by a development and the infrastructure to which the developer’s contribution is diverted. 	<p>community however is a key partner in this scheme. Government proposals in the Localism Bill make it clear that Ministers will make decisions on nationally-important infrastructure projects and that these could override local communities’ objections.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - the government proposes that the money provided through the New Homes Bonus will not be ring fenced and “local authorities will be able to decide how to spend the funding in line with local community wishes”¹. Local authorities’ decisions will reflect their role in representing the local community.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
Sites		
Adams Hendry on behalf of Bovis Homes and Heron Land Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CS must be prepared in conformity with the SE Plan regardless of the governments’ intention to revoke them (in relation to delivery proposals for Barton Farm and Bushfield Camp being included within the appendix). • There is insufficient detail on the likely infrastructure requirements for the proposed Knowledge Park at Bushfield Camp which would be required to demonstrate a sound CS. The evidence studies highlight infrastructure capacity as a significant issue. – MVA Stage 2 report states Highways Agency has concerns about the impact on the SRN, particularly J11. It is likely any off-site works would need to be developer funded. The Vail Williams 2009 viability report also confirms 	<p>Agree in part.</p> <p>1. Further detail on sites is needed, but we believe this would be better included in a delivery plan for the pre-submission stage of the Core Strategy. This will confirm whether the existing Strategic Allocations are retained or changed.</p> <p>2. The information used in the report comes from the Church Commissioners and represents a more detailed picture of contributions required than the earlier Vail Williams report. Studies on the viability of the site are ongoing. As for all Strategic Allocation sites, the information submitted is not finalised and is subject to change following further</p>

¹ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/pdf/1846530.pdf>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>that the development is not viable and development would require a negligible land value; this report a contribution for off-site works of only £500k. The IS estimates btw £1.7 and 2.6 mill which compounds concerns regarding the viability of the site.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider it more appropriate to concentrate development to the North of Winchester to generate sufficient revenues to cover the cost of the necessary infrastructure requirements or improvements arising from the development of a strategic housing and employment allocation. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To conform with PPS12, para 4.8 and 4.9, the draft Infrastructure Study should specify where off-site highway improvements to mitigate traffic impacts at Barton Farm should be focused and what they should entail. <p>The IS should not include infrastructure requirements for Barton Farm from their refused planning application as they have no basis in any adopted or emerging statutory development plan (realignment of Andover Road, provision of P&R light) particularly as reasons for refusal included inadequacies of the realigned road and impact of the proposal on the SRN.</p>	<p>detailed studies.</p> <p><u>Proposed action</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is proposed that the information for Strategic Allocations is removed from this Infrastructure Study and instead developed through a Delivery Plan to accompany the Core Strategy. Until the Core Strategy is further advanced, it is not possible to confirm which Strategic Sites will be allocated, but those that are will be included in the Delivery Plan. 2. It is proposed the detailed information is developed through an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. <hr/> <p>Comment noted</p> <p><u>Proposed action</u></p> <p>No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u></p> <p>It is proposed that the information for Strategic Allocations is removed from this Infrastructure Study and instead developed through a Delivery Plan to accompany the Core Strategy. Until the Core Strategy is further advanced, it is not possible to confirm which Strategic Sites will be allocated, but those that are will be included in the Delivery Plan.</p>
Savills on behalf of Grainger plc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council must recognise that all sums included in S.3 of the study are indicative and are work in progress. The table for the Grainger development was based on the evidence base available for the HBCCS Examination in Public. Some of the sums included may be amended during further negotiations with WCC and HBC on the submitted hybrid application for land in the West of Waterlooville development and in the light of detailed evidence base submitted with the with the hybrid application. 	<p>Comment noted - It is proposed that the information for Strategic Allocations is removed from this Infrastructure Study and instead developed through a Delivery Plan to accompany the Core Strategy. For all sites, the information submitted is not finalised and is subject to change following further detailed studies.</p> <p><u>Proposed action</u></p> <p>It is proposed that the information for Strategic</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider that the 'min 40% affordable housing' requirement is not flexible and therefore not compliant with PPS12. The table should therefore state a 'target of 40% affordable housing'. This is especially pertinent to the cross boundary nature of the WoW MDA; the issue was also addressed through the draft HBC CS stage which was amended to state 'a target of 40% affordable housing'. 	<p>Allocations is removed from this Infrastructure Study and instead developed through a Delivery Plan to accompany the Core Strategy. Until the Core Strategy is further advanced, it is not possible to confirm which Strategic Sites will be allocated, but those that are will be included in the Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Comment noted – the requirements for affordable housing will be established through the Core Strategy and the process will include a public examination and consideration of adjoining authorities' plans. <u>Proposed Action</u> - No amendments proposed</p>
<p>Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about how both of the Strategic Allocations (SA) in the Winchester Town area are addressed in the study as they have been included separately in Appendix 1 unlike the other SAs. The title of App. 1 suggests that the Council is already minded to step by from these allocations in light of the government's proposal to revoke the SE plan and therefore the infrastructure requirements for the town should be considered generically rather than in relation to the existing Preferred Option sites. In the absence of further consultation and evidence, it is premature and potentially unsound to indicate these sites have already been reconsidered and contrary to PPS12. In addition, draft policy WT3 (Knowledge Park at Bushfield Camp) does not emanate from the RSS but reflects the evidence base derived need for highly skilled employment opportunities within Winchester Town. The study misses the opportunity to refer to the benefits of a knowledge park for Winchester (see WT3 of CS Preferred Option) such as in the Communications section of the Study and links to future ICT development and the contribution the proposal could have to 	<p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> It is proposed that the information for all Strategic Allocations is removed from this Infrastructure Study and instead developed through a Delivery Plan to accompany the Core Strategy. Until the Core Strategy is further advanced, it is not possible to confirm which Strategic Sites will be allocated, but those that are will be included in the Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Disagree The intended revocation of the RSS is likely to have an impact on the strategy for Winchester such that this strategic allocation needs to be reviewed as well as the proposed housing allocation at Barton Farm. <u>Proposed Action</u> - No amendments proposed</p> <hr/> <p>Disagree The study is not intended to promote the benefits of particular sites but to identify the infrastructure requirements. The appendices set out the</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	Green Infrastructure and public open space for the Town.	requirements for open space, etc. <u>Proposed Action</u> - No amendments proposed.
WCC Community Planning Manager	<p>4.2 (West of Waterlooville)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that there is a, "Possible need for new community centre...". This has been included within the S106 so I don't think that "possible" is the correct term. It also makes reference to a community development contribution and I would expect to see something similar in section 4.1 for North Whiteley, although nothing is currently included. 	<p>Agree</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly. (See also comments above regarding indicative sums and further work through the Delivery Plan). Reference to community development contributions should be added to North Whiteley; this will need to be agreed for the site and developed through the Delivery Plan.</p>
Curbridge Preservation Society	<p>4.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed MDA is contrary to the Curbridge Village Design Statement. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is contrary to EC.6 of Planning Policy Statement 4 relevant as the site is within the economic development sub-region of PUSH. The Preferred Option development levels for communities should be applied (Curbridge – Level 4). Curbridge is at risk from the Whiteley development and further encroachment should be restricted to its Parish boundaries. Transport infrastructure is inadequate to support the proposed development at N. Whiteley and will remain so. The proposed infrastructure expenditure at A3051/A334 is inadequate and impacts cannot be mitigated and therefore contrary to PPS12. The LRN and SRN do not have the capacity for an increase in local traffic. If the Botley Bypass is not going to be built (The TfSH report states that there is no justification for a Botley Bypass) and Whiteley Way is not going to be a high capacity distributor road, the development will be highly unsustainable as transport is constrained by the bridge at Botley. 	<p>Comments noted – The VDS is supplementary to the current Local Plan. The VDS will need to be examined for its conformity with the higher level Core Strategy and reviewed if it is not consistent with it. The Core Strategy is the document which would decide on Strategic Allocations. <u>Proposed Action</u> - No amendments proposed</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - The information provided by the Curbridge Preservation Society relating to the impacts of a development at North Whiteley on infrastructure will be considered through the development of the Core Strategy and associated Delivery Plan. The requirement for traffic calming/offset proposals for the centre of Curbridge can be considered through this document. Congestion and poor access are identified in Table 1 of the Study, as being issues in Whiteley Parish. The draft Study included the information on the Botley Bypass. <u>Proposed Action</u> It is proposed that the detailed information for Strategic Allocations is developed through a Delivery Plan to accompany the Core Strategy. Until the Core Strategy is further advanced, it is not possible to confirm which Strategic Sites will be allocated, but those that are, will be included in the</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is likely to result in high levels of out commuting exacerbating problems highlighted in the Winchester District Local Development Framework Transport Assessment (Stage 2 Report) Final Report. • The northern exit from Whiteley was always proposed to be to the north of Curbridge; however recent plans show an additional exit south of the hamlet's hub which will further impact on the ability of residents to have peaceful enjoyment of their property and affect their safety as road users – as pedestrians, riding horses or on bicycles. • No traffic calming/ offset proposals for the centre of Curbridge have been suggested in the infrastructure plan. This is highly unsustainable if the Master Plan is to be seen through with this 'south of Curbridge' ingress/egress point. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is 50% over even the SE Plan imposed target. <hr/> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The infrastructure costs per dwelling are extremely high and likely to increase. This does not positively contribute to affordability or sustainability and does not take into account land value costs or the cost of affordable housing <hr/> <p>Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Curbridge is at the bottom of a valley, bordering the River Hamble. Existing dwellings in Curbridge are in the floodplain and cannot get flood insurance. Concerned that the Flood defence strategy has yet to be devised, but that development will avoid areas within flood zones 2 and 3. • This is contrary to PPS25 and is high-risk strategy which will impact existing properties within flood zone as hard surfacing the agricultural land will affect flooding to existing properties. Significant mitigation for 	<p>Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments Noted- The South East Plan does not specify the number of dwellings on specific sites, which is a matter for the Core Strategy to determine as part of the development strategy for the District. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments Noted – Funding for infrastructure from development of dwellings will need to take account of the effect on viability of the development (taking into consideration the affordable housing element). <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - Flooding is identified as an issue in the Sustainability Matrix. The flood defence strategy will be devised following the flood risk assessments as required by PPS25. The Environment Agency is a consultee on flood issues associated with the development and their advice will be sought on the effectiveness of the SUDs and flood defence strategy. This will also consider off-site impacts of any strategy. The flooding</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>these risks is required particularly considering climate change. Believe that SUDS is not sufficient to cope with significant rainfall and water accelerating down hard surfaced slopes to river (tidal). Development of Bluebell Way has already exacerbated flooding in the areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that if MDA raises ground levels, water will flow downhill and a times of high rainfall, SUDS will not cope and the run-off will hit Curbridge from 3 sides and could only escape down the river which will also be exacerbated by downstream fluvial flood water entering the river. • The EA has expressed concerns over SUDS issues for Area 2 and water quality run-off into the Hamble SAC. <hr/> <p>Renewable Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed large-scale wind turbines within the MDA will have a detrimental effect on the local environment both in terms of visual impact and on species such as (inter alia) Sparrow Hawks and Tawny Owls and should not be permitted. <hr/> <p>Green Spaces/Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leisure and Tourism is important to this community, provided by the river and the walks through the National Trust owned woodlands and enhanced by the riverside pub, The Horse and Jockey. All of these resources are important locally for employment, volunteering and sense of community. • Bridle paths are needed across the parish. • The natural environment SINCs and SACs/RAMSAR sites should be properly protected/buffered from the impact of development and undesirable human recreational pursuits. • The Sustainability Matrix (WCC 2009) for Area 2 North of Whiteley MDA demonstrates on almost every single environmental issue the proposed MDA is highly unsustainable. Buffer zones appear to be 	<p>information provided by Curbridge Preservation Society will be passed on to parties dealing with flooding on the site. Any potential impact on the European protected sites (SAC and SPA) will have to be assessed through the Appropriate Assessment and any impacts to the SSSI through an EIA.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> The impact of any renewable energy proposal will be considered through the planning application process. Species surveys would be required for potential impacts to any protected species; if designated sites (SSSI, SAC, SPA, RAMSAR) could be effected, then the necessary assessments will also be required before planning permissions is granted. The Council would also take impacts on landscape into consideration.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree – Reference to bridle paths should be added to information in the Study. Work to identify and propose mitigation for potential impacts to protected sites and species is ongoing and is being carried out in consultation with Natural England. It is agreed that an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations may be required and will be carried out if necessary. Protected species surveys are also being carried out. The Sustainability Matrix identified issues if Area 2 is developed in isolation, but recognises that</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>inadequately costed for in land use and landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A specific Appropriate Assessment under the HRA Regulations needs to be carried out on the European Protected Site (SAC/Ramsar) of any proposed development and its potential effects including potential impact on other SAC/SPAs in the vicinity. • Protected species including Dormice (European) and bats (including the rare Barbastelle) and their habitats/feeding routes must be protected. • The Whiteley Way has been moved (in the Draft Master Plan) to a different route as it would not be considered environmentally ethical in this day and age to do what might have been acceptable in the 1980s as the original route destroyed more SINC's than the recently proposed route. All SINC's should be properly protected. 	<p>infrastructure could be delivered if developed with Area 1, which is the proposal. The matrix does pick up that further work on infrastructure delivery is needed and this is being carried out. The issues regarding impacts to biodiversity is addressed above.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Add information on bridle paths to Study where information available.</p>
Transport		
Hampshire County Council	<p>Glossary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition of s278 is incorrect. S38 (not S278) is the process by which roads are adopted by the highways authority (HCC), and become public highways. S278 is a process under which parties other than the Highway Authority can carry out works on the public highway. <hr/> <p>3.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'HCC Transport Contributions Policy September 2007' should be added to this list. <hr/> <p>3.1.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is hugely important that development provides for access by all modes of transport. This includes making sure that bus provision is a key consideration in development proposals. <hr/>	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree - Many bus services are provided on a commercial basis and funding to subsidise other services is limited. The Study can help to identify where developer contributions may be warranted to help provide/improve bus services. <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend Study to provide further information on bus provision. Work on bus service provision relating to specific sites should be dealt with in the Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>3.1.13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarification it would be worth noting that the work HCC is commissioning for a Road Network and Traffic Management Stage 2 Study is being progressed for the urban area of Winchester in conjunction with the Winchester Town Access Plan. <hr/> <p>3.1.14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The words 'HCC tariff' should be replaced by 'HCC Transport Contributions Policy September 2007'. In the paragraph regarding the list of local road infrastructure improvements for which it is considered reasonable to seek contributions from development proposals It might be worth noting that potentially there could be other road infrastructure improvements which the County Council would like to undertake but which, for one reason or another, it would not be suitable to seek developer contributions. <hr/> <p>3.1.15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is misleading as there are no longer any regular and direct services between Winchester and Scotland. <hr/> <p>3.1.19 to 3.1.22</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlike the rest of the document, these paragraphs appear to be a resume of the current position and not an indication as to how these networks might be developed and improved in the future. <hr/> <p>3.1.25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A smarter choices strategy accompanied the Hampshire Local Transport Plan 2. By and large this strategy has been overtaken by events and is no longer relevant. The County Council still wishes to reduce and manage car trips in order to facilitate modal shift away from the private car and uses techniques (such as requiring development-related travel plans) to 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Add further information on footpaths, cycleways etc where available and identify the opportunities for enhancing the network. For example, show where development could link in with the aims of The Hampshire Countryside Access Plan. Also show the links between the access network and opportunities to enhance GI network.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>carry this out.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 2 – North Whiteley Measures under consideration and 4.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In measure (6), the A3051 could refer to either the A3051 Botley Road or the A3051 BurrIDGE Road, but it is not Southampton Road. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The items under “Preparation and monitoring of travel plans for residential, employment, schools” and “Travel Plans (Including personalised Travel Planning within existing local residential and employment areas to achieve required Trip Credits)” are currently separately costed and there is a possibility that some double-counting has occurred. <hr/> <p>Table 2 – North Whiteley Funding Mechanism and 4.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear what the scale of ‘Phase 1’ is, in the section on “ 1st phase accommodated by Smarter Choices/ Public Transport 'Trip Credits”. The County Council has seen no evidence that this development can be “accommodated by Smarter Choices / Public Transport 'Trip Credits”. Other sources of funding should be identified in the funding mechanism’ column regarding Botley Village Traffic Management “to ensure that this proposal remains realistic and viable. <hr/> <p>Table 2 – North Whiteley Current deficits in provision’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rephrase “...development at Fareham SDA would intensify the problem further”. North Fareham will impact on junctions 10 and 11 of the M27, but there is not expected to be a direct impact from the development at North Fareham on junction 9. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rephrase the paragraph on “Demand management is needed for development at North Whiteley. Mitigation is being looked at through a feasibility study and modelling” to clarify that this work is the responsibility of the developer and is being undertaken by the developer for inclusion with the Transport Assessment for the North Whiteley development. <hr/>	<hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> Clarify through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to be prepared to accompany the LDF Core Strategy.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> Clarify through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, including looking into other funding sources.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rephrase the sentence 'This (6) is one of 2 options being considered by M27 Parallel Study for improved pedestrian links across M27' to read "This is one of two options identified in the M27 Parallel Study for possible progression". <hr/> <p>West of Waterlooville MDA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Infrastructure Plan needs to take into account the revised planning application which will increase the total number of dwellings from 2,500 to 3,000. The full impact of the new trips associated with the development are not yet known. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Havant Borough is referred to in the right-hand column but it should also be clearly noted in the 'Measures under consideration' column that, whilst the MDA site is in the Winchester City Council area, the majority of the off-site highway works fall within Havant Borough. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the reference to the pedestrian and cycle link proposed between the development and the town centre in the 'Measures under consideration' column, it should be noted that the integration issue between the new development and Waterlooville town centre has still to be resolved. There is a minimum infrastructure requirement for an at grade crossing point on Maurepas Way but other options for new infrastructure are being investigated by HCC. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the reference to 'enhanced public transport services' in 'Measures under consideration', it should be noted that no specific infrastructure (on-site or off-site) has been detailed for the new bus services. A bus strategy for the new development is being negotiated with HCC and the developers. The proposed Havant cross-borough BRT route will serve the new development from the east. <hr/> <p>3.1.32</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In reference to the 4 year period, the LTP3 Implementation Plan is designed to cover a three year period, to be updated/rolled forward each year. 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Add text to section: 'The information in this section is provided for guidance; work on transport requirements and contributions is on going and will be updated through the Delivery Plan which will follow this study'.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>3.1.39 (Delivery of the Local Road Network)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban Challenge Fund no longer exists and has been superseded by the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. <hr/> <p>3.1.43 (Delivery of the Rail Network)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These costs are taken from a document written almost five years ago. The current costs might be significantly more than this. <hr/> <p>3.1.45 (Delivery of the Bus Network)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest change as follows: Major developments will be expected to contribute towards improving bus services. The major investment expected in the southern part of the district is the proposal by TfSH to provide a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system across the sub-region. Initially it will link Fareham to Gosport, but will be rolled out to connect with the SDA north of Fareham, which will be of benefit to Knowle, and eventually to Segensworth and Whiteley. <hr/> <p>3.1.46 (Delivery of the Bus Network)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to the local bus service will be expected as part of both the North Whiteley and West of Waterlooville major developments Suggest change as follows: Improvements.....major developments which will link with the A3 ZIP Corridor and BRT. 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree The <i>Network Rail London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS)</i> (see Fig 10.3) provides cost estimates. The Fareham to Botley line redoubling options range between £38.5mill to over £128mill, and the Eastleigh Chord could cost between £89 mill to £256mill depending upon the option taken. Again these figures are based on information from 2003 or 2008 and therefore costs could be significantly greater. <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p>
Highways Agency	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is responsible for Strategic Road Network which in Winchester, is the M3, M27 and A34 which are currently experiencing severe congestion in the peak periods. Face an 11% capital spending cut through the comprehensive 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> This response came in early and amendments were made prior to publication of the consultation document. <u>Proposed Action</u></p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>spending review. The HA will therefore not make any commitments to individual schemes where construction has not started until the impact of the cut on the HA spending is considered.</p> <hr/> <p>3.1.29, 3.1.34, 3.1.36 and Table 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend wording to reflect the following:- • DaSTS was a sub regional project and it's goals are being implemented through the Hampshire LTP3. The May 2010 interim study identified managed motorways as an intervention for M27 network enhancement. This is being taken forward through LTP3. • Revise to clarify that the HA are not using DaSTS to assess investment post 2014. <hr/> <p>3.1.35</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise to reflect the tone and content of paragraph 40 of DfT Circular 02/2007, 'There is a general presumption that there will be no capacity enhancement on routes of strategic national importance purely to accommodate new developments.' <hr/> <p>Table 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update information on WoW funding package as the amended funding package for the 1100 additional dwellings is still being agreed. • Fareham SDA – BRT reference, The bus lane along the M4 has been suspended, this announcement may have impact on all public transport priority measures on the SRN. 	<p>No amendments proposed</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly</p>
Natural England	<p>3.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England welcomes the references to Countryside Access Plans as part of the transport proposals, together with the network of the District's footpaths, bridleways, byways, cycle ways and routes. <hr/> <p>3.1.25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wish to see the Infrastructure Study consider the impacts on air quality from additional road traffic which may be generated through new development, particularly where there will be significant increases in traffic on roads passing close to sites of national or international importance for nature conservation. 	<p>Support welcomed <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed</p> <hr/> <p>Disagree - The impacts on air quality from additional traffic generated by development proposals identified in the study are best assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal on the developing Core Strategy which will allocate the Strategic Sites and EIA, where required, for any planning application.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>3.1.29</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England would generally welcome the commitment to improve the Rights of Way network, linking urban areas with the surrounding countryside. <hr/> <p>3.1.47</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the commitment to contribute towards implementing the PUSH GI strategy by, where appropriate, improving links to the adjoining countryside to create a linked network of open space. 	<p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed</p> <hr/> <p>Support welcomed <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed</p> <hr/> <p>Support welcomed <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed</p>
Cllr Robert Hutchison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councils need to create a network of safe cycling routes (NSCR) as part of the transport infrastructure required in Winchester district and as a central part of developing a cycling strategy. As a matter of urgency Hampshire’s local authorities need to develop and implement effective cycling strategies for each of the district council areas in Hampshire which should be part of the evidence base for the CS. <p>1.1.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating a NSCR in Winchester is in line with the District’s Sustainable Community Strategies’ aim to reduce it’s carbon footprint. Cycling should be promoted as one of the ‘smarter choices’. Evidence suggests that in recent years emissions from transport have been continuing to rise (or at least not decrease in line with government targets). It is now widely accepted that it will not be possible to tackle climate change (or congestion) without major modal shifts to walking, cycling and public transport. A NSCR will include routes in which speed limits have been reduced particularly in residential areas, cycle lanes on stretches of major roads, contraflow systems, joint pedestrian routes and cycle paths, other shared spaces, as well as – wherever appropriate and possible – dedicated cycle routes. The draft infrastructure refers to recreational cycle circuits, one of which is mostly outside the district, as if they provide a well-developed part of transport infrastructure. But it fails to identify the serious gaps in existing routes, especially the lack of direct and attractive routes 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> The information on the need for a NSCR should be added in the Study as follows:</p> <p>“3.1.24 The aim should be to create a network of safe cycling routes (NSCR) as part of the transport infrastructure required in Winchester District, which also provides for commuter cycling. There are gaps in existing routes particularly direct/attractive routes through Winchester Town. A NSCR would include routes in which speed limits have been reduced particularly in residential areas, cycle lanes on stretches of major roads, contraflow systems, joint pedestrian routes and cycle paths, other shared spaces, as well as – wherever appropriate and possible – dedicated cycle routes.</p> <p>3.1.48 Funding to create a network of safer cycle routes could be funded through the Governments’ Local Sustainable Transport Fund or from developer contributions where appropriate.”</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>through the centre of Winchester.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to funding from developer contributions (Section 106 agreements) a NSCR could be funded from the government's new Local Sustainable Transport Fund and other funding for small transport schemes. The cost of developing a NSCR need only be a small percentage of transport infrastructure investment in Winchester – but, for the reasons given above it should be prioritised in that investment. 	
Cllr Margot Power	<p>3.1.19 and 3.1.20 and 3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study omits reference to the pedestrian network also important in section on GI. Wish to encourage walking for many reasons: health, community engagement, and carbon footprint. Footpaths need to be clean, attractive, safe and link destinations. Although action is required at the development level for local paths, we also need investment in the town centre. The predicted population growth and change in age profile will exacerbate the existing problems in Alresford Town Centre and require funding from all development for the necessary work on footpaths and pedestrian crossings. <p>3.1.12-3.1.14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are major concerns regarding drainage and maintenance of local roads throughout my area. The severe weather has extended the damage, and interrupted maintenance. Several capital projects have been identified that would benefit from developer funding. 	<p>Comments noted - The Local Transport Scheme list sets out projects for which it would be reasonable to seek developer contributions.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> A link to this list and a reference to the pedestrian network (not just footpaths) should be made in 3.1.19:</p> <p>“The pedestrian network includes footpaths and pedestrian crossings in rural and urban areas. The Local Transport Schemes lists pedestrian and cycle projects for which it would be reasonable to seek developer contributions.”</p> <p>Comments noted - any significant drainage issues should have been identified by the Study, but it does not consider road maintenance issues.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
Cllr Jacey Jackson	<p>3.1.20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The statement "... contraflows have been provided along some key routes." may not be accurate. The few contraflows that exist in the City Centre are not along key routes where they are really needed, but are incidental and disjointed. For the statement to be correct we need contraflows along Parchment Street, Cossack Lane, Jewry Street, Upper High Street, Upper part of the High Street and even North Walls and St.George's Street; so it might be easier to change the text to : "... contraflows have been provided along a few roads, and we recognise the need for more on 	<p>Agree</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Remove 'key' from the reference to contraflows on 'key' routes. Add information on local cycle schemes for which it would be reasonable to seek contributions. These include proposals for contraflows along Jewry Street, Cossack Lane, the upper High Street as well as proposals for improvements for cyclists along North Walls and St</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>key routes."</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be very helpful to know usage figures for these contraflows. Most cyclists want to cycle by the shortest and most direct route to their chosen destination - they don't want to keep getting off their bike to walk, nor do they want to be forced round the one way system designed for motor vehicles. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May also be better off without a link to the City Centre Cycle Map. Because it was published in 2005 it is now out of date and has a notable inaccuracy - Parchment Street one way traffic flow N>S. 	<p>George's Street.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments Noted - Have not been able to look into usage figures of contraflows as part of finalising this study, the Access and Infrastructure Team are best placed to advise on this. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Disagree - Map is still useful link on Council's website <u>Proposed Action</u> Add note to text re. change in traffic flow in Parchment Street.</p>
WinACC Transport Group	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report does not consider transport services or the need to provide access by all modes to developments which can also attract funding from developments. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Report does not mention the DfT DaSTS, Government Planning and Policy Statements, the DfT "Manual for Streets" or the CIHT "Manual for Streets 2". One of the five national DaSTS transport goals is reducing carbon emissions which should be a major factor in determining transport infrastructure and services requirements as well as in defining the location and form of development. <p>1.1.8 / 3.1.25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report rightly states, when referring to highways and transport infrastructure, that "it will not be possible to build our way out of the problems currently facing the district and smarter choices will be required to reduce the demand for travel by the private car". The County Council cannot claim that it has a smarter choices strategy when it has withdrawn funding for implementing any such strategy. 	<p>Agree in part The Study does cover a range of transport modes, but perhaps does not make a clear link to the importance of linking different modes through developments. <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text to demonstrate links between transport modes and enhance section on cycle networks and bus provision.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted – The Manuals for Streets are more focused on design of infrastructure than on future need, but it is recognised that they will provide important design principles for the development of roads and streets. DaSTS is mentioned in the study (under list of other strategies and para 3.1.31). As set out in the Study, The DaSTS report identifies investment opportunities across different transport funding streams thereby helping local authorities to align their investment programmes in LTP3 with Highways Agency and Network Rail investment programmes. It is therefore considered that the goal of DaSTs to reduce carbon emissions has been considered</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>3.1.26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inverted commas around 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport System' are well-deserved. Increasing personal private vehicle use through use of the M27 hard shoulder cannot in any sense be part of delivering sustainable transport. This study should be clearer about transport sustainability. If 'building our way out of the problem' is not possible we should invest heavily in schemes to encourage modal transfer from personal private vehicles to walking, cycling, and public transport, and this report should indicate what those schemes might be. <hr/> <p>Tables 1 and 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be text within the Draft Infrastructure Study Report explaining the significance of these tables, and individual schemes, and providing a reference to the MVA Consultancy Report and its findings which are directly relevant to the Local Development Framework. <p>3.1.32</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We hope there will be consultation on the LTP3 implementation plan once it has been produced. <hr/> <p>1. The references to rail utilisation strategies now need revision. The reference to Great Western Route Strategy (p13) has now been superseded. The proposals to extend six Cross Country trains on weekdays (7 on Saturdays) from Reading to Southampton were implemented on 12 December. The issue now is that only three of them stop at Winchester (northbound) on weekdays. There appears to be no reason for this in that they take the same amount of time between Southampton and Basingstoke.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional essential references should have been to: the South West Main Line Route Utilisation Strategy (Network Rail March 2006) which had important proposals for the railway line from Waterloo to Bournemouth through Winchester and set the current pattern of main-line services, and the draft London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy 2010 which analyses in detail the services in the Southampton area (including 	<p>through, and is an aim of LTP3, the final version of which will be published in April 2011.</p> <p>The Study sets out proposals/links for non-road transport schemes for rail and cycle schemes, but there is a deficiency of information on other public transport schemes.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Strengthen the section on transport particularly non-road transport schemes.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Clarify in text that the information in Table 1 relates to transport aspirations in local communities and Table 2 sets out the infrastructure measures being considered for Strategic Allocations which is based on the Preferred Option and will be taken forward through a Delivery Plan for the Core Strategy Pre-Submission document.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed in part</p> <p>1. It is agreed that the emerging London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy 2010 will be a key document for the District, but it is still in draft form. It is considered that the link to the Great Western Route Strategy, which sets out strategies affecting the line through Winchester District, is still a useful reference to keep into the document until the SE RUS is finalised and adopted. The Great Western RUS was published in March 2010 so is relatively up-to-date. The SW Mainline RUS was published in 2006, but also covers the District more specifically, therefore it is agreed that reference should also be made to this document in the Study.</p> <p>2. Network Rail announced on their website in</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>Winchester) and makes proposals for a range of improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would welcome a higher level of engagement between Winchester City Council and Network Rail on these strategies. <p>3.1.17 / 3.1.42-44</p> <p>2. Unfortunately, the reference to train destinations is a little too optimistic: there is currently only one direct train per week to Scotland (14:03 Saturdays). A bit more detail on the shape of these services would be useful for identifying gaps. The London and South East Rail Utilisation Strategy is an important opportunity for Winchester City Council to say how it would like the services to London to develop. This paragraph should be updated to take account of the latest developments. A campaign by Winchester City Council to introduce a Winchester stop on all six new services would seem to be the next step. There is no discernible reason why three of the trains do not call at Winchester on weekdays: they are allowed identical timings between Southampton and Basingstoke, whether or not they stop.</p> <p>3.1.42, 43, 44</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We very much hope that Winchester City Council will respond to the Network Rail London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy on Solent area services (pp 130 +). A good local service from Winchester to all stations in the Southampton area would be the cheapest way to tackle congestion on the M3 between Winchester and Southampton and reduce traffic in Winchester. This is where the case can be made. This whole section has been superseded by the new strategy and needs fundamental rewriting. It is odd that this report spends time on the Eastleigh chord and Botley redoubling, all of which are outside the district. <hr/> <p>3.1.15 / 3.1.42-44</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference the central role of Winchester Station in the district's transport infrastructure of the district would be appropriate. Just under 	<p>December 2010 that a number of trains running between Reading and Newcastle would now also run down to Southampton, many also calling at Winchester, and one starting at Winchester. It is therefore considered that the information in the Study only needs minor updates. All weekend services stop at Winchester².</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u></p> <p>Add reference to other relevant RUS documents. Amend text to clarify that not all of the services stop in the District. The Council has responded to the consultation on the London and SE RUS and supports these suggestions made by WinACC. The full consultation response can be found at: http://www.winchester.gov.uk/Documents/Committees/PortfolioDecisions/201011/Final/PHD335.pdf</p> <hr/> <p>Agree</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u></p> <p>The text in paragraph 3.1.15 should be amended to better reflect the importance of Winchester Station</p>

² The time tables and further information can be found at:

- http://www.nationalrail.co.uk/service_disruptions/timetable_changes/2010_December/XC.html
- http://www.crosscountrytrains.co.uk/Sitelimages/Assets/3/Timetable_South_Coast_to_Manchester_North_East_Scotland_December_2010.pdf

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>4 million journeys per year begin or end at the station according to the London and South East Rail Utilisation Strategy. This scales down to about 15,000 per day which makes it a major facility, with a high potential for resolving congestion problems, through highly intensive use of minimal infrastructure.</p> <hr/> <p>3.1.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to include analysis of bus service provision. • Disagree that “[a lack of] bus service provision will not prohibit development”. A key consideration in any development is that it provides good access by all modes of transport. • This study should identify bus service gaps that need filling: for example early morning, evening and late night services to the more rural parts of the district, good interchange between trains from Southampton and fast buses to Alresford, or an acceptably fast direct service between Winchester and Bishop’s Waltham and Wickham. Refer also to the imminent redevelopment of the bus station. <p>Para 3.1.46</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We very much regret that the report says nothing about buses serving Winchester. Something is needed on Stagecoach’s new buses, Bluestar’s development (increase in frequency) of route 1 and the development of Park-and-Ride services. The report should identify the need for real time information, everywhere, especially outside the city area, the scope for putting cycle parking hoops / shelters by out-of-city bus stops, the paucity of early morning / late evening buses and the need for better bus – train interchange facilities. <hr/> <p>3.1.9 / 3.1.44</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion on the M3 between Winchester and Southampton is a key SRN problem. The council should press for a cost effective modal-shift solution to this problem, which also has the benefit of reducing emissions. • Scope for widening the motorway between Winchester and Southampton is limited and expensive, it would be more cost effective to develop the local passenger service on the parallel railway line. Limited infrastructure improvements could enable an intensive passenger service between Winchester and all stations in the 	<p>in the area.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree in part – Many bus services are provided on a commercial basis and funding to subsidise other services is limited. The Study can help to identify where developer contributions may be warranted to help provide/improve bus services. It is the case, however, that lack of bus services may not necessarily be a reason for resisting development, despite the importance of such provision for larger schemes in particular.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend Study to provide further information on bus provision. Work on bus service provision relating to specific sites should be dealt with in the Delivery Plan</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted – The Council has responded to the consultation on the London and SE RUS and supports these suggestions made by WinACC. The full consultation response can be found at: http://www.winchester.gov.uk/Documents/Committees/PortfolioDecisions/201011/Final/PHD335.pdf</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text to take account of the issues raised in the Councils response to the RUS consultation.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>Southampton area and reduce traffic flows on the M3. An opportunity to press for this solution presents itself with the publication of the draft London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy December 2010 (which looks closely at developing services in Solent and South Hampshire).</p> <hr/> <p>3.1.12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures taken by HCC in the last twenty years have had little or no effect demonstrating that there are limited possibilities for tackling congestion in Winchester Town in conventional ways such as traffic management and provision of additional road capacity for personal private vehicles. There is an urgent and pressing need for infrastructure that will promote modal shift to walking, cycling, and public transport. <hr/> <p>3.1.13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Winchester has had many studies over the past 30 years. Need agreed solutions and a feasibility study to design and implement the solutions. We hope any studies will propose imaginative solutions to encourage a modal shift away from personal private transport (cars) as a way of reducing congestion. <hr/> <p>3.1.14 / 3.1.40</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These paragraphs refer to the useful list of Local Transport Schemes but will need updating in line with HCC's Local Transport Plan 3 and the HCC/WCC Winchester Town Access Plan. The list should also focus on pedestrian, cycling and public transport infrastructure. It would be helpful if the List of Transport Schemes, after updating, were included in the published Infrastructure Study Report. <hr/> <p>3.1.19 / 3.1.47</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some analysis of the gaps in footpaths or the desired destinations not reached, or some reflection on how this problem might be solved would seem essential here. <hr/> <p>3.1.20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like rather more information on the cycle infrastructure in 	<hr/> <p>Comments noted - These issues will be addressed by the Winchester Access Plan. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> The list should be updated when the LTP3 is published in (due out in April 2011).</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Identify proposals where available, and potential opportunities to reconnect the footpath network.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u></p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>Winchester. In particular we would like to see some informed acknowledgement of the deficiencies: They may have been mapped, but the maps are not widely available, they are not signposted, and there are many route gaps, or dangerous pinch points that discourage all but the most determined cyclists. There is no safe direct way of crossing the town centre from north to south, or east to west without dismounting. Some indication of possible solutions would be valuable.</p> <p>3.1.21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The situation for cyclists is by no means as positive as the description would suggest and the paragraph needs rewriting. One route is almost all outside Winchester District, and all three are essentially leisure facilities, not transport facilities. The study should refer to the schemes in the Town Centre Access Plan, and the gaps that will remain even when those schemes have been implemented. <hr/> <p>3.1.23</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This comment on growth rates conflicts with the comment in paragraph 3.1.12. This report needs to clarify whether Winchester City Council is assuming and accepting that there will be an increase in traffic, or whether it is proposing measures that will limit the increase in traffic as part of its commitment to preventing global warming. A succinct list of infrastructure proposals that will limit carbon transport emissions would be helpful. 	<p>Amend and enhance section on cycle networks.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree- agree that there is conflict between recent observations and forecast trends, but like other forecast data, this information should be used in the correct context. 3.1.12 talks of the observed use locally on the LRN and 3.1.23 talks about forecast use across England, which are different assessments made at different scales. It is agreed that it would therefore be helpful to clarify this in the Study. 3.1.12 also validates the observations by highlighting that the LRN is at capacity in places and cars are being shifted onto the SRN. Therefore it does not imply that car usage across the whole road network has stabilised. This Study does not aim to make its own assessment of future trends in car usage, but relies on judgements made by competent authorities and information provided through studies such as the emerging Winchester Access Plan and LTP3. If data becomes available that shows a different trend in car usage, then the Study can be amended to take account of any resulting changes in infrastructure provision.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>3.1.33 / 3.1.38</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like to see an update in the light of the settlement, and some analysis of how the settlement relates to earlier years. Over the next four years the amount for road repairs will reduce, the amount for small projects and sustainable projects will increase. <p>3.1.39</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like to see specific mention of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund and the Small Transport Schemes Grant, and the possible uses for these. We hope that significant proposals can be produced quickly to ensure that Winchester will win funding from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund 	<p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Further work is required on this, in consultation with the delivery agents. When this information is available it can be used to update the Study.</p> <p>Agree – Reference to these funding streams should be included in the study. <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend Study accordingly.</p>
Friends of the Earth 05/01/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional road infrastructure is unlikely to be necessary as road traffic has declined over the last two years as a result of fuel costs and the recession linked to the oil industry and fuel prices. <hr/> <p>1.1.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On looking for smarter choices for travel solutions conflicts with the mitigation measures and junction improvements enabling capacity increases in paras 3.1.26 and 3.1.28). <hr/> <p>3.1.4</p>	<p>Comments noted - Advice has been sought from the Highway Authorities on road infrastructure. If road traffic has stabilised or is declining, the evidence for this information is not available now, and the Study would have to be updated as the changing patterns emerge. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - Works in 3.1.26 and 3.1.28 are future works being considered. This does not conflict with the County’s aspiration to “reduce and manage car trips in order to facilitate modal shift away from the private car and uses techniques”. The Study recognises it will not be possible to build our way out of the problems currently facing the District, and ‘smarter choices’ will be required to reduce the demand for travel by the private car. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - The Council is aware of the</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>• Have made many comments on parking before and is key to moving towards sustainable transport policy, carbon reduction and social inclusion. Private road transport and commercial road freight transport are highly subsidised activities which externalise costs by 2-3 times the total tax and duty contribution they make. Public car parking is directly subsidised; parking and journeys made to access commercial ventures is indirectly subsidised by society, but is something for which the business should be responsible. These subsidies should be removed as the only way to meet the transport element of our carbon commitments and to meeting our air quality commitment. The Council should consider introducing workplace parking levying.</p> <hr/> <p>3.1.5</p> <p>• Need clarification on why bus service provision will not prohibit development.</p> <hr/> <p>3.1.6</p> <p>• This does not reconcile with the desire to increase the capacity of the Easton Lane junction. Further increasing traffic onto the A34 and M3 by capacity increases at this junction goes against the meaning of Circular 02/2007. The Council should deal with congestion problems created through planning by demand management that does not cause environmental problems elsewhere.</p> <hr/> <p>3.1.9</p> <p>• This paragraph is not relevant to the District Council. DfT don't calculate economic costs of road congestion properly. If car and road freight were not externalised on the rest of society, there would be no congestion and therefore no true economic cost. Relieving congestion by capacity increase where true costs are not paid would result in the</p>	<p>issues around parking availability and achieving a modal shift into public transport. However, the future of the Town's car parks is an issue best addressed in the Winchester Town Access Plan (WTAP).</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree - Many bus services are provided on a commercial basis and funding to subsidise other services is limited. The Study can help to identify where developer contributions may be warranted to help provide/improve bus services.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend Study to provide further information on bus provision. Work on bus service provision relating to specific sites should be dealt with in the Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted This is clarified in the following paragraph (3.1.7). <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - This is relevant to the District Council in that impacts which exacerbate congestion could affect the deliverability of proposed development. How development could impact on the economy particularly in an 'economic growth area' are also of concern to the Council.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>externalised costs increasing. There would be no benefit to Winchester by increasing trunk road capacity in the vicinity in Winchester.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand management is the only approach to reduce carbon emissions. Capacity increases, hard shoulder running and variable speed management to maximise flow induce road-based trip and will therefore not reduce carbon emissions. <hr/> <p>3.1.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High commuting rates hinder meeting our carbon responsibilities. Short-term solutions need to target most inefficient means of travel; in medium/longer term, society will have to travel less, including travel by rail. Council cannot influence air travel, but can influence many road journeys through parking policy. Consider that ‘carrot and stick’ transfer of subsidy from parking to conventional buses is most powerful influence on car commuters. Do not support park and ride. • Want to see:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Removal of central surface car parks in short term. Monies released from the sites should feed into alternative transport/ socially desirable purposes. ○ All central on-street parking should be residential only at a higher realistic price. ○ Allowing 1 way system to move to two-way system. ○ Progressively increase the price of parking in the central multi-storey perhaps discounting for disabled use. Eventually phase out multi-storey car parks. E.g. Friarsgate shouldn’t be replaced in any redevelopment of Silverhill. ○ Money released from selling land assets and more realistic parking fees should be directed towards setting up a good alternative access system based initially on existing bus routes. ○ Need to address the issue of in-commuting via rail. <hr/> <p>3.1.12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should have reduced traffic levels in the City and should not be self congratulatory that there has been no significant increase in traffic levels within the Town since 1990. Don’t accept traffic has 	<p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - Winchester Town Access Plan is the most suitable document for addressing car parking and related transport policy. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted No amendment is proposed as this information was provided by the County Council and is not a subjective comment made by the Council. The</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>stabilised since 1990 since it is contrary to common observation. There is clearly more rat running on transverse routes (Chilbolton Ave, Bereweek Rd, Park Rd, Sarum Road). Consider that traffic outside the radial count hours (7am to 7pm) has increased.</p> <hr/> <p>3.1.13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC Road Network and Traffic Management Stage 2 is a study already know answer to and is not needed. <hr/> <p>3.1.14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about Easton Lane works as described above. • The list of Local Transport Schemes doesn't include cycle schemes. WTAP cycling measures and those proposed by the John Edwards/Sue Coles table in WTAP 2009 process should be supported. • Cyclists should not be excluded from roads, but there should be safe, dedicated routes to encourage less confident cyclists to get back into cycling. • The priority of Winchester Streets needs to change to walking>cycling>buses>taxis>cars which should come out of WTAP. • Cyclists should not be constrained by the one way system. • The cycle schemes do not address the longer commuting routes. Long-distance recreational routes are being developed, but long distance cycle routes for commuting is unmet (e.g. to Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh, Southampton). Need to clarify if the Itchen Valley route is the Wildlife Trust improvements to the towpath and footpath. 	<p>statement is put into context by the reasoning that there has been no significant increase in traffic levels on the Local Road Network (LRN) mainly because the LRN is at capacity and more short journeys have therefore shifted onto the SRN. The County's work on the LRN is ongoing as explained in the following paragraph.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - The Council cannot make assumptions without having a robust evidence base as required PPS12. The County and Council's studies are needed to identify the traffic conditions objectively to feed into further infrastructure planning for the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>The link to the transport schemes list which it is reasonable to seek developer contributions towards has been updated in the study. This also links to the list of cycle schemes. These are approved by the City and County Councils and are informed by the emerging WTAP. A number of the issues raised in the comments have been included in the list of transport schemes, such as providing contraflows for cyclists on one-way systems. The comments on how the cycle network should be amended are noted, but are more suitable for consideration through the WTAP and list of transport schemes.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend the text in the Studt to also refer to the need for commuter cycle routes as it is appropriate that this is included in the Study as an infrastructure deficiency – see paragraph 3.1.25.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>3.1.16</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear if Council can influence rail improvements. Missing is a useful frequency for services stopping at minor Southampton stations and Eastleigh. If additional shuttle services cannot easily be added to the timetable, what infrastructure is needed to allow it to happen? 	<p>Comments noted The Study is focused on what infrastructure will effect, or be affected by development. Transport links, including rail improvements are therefore considered in the Study. The comments are noted regarding shuttle services and the Council have responded accordingly to the recent consultation on the London and South East RUS.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
	<p>3.1.23</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DfTs forecasts are unreliable. They should not be a material factor in local planning. 	<p>Comments noted - The DfTs forecasts indicate that traffic volumes and congestion will increase in the South East in the near future. It is not clear why the DfT forecasts are thought to be unsuitable for use in this Study. The Council is aware that the forecasts were made before the main impact of the economic recession was felt and acknowledges the potential limitations of using any such data. The information from the model has been updated using the later 2009 forecasts published in 2010.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
	<p>3.1.25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aim should be to reduce the burden of traffic impact on climate (et al.) not reducing the rate of increase in traffic. 	<p>Comments noted - This is part of the Countys aim to reduce and manage car trips in order to facilitate modal shift away from the private car.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
	<p>3.1.26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not agree hard-shoulder running helps to deliver sustainable transport. 	<p>Comments noted</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
	<p>3.1.27</p>	<p>Comments noted - See comments on parking</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P&R does not alleviate pressure on roads without car park removal in Winchester City centre. • <hr/> <p>3.1.28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening Easton Lane and Botley Bypass are undesirable proposals. Don't see need for more P&R sites until begun process of removing traffic from town centre. <hr/> <p>Table 1 - Stanmore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To change car use habit, buses need to be reliable, frequent, cover most times, and be reasonable priced. Council has not considered how to fund this. • Clarify 'investigate the feasibility of improving traffic flow and access'. <hr/> <p>Table 2 – non PUSH Winchester</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments requiring improvements to SRN should not take place. 	<p>above</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - See comments on WTAP. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - Comments noted. This has also come out through responses to Blueprint. Many bus services are provided on a commercial basis and funding to subsidise other services is limited. The Study can help to identify where developer contributions may be warranted to help provide/improve bus services. <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend Study to provide further information on bus provision. Work on bus service provision relating to specific sites should be dealt with in the Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
Phil Gagg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider more seriously the requirements of the Climate Change Act 2008. Need direct analysis of the sustainability of the infrastructure and indirect analysis of how far elements of infrastructure contributes to sustainability including the benefits of walking, cycling, public transport infrastructure and a critique of how environmentally disastrous proposals (using the hard shoulder on M3 and M27) will increase Winchester's huge carbon footprint even further. <hr/>	<p>Comments noted - Concerns regarding the impact of proposed infrastructure are important. However, the Sustainability Appraisal for the Core Strategy and Strategic Allocations is the most appropriate document to assess the sustainability of any proposals within these policy documents. This is being developed alongside the emerging Core Strategy. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - The information published in</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to rail documents are inappropriate and the analysis out-of-date. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Great Western Route Utilisation Strategy proposals for extending services from Reading to Southampton have (December 12) already been implemented. The issue is not the one raised, but that on weekdays three of the extended six services do not stop at Winchester. There appears to be no pathing reason for this; the trains have the same timings between Southampton and Basingstoke, whether or not they stop. ○ The South West Main Line Route Strategy 2006 should have been mentioned because it brought about significant changes in the service from London to Weymouth. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The draft London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy should have been mentioned. It is currently out for consultation. It is crucial that Winchester and Hampshire respond. ○ The draft rail utilisation strategy considers a number of ambitious suggestions (e.g. redoubling Eastleigh to Romsey and Eastleigh to Fareham), but I hope a relatively modest development can be proposed: regular services from Winchester to all the stations on the main line through Southampton. I believe this would be a cheap way of relieving the congestion on the M3 between Winchester and Southampton, and reduce parking and traffic in Winchester by encouraging modal transfer from cars to trains. Now would be the time for a campaign on this by the city council. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winchester is the second busiest station in the region with 4 million journey starts and finishes per year (13,000 per weekday?). The infrastructure study understates the crucial role played by the railway station and undervalues its potential for expansion. 	<p>November was accurate at the time of publication. Network Rail announced on their website in December 2010 that a number of trains running between Reading and Newcastle would now also run down to Southampton, many of also calling at Winchester, and one starting at Winchester. It is therefore considered that the information in the Study only needs minor updates. All weekend services stop at Winchester³.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text to clarify that not all of the services stop in the District. Add reference to the 2006 SW RUS.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text to refer to the <u>Network Rail London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS)</u> in para 3.1.43. The comments made have been passed on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration as part of the Portfolio Holder Notice. The Council have responded to the consultation and the response can be viewed at:- http://www.winchester.gov.uk/Documents/Committees/PortfolioDecisions/201011/Final/PHD335.pdf</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> The text in paragraph 3.1.15 should be amended to better reflect the importance of Winchester Station</p>

³ The time tables and further information can be found at:

- http://www.nationalrail.co.uk/service_disruptions/timetable_changes/2010_December/XC.html
- http://www.crosscountrytrains.co.uk/Sitelimages/Assets/3/Timetable_South_Coast_to_Manchester_North_East_Scotland_December_2010.pdf

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section on buses needs more research and I hope more ambitious proposals can be included. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no analysis of services even though the local timetable is available from the Guildhall Tourism Office. ○ There is no analysis of what Winchester City Council could do – some mention of the quality partnership and what it can achieve is needed ○ The report should have highlighted the inadequacy of the electronic information system: it is worse than the printed timetables because a bus disappears when it should have left the bus stop so passengers do not know when they might catch a bus running late. Some identification is needed of the need for a real time information system and the need to spread it throughout the district (a Local Sustainable Transport Fund bid??) ○ Winchester has many spare bicycle parking hoops that could be installed at main rural bus stops to make rural bus travel more attractive ○ Something on average age of buses operating would have been useful (they are relatively new) ○ Something about the future of the bus station and the need for good interchange with trains is needed. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section on cycling does not focus on the main elements and possibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The recreational cycle circuits referred to are at best marginal to transport infrastructure, and one of them is mostly outside the district. ○ It fails to identify the serious gaps in existing routes, especially the lack of direct and attractive routes through the centre (even though the description of one of the recreational routes suggests it is easy to cross the centre) ○ It ignores the potential for signage as a way of promoting cycling ○ It could find a use for the spare cycle hoops (at rural bus 	<p>in the area.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree - Many bus services are provided on a commercial basis and funding to subsidise other services is limited. The Study can help to identify where developer contributions may be warranted to help provide/improve bus services.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend Study to provide further information on bus provision. Work on bus service provision relating to specific sites should be dealt with in the Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> The text in paragraph 3.1.22 should be amended to reflect the information raised on the cycle network and refer to the potential use of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund to fund a wide range of transport initiatives.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>stops?) or identify the need for high quality storage facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It could identify the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (£2m over 4 year for Winchester, £15m for Hampshire?) as a way of building safe routes to school ○ It could identify the £30m for Hampshire (£3m for Winchester?) for small transport schemes over the next four years as a source of funding <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft could be more consistent about traffic congestion and road infrastructure • It is not clear whether the draft believes traffic is on the increase or stable? <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft says it is 'not possible to build our way out of problems' but does not propose smart infrastructural solutions. Hopefully the next draft will not leave the debate hanging. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It fails to identify modal shift from cars as a key to potential and cheap solutions to congestion. 	<hr/> <p>Comments Noted- This Study does not aim to make its own assessment of future trends in car usage, but relies on judgements made by competent authorities and information provided through studies such as the emerging LTP3. The forecast from 2008 is that car usage will increase across, but local observations are indicating that usage in the City is not increasing as cars are being shifted off the LRN to the SRN. If data becomes available that shows a different trend in car usage, then the Study can be amended to take account of any resulting changes in infrastructure provision. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed</p> <hr/> <p>Comments Noted Matters relating to the transport strategy for Winchester will be addressed by the Winchester Access Plan and site-specific issues by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments Noted Agree that this is an important goal, but do not agree that is an automatically cheap solution. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would welcome some mention of the gross overprovision of parking spaces in Winchester (never more than 60% occupied), and of the potential for putting 1500 city centre car parks to more productive use. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document would benefit from a clearer link between the general analysis and the table of specific schemes. I would like a clearer analysis of how the specific schemes illustrate the general points. 	<p>Comments Noted – parking is not directly part of the infrastructure addressed in the study, although it links in with providing a modal shift away from car usage.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text to refer to links between parking provision and providing a modal shift away from car usage.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text clarify how the information in tables links into the main Study.</p>
Green Infrastructure		
Natural England	<p>1.1.13 Welcomes the recognition that a key requirement of new developments (and therefore partly a determinant of their scale) is that they do not create unsustainable pressure on existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>Support welcomed</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed</p>
	<p>1.1.14. The Draft Infrastructure Study states that although viability will need to be assessed as master-planning proceeds, there would not appear to be any significant items of infrastructure required to bring forward the strategic sites that cannot be funded and provided in a timely fashion. However, Natural England is concerned that there is no supporting reference to the assessment of impacts on the hierarchy of designated sites which may be affected by infrastructure requirements.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Suggest adding amended wording ... ‘and site proposals may need to be assessed through the Habitats Regulations and through the Environmental Impact Assessment processes’. Will address the hierarchy of sites further in the section on GI.</p>
	<p>2.3.16.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England would wish to see SA and HRA used as iterative processes, developed in parallel with other supporting documents such as the Draft Infrastructure Study. This would enable SA and HRA to inform these other documents and provide the necessary over-arching guidance at the strategic level for individual development proposals, including the identification of appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures. 	<p>Comments noted - This process is happening.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HRA and SA must provide the necessary level of certainty that the Core Strategy’s proposed development, alone or in combination with other plans or projects, can be delivered without adverse effects on the integrity of nationally and internationally designated sites. Natural England recommends that the Draft Infrastructure Study should acknowledge any inherent uncertainties in assessing impacts on designated sites, which will need to be addressed at a later stage, such as our understanding of the ecological impacts which may occur as a result of recreational disturbance from new development in areas near to the coast. This is now being researched through the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project and we would wish to see the Council make an express commitment in the Infrastructure Study to respond to the published findings and recommendations of this project. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nationally important landscape of the South Downs National Park occupies a substantial part of the Winchester District. Natural England considers that it should be a stated aim of infrastructure delivery to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the South Downs National Park and its setting, together with providing opportunities for open air recreation consistent with the landscape objectives. 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Add following text to 3.2.14 ‘Impacts to designated sites will need to be assessed as part of the consideration of proposed plans or projects.’ The Council is party to the ongoing work on the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project and the information from this study will inform Appropriate Assessments.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Add text to recognise impacts to the nationally important landscape of the South Downs National Park in para 3.2.14.</p>
	<p>3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of settlements and proposed development have been identified as being deficient in meeting some or all ANGSt standards and we would wish to see the Infrastructure Study give clear guidance on the measures required to address these deficiencies. • In some cases, the study places reliance on existing areas of woodland to meet the greenspace requirements of new development. However, it is of concern that the study does not identify that these sites may be county Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCS) or nationally important Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI, e.g. Botley Wood and Everett’s & Mushes Copses SSSI) and their capability to accommodate additional recreational pressure, without affecting their biodiversity interest, has not been assessed. We would therefore strongly urge the Council to undertake this assessment as part of the Infrastructure Study. However, in addition to safeguarding designated sites, we would wish to see development 	<p>Comments Noted - Winchester City Council has not officially signed up to the ANGSt standards, but the Winchester GI Study recommends that, until local standards are developed, ANGSt standards are adopted to enable access to the wider countryside and more informal green spaces. The Council produce an Open Space Strategy annually which sets out the deficiencies in recreational space where developer contributions will be targeted. The Council are looking to adopt the built facilities standards and appropriate standards for GI through the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Add the following sentence to 3.2.10 ‘A number of these sites are designated for the nature</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>deliver appropriate beneficial gains to the natural environment.</p> <hr/> <p>Table 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure measures being considered – Please see the comments made above, concerning the need to for the Infrastructure Strategy to demonstrate how adverse impacts on designated sites will be avoided, including the identification of necessary mitigation, as well as securing appropriate beneficial environmental gain. These comments apply equally to the individual strategic proposals. Further assessment at the strategic level would also help to identify potential funding mechanisms for environmental measures proposed. The table refers to the requirement to mitigate impacts on internationally protected sites, but the Infrastructure Study should refer to a sequential approach to avoidance, cancellation and reduction measures (often referred to generically as mitigation measures) not only for international sites, but also nationally and locally designated sites. <hr/> <p>3.2.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This paragraph states that Biodiversity Opportunity Areas should therefore be given consideration when looking at development proposals. However, Natural England considers that there should be a much more positive commitment to contribute to the delivery of Biodiversity Target Areas and Biodiversity Action Plan targets through new development. This would particularly include the buffering and linkage of established habitats. <hr/> <p>3.2.8</p>	<p>conservation interest (SSSI, SINC) and their capability to accommodate additional recreational pressure, without affecting their biodiversity interest, will need to be assessed when considering any plan or project which may have an impact on these sites. The Delivery Plan will need to take this into consideration when setting out infrastructure requirements for the Strategic Allocations.’</p> <p>Comments on looking for biodiversity gain are noted and proposals to enhance areas are proposed in table 6.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u></p> <p>Amend table 6 to include general comment ‘Proposals should look at options to avoid impacts to designated sites before looking at mitigation measures which may be required to remove or reduce impacts on designated sites.’</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u></p> <p>The reference in para 3.2.8 to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas should be removed as it is considered this is more appropriately addressed in the Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>• This paragraph states that, in relation to ANGSt standards, that some smaller sites may be more robust and be able to take a greater degree of usage than some more sensitive or less accessible sites. Natural England would advise that sites need to be appropriate in scale, quality and accessibility if they are to effectively attract visitors and to divert pressure away from more sensitive sites. Further guidance is available in Natural England’s publication ‘Nature Nearby’ Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance, on Natural England’s website.</p> <hr/> <p>3.2.10</p> <p>• The Draft Infrastructure Study suggests the potential for creation of a country park covering the woodlands that form the Forest of Bere. The PUSH GI Strategy refers to the Forest of Bere Land Management Initiative, which seeks to take a comprehensive and integrated approach to the creation and management of a variety of GI assets in the area, including supporting sustainable food, fibre and fuel production, opportunities for open air recreation and biodiversity. However, Natural England would advise that an additional country park could have major social, economic and environmental implications for the area, which would require a detailed feasibility study. We would be happy to participate in any further discussions with the Council concerning this matter.</p> <hr/> <p>3.2.14</p> <p>• This section should also be informed by Habitats Regulations Assessment. With regard to the New Forest, reference should be made to the New Forest Recreation Management Strategy and, for coastal sites, the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project. The HRA should also include consideration of other relevant inland internationally designated sites. It should not be assumed, as stated in the Draft Infrastructure Study, that the provision of greenspace on-site or within close proximity of a site will avoid the need for appropriate assessment. Any likely significant effects identified at the HRA screening stage would need to be taken forward to appropriate assessment.</p> <hr/> <p>Appendix 2: Current level of open space and built facilities provision</p>	<p><u>Proposed Action</u> The following text should be added to para 3.2.10 ‘sites will need to be appropriate in scale, quality and accessibility if they are to effectively attract visitors and to divert pressure away from more sensitive sites’. Reference to ‘Nature Nearby’ Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance should be added to chapter.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted PUSH is undertaking work on the implementation of the PUSH GI Strategy, which will be reflected in the Core Strategy Delivery Plan as appropriate.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text in 3.2.15 to take account of suggestions. Add reference to the New Forest Recreation Management Strategy and the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project in the Study.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>within Winchester District</p> <p>Table 28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should acknowledge the level of designation accorded to named sites, including St Catherine's Hill SSSI, Crab Wood SSSI and Botley Wood and Everett's & Mushes Copses SSSI and the study should assess the recreational impacts on their features of interest. 	<p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend table accordingly.</p>
<p>WCC Community Planning Manager</p>	<p>3.2.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add Parish Councils. A significant amount of GI in the rural parishes is owned and managed by Parish Councils. <hr/> <p>Table 5 - Some of the information may need to be put into context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Alresford would like to identify a site for a swimming pool, but they may not have conclusive evidence to support this. The pool at River Park meets the strategic requirement for a catchment that includes New Alresford and therefore the Council would not support a new pool in Alresford. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bishops Waltham Town Healthcheck identified a desire for indoor sports facilities, although this is not referenced in table 5. The WCC view on this desire is similar to that for the Alresford swimming pool, with the facilities at Swanmore College meeting the strategic demand for a catchment that includes Bishops Waltham. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to update table to reflect that some of the Wickham play area improvements have been carried out. The Parish Council could probably advise on the exact situation. 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>
<p>Hampshire County Council</p>	<p>3.2.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> suggests that HCC own (sic) and manage (sic) 372ha of countryside. This should be "HCC Countryside Service manages 388ha of Countryside Site" (Other HCC departments have more land within WCC which is also countryside) <hr/> <p>3.2.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> states "HCC have raised concerns that the sites they own....." should read "HCC has raised concerns that the sites it owns..." 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u></p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>3.2.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> states "HCC have suggested areas of potential....." which should read "HCC has suggested....." <hr/> <p>3.2.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> claims that there is only LNR in the district. In fact there are nine LNRs totalling 108.7ha (all in HCC ownership). <hr/> <p>3.2.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> comment about FC land at West Wood adjoining Farley Mount CP. Strictly speaking West Wood is part of the Farley Mount CP. <hr/> <p>Table 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> contains the following quote in relation to North Whiteley, West of Waterlooville and Fareham SDA. " There is no access to accessible natural green space sites at least 500 ha within 10km of home. " This statement is rather confusing. 500ha is rather large unless what is meant, is that there is not a selection of sites within 10km which together total at least 500ha. Or, is it meant to be referring to individual sites of at least 50ha ? (Although not within the 10k limit, Royal Vic is 80ha and Manor Farm 160ha) 	<p>Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted - Having access to a 500ha site within 10km of home is one of the ANGSt recommended standards. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed</p>
Forestry Commission	<p>3.2.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tourism should be added to the list as an amendment to the SEGI Framework. <p>3.2.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FC would support the inclusion of linear access routes (i.e. Public Rights of Way and permissive access) that provide connectivity between green infrastructure, but are not part of ANGSt. <p>Table 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fareham SDA add ...The Forestry Commission has a total of 550ha of woodland in Winchester District '(which forms the largest area of woodland in the Forest of Bere)', some of which may link' via linear 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>access routes' with the Fareham SDA.</p> <p>3.2.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to paragraph: 'In addition, The Forestry Commission and Hampshire CC own and manage the only Country Park within the District at West Wood / Farley Mount , although there are several just over the boundary including Queen Elizabeth and Manor Farm'. <p>3.2.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Biodiversity interests restrict the scope of Green Infrastructure on site, then it limits its potential for delivery. Should this paragraph not be stated in the Biodiversity Action Plan and not within GI section? • Delete paragraph 'In addition, there is only one Country Park within the District at Farley Mount although there are several just over the boundary including Queen Elizabeth and Manor Farm'. 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <p>Agree - Infrastructure Study should refer to BAP, but not comment on how the shortfall should be met; this is something for the BAP to address. <u>Proposed Action</u> Remove comment.</p>
<p>Friends of the Earth 05/01/11</p>	<p>3.2.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green spaces must be increasingly reconnected. Concerned about whether Green spaces will be prioritised for any funding. Would welcome green bridge over Twyford gap, but consider this unlikely to happen due to funding. If development compromises provision of adequate green spaces then it should not be permitted. 	<p>Comments noted - Connectivity between green spaces has been highlighted in the Study. The Council have an Open Space Strategy to secure appropriate funding from development and potential Green Infrastructure improvements are identified in the GI Study. The Winchester GI Study refers to the Twyford Gap 'green bridge' but this is likely to be extremely costly and other means of improving GI are likely to be much better value for money. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
<p>Housing, affordable and specialist housing including extra care</p>		
<p>Hampshire County Council</p>	<p>3.3.18 to 3.3.20 500 Affordable Homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC through work with its cross council partners on the Hampshire Senate and Hampshire Alliance for Rural Affordable Housing, has begun work on an initiative that aims to deliver affordable housing across the county on publicly owned land. This seeks to address housing needs for those who are unable to secure housing on the open market. 	<p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed. This initiative has been included as a Primary Delivery Mechanism in paragraph 3.3.31.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By bringing forward available County Council and partner held landholdings, 'Project 500' aims to provide 500 high quality and sustainable affordable homes on suitable sites. • The Project 500 Team will work collaboratively with the City Council's Housing and Planning departments to progress the identification and delivery of suitable sites within the Winchester District, in consultation with the local community. <hr/> <p>Extra Care Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC is committed to work closely in partnership with local authorities in Hampshire, as well as Registered Social Landlords (RSLs), to develop Extra Care Housing schemes with an appropriate affordable and private tenure mix. In the current climate, the County Council will not itself provide such schemes, rather act as an enabling partner alongside the City Council, with an RSL owning and running the resulting extra care affordable housing provision. In the future Hampshire County Council would like, in partnership with the Council, to seek planning contributions from section 106 agreements to enable the successful delivery of such provision. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department of Health's Extra Care Housing Toolkit states that 'local planning policies need to reflect the needs of the ageing population and be geared towards supporting the development of Extra Care housing <i>locally where required</i>'. • A study (¹ "Providing a Context and setting Priorities in Accommodation and Care for Older People in Hampshire", Nigel Appleton / Contact Consulting, November 2007) undertaken in 2007 looked at the context for developing new forms of accommodation and care for older people in Hampshire, and specifically the opportunities presented by Extra Care housing. The study assessed the current demand for accommodation for older people in all Hampshire local authority areas against the existing levels of provision of various forms of accommodation. • Owing to the need to accommodate and support a range of appropriate care facilities and services on site, it has previously been widely accepted that a certain scale of development is needed in order for Extra Care schemes to be viable. It is clear that providing Extra Care 	<hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text to remove detail on HCC financial contributions towards Extra Care Housing, and add wording to clarify facilities will be RSL owned and managed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> Add link to Study 'Providing a Context and setting Priorities in Accommodation and Care for Older People in Hampshire'. Add information regarding the uncertainty of the development trigger for delivering new Extra Care schemes and refer to the new models of Extra Care and different options available for delivering this provision.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>units as a quota from very small housing developments remains unfeasible but previous assumptions about the need for a 'critical mass' of Extra Care units, usually around 50 in number, are now less certain. New models of Extra Care are in development and there may be a way, and a need, to develop a more flexible approach – such as a core and cluster or community based model for the delivery of care by one team – which respond to local variations, sites, and viability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extra Care housing could be incorporated as part of the Section 106 requirements from private developers on larger new housing development, whereby the developer is required to make available a proportion of a site or dwellings for Extra Care housing as a condition of the planning consent. Agreements reached could either be in the form of a scheme built by the developer and then handed over to a provider to run, a handover of land at subsidised or nil cost to a specialist provider, the local authority to build a scheme, or a monetary contribution which can be put towards future developments on better located or sized sites. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC therefore advocates the inclusion of a specific policy on Extra Care Housing (summary provided below), together with a specific target number of extra care units to be delivered over the plan period, evidenced by a local housing needs assessment. • WCC will need to Provide for the development of at least '216' units of Extra Care Housing in the period up to 2026. WCC should consider when identifying sites or determining planning applications for Extra Care housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the need for each site to accommodate at least 50 Extra Care Housing units; ○ The need for each site to provide an appropriate tenure mix to reflect the identified need within the District; ○ The Extra Care Housing Model in the Partnership for Extra Care Housing in Hampshire Strategy in respect of the provision of services and facilities (and any further guidance received from Hampshire County Council); ○ Sustainability – sites should be sustainable by virtue of their location and there will be a preference for sites within defined settlements, but where such sites are not available regard will be 	<hr/> <p>Comments noted Proposed policy wording will be considered through the emerging Core Strategy, where this issue has already been raised.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Add reference to requirement for 216 units up to 2016 within this Study.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>had to the potential for development to be self-contained to reduce travel requirements and the availability of public transport;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The priority will be for the re-use of previously developed land, greenfield sites will only be acceptable following allocation in the LDF; and ○ The potential to co-locate a nursing/residential care home on the site where there is an acknowledged need. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Council should work with its partners, Hampshire County Council and Hampshire Primary Care Trust in identifying suitable sites and securing the provision of schemes. ● The Council should support suitable proposals notwithstanding that such developments may result in or exacerbate an excess of housing development against South East Plan requirements. 	
Friends of the Earth 05/01/11	<p>Table 5: Winchester Town</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need to distinguish demand from need. WCC has duty to provide social housing to those in its care, but not duty to provide for in-commuting labour to houses in Winchester. This is not economic or climate argument. Comments on 'as the market picks up and house prices increase' is an amateur economist's point of view stated as certainty. 	<p>Comments noted - Housing need will be assessed by the Council but market demand has to be taken into account as the Council cannot dictate who can buy open market housing.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
Education		
The University of Winchester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● please delete the following paragraph at p 64 ● " University of Winchester is looking at developing satellite facilities around Andover and Basingstoke to coordinate with proposed development at these locations." ● Lack of reference to the University and its supply of and needs for infrastructure e.g. nothing on its effect on affordable housing which is a big political issue for the community and the council; no mention of the Sport Stadium; nothing about its need for new teaching space as identified in our Masterplan which is lodged with the City Council. 	<p>Agree</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly. Use information from Masterplan to inform the Study.</p>
Friends of the Earth	3.4.18	Comments noted - The University has a

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
05/01/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is hoped that the University will accommodate more in purpose-built student residential units or slow expansion of university until this can be provided. 	masterplan setting out the future development proposals for student accommodation. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.
Health facilities and social services		
NHS Hampshire Primary Care Dental Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study should take into account the NHS dental services in Wickham that commenced there recently. Further information can be found at: www.iosisclinic.co.uk/practices/hampshire/wickham.html. 	Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text to refer to dental services.
Cllr Margot Power	Table 18 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding mechanism for health centre improvements from developer funding please. The site is part of proposals for redevelopment on the Dean, see NATC Blueprint response. 	Comments noted The table states that developers should contribute serviced land and provide capital contributions where appropriate, subject to Developer/ PCT/ Private agreement. This would be through CIL or S106. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.
Social Infrastructure: Creative Industries, Arts and Culture including Community Halls		
WCC Economy and Arts Officer	3.6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include Winchester District Arts Strategy Check the definitions comply with the above strategy, in consultation with WCC Arts Development Officer 'WCC Cultural Services' no longer exists as a division. Instead, the following teams should be referred to; Economy and Arts, Museums, Curatorial Services 3.6.14 might also mention Guildhall Winchester as a venue 	Agreed – all points <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly
WCC Community Planning Manager	3.6.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't capture the importance of social infrastructure such as 	Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>community halls in ensuring that our communities are inclusive and cohesive. It gives the impression that their function is nothing more than a venue for artistic activity, when in fact they provide a home for services as varied as debt advice, pre-school provision, adult education, support for the elderly and local government activity such as parish council meetings and election polling stations. This should be reflected somewhere in the document - most appropriate would seem to be as an addition to section 3.6.18 on page 82. ACRE has recently produced a report entitled The Economic Impact of Community Buildings in Rural Communities http://www.acre.org.uk/DOCUMENTS/community%20assets/NVHS_economic_impact.pdf .</p> <hr/> <p>3.6.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infers that the standards in the Hampshire Infrastructure Report are utilised by WCC. This is far from the case, with the contribution towards a community development worker at West of Waterlooville equalling £350,000 over 10 years in comparison to a figure of a £45,000 for the first 3 years for a part-time officer in the Hampshire Infrastructure Report. We should make a statement to the effect that we do not believe that to be adequate. <hr/> <p>3.6.12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes reference to the identified desire in Whiteley Parish Plan for a library as part of the redevelopment of Whiteley centre. There are possible funding difficulties within the Libraries Service at HCC. <hr/> <p>3.6.14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States that there is a lack of coverage of smaller multipurpose venues outside Winchester Town. I would challenge that, as almost every settlement has a village hall, community centre or something similar. I agree that they may not be fit for all purposes, but the venues do exist and could provide very well with appropriate investment. <hr/> <p>Table 19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States that New Alresford Town Health Check identified a need in the Town for a suitable facility to cater for large indoor events. The exact 	<p>Amend text accordingly in paragraph 3.6.2 and 3.6.17. Add link to reference.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly (para 3.6.12).</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>wording talks about the "perceived need for" and my understanding is that there is not yet enough evidence to back this up and the first stage would be more detailed research to identify the true need. It may be worth toning down the wording in the document.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The information on the community facility proposed for West of Waterlooville doesn't capture the breadth of activity that will take place and only focuses on the public services that will hopefully be provided. A better form of words would be, "..... provide a venue for a wide range of community activity and also office space for the Citizens Advice Bureau.....". 	<hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>
Theatres Trust	<p>3.6.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include theatres in the range of facilities at para.3.6.1 on page 79. <hr/> <p>3.6.14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We see that your Theatre Royal and the Chesil Theatre appear as multi-purpose venues in para.3.6.14. and that there is a good range of such facilities in the District. Theatres can be very complex buildings technically and from time to time need substantial development if they are to keep pace with public expectations and the needs of performers and producers and we are keen to help theatre owners do more to improve and adapt their buildings to attract new audiences. 	<p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>
Emergency Services - Police Service		
Hampshire Constabulary	<p>The following response was made to Blueprint but is also relevant to the Infrastructure Study so has been copied here from Appendix A of CAB2148(LDF)</p> <p>Request that the Police are clearly identified as a major infrastructure provider in both the LDF and other relevant policies and to be an automatic consultee, particularly in relation to developer contributions and CIL. Police infrastructure requirements will differ with greater interest in larger developments. Are not in a position to state specifically what future needs may be, this will depend on targeted growth plans for the District following revocation of the South East Plan. This approach will</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Future work to develop a 'charging schedule' for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be needed and should consider the needs of the public protection services. Further information on the justification and costs of including Police services within CIL will be needed at this time and the Council will need to decide its priorities for CIL funding.</p> <p>Any requests by the Police for developer</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>enable police to match support to community growth.</p> <p>Request that the police can with immediate effect make submissions to secure Section 106 contributions for police infrastructure.</p>	<p>contributions would be considered on their merits taking account of the Circular 05/05 tests.</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Add to wording in paragraph 3.7.13 in response to Hampshire Constabulary's response to Blueprint.</p>
<p>WCC Community Planning Manager</p>	<p>3.7.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that in future funds could be secured through S106 towards the cost of a PCSO to assist, "during the early stages of community development". While I agree that this could be funded through the S106, I am concerned at the reference to this in respect of community development. If we provide sufficient resources to undertake good quality community development in new communities then there shouldn't be a need for more PCSO's. By seeking funding for that purpose, we would be acknowledging before we have even started that we cannot create successful and cohesive communities. 	<p>Agreed</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>
<p>Emergency Services - Fire Service</p>		
<p>Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service</p>	<p>3.9.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fire service in Winchester District is split between 6 fire stations within the District ADD as follows: Wholetime, Crewed at Winchester City (permanent cover) and Retained Duty System (RDS), cover at the remaining 5 stations with an additional (RDS) section at Winchester City (RDS respond for fire calls from their permanent place of work or home via pager) (listed 6 stations). • From outside the District, Eastleigh fire station provide some fire cover in to the west area to Colden Common, Fareham fire station provides some fire cover in the south area towards Whiteley and Waterlooville fire station provides some fire cover in to the south east at Denmead. <p>Additional information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new station has been built at Winnall and will become operational on the 23rd February 2011 with 1 wholetime crewed appliance, 1 Wholetime Crewed Special Equipment Unit (currently under service review) and 1 Retained Duty System Crew. This station has provision to increase central capacity within the Winchester District and central Hampshire being strategically placed close to Junction 9 of the M3 motorway. 	<p>Comments Noted</p> <p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service is due to publish its Service Plan 2011 - 2014 in February 2011 and will set our standards for the next 4 years this plan will be located at http://www.hfrs.net/ 	
Utilities Services: Gas and Electricity Provision		
Friends of the Earth 05/01/11	3.11.12 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is source of projections? Conclusion is surprising that only a slight increase in the total annual electricity usage is predicted between 2011 and 2015... The offset in 'embedded generation' is unquantified. 	Comments noted - The information comes from the electricity supplier and as referenced. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.
Renewable Energy		
Natural England	3.12 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England recognises the benefits of renewable energy and supports its promotion in appropriate forms and locations, where this will also protect important wildlife habitats and landscape character, in particular where it is compatible with designated landscapes and nature conservation sites and will not compromise the reasons for designation and special qualities, or adversely impact on priority habitats and species. <hr/> 3.12.5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England would urge the City Council undertake sufficient assessment at a strategic level to identify appropriate forms of renewable energy which will meet the other environmental criteria identified at 3.12 above. 	Support welcomed <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.
Cllr Margot Power	Table 21 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO₂, insert Reduce under target for 2020 	Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.
Friends of the Earth 05/01/11	3.12.1 and 3.12.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statements are unqualified. CHP is not synonymous with 'renewable energy infrastructure'. CHP is desirable concept, but not often about renewable inputs. No path to renewability is defined here, nor any 	Agree - CHP should be referred to as an decentralised energy efficiency measure, not a renewable. The Council is currently producing a SPD/guidance note on sustainability which will include planning guidance on renewable energy.

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>suggestions of what can or should be done.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly and add further information on renewable measures being considered.</p>
<p>Utility services – Waste and Resource Management</p>		
<p>Hampshire County Council</p>	<p>3.13.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The County Council is the waste disposal authority, and is also responsible for the Household Waste Recycling Centres. The Material Recovery Facilities, Composting Sites and Energy from Waste infrastructure in the county are provided by Hampshire County Council, as well. <hr/> <p>3.13.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Winchester City Council is responsible for the refuse collection service and this is funded through council tax charges. Collections of waste and recycling materials from your home are transferred to the County Council for processing and disposal. <hr/> <p>3.13.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The strategy in Hampshire is to reduce waste in the first instance then re-use waste, followed by recycling and finally energy recovery. Some unavoidable waste is sent to landfill. However Hampshire sends just 10% of its household waste to landfill currently, which is much less than any other UK authority. 	<p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>
<p>Water Management - Fresh Water Abstraction and Foul Water Discharge</p>		
<p>Environment Agency 21/12/10</p>	<p>PPS25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IS should refer to the principle aim of PPS25 to ensure development is safe, and that flood risk overall should be reduced wherever possible. Opportunities should therefore be sought to reduce risk as a result of the Core The local framework Strategy. 	<p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Propose additional wording in section: 'Under PPS25, Local Planning Authorities should set planning policies which avoid where possible;</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>CFMPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LDFs should make reference to, and be informed by, CFMPs which establish flood risk management policies which will deliver sustainable flood risk management for the long term. The relevant CFMP for Winchester is the Test & Itchen and South East Hampshire CFMPs. The infrastructure plan should seek to facilitate the implementation of the priorities and actions set out within the CFMP through new development. This could be achieved through the exploration of opportunities for multi-functional green infrastructure (flood storage, reducing risk elsewhere), and through the provision of SUDs infrastructure on new development sites. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to see more detail on the specific flood risks to and from the proposed strategic allocation sites, drawing on information from SFRA. This will provide a good evidence base to accurately inform the flood risk management infrastructure required (mitigate against flood risk displacement to other areas). <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include reference to EA document 'Groundwater protection: policy and practice (GP3)' under other studies/guiding principles for Sections 3.1., 3.14 and 3.15. This document sets out the EA's position for the protection of groundwater quality and quantity for a wide range of activities. <hr/> <p>SuDs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the use of SuDS, but which are appropriate for the location i.e. not located in areas of known or potential contamination, and ensure protection of groundwater from pollution. <hr/> <p>3.14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The River Itchen and the groundwater in the valley supply a large part of the PUSH area as well as Winchester and it needs continued 	<p>manage (taking account of climate change) and reduce flood risk to and from development.'</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Add text to chapter on Flooding to identify information on different flood risks in the District and proposed actions that relate to development planning. Add text to table 25: 'new development to manage drainage so that there is no net increase in flood risk and avoid inappropriate development in the floodplain. Seek opportunities for multi-functional green infrastructure (flood storage, reducing risk elsewhere) and the provision of SUDs infrastructure on new development sites.'</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> The Strategic Allocations will be considered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u></p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>protection against human impacts, including urban as well as rural diffuse pollution.</p> <hr/> <p>3.14.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support this statement. <hr/> <p>3.14.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support this statement. <hr/> <p>3.14.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wastewater treatment works (WWTWs), referred to in this section, are outside Winchester District, however, there are other large works within the District including Morestead, Harestock, Bishops Waltham WWTW. <hr/> <p>3.14.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Agency has or will also be reviewing discharge consents under Habitats Directive Review of Consents process as mentioned in 3.14.12 and not just abstraction licences as referred to here. <hr/> <p>3.14.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome reference to the link between water usage and wastewater generation. <hr/> <p>3.14.15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirements of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) will impact on discharge consent limits as well as abstraction licences. The Directive seeks to achieve "good status" for all designated water bodies in addition to "no deterioration" in current quality. DEFRA will 	<p>Strengthen wording in 3.14.1... 'The District plays an essential role in the provision of water resources for the District and PUSH area... These water resources need continued protection against impacts from development as well as from diffuse pollution.'</p> <hr/> <p>Support welcomed. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Support welcomed. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text to refer to these sites.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly... 'a review of discharge consents under this process is ongoing.'</p> <hr/> <p>Support welcomed. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly in 3.14.14... 'and discharge consent limits. The Directive seeks to achieve "good status" for all designated water bodies in</p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>soon be issuing statutory guidance on the interpretation of "no deterioration".</p> <hr/> <p>Table 24</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be noted for all options that: Additional wastewater treatment capacity may not initially be technically possible in some locations already operating at the best available level of treatment. In other cases, additional treatment may be considered unsustainable in terms of carbon costs and/or financial costs which will mean funding is unlikely to be approved. Water efficiency and metering initiatives are believed to reduce pressure on treatment capacity. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non PUSH Area or Winchester: We would welcome clarification on what "Options for sustainable on-site treatment will be considered" means? <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rest of PUSH Area: We welcome the statement that "the prevailing expectation is that development should be delayed until capacity can be provided". <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EA have amended the following points for the purposes of clarity and accuracy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.15.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) has overall policy responsibility for flood and coastal erosion risk in England. 3.15.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In April 2008, the Environment Agency became responsible for overseeing the management of flood risk in England. This includes the 	<p>addition to "no deterioration" (awaiting Defra guidance on "no deterioration") in current quality'.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Add text to table 24: 'Additional wastewater treatment capacity may not initially be technically possible in some locations already operating at the best available level of treatment. In other cases, additional treatment may be considered unsustainable in terms of carbon costs and/or financial costs which will mean funding is unlikely to be approved.' 'Water efficiency and metering initiatives being introduced through the Water Resource Management Plans should reduce pressure on treatment capacity. '</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> The requirements for specific Strategic Allocations will be considered in the Delivery Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Support welcomed <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u></p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>allocation of all flood risk management capital funding. The Environment Agency is also an operating authority.</p> <p>3.15.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other operating authorities include WCC and highways authorities (HCC and Highways Agency), who lead on the management of local flood risk and the flooding of roads and highways respectively. HCC became a Lead Local Flood Authority as a result of the Flood & Water Management Act. Water Companies are responsible for foul water system flooding. Operating authorities have permissive powers that allow them to protect both people and property where it is economically, technically and environmentally viable, and where affordable within national budgets. There is, however, no legal duty to build and maintain defences. <p>3.15.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowners are liable for maintenance works on their own area of streams, but cannot change downstream flows. <p>3.15.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would question the value that Paragraphs 3.15.5 and 3.15.6 bring to the Infrastructure Study, as they repeat PPS25. A reference to the Policy could perhaps be used instead. If retained, please note that the Environment Agency Flood Map does not generally distinguish between Flood Zones 3a and 3b. Reference should be made to the relevant Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, which provide more information in this respect. <p>3.15.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to note that whilst the Environment Agency hold information on groundwater flooding, this information is not complete, we act only as an advisory on this issue and are not the responsible body 	<p>Amend text accordingly.</p> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <p>Agreed <u>Proposed Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove information on flood zones. Amend remaining text in paragraphs to read... 'The level of flood risk associated with an area will determine the type of development that could be considered for the site. This information and requirements for flood risk assessments or exception tests is set out in PPS25.' <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text to read...'The EA hold some information on this source of flooding and have an advisory role regarding groundwater flood management, but the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 sets the responsibility on the County Council to address local risks.'</p>
Portsmouth Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome amendments made to previous comments. 	Support welcomed

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
18/11/2010	<hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of clear and consistent housing targets • Uncertainty regarding the SE Plan, but important that clear and consistent housing forecasts are available for future resource planning. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference to “higher standards of water neutrality”, refers more to “water efficiency” (reducing demand for water). Water neutrality means that water demand from new development would have to be off-set by reductions in existing demand. This would require efficiencies to be made in existing stock so that there would be no net additional abstraction from new development. As Portsmouth Water have a surplus of supply, this is not cost effective. 	<p><u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>
Southern Water 04/01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the changes that have been made in response to earlier representations. • Overall consider that the report recognises, where necessary, constraints in the provision of water and wastewater services, and highlights the measures that need to be taken to overcome them (e.g. connection off-site to the nearest point of adequate capacity). <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider that the footnotes attached to the evidence we have submitted should be deleted (e.g. “This information has been submitted by Southern Water, but has not yet been confirmed with the landowner/developer/agent proposing this site.”). We do not consider that our comments need confirmation from these parties. <hr/> <p>Table 24</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • insert underlined text • Investment to the local <u>water distribution</u> system would need to be funded by the development. • Investment to the local <u>sewerage</u> system would need to be funded by the development <hr/> <p>3.14.24</p>	<p>Support welcomed <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u></p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The delivery of infrastructure for water <u>and wastewater services</u> is dependent on the planning authority:- • Add additional information to SW infrastructure:- <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern Water has a scheme in place to increase water treatment capacity at Testwood Water Supply Works, and to transfer water from Testwood to Otterbourne Water Supply Works. The pipeline will need to pass through small parts of Winchester District to reach Otterbourne. The scheme is part of the River Itchen sustainability solution. 	<p>Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> Amend text accordingly.</p>
Cllr Margot Power	<p>Table 23</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste water treatment is a current problem. • Although some villages would like small development of both open market and social housing, the lack of mains drainage and the effect on water quality on the streams and rivers as is a concern. Water abstraction has also had an effect on water quality. • In the town the situation is different. Due to the small plot size of recent development it has been impossible to provide soakaways for surface water within the curtilage, rain water has therefore been routed to the foul water system, leading to pumping and treatment capacity problems in times of severe rain. We have an opportunity to mitigate the effects of this now, by promoting the use of water butts, and supporting grey water recycling initiatives. • For new developments we should take more stringent action. If possible, insist on:- grey water recycling; permeable surfacing throughout, including access roads; use of communal green spaces as soakaways. 	<p>Comments noted The Council has set out Interim Policy Aspirations to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 for water use. This would include grey water harvesting. The Water Companies and the Environment Agency have raised issues as to how feasible this is due to the carbon cost of installing these systems in some developments. This is an ongoing debate. Permeable surfaces are proposed for the strategic allocations (SUDS) and reference to the function of green infrastructure in managing flood events has also been highlighted. Therefore no amendments to the study are proposed at this time. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>
Flood defences		
Natural England Comments on Flood Defences	<p>3.14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • refer to the role of GI in management of water resources. 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u> This is included in Study in 3.2.1. No amendment proposed.</p>
Utilities Service: Communications		
WCC Economy and Arts Officer	<p>3.16</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This applies to all three elements of the community strategy, not just a 	<p>Agree <u>Proposed Action</u></p>

Organisation	Comments Made	Officers Response
	<p>prosperous economy</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.16.4 although 2mps is what is referred to here, in reality, this is not fast enough for the developing economy. Check with eHampshire what an appropriate speed target should be. 	<p>Amend text accordingly.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments noted <u>Proposed Action</u> Will need to update broadband speeds in consultation with ehampshire.</p>
Cllr Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study needs to consider broadband provision, important for home working and education. 	<p>Agree - this is covered in section 3.16. <u>Proposed Action</u> No amendments proposed.</p>

Glossary

IS	Infrastructure Study
BREEAM	BRE Environmental Assessment Method
CFMP	Catchment Flood Management Plan
DaSTS	Delivering a Sustainable Transport System
DfT	Department for Transport
HCC	Hampshire County Council
LRN	Local Road Network
LTP3	Hampshire Local Transport Plan 3
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
Ramsar	Site designated under the Ramsar Convention
RUS	Rail Utilisation Strategy
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SPA	Special Protection Area
SRN	Strategic Road Network
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuD	Sustainable Drainage Systems