

Your Place, Your Plan

‘Sustainable Transport’

Why has Transport got “sustainable” attached to it? The whole plan should be sustainable in everything, everywhere. Please drop the word “sustainable”

(E718)

Summary of Comments and Issues Raised

Question 1: Are the current Local Plan policies for promotion of sustainable and active forms of transport ambitious enough?

Are the current Local Plan policies for promotion of sustainable and active forms of transport ambitious enough?

The table below shows the responses received to the Citizenspace questions and in addition 12 e mail responses which directly answered the Citizenspace questions. All other comments received are detailed below.

Option	Citizenspace	Emails	Total	Percent
Yes	67	4	71	21%
No	146	8	154	46%
Don't know	113		113	33%
TOTAL RESPONSES	326	12	338	100%

Question 1 Summary of responses and comments received.

A total of 338 people responded to this question on Citizen Space (or by e mail directly responding to the questions) with around 21% agreeing that the policies are ambitious enough and around 46% saying that they don't think that they are ambitious enough. Around 33% of respondents didn't know. It would appear therefore that the current policies for promotion of sustainable and active forms of transport are not considered to be ambitious enough in the majority of respondents to this question.

Respondents identified that what is need is a step change move away from car culture to meet climate emergency targets. Respondents could see the benefits of active / sustainable travel for health, congestion and air quality improvements. It was also recognised that some of these things will be hard to achieve in the local plan.

There is general support for active and public transport but it needs to be good quality, frequent and given priority on the roads. Public transport will also need to be made greener as well as more easily accessible in the more rural areas.

There was also recognition that things might not go back to "normal" so will additional transport measures / improvements be needed.

There was some support for existing policy CP10 which it is considered should be updated and included in the new local plan.

The main messages for promoting walking is that is must be safe, with pedestrians given priority including quicker road crossing points with the signals in favour of pedestrians not vehicles.

It is recognised that there should be more electric vehicle charging availability where appropriate and electric vehicles should be allocated the most convenient parking spaces and prioritised over petrol / diesel vehicles.

There were some site specific suggestions which are set out below.

There was support for developers funding new infrastructure and adopting an integrated land use and transport planning approach.

On the negative side it was recognised that walking and cycling will not be suitable for everyone or every location and the needs of those less able, elderly or children must not be forgotten.

The breakdown of the detailed comments received is as follows:

General policy related comments.

8 respondents commented that what is needed is a step change / cultural change away from cars which current policies don't allow for / must focus on move away from car to sustainable transport or won't meet climate emergency targets (E1121, E1149, E1182, E1218, E1224, C357, E1244, E1179)

5 respondents commented that they consider it good to reduce car use to improve air quality / meet Climate emergency targets / reduce emissions (E1118, E1121, E1149, E1179, E1244)

3 respondents commented that this would support the Movement Strategy which promotes active travel and public transport as priorities (C515, E1121, E1238)

2 respondents commented that this would be in support existing policy CP10 and think it should be repeated / updated in new local plan (E1092, E1149)

2 respondents said it is important to address new opportunities and trends that have emerged during pandemic such as increased working from home (E1118, C580)

Single respondents made the following observations;

Yes and need to ensure it continues cross boundaries within the region and in accordance with Partnership for South Hampshire (E1220)

More needs to be done but some is outside scope of the local plan (C580)

Promote active and public transport whilst making status quo less attractive (E1244)

Greater emphasis on shared mobility (E1121)

Must accord with NPPF (E1179)

Think mobility and accessibility not just physical transport (E1228)

Need cooperation / input from HCC and major transport service providers (E1228)

Highways England who are a statutory consultee commented that they support the "Move away from use of private cars and create low traffic neighbourhoods. In order to reduce the reliance on the private motor car, the Local Plan needs to promote the concept of 15 minute cities (this is addressed in the Living Well section), with both cycling and walking infrastructure that promotes active travel and access to public transport buses and trains to connect together neighbourhoods, facilities and services."

This strongly aligns with Highways England's Strategic Business Plan 2020-2025 outcomes. As agreed with DfT, Transport Focus and ORR, our framework reflects how we will deliver the following six committed outcomes:

- 1) Improving safety for all
- 2) Providing fast and reliable journeys
- 3) A well-maintained and resilient network
- 4) Delivering better environmental outcomes
- 5) Meeting the needs of all users
- 6) Achieving efficient delivery (E1212)

Network Rail are in support of the Council's priorities, particularly the need for sustainable transport promotion. We welcome the focus on the need to promote active travel and integration of transport modes, as this aligns with Network Rails views.

Network Rail acknowledge the push to have new developments close to railway stations and other transport options to ensure the modal shift and decarbonisation aspirations are met and, of course, Network Rail will continue to work with councils and developers as and when development applications come in to understand how they will impact stations and services in and around the area.

Network Rail have several stations within the Local Plan area, one of such is Winchester, which is operated by South Western Railway (SWR). Network Rail would like to see SWR consulted as well.

Good, accessible walking and cycling links, and a cycle hub / parking at the station. The first and last mile of people's journeys are important in encouraging sustainable transport and linking developments to stations (E1236)

Public Transport

13 respondents said that the policies should be made wider ranging in that public transport should be made greener as well as encouraging more people to rely on this form of travel outside the well served areas. There needs to more thought on serving the rural areas, especially those where the only option is the car / or those who will still need to use a car (C342, E1182, E1224, C357, E1221, C357, E1230, C357, E1230, E1221, C291, E1224, E1219)

2 respondents considered that public transport should be boosted (C580, E1244)

2 respondents said that there should be a move towards active and public transport and that they would welcome this (E1228, C580)

2 respondents said that bus and other transport providers should be key consultees to ensure public transport success (E1211, E1233)

Single respondents made the following observations;

More emphasis on bus (E1230)

Give bus advantage over car such as bus lanes (E1230)

Quality public transport information and affordable (E1244)

Modal interchange must be minimised (E1244)

Encourage employment near good public transport to reduce need to commute to city centre (E1232)

Walking

Pedestrian priority, more crossings, quicker pelican crossings, longer to cross (E1244)

Walking is now the option of choice but it needs to be safe (E1244)

Electric vehicles

2 respondents said that there should be more emphasis on vehicle charging infrastructure where it doesn't detract from the public realm (E1216, C357)

1 respondent said make parking for electric cars the most convenient with charging facilities available (E1244)

Site specific suggestions/ promotions.

Direct bus link from train station to Winnall employment area (E1230)

Improve bus service to Tesco should be on a par with those to Sainsburys (E1230)

General point need to consider the impact of increased traffic on roads within SDNP (E1240)

Improve access to and from SDNP to Winchester over M3, including better signage (E1240)

Stop cars accessing the city altogether (E1244)

Promote new cycle lanes, paths between villages and Winchester (E1232)

Need facilities for longer journeys to larger settlements from small ones (E1216)

Future development considerations

2 respondents said that they considered that new infrastructure should be funded via CIL or proportionate S106 contributions from developers (E1092, E1211)

2 respondents stated that an integrated land use and transport planning approach is needed (E1121, E1211)

Single respondents made the following observations;

Development should be focussed on the edge of Winchester where there are existing active and public transport links (E1114)

Key is putting homes in the right place (C580)

All new development must be planned around integrated residential, leisure, employment and retail to reduce the need to travel (E1244)

Highways England who are a statutory consultee commented that they would be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network, in this case the A303, A34, M3 and M27. They therefore look to Winchester City Council to promote strategies, policies and land allocations which will support alternatives to the car and the operation of a safe and reliable transport network. They also comment that they seek to be consulted regarding any studies that may be being prepared in relation to transport infrastructure at the scoping stage, in order to ensure it meets Highways England's requirements for assessing any potential impact on the SRN appropriately and thereby avoid abortive works. If any impacts to the SRN are identified we welcome early discussions regarding any mitigation plans, including but not limited to potential schemes, funding sources and timescales. (E1212)

Possible issues single respondents made the following observations;

Walking and cycling only appropriate to those within a mile of Winchester city centre (E1230)

Ignore needs of young children, elderly or mobility issues (E1230)

Too dependent on existing infrastructure (E1232)

**Question 2: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Development should be concentrated in locations which already have cycling, walking and public transport opportunities.**

The table below shows the responses received to the Citizenspace questions and in addition 1 letter and 17 e mail responses which directly answered the Citizenspace questions. All other comments received are detailed below.

Option	Citizenspace	Letters	Emails	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	94		3	97	27%
Agree	124	1	11	136	38%
Neither agree nor disagree	63			63	18%
Disagree	41		2	43	12%
Strongly disagree	17		1	18	5%
TOTAL RESPONSES	339	1	17	357	100%

Question 2 summary of responses and comments received.

A total of 357 people responded to this question with around 65% of those responding strongly agreeing or agreeing that development should be concentrated

in locations which already have cycling, walking and public transport opportunities. Around 17% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement whilst around 18% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. This would therefore indicate that the majority of respondents agreed that development should be concentrated in locations which already have cycling, walking and public transport opportunities.

The majority of respondents agreed that development should be directed to where existing infrastructure can accommodate additional people / transport and stating that where there are no or poor active or public transport opportunities then development should be resisted.

There was some support for a flexible approach for sites in smaller settlements if they are being promoted with active and sustainable transport options. Some rural employment opportunities should also be allowed for.

Home working should also be considered now.

Really need to focus on reducing car use and improve cycle and walking routes. Need to make the car the least convenient method of transport.

Consider the use of mobility hubs to allow at least part of journeys to be undertaken sustainably.

This approach is considered to support the aims of the Movement Strategy and the NPPF.

Again it was felt that this approach might not be appropriate for children, elderly or disabled and this must be taken into account.

When looking at cycling and walking pedestrians, cycles and in particular e cycles should not be mixed to ensure safety and minimize conflict. Active methods of transport might be less attractive in bad weather.

Buses are often too expensive and not frequent enough.

The breakdown of comments is as follows:

General comments / suggestions

12 respondents agreed with this where existing transport infrastructure can accommodate the additional people and vehicle movements and there is a choice of travel modes / no developments where there are poor cycling, walking and public transport opportunities (C291, C343, C516, C583 ref BW, C323, E718 rules out Royaldown, E1128, E1149, E1179, C597, E1230, E1238)

6 respondents thought that developers should contribute / provide needed improvements (C343, C516, C583, C323, E1211, E1238)

6 respondents thought there should be flexibility for smaller settlements outside Winchester if the sites are being promoted with active and sustainable transport options (E1082, E1123, E1124, E1128, E1216, E1218)

6 respondents agreed but thought that it should be expanded to include other suitable sustainable locations where infrastructure can be delivered / don't just look at Winchester / working at home potential to boost villages (E1092, E1123, E1124, E1128, C597, E1218)

3 respondents thought that this will be required to meet Council's key climate emergency targets / improve air quality (C515, E1233, E1238)

3 respondents said that Local Urban Planning must provide for high quality active and public transport routes (E718, E1238, C580)

2 respondents considered that those places which don't have this infrastructure should be discounted automatically / development only permitted where direct links to active / public transport exist (C323, E1211)

Single respondents made the following observations;

Provide safe cycle paths to connect outlying villages to city where bikes can be charged and secured (E1242)

Partly agree but should focus on reducing car use (C550)

Consider using Mobility Hubs; Primary – a hub that is located on a Sustainable Transport Corridor, Secondary – hubs that are located on a Sustainable Transport Corridors and/or at the heart of an existing or new community or employment area that is generally only expected to serve the immediate adjacent community/destination and Tertiary – a local hub that is not located near the centre of a large community or employment area but is at a convenient location for users to interchange for local active or sustainable transport modes in order to access a Sustainable Transport Corridor or other public transport service route that provides onward journeys. These hubs will be smaller and more limited in the services (E1121)

Agree but would support small rural employment opportunities (C342)

There has been significant growth in people cycling and walking (E1118)

Need fast and frequent bus services to key nodes which offer advantage over using car (E1211)

Need to consider walking times to bus stops (E1211)

No large greenfield developments (E1230)

Most suited to major development areas which have the scale to provide local essential services and facilities within 15 minute neighbourhood (E1238)

Help to minimise car trips (E1238)

Use hierarchy with active and public transport prioritised over car (E1238)

This would support the aims of the Movement Strategy (E1238)

Site specific comments / suggestions Single respondents made the following observations:

Should have a new policy to require all new development in Winchester town to have zero on-site parking except servicing and disabled access (C343)

All town centre car parks to be redesignated for development except servicing and parking for disabled badge holders (C343)

Winchester centre should all be pedestrianised (M47)

Direct bus needed from train station to Winnall (C291)

Cyclists will benefit from planned cycle route from South Wonston to Harestock and onwards to city centre (C357)

Keep parking in Winchester city centre (E1209)

Possible issues

4 respondents felt that this approach could ignore the needs of young children, elderly or disabled (C291, C304, E718, E1224)

3 respondents considered that rural areas less conducive to active / public transport (C515, E1124, E1211)

2 respondents thought that this approach would be in accordance with NPPF para 103 (E1124, C597)

2 respondents said that new development should be located where there is a genuine choice of travel that can be sustained (E1209, E1230)

2 respondents said that pedestrians and cycles especially with e bikes should not be mixed (E1238, E1244)

Single respondents made the following observations;

Active travel has limitations e.g. shopping (E1224)

People living in rural areas will still want to travel to the city for services (E1242)

Walking and cycling only applicable to those within about a mile of Winchester city centre (C291)

Cycling and walking only suitable for good weather won't be used other times (E718)

Buses too expensive and not frequent enough (E1242)

**Question 3: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Provision should be made for additional Park and Ride facilities in the district.**

The table below shows the responses received to the Citizenspace questions and in addition

1 letter and 17 e mail responses which directly answered the Citizenspace questions. All other comments received are detailed below.

Option	Citizenspace	Letters	Emails	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	49		2	51	14%
Agree	108		8	116	33%
Neither agree nor disagree	106		3	109	31%
Disagree	51	1	1	53	15%
Strongly disagree	23			23	7%
TOTAL RESPONSES	337	1	14	352	100%

Question 3 summary of responses and comments received.

A total of 352 people responded to this question with around 47% strongly agreeing or agreeing that there should be additional Park and Ride facilities in the district and around 22% of respondents strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with this statement and around 31% neither agreeing nor disagreeing. Therefore the majority of respondents agreed with the statement that provision should be made for additional park and ride facilities in the district.

Many of the respondents questioned whether or not additional park and ride sites will be needed post pandemic as they recognize that home working might become the norm and people will possibly travel less or at least not on a daily basis as before. Some also questioned whether the existing P&R are operating at capacity. For some it would be preferable to consider developing existing sites rather than creating new and providing EV charging for cars parked there.

It was also considered to be preferable to promote active travel and improve public transport rather than provide more park and ride facilities. Should it be park and walk or cycle?

Are the buses “green” enough? Should we only be promoting them if they are electric? Are P&R in line with the Climate Emergency as they are encouraging car use?

People can see the benefits of keeping cars out of town centres and generally reducing car use.

The breakdown of comments is as follows:

22 respondents questioned whether additional park and ride sites will be needed post pandemic / increased working from home (C397, C399, C404, C3, C58, C292, C407, C488, C513, C567, C568, C569, C596, C326 C344, C385, C489, C570, E1124, E1230, E1233, C580)

16 respondents thought it would be preferable to promote active travel instead/ safe cycling / improve public transport (C586, C21, C264, C578, C343, C78, C124, C187, C100, C239, C321, C462, C344, C385, C489, C570)

14 respondents said that existing sites should be developed / expanded / double level if needed and/or equipped with a roof of solar panels and EV charging (C352, C361, C372, C449, C397, C399, C407, C513, C567, C568, C569, C449, E1230, E1238,

10 respondents challenged the assumption that the demand for spaces is going to increase and whether there is enough park and ride capacity / Are the existing park and ride sites full (C343, C100, C124, C596, C198, C488, C500, C517, C549, C573)

8 respondents said that they thought it was a good idea to keep cars out of historic centres (Wickham) / Winchester better environment for people / remove town centre parking / useful tool to manage traffic levels in city (C42, C277, C386, C282, W1092, C597, E1218, E1238)

5 respondents agreed but with the proviso that this would not be at the expense of the bus / train service (C256, C382, C357, C359, C392)

4 respondents said that this should be determined by the Highways Authority / modelled need / should be part of an integrated transport system (C168, C282, C113, C570)

4 respondents considered that there should be free / additional parking in Winchester on Sundays to support business / visitors (C489, C191, C111, C361)

4 respondents said that they considered that Park and ride most useful for visitors and workers staying longer term not used by locals (C111, C413, C596, E1209)

4 respondents said that they felt that this would not be in accordance with 2030 net zero carbon target / green sustainable policy / encourages car use (C365, C596, C343, E1216)

4 respondents considered that the use of cars should be limited / reduce reliance on cars/ park and ride encourage car use / so that P&R don't have to keep expanding to meet demand (C578, C436, C392, E1092)

3 respondents said that it should be park and walk not ride or just car park (C413, C479, C21)

3 respondents said that there needs to be a network of carbon free / cheaper regular express buses (C282, C274, C573)

3 respondents considered that park and ride has been a success in Winchester itself so it should be actively looked for in other areas / and in rural areas (C395, E1074 ref Knowle to Winchester, Southampton and Portsmouth, C357)

3 respondents considered that this would be in accordance with the Movement Strategy (C482, E1283, E1238)

2 respondents question sustainability credentials of park and ride do they reduce emissions? (C90, C187)

2 respondents didn't consider park and ride is successful / how popular is it? – Too slow (C78, C452)

2 respondents considered it to be illogical to have to drive to a car park to catch a form of public transport (C192, C198)

2 respondents said that alternatives / replacement for cars should be considered (C452, C365)

2 respondents said that car-sharing should be facilitated by providing car parking close to motorway access points (C208, C305)

Single respondents made the following observations;

Need to also look at controlling availability and cost of parking (E1238)

Need bus priority to enable quick service (E1238)

Could boost the sustainability credentials of dispersed development strategy (C597)

National Bus Strategy March 2021 might lead to better bus services and possible decline in need / demand for park and ride (E1218)

They need to be better signposted (E1242)

Need to be clear on the purpose of park and ride (C186)

Don't disadvantage people with mobility issues (C241)

Don't agree with expanding existing sites by using multi storey car parks (C220)

If the hospital moves to Popham then will be capacity at park and ride (C326)

May not be needed due to National Bus Strategy (C548)

Take up too much land (E1219)

Distort green belt provision (E1219)

Don't build 5 football pitches at Knowle use it for P&R instead (E1074)

Net importers of cars such as the County and District Council as well as staff to Hospitals Prison etc. should be directed to park and ride (C248)

Need well lit stops and walking routes from them to the train station assuming people will still commute to London post pandemic (C385)

Park and ride should include paths and cycle ways (C170)

These should be used at night as interchange stations between large, heavy articulated delivery vehicles and light electric commercial vehicles, to keep heavy vehicles and their pollution out of the City (C400)

Where they are needed (E1149)

Will help to improve air quality / environment / safety for pedestrians and cyclists (E1238)

Help reduce congestion (E1238)

If you agree with question 3 where would you like to see additional Park and Ride facilities in the district?

The majority of respondents (104) thought that additional Park and Ride facilities should be provided to the area north of Winchester Town with several identifying the area around Kings Barton, Three Maids Hill and Sir John Moore Barracks being suitable areas to meet demand.

The area to the east of Winchester was promoted by 22 respondents with 16 of those identifying an opportunity to incorporate the existing HCC staff parking into the park and ride site.

West of Winchester was promoted by 12 respondents with several noting that the existing park and ride at Pitt is completely oversubscribed and causing traffic congestion therefore seeing a need for a new park and ride site.

The provision of a new park and ride site to the south of the city was less popular with only 4 respondents promoting this.

14 respondents promoted general need for park and ride around the centre of Winchester or expanding the routes of the existing park and ride to include additional roads such as St Cross Road.

18 respondents identified the need for new park and ride facilities in the south of the district away from Winchester and with a view to linking with other towns outside the district such as Havant, Fareham, Southampton, Portsmouth and Eastleigh where people in our district travel to for a variety of reasons.

5 respondents suggested a need in the north of the district suggesting Kings Worthy, Hursley, Littleton and Sparsholt College.

General comments suggested that park and ride should aim to link up open spaces and amenities and rural areas and should be focused where new development will take place. There was support for using brownfield land and avoiding building new park and ride on greenfield sites. There were suggestions that smaller buses should be used to access more of the smaller streets in Winchester and by increasing coverage avoid people having to drive to the park and ride to get the bus back into town.

There was a comment that within the district no settlement outside Winchester is big enough to support park and ride.

The breakdown of comments is as follows:

North of Winchester.

In total 104 people suggested sites to the north of Winchester broken down as follows;

60 respondents considered that a good place for additional park and ride facilities would be to the north of Winchester (C4, C25, C33, C57, C79, C90, C105, C111, C122, C123, C127, C142, C154, C155, C156, C177, C194, C196, C202, C216, C239, C250, C253, C286, C274, C293, C306, C310, C325, C327, C331, C337, C342, C350, C352, C356, C357, C358, C359, C390, C385, C405, C425, C439, C462, C504, C514, C516, C523, C543, C545, C548, C558, C584, C487, C342, E1121, E1218, E1242) plus one respondent who didn't wish to be identified.

16 respondents considered additional park and ride should be provided at Barton Farm / Kings Barton (C63, C358, C379, C391, C397, C399, C407, C408, C494, C513, C514, C567, C568, C569, E1230, E1237)

6 respondents suggested Three Maids Hill (C285, C144, C75, C396, E1221, E1228)

5 respondents suggested Sir John Moore Barracks (C252, C144, C491, C523, E1237)

5 respondents suggested Andover Road (C142, C84, C22, C396, C491)

4 respondents suggested Stockbridge Road (C75, C84, C228, C396)

4 respondents considered they should be provided close to the A34 (C247, C299, C357, C494)

Single respondents made the following location comments for the north of the district;

Harestock Road (C396)

Near new leisure centre (C264)

Wellhouse Lane / Three Maids Hill (E1121)

Not north of Winchester as no need (C365)

East of Winchester

A total of 22 respondents suggested sites to the east of Winchester.

16 respondents thought that there could be a useful addition to park and ride on the east of the city (Bar End area) by incorporating the “temporary” HCC free staff parking into the publicly available parking (C361, C397, C399, C407, C408, C513, C567, C568, C569, C4, C43, C216, C390, C543, E1230, E1237)

6 respondents suggested sites around Winnall A34/M3/A31 (C127, C159, C247, C592, C530, C574)

West of Winchester

A total of 12 respondents suggested sites to the west of Winchester.

6 suggested generally west of Winchester (C11, C90, C122, C250, C592, C408)

4 respondents consider that the existing P&R in Pitt is completely oversubscribed causing traffic congestion. This needs to be resolved / enlarge this park and ride (C150, C274, C274, C285)

1 respondent suggested changing the location of the disabled spaces at Pitt P&R. It's a long walk from the southbound bus stop (C285)

South of Winchester

A total of 8 respondents suggested sites to the south of Winchester.

4 respondents said generally south Winchester (C148, C487, C522, C511)

4 respondents said not south of Winchester (C306, C155, C156, C306)

Central Winchester

A total of 14 respondents suggested sites around the centre of Winchester.

12 respondents suggested sites generally around Winchester City to keep cars out of the centre (C7, C47, C48, C81, C160, C168, C329, C561, C586, E1099, C360, C487)

1 respondent said expand routes of existing P&R to include roads such as St Cross Road (C342)

Olivers Battery currently takes 1.5 hours to get to new leisure centre without using car (C274)

South of District.

A total of 18 respondents suggested sites in the south of the district.

4 respondents suggested Whiteley (C4, C277, C386, C586)

4 respondents suggested Wickham (C42, C277, C386, C282)

3 respondents said they would be needed to serve Havant, Fareham and Eastleigh (C36, C41, C282)

3 respondents suggested locations to serve the central southern part of the district, Winchester/Southampton/Portsmouth (C27, C37, C282)

2 respondents suggested Bishops Waltham (C41, C282)

1 respondent suggested West of Waterlooville (C586)

1 respondent suggested Knowle (E1074)

North of District

A total of 5 respondents suggested sites in the north of the district.

2 respondents suggested Kings Worthy (C84, C502)

1 respondent suggested Hursley (C586)

1 respondent suggested Stockbridge Road between Harestock Road and Sparsholt College (C228)

1 respondent suggested Littleton (C514)

Generic

A total of 78 respondents made generic suggestions as follows;

20 respondents suggested that rural areas / spaces and access to amenities / should be linked up (C32 , C227, C231, C241, C255, C262, C347, C348, C461, C23, C397, C399, C407, C408, C439, C513, C567, C568, C569, C596)

14 respondents considered that decisions on additional park and ride facilities should follow the strategies on economic and residential redevelopment of brownfield sites and town and city centres (C227, C231, C262, C347, C348, C461, C567, C568, C569, C260, C361, E1209, E1230, E1232)

11 respondents were against building park and ride on green sites preferring instead to use brownfield land (C100, C199, C241, C243, C244, C439, C566, C344, C385, C489, C570)

6 respondents suggested wherever large scale development is planned (C6, C160, C168, C255, C304, C364)

6 respondents would support the use brownfield sites on areas next to main roads (C12, C23, C144, C364, C513, C515)

3 respondents suggested using smaller more frequent smaller buses (as in Oxford). Small buses might even use College Street, bypassing the congestion on George Street / faster connections / expand the routes to take in St Cross Road (C208, C305, C563)

2 respondents said that sites closer to residents in Winchester are needed to avoid the need to drive to get to park and ride / cheaper than buses as well as long stay parkers who come from further away (C190, C573)

2 respondents considered that the parking at railway stations such as Botley should be expanded (C208, C305)

2 respondents considered they should be provided at local town and village hubs (C170, C280)

Single respondents made the following comments;

Don't exclude those who live in rural areas getting easy access to Winchester for jobs and facilities (E1232)

Only where there is a benefit for visitors or the centre (C77)

We need good transport services throughout the area (C192)

Not suitable outside Winchester no settlements are big enough (E1216)

Close to motorways (C199)

Provide more disabled spaces. Park and Ride buses take you closer to city centre sites than any of the city car parks (C285)

Buses should terminate at the P&R, then large diesel buses no longer need to enter the city itself. Ultimately the aim has to be a car-free city centre during the working day (C168)

In the vicinity of M25 junctions so rural dwellers can use it for access to urban centres for work and leisure (C334)

Park and Ride could include existing less accessible central car parks - with electric transport to & from these (via mobility scooter, electric bikes, etc) (C197)

Adjacent to settlements with transport links but no new roads (C246)

Where there are none at present (C345)

Need to give consideration given to locations for new park and ride as can cause increased local congestion (E1238)

**Question 4: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Neighbourhoods that are accessible to services and facilities within 15 minutes (using sustainable modes of transport such as buses, walking or cycling) should be created.**

The table below shows the responses received to the Citizenspace questions and in addition 1 letter and 17 e mail responses which directly answered the Citizenspace questions. All other comments received are detailed below.

Option	Citizenspace	Emails	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	81	5	86	25%
Agree	120	6	126	36%
Neither agree nor disagree	72	5	77	22%
Disagree	30	1	31	9%
Strongly disagree	27	1	28	8%
TOTAL RESPONSES	330	18	348	100%

A total of 348 people responded to this question in Citizenspace or by e mail with around 61% strongly agreeing or agreeing that 15 minute neighbourhoods that are accessible to services and facilities using sustainable modes of transport such as buses, walking or cycling should be created and around 17% of respondents strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with this statement and around 22% neither agreeing nor disagreeing. The majority of respondents answering this question agreed or strongly agreed that 15 minute neighbourhoods should be created.

If you agree with the above statement, please tell your thoughts about 15 minutes neighbourhoods:

Question 4 Summary of responses and comments received.

Whilst there was general support for the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods (or communities preferred term by some) there were some comments that it is not a concept that is suitable for every location in the district and might be difficult to achieve (this point is picked in other topics). It was considered very important to provide the right level of infrastructure and facilities which can be reached easily by non car modes of travel with

good public transport available for the need to travel to some higher level facilities. There was support for mixed living with the ability to work from home or locally without having to travel to other locations and having local economies with people encouraged and able to shop locally. Good for people to be able to walk and cycle or use public transport rather than the car. No support for building new settlements on greenfield land.

Sport England who are a statutory consultee were supportive of the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods as it aligns with their Active Design Principles/Guidance. They emphasise the importance of well-connected walk and cycle ways and co-location of community services to enable linked trips. They consider that greater reference should be made to the importance of physical activity and movement and the physical and mental health benefits that come from being physically active.

The concept would meet the aims of the Movement Strategy.

A good range of facilities and services will be needed, could existing village halls be revamped and made more affordable for community events. Encourage pop up style shops. Create community gardens, allotments and edible landscapes to help reduce food miles.

15 minutes of safe movement is of paramount importance. Footpaths and cycle ways need to be upgraded and expanded upon. Don't mix walkers and bikes especially e bikes or cars with walkers and cyclists. Give the car lowest priority at junctions, crossings etc.

Do we need such anti car bias with electric cars coming online? These might have greener credentials than diesel buses.

Consider more pedestrianized areas in towns.

Possible negatives identified included 15 minutes too far in bad weather or in hilly locations and not a suitable concept for smaller developments. Public transport is often expensive and not reliable or frequent enough to encourage people to part with their cars. Model appears to be based on Winchester and needs to suit the whole district. Not supportive of new communities or building on greenfield land. Will this allow existing villages without services and public transport opportunities to thrive?

There were several suggestions for sites suitable for the 15 minute neighbourhood concept.

Will post covid online shopping habits impact on this?

The Breakdown of the comments is as follows;

Comments on the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods.

A total of 150 respondents provided comments on the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods;

17 respondents considered that the concept not suitable for suburbs such as Olivers Battery / all areas / small settlements, villages (C291, C306, C325, C327, C361, C363, C397, C399, C404, C407, C482, C513, C567, C568, C569, E1228, E1230)

7 respondents consider that this is important to create cohesive and vibrant communities with right infrastructure and facilities (C75, C90, C202, C250, C409, E1123, E1124)

5 respondents considered that promoting communities with facilities and services that can be reached by non car modes is vital (C323, E1123, E1124, E1149, E1238)

5 respondents thought it was a good idea but must be genuinely accessible (C357, C386, C394, C445, C561)

5 respondents considered that building new settlements would not achieve this aim (C119, C231, C347, C348, C461)

4 respondents thought it was a good concept but might be difficult to achieve (C405, C445, C462, C561)

4 respondents said this concept should relate to Market Towns and MDAs & all sustainable locations (C586, E1123, E1124, C597)

4 respondents would not support building them on greenfield land (C44, C379, C445, C414)

4 respondents questioned what about needs of disabled or small children? (C292, C542, M16, H75)

4 respondents said they consider a mixed development would work home/work/office (C27, C47, C113, C409)

4 respondents consider that Winchester already achieves this / already happens in some areas (C234, C461, C498, E1209)

4 respondents commented that localised economies assist people to cycle and walk (E1118, E1123, E1124, E1238)

4 respondents thought it was a good concept (C578, E1099, E1137, E1211)

3 respondents considered supported accessing food and basic supplies locally with good public transport to serve higher level facilities / encourage people to shop local (C385, C396, H49)

3 respondents thought that this would be a sustainable solution (C79, E1123, E1124)

3 respondents would not be supportive of new neighbourhoods and services (C187, C192, C246)

3 respondents considered that it could create sprawl along bus routes / resist ribbon development (C208, C305, C566)

3 respondents questioned are 15 minute communities realistic? (C239, C241, C326)

3 respondents commented that people moving out of cities now they can work from home / changed behavior post COVID (E1118, E1123, E1124)

3 respondents questioned 15 minutes by what? Car foot or bike? (C124, C511, C561)

2 respondents commented that Market towns vibrant high streets and independent shops depend on easy access for local residents (C301, C452)

2 respondents suggested looking at examples from the Netherlands (C274, E718)

2 respondents considered that this will only work in newly created neighbourhoods or those with substantial facilities (C160, C168)

2 respondents suggested using towerblocks to create community include services and open space (C41, C36)

2 respondents said that large developments with no services should be resisted / or bus service to other settlements (C194, C596)

2 respondents consider that this model can't be used for existing rural settlements (C160, C168)

2 respondents agreed that buildings should be located close to services/transport modes (C194, C489)

2 respondents were supportive of the concept of local living (E1121, C285)

2 respondents questioned whether there would be Government subsidies? (C127, C453)

2 respondents said this will be needed to reduce carbon emissions from transport / improve air quality / meet climate emergency targets (E1121, E1149)

2 respondents consider that this is a good way to promote walking, cycling and public transport use over car (E1211, E1238)

2 respondents said that building should only take place where facilities already exist (C543, E1149)

Single respondents made the following observations;

Sport England is supportive in principle of the 15 minute neighbourhoods and it aligns with our own Active Design principles/guidance. This includes the importance of well connected walk and cycle ways and walkable/cyclable communities; co location of community services and facilities to enable linked trips (C524)

Based on Town Vision so needs to be adapted for whole district (E1232)

Will need a lot of public participation (C462)

They worked in the past (C252)

Only new development to provide affordable housing for young people with local connection or housing for elderly to allow downsizing and freeing up of family homes (C285)

Easier to design a new neighbourhood than retrofit existing (E1121)

Would be efficient use of land (C36)

Will give people increased disposable income, health and happiness (C570)

Prefer term "communities" to "neighbourhoods" (C36)

Good to provide cultural activities for residents without having to travel to Basingstoke, Southampton or London (E848)

15 minutes too long in bad weather etc. (C248)

Will encourage home / local working (C176)

Some places within 15 mins inappropriate (C37)

15 minutes means different things in Winchester compared to other areas (C511)

Good for connecting sectors of the population (C4)

Should enable 70 – 80% of trips to be kept local (E1121)

Need to promote development in each community to allow for market, affordable housing, then employment and facilities will follow (C309)

Question optimum size for such a neighbourhood (C186)

Perhaps oversimplified concept (C329)

Development should be considered on sites within 15 mins of existing centres. New facilities will come if population sufficient (C341)

Need a policy to underpin concept of 15 minute neighbourhood (C343)

Historic towns and villages should be considered in this way (C334)

Don't think this is the way things are going (C353)

Not suitable concept for smaller developments (C383)

Development should be contained and localized (C395)

Geography of district might make it difficult to achieve (C364)

Supports Homes for All options 1 & 4 (C439)

Not that simple (C576)

They already exist but many areas are not as accessible (C400)

Will stay local for leisure saving on driven journeys (C176)

Needs more research on where 15 minute boundary should be drawn (E1232)

Will help to meet the aims of the Movement Strategy (E1238)

Residents should have access to employment, education, shopping, health and leisure within 15 minutes of home (E1238)

Challenge for rural communities but don't rule out development just because it can't deliver on 15 minute neighbourhood concept (E1209)

Transport and movement comments in relation to 15 minute neighbourhoods.

17 respondents said that this will only work with improved sustainable public and active transport options / suited to work hours / essential to reduce emissions (C42, C61, C63, C286, C420, C437, C457, C488, C500, C573, H53, H79, C283, E1074, E1099, E1245, E1238)

13 respondents noted that Winchester is too hilly for bikes and walking especially for elderly and children (C167, C286, C291, C397, C399, C407, C408, C419, C513, C567, C568, C569, C596)

12 respondents made comments in respect of the affordability of public transport. Buses are too expensive / need affordable public transport (C118, C155, C156, C409, C420, C500, E1074) / Public transport should be subsidized (C127, C420, C453, E1074, C357)

10 respondents identified the need to be 15 minutes of safe movement / roads wide enough for cycling (C12, C79, C118, C437, C545, E1245 Cheriton dangerous for walking and cycling, C22, C437, C513 Romsey Road too narrow, H128 Northwood Park to Winchester)

9 respondents said that the focus should be on cycling and walking (C78, C79, C365, C409, M14, M38, C414, E1099, E1238)

8 respondents suggested increasing the frequency of P&R and bus services (C516, C535, C453, E1074, E1123, C596, M16,) plus one who asked not to be identified.

8 respondents suggested more investment on upgrading paths, pavements and trails / make them wide enough to cope with increased use (C424, C488 SW P&R to Compton, C545, C586, H116, H128, H134, C283)

7 respondents considered that people will always have to travel to some services (C119, C231, C346, C347, C348, C461, E1232)

6 respondents said that 15 minute neighbourhoods should reduce car use / encourage car free living / reduce car use for most / reduce general transport needs (C522, C570, C598, C357, C90, C570)

6 respondents said that there is a need for cycle paths / join up cycle paths (C103 Colden Common, C469, C488 Badger Farm/Olivers Battery to Viaduct, H35 Durley to Bishops Waltham and Swanmore, H60 Tesco Winnall to Kings Worthy, C545)

5 respondents pointed out that some areas poorly served by public transport / rural areas (C155, C156, C500, C283, E1245 Cheriton)

5 people said that the bus service not reliable or frequent enough to rely on / stop running infrequent services (C277, C282, C420, C488, C594)

4 respondents identified the need for traffic free walk and cycle routes (C282, C365, C437, C545)

4 respondents suggested reducing speed limits / Max 20mph for cars (C396, C545, C516, C535)

4 respondents thought it was good to encourage walking and cycling (C250, C452, C462, E1099)

4 respondents commented that all new development should prioritise walking and cycling routes to facilities, services and open space (C365, C375, C149, C383)

3 respondents identified that this will need to make life easier without a car or driving won't stop / people will prioritise convenience over the environment (C436, C561, E1238)

3 respondents said that the existing public transport system is too run down (C596, M16) plus one who asked not to be identified.

3 respondents noted that there is a need to reduce traffic in Winchester problem for health, environment (C239, C420, E1099)

3 respondents thought that people will also walk / cycle for longer than 15 minutes to access services (C190, C358, C425)

3 respondents said consider development of railway to towns like Bishops Waltham and New Alresford (where there may be a higher number of brownfield sites that would be more appropriate for development) (C596, M16) plus one who asked not to be identified.

3 respondents commented that existing towns such as Winchester already have larger numbers of buses and trains available, which people will use, but they need to run more frequently to a wider range of outlying villages (C596, M16) plus one who asked not to be identified.

3 respondents questioned the need for anti-car bias – increasing use of electric cars should help satisfy the green lobby re air quality / need cheaper and more reliable electric cars / incentivize use of electric vehicles (E343, E1074, E1245)

2 respondents considered that the necessary infrastructure to be in place prior to development (C6, E1074)

2 respondents said that there should be limits on the delivery times in town (C516, C535)

2 respondents suggested electric last mile deliveries (C516, C535)

2 respondents suggested using central car parks and under used sites as meanwhile uses include food growing (Friarsgate) (C516, C535)

2 respondents said that the cycle path between Kings Worthy and Winchester is poorly maintained (C425, H60)

2 respondents said that development should be located within easy reach of buses, trains and active travel routes (C343, E1211)

2 respondents identified the need for better transport for the elderly / less mobile (C407, C457, C595, C596, M16,)

2 respondents commented that it would be good to be able to access services without getting in a car (C457, E1123)

2 respondents said care will be needed to avoid rat runs (C282, C343)

2 respondents said that Walking and cycling = health benefits (C100, E1099)

2 respondents identified the need to have a high quality / vision for active travel offer (C545, C586, C596, M16) plus one who asked not to be identified.

2 respondents said this will need active plans to encourage sustainable models of transport or won't happen (C521, E1238)

Single respondents made the following observations;

Decrease need for road maintenance (C570)

Should result in low traffic neighbourhoods (C545)

Existing provision for cyclists is poor (C521)

Cars will still be needed (C586)

Develop a tram system (C538)

Cycle priority on hills (C545)

15 minutes is an arbitrary timeframe, why can't modes of transport cover wider areas? (C454)

Buses need to be electric (C393)

Easy access to bus and trains (C365)

Doubt whether people will use buses now (C375)

E bikes allow greater range (C358)

Should make reference to trains (C360)

Prioritise low carbon modes of transport (C343)

Draft plan should assume Governments Bus Back Better and SWIS2 funding programmes will make additional bus, walking and cycling facilities possible (C343)

Parking provision should not be reduced for new developments (C277)

Pedestrian priority over vehicles especially in town (C545)

Include traffic calming (C282)

Restrict vehicle size (C282)

Should sustainable transport include electric cars better than diesel buses (C198)

Create connections between rail / bus / Uber (H134)

Restricted access for commuters to St Cross Road and Romsey Road in rush hours would force people on to public transport (C256)

Badger Farm is a good example of balance between cars, buses, walking and cycling (C259)

15 minutes good idea particularly for cycles as broadens the reach (C46)

Think people will still use cars as quicker (C93)

Pedestrianise Winchester City Centre (M47)

Get rid of single lane North Walls (H67)

Stop pandering to cyclists (H67)

The existing transport structure is not adequate for the ever increasing housing numbers (H111)

Place development where there are existing rights of way (H116)

Improve cycle access to RHCH (E1099)

Trust is keen to ensure that any movement of emergency and unplanned activity from the city centre is supported by well-developed and sustainable transport links (E1099)

For people in the suburbs of Winchester (such as Oliver's Battery, Badger Farm, Harestock and the further areas of Weeke) bus travel should be the focus of travel to reduce reliance on the private car. Transport planning needs to favour the bus, for example bus lanes, giving it a competitive advantage over the car. The bus services to Tesco in Winnall should be on a par with those to Sainsburys in Badger Farm (C291)

More pedestrianized streets (H134)

Easier to walk and cycle (C142)

Need secure cycle parking (C500)

Walking fosters community as people can interact which they can't in cars (C301)

There are not enough safe cycle paths in Winchester from outskirts to town centre (C308)

Less travel = benefit to all (C350)

Ensure layouts provide for bus access (E1211)

Buses to be provided early in development to create sustainable travel habits (E1211)

Cycle routes to comply with new National Cycle Infrastructure Guidance LTN 1/20 (E1238)

Have a hierarchy which prioritises active and public transport over car use make them easier to use and more attractive (E1238)

Comments on Services needed for 15 minute neighbourhoods.

7 respondents said that a range of services would be needed including Schools, Doctors, Essential food and groceries, Decent sized coffee shop, Pub, Restaurant, Takeaway OR good home delivery service, food outlets, community shops (C127, C57, C321, C356, C396, C516, C535)

4 respondents suggested revamping village halls / existing facilities to make them suitable and affordable for community events (C452, C498, C516, C535)

3 respondents suggested utilizing pop up style shops to encourage people to buy local (C42, C516, C535)

2 respondents identified that green transport links need to be improved (C75, H61)

2 respondents pointed out that the Internet / mobile connectivity are the key facilities and services in peoples lives and reduce the need to travel (C236, E1118)

2 respondents suggested community gardens, allotments and edible landscapes, reduce food miles (C516, C535)

2 respondents suggested the provision of wild play areas (C516, C535)

Single respondents made the following observations;

Reduce business rates to encourage shops (C545)

People are shopping online more (C586)

Technology allows people to access health services remotely (C586)

Delivery vehicles to homes or PO boxes, use drones (C586)

Flexible work spaces and community spaces needed (E1121)

Refer to HCC 2050 commission for scenario for delivering prescriptions in the future (C586)

Health and wellbeing considerations for 15 minute neighbourhoods.

3 respondents said that 15 minute neighbourhoods make very good sense good for health and wellbeing (C15, C127, C570)

3 respondents said that they will improve Carbon footprint, air quality, life quality and reduce congestion (C176, C199, C570)

Single respondents made the following observations;

If hospital moves from Winchester to Basingstoke it will create significant extra private car travel (C357)

Sport England would considers that greater reference and consideration should be given to the importance of physical activity and movement within this section, and the physical and mental health benefits that come from being physically active (C524)

Reference should be made to providing active travel connectivity to multi-functional greenspaces, to enable people to participate in sport and physical activity local to where they live (C524)

Potential downsides / areas for concern with 15 minute neighbourhoods.

18 respondents felt that the model was based on Winchester and needs to be expanded to reflect entire district (C119, C231, C255, C262, C291, C347, C348, C382, C392, C397, C399, C407, C461, C482, C567, C568, C569, C557)

15 respondents considered that it would be better to service existing communities than build new ones (C40, C101, C102, C187, C192, C283, C326, C345, C352, C394, C445, C469, C194, C556, C594)

7 respondents said that they didn't want significant expansion of housing beyond existing boundaries / large new developments (C63, C144, C359, C445, C596, C317, C345) plus one who asked not to be identified.

4 respondents said they would prefer use of Brownfield sites (C100, C164, C331, C498)

3 respondents considered that existing villages without services and public transport will not thrive under this policy (C25, H128, C283)

2 respondents said they would prefer to see city centre opened up with shuttles to outlying population centres (C58, C177)

Single respondents made the following observations.

Don't build on green space within communities (C491)

Doesn't suit all ages or disabilities (E1232)

Can push high volume of traffic into new areas (E1232)

Don't want suburbs that become ghost communities during the working week (C33)

Will result in a lot of new mini towns / villages (C498)

Not suitable areas around Winchester without eroding green space (C214)

Some facilities and services will never be within 15 minutes (E1232)

Specific Sites being promoted as suitable for 15 minute neighbourhoods.

5 respondents were promoting Sir John Moore Barracks. Development would help link Littleton and Harestock and provide opportunities for residents to access services by cycle instead of car to city centre. Is on a good bus route and would provide park and ride. (C167, C291, C578, E1092, E1230)

3 respondents considered that the proposal at Royaldown would not fit this model highways insufficient, junction pressure no existing cycle and walking, not 15 minute neighbourhood, question pedestrian safety, no need for more park and ride (C304, C563, E1209)

3 respondents commented that development at Micheldever will increase traffic and air pollution through Micheldever itself, damage rural environment / against carbon neutrality commitment, will be car dependent (E193, E196, E223)

2 respondents were promoting Bushfield Camp as a suitable site for employment and residential, sustainable site equidistant Shawford and Winchester train stations, 15 mins

cycle from Winchester train station, 15 minutes cycle to Sparsholt cycle route, bus stops close by, park and ride nearby (E1179, C167)

Single respondents were promoting / commenting on the suitability of the following sites.

Littleton Nursery would fit this model (C336)

Promoting development at Mount Edgecombe Farm, sustainable location within 15 minutes of facilities and services in Denmead (C515)

Barton Farm for example is not near enough to the train station for many people to get there in 15 minutes on foot? Maybe these places need commuter hour bus services to the station (C574)

Promote Mill Mead site in Bishops Waltham within 15 minute walk of village centre, existing cycle routes (C583)

Land north of Rareridge Lane Bishops Waltham 15 minute walk to town centre served by bus (E1051)

Promoting Land south of Titchfield Lane Little Park Farm, suitable for development sustainable site, bus service, facilities and services at Wickham Square (E1123)

Promoting New Farm Road Alresford, sustainable settlement suitable for new development (E1124)

Specific support for Filditch Farm proposed development site reasonable walking distance to good range of facilities and services in Waltham Chase, could enhance sustainable transport, upgrade existing infrastructure and local public transport (E1137)

Support for Micheldever Station New Town 15 minute neighbourhood with improvements to train station, comprehensive infrastructure including new roads, cycle and walking routes (E739)

Support for Brightlands Sutton Scotney close to local facilities and services, public transport, walking routes promoting new sustainable / active transport (E1082)

Support for Pudding Lane 20 minute walk to facilities and services, good public transport, walking and cycling routes (E1114)

Support for Wickham Park Golf Club edge of settlement close to local amenities and services, bus, cycle and walking routes (C515)

Promoting South Winchester Golf Course 2.5 miles from Winchester centre, good road, bus links. Natural extension to Winchester new facilities on site and active travel promoted along with P&R (C515)

Promoting land north of Wellhouse Lane would encompass walking and cycling close to Winchester could provide mix of uses to meet everyday needs (E1121)

A strategic growth zone, which combines the existing Kings Barton MDA with opportunities north of the City (north of Wellhouse Lane and Sir John Moore Barracks), would be able to

make use and to significantly improve effective and well-designed sustainable transport corridors. By adopting the principles informing the 15-minute neighbourhood model to the north of Winchester City the Council will be able to make a positive step towards achieving its net zero ambitions. Such an approach requires critical mass (a neighbourhood of 5,000+) to ensure that the infrastructure needed can be delivered effectively (E1121)

Promoting Fairthorne Grange and Brindle Farm as a sustainable extension to North Whiteley with facilities and services at Whiteley 2km away and pedestrian and cycle links including to Botley train station great example of 15 minute neighbourhood (E1128)

Promoting Pitt Vale as a 15 minute city, walking and cycling opportunities, park and ride, bus links sustainable location (E1149)

Promoting Botley Station, Curdrige, sustainable location close to Botley trail station, daily needs services nearby, safe cycling routes, close to Whiteley and Botley (E1162)

Promoting Anmore Road Denmead, sustainable location close to facilities and services in Denmead (E1162)

Promoting Land South of Bishops Sutton Road New Alresford, close to good facilities and services in New Alresford, east car access / road network (E1162)H116

Promoting Land north of The Lakes Swanmore sustainable location (E1162)

Promoting Land west of Littleton sustainable location, facilities and services at Littleton, 4km from Winchester centre, 3,3km from train station, bus opportunities (E1179)

Promoting land at South Wonston Farm sustainable location facilities and services exist in South Wonston, bus to Winchester and road within 15 minutes (C597)