

# **Consultation on draft third Hampshire Local Transport Plan Strategy (July to September 2010): Record of all comments received from respondents to open questions and the HCC officer response**

## **Background to the consultation**

A 12-week public consultation on the draft Hampshire third Local Transport Plan (LTP) Strategy, was carried out between July and September 2010. In total 280 responses were received to this consultation. The consultation was structured in six parts, and respondents were encouraged to respond to whichever sections were of interest to them. The six consultation documents on the draft LTP Strategy were:

- (i) Part A – Long-term Vision;
- (ii) Part B – Emerging Strategic Transport Priorities;
- (iii) Part C – Wider Challenges and Policy Context;
- (iv) Part D – Area-based strategy for North Hampshire;
- (v) Part E – Area-based strategy for Central Hampshire and the New Forest; and
- (vi) Part F – Area-based strategy for South Hampshire.

## **Purpose of this document**

This document synthesises all the main comments made to the 'open' questions posed within the Hampshire LTP Strategy Consultation Response Form. It also includes an officer-level response from the County Council to each comment made.

Comments by stakeholders appear before comments from members of the public. The latter have been made anonymous, in accordance with data protection requirements. All Consultation Response Forms, both hard copies and electronic survey forms contained statements on Data Protection, explaining how response information would be used.

The purpose of this document is to provide a clear 'audit trail' to demonstrate how comments made as part of the public consultation process have been taken into account when revising the LTP Strategy.

## **How this document is structured**

This document contains five sections, with a section on each of Parts A to E of the consultation material, all structured in the same way. These sections have been colour coded, using the same colours used within the LTP Strategy consultation material. A separate document covering part F (South Hampshire) has been produced jointly with Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils.

The comments made are set out in the first column of the tables. The second column contains the officer-level response from the County Council to each comment made, including where appropriate reasons why it is not proposed to make changes to the final LTP3 Strategy document. The third column sets out whether or not in light of the comment changes are proposed to the final LTP3 Strategy document, and the nature of the change.

## **Next Steps**

The proposed changes to the strategy set out in this document alongside other amendments that have been made to reflect recent Government policy announcements are subject to consideration and acceptance by Cabinet and Full Council. The proposed final LTP3 Strategy (incorporating changes that have been made in light of respondents' comments) will be taken to the February meeting of the Full County Council for decision (also being considered by Cabinet beforehand). Following this the new LTP will be published by the end of March 2011.

## **Respondent comments by section**

Please refer to the following pages to view comments and our response to each comment, for Parts A to E:

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Part A – The Long Term Vision</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Part B – Strategic Transport Priorities</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Part C – Wider Challenges and Policy Context</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Part D – Future of Transport in North Hampshire</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Part E – Future of Transport in Central Hampshire and the New Forest</b>	<b>53</b>

**Part A – Suggested amendments to draft LTP3 Long-term Vision to be made in light of stakeholder and respondent feedback received through the consultation process**

**Q2: Do you have any general comments regarding the transport vision for Hampshire or the general content of Part A of the consultation?**

<b>Respondent name &amp; main comments (paraphrased)</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment which (with Strategic Transport Priorities section) will form a 'chapter' of LTP3</b>
<p><i>Transport Alliance</i> – long-term vision needs to take into account the emerging LEP's and Hampshire Economic Development Strategy.</p> <p>Also needs greater emphasis on sustainable modes of travel.</p>	<p>Agree. This will be addressed by addition of a reference to LEPs and this strategy within Part C.</p> <p>Noted. Addressed in Part B by priorities that seek to improve travel choice, (Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O and P).</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Hampshire Chamber of Commerce</i> – long-term vision needs to take account of the Hampshire Economic Development Strategy.</p>	<p>Agree. This will be addressed by addition of a reference to this strategy within Part C.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Natural England</i> – long-term vision should make reference to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p>Would welcome a commitment to sustainable transport.</p> <p>Change 'The Road Ahead' to read "Whilst acknowledging that most people will wish to own and use cars, new development will be planned to avoid increasing traffic pressure by ensuring that attractive alternatives are available and promoted".</p> <p>Need reference to avoiding traffic increase and congestion on roads near designated areas of nature conservation.</p>	<p>Agree that such a reference would be a helpful addition to Part A.</p> <p>Noted. This commitment can be found within Part B by priorities that seek to improve travel choice, (Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O &amp; P).</p> <p>Suggested amendment noted. It is felt that this text would fit better within Part B "Theme 5 – Transport and Growth areas" supporting text rather than in Part A.</p> <p>Noted. By delivery of measures that address the Priorities set out in Part B, this should widen travel choice and limit any traffic increase. Greater scope to improve alternatives to the car exists in urban areas and on main inter-urban routes. HCC will work with partners Highways Agency to address congestion and increases in traffic volumes on main routes.</p>	<p>Additional text on this to be added to first paragraph of "The Role of the County Council" section.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Additional text along the lines suggested to be added to Part B.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<p><i>Basingstoke &amp; Deane Borough Council</i> – Need for partnership with transport providers e.g. bus &amp; rail. Need for consistency between authorities and bodies.</p> <p>Need to encourage modal shift to reduce carbon generation.</p>	<p>HCC intends to continue to work in close partnership with bus operators to improve services through Quality Bus Partnerships and the rail industry as set out in Part B (Priorities F and H).</p> <p>Addressed in Part B by priorities that seek to improve travel choice, (Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O and P).</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>East Hampshire District Council</i> – no clear commitment to public transport. Lack of suggestions as to how public transport can be improved, no mention made to altering routes. Will not meet needs of vulnerable users.</p> <p>Long-term vision needs to be more ambitious.</p> <p>Clarification needed on priority to economic prosperity in the detailed documents. Also Part 3 second paragraph.</p> <p>Part 4 last paragraph, how easy will it be for people to influence policy after the consultation? Will the authority still be flexible to changing needs?</p> <p>Need to support sustainable modes. Need to highlight possible 20mph zones in urban areas.</p>	<p>HCC intends to continue to work in close partnership with bus operators to improve services through Quality Bus Partnerships as set out in Part B (Priority F). Community transport solutions and travel training can help support vulnerable users.</p> <p>Noted. Vision in its' current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook of what can be achieved, that reflects funding constraints.</p> <p>Greater prominence will be given in Parts A and B to the role of transport in supporting economic development and prosperity in response to comments.</p> <p>People will be consulted on local plans and programmes such as Town Access Plans. Production of shorter-term future Implementation Plans for the LTP will allow flexibility to respond to changing needs.</p> <p>Speed management is addressed within Part B (Priority C). The key criteria for speed limit reduction will be casualty reduction.</p>	<p>Additional text to be added in Part C “Transport and older people” to refer to travel training, companions and other measures that support vulnerable users.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Parts A and B to be edited to give greater prominence to the role of transport in supporting economic development &amp; prosperity.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Eastleigh Borough Council</i> – vision needs to take into account health &amp; environmental issues and future economic and housing growth.</p>	<p>Our view is that these issues are already addressed within Part C. However greater prominence will be given in Parts A and B to the role of transport in supporting economic development and prosperity in response to comments.</p>	<p>Parts A and B to be edited to give greater prominence to the role of transport in supporting economic development and prosperity.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<p><i>Hart District Council</i> – while HDC will through the planning process aim to increase sustainable modes of transport, support from HCC is needed.</p> <p>Public transport needs to be reliable and frequent if it is to provide an incentive for modal shift.</p> <p>Part A does not mention importance of developer contributions.</p>	<p>HCC will work closely with district partners and developers to ensure that those living and working in new developments have a range of travel choices open to them.</p> <p>HCC intends to continue to work in close partnership with bus operators through Quality Bus Partnerships as set out in Part B (Priority F).</p> <p>Agree Part A should refer to role of developer contributions in “Constraints and Choices” section.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>New sentence to be added to “Constraints and Choices” section to cover this point.</p>
<p><i>Fareham Borough Council</i> – lacks vision in terms of a better and more sustainable future. Too much emphasis on road access.</p> <p>More encouragement needed for sustainable transport.</p>	<p>Noted. Vision in its’ current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook of what can be achieved, that reflects funding constraints.</p> <p>Current emphasis accorded to sustainable transport is felt to be about right,</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Rushmoor Borough Council</i> – more emphasis on residential environment as well as maintaining public spaces.</p> <p>Need continued investment in alternative transport modes.</p>	<p>Noted. Part B is the section covering priorities for investment. Improving the quality of residential areas and public spaces in town centres (Priority K) is covered here.</p> <p>Addressed in Part B by priorities that seek to improve travel choice, (Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O and P).</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Winchester City Council</i> – concerned over the pessimistic tone of the document especially in terms of future funding.</p> <p>Need to support public transport in rural areas.</p>	<p>Noted. Vision in its’ current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook of what can be achieved, that reflects funding constraints.</p> <p>Agree – where affordable to do so. Issue addressed in Part B – (Priorities F and G) and in Part E (Villages and rural section). In more isolated areas, community transport will be the favoured solution.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<i>New Forest National Park Authority</i> – no reference to protected landscapes in the vision or how traffic impacts on these.	Noted and agree. Part B would be a more appropriate place to cover this issue.	In Part B, supporting text on “Theme 4- Quality of life and Place” to be amended to cover importance of protected landscapes and how traffic affects them.
<i>South Downs National Park Authority</i> – would like commitment to reduction in emissions and environmental protection / enhancement.	Noted. Part B is the section covering priorities for investment. Reducing emissions (Priority L) is covered here.	In Part B, supporting text on “Theme 4- Quality of life and Place” to be amended to cover importance of protection and enhancement of habitats. No further changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Associated British Ports (Southampton)</i> – Part A fails to recognise importance of Hampshire’s transport network, and that its impact extends beyond the county boundary. Vital in achieving national growth and competitiveness.  Vision needs to reflect support for national economic growth & competitiveness.	Agree.  Agree.	Additional sentences to be added in Parts B and C to emphasise the importance of strategic road and rail networks in providing access to and from the international gateway ports and airport.  Additional sentences to be added in Parts A, B and C to emphasise the importance of transport networks in contributing to economic growth and competitiveness.
<i>DP World Southampton</i> – vision needs to stress economic growth more that it does at present.	Agree.	Additional sentences to be added in Parts A, B and C to emphasise the importance of transport networks in contributing to economic growth and competitiveness.
<i>North Hampshire Enterprise Andover</i> – more emphasis needed on reducing congestion. Investment in rail network required.	Noted. Part B is the section covering priorities for investment. Tackling congestion (Priority B) and rail investment (Priority H and J) are covered here.	No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>NHS Hampshire Public Health Promotion Team</i> – needs to highlight Active Travel and other transport related issues such as congestion, air quality safer roads etc.	Agree.	A new “About Hampshire” section will provide more information about congestion. Consider re-wording Priority L to cover air quality in general, not just carbon.
<i>South West Trains</i> – should include statement about HCC working with train operators to secure third party funding for rail investment.	Noted. It is felt that to a large extent Part B (the wording of Priority H) already achieves this. Repetition of this in Part A is not considered necessary.	No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<p><i>Freightliner</i> – need to acknowledge the importance of the freight network in Hampshire (road and rail) to the port of Southampton.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Additional sentences to be added in Parts B and C to emphasise the importance of strategic road and rail networks in providing access to and from the international gateway ports and airport.</p>
<p><i>Confederation of passenger Transport</i> – greater partnership working with bus operators will help HCC to deliver a efficient and sustainable transport system, and reduce carbon emissions.</p> <p>HCC should concentrate on getting the most out of what it has, through traffic management.</p> <p>Need to acknowledge the wider economic benefits that tourist coaches bring to Hampshire. Need to provide improved facilities for these.</p>	<p>Agree. HCC intends to continue to work in close partnership with bus operators through Quality Bus Partnerships as set out in Part B (Priority F and within areas of planned development also Priorities O and P).</p> <p>Agree. HCC's approach is set out in Part B (Priority B).</p> <p>Agree.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Additional sentence to be added to Part B supporting text under Theme 3 “The role of public transport” to refer to role of tourist coaches and scheduled inter-urban coach services.</p>
<p><i>Sustrans</i> – spending cuts and a shift to localism opportunity for cost effective sustainable transport to be put in place. Authorities should prioritise value for money schemes to get more from the network and invest in smarter travel &amp; public transport.</p>	<p>Noted. HCC intends to improve travel choice and options, and sustainable transport is part of this.</p> <p>Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed. More details on ‘localism’ to be added once HCC has considered implications of Localism and Decentralisation Bill (when this is published in December 2010).</p>
<p><i>Campaign to Protect Rural England</i> – greater emphasis on ‘respecting and protecting physical quality of places’.</p> <p>Reduce signage and visually intrusive highway related roadside furniture (e.g. equipment boxes etc).</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>It is felt that this issue is addressed through Part B (in Priority K and the supporting text) and sign de-cluttering proposals within rural areas as set out in the appropriate sections of Parts D and E.</p>	<p>In Part B, supporting text on “Theme 4- Quality of life and Place” to be amended to cover importance of respecting/ protecting the physical quality of places.</p> <p>No further changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>South Downs Society</i> – greater emphasis needs to be put on the Climate Change Act. Document too pessimistic about meeting targets and achieving modal shift.</p>	<p>Noted. Vision in its’ current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook of what can be achieved, that reflects funding constraints.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<i>Hampshire &amp; Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust</i> – would like to see a full HRA undertaken before LTP3 progresses further.	Noted. For most delivery options within this long-term strategy, there is not sufficient detail available to quantify impacts on protected sites. On the advice of specialist consultants, HCC plans to mitigate the ecological impacts of transport interventions at the individual scheme level, as it is at this stage where sufficient detail of impacts emerges.	No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>New Forest Access Forum</i> – need to make reference to the increasing elderly population. ROWIP does not need to integrate with LTP3.	This issue is referred to in Part C. Part A is intended to be a strategic overview. HCC has decided to align LTP3 with RoWIPs, so that the two plans whilst separate are complementary to each other.	Additional text to be added to Part B section to explain how Rights of Way issues have been dealt with.
<i>Isle of Wight Council</i> – text needs to acknowledge that all the islands' goods and services pass through Hampshire and people travel across the Solent both ways for employment, education, shopping and health purposes.	Part A is strategic in nature, covering issues affecting all parts of Hampshire.	Text of Parts E and F to be revised to accord greater emphasis to the importance of cross-Solent ferry services and Hampshire's transport networks in providing access the Isle of Wight.
<i>West Berkshire Council</i> – the long-term vision lacks vision and ambition.	Noted. Vision in its' current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook that reflects funding constraints.	No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Reading Borough Council</i> – what does it mean for Hampshire and environs if there are more people shopping than working? Is there any basis for saying peoples travel and patterns will change slowly or not at all?  Also question whether the document is implying that places not transport can be sustainable.	The purpose of this text is to highlight likely and possible scenarios, and to manage expectations. The assessment of changes to travel patterns is based on what is realistically achievable based on levels of available funding and public acceptability.  The wording of the section is intended to suggest that both travel patterns and places can be more sustainable.	No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>New Forest Cycle Working Group</i> – disagree with the vision as no mention is made to the health of individuals. More emphasis on cycling and associated health benefits needed.	Our view is that Part C of the consultation draft covers the links between transport and health satisfactorily. The current level of emphasis given in the Vision to walking and cycling is considered to be about right about right and addresses this issue satisfactorily.	No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<p><i>CTC Central Hampshire</i> – disagree with vision which fails to reflect health of residents and the impact of transport on this. Vision fails to support sustainable transport and is defeatist in tone.</p>	<p>Our view is that Part C of the consultation draft covers the links between transport and health satisfactorily. The current level of emphasis given in the Vision section to sustainable transport is considered to be about right and addresses this issue satisfactorily.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>CTC North Hampshire representative</i> – need to reduce speeds to encourage cycling. Part A merely accepts the status quo and lacks ambition.</p>	<p>Speed management is addressed within Part B (Priority C). The draft vision section is felt to be grounded in realism to reflect the immediate reduced funding situation, and suggests room for greater ambition in the medium and longer term.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>CTC Right to Ride representative for Havant</i> – document fails to support cycling as an alternative mode of travel and does not consider dropping speed limits to 20mph in residential areas. Cycling only recommended for short journeys. How is a short journey defined?</p>	<p>Speed management is addressed within Part B (Priority C). The emphasis accorded to cycling in the draft vision section (including the focus on shorter urban journeys – such as those 5km or less) is about right.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Eastleigh Southern Parishes Older Peoples Forum</i> – travel to hospital should be included in Part A.</p> <p>Do not understand statement ‘A balance needs to be struck...’</p>	<p>The term “travel to healthcare centres” is meant to include hospitals.</p> <p>In some instances, the same service will be provided to all, and in other cases, where affordable and practicable to do so, transport for older people can be tailored to individual needs.</p>	<p>The word “hospitals” to be added to this sentence for purposes of clarity.</p>
<p><i>Winchester Friends of the Earth</i> – vision has no inspiration and is banal.</p> <p>Need to reduce speeds and change behaviour in towns and villages.</p> <p>Needs greater emphasis on modal shift. Document does not tackle the issue of carbon reduction over the next 20 years. Document says nothing about controlling emissions or a future of declining resource availability.</p>	<p>Noted. Vision in its’ current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook that reflects funding constraints.</p> <p>Addressed in Part B (Priorities C and K).</p> <p>Addressed in Part B by improving travel choice, (Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O and P).</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<p><i>Winchester Friends of the Earth (cont)</i> – Needs to address the perceived or actual problems of bus reliability.</p> <p>What is the definition of ‘prosperous’?</p> <p>Document repeatedly mentions sustainability but does not explain how this is to be achieved.</p>	<p>Addressed in Part B (Priorities B and F).</p> <p>By this, it is meant improved economic competitiveness and GVA.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Carry out review of existing wording within Part C and improve explanation of how can be achieved.</p>
<p><i>WinAcc</i> – no detail on how HCC is to reduce dependency on the car and encourage low carbon transport.</p>	<p>HCC is seeking to reduce dependency on the car by improving travel choice, as set out in Part B (Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O and P). Encouragement of low carbon transport is set out in Part B (Priorities E and L).</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Railfuture Wessex</i> – not enough emphasis on the importance of rail to Hampshire.</p>	<p>Improvements to the rail network is addressed in Part B (Priority H).</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>North Whiteley Consortium</i> – vision should reflect a need to inform people about travel choices. Need to build on smarter choices principles and recommendations of Prof. Goodwin’s peer review of TfSH Priority must be given to improved bus network and BRT.</p>	<p>HCC is seeking to reduce dependency on the car by improving travel choice, as set out in Part B (Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O and P). Of these Priority O covers bus and BRT in growth areas. Priority F also covers bus network improvements. HCC will work with Districts and developers to achieve this.</p>	<p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Airey (Eastleigh BC)</i> – greater emphasis needed on health, housing, environment and economic development.</p>	<p>Our view is that these issues are already addressed within Part C. However greater prominence will be given in Parts A and B to the role of transport in supporting economic development and prosperity in response to comments.</p>	<p>Parts A and B to be edited to give greater prominence to the role of transport in supporting economic development and prosperity.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Ashton (East Hampshire DC)</i> – Part A lacks detailed statistics and the 7 bullet points on p.1 are too vague. There is nothing to indicate how modal shift might be achieved.</p> <p>Lack of detail on how speed management and 20mph zones are going to be introduced.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Modal shift would be achieved by improving travel choice, as set out in Part B (Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O and P).</p> <p>This level of detail is too great for a long-term strategy. These issues will be covered in more local plans and programmes.</p>	<p>Final LTP will include an “About Hampshire” section or chapter, providing such contextual statistics.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this section are proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<i>Cllr Comber (East Hampshire DC)</i> – need to tackle the issue of speeds on rural roads making them unsafe for non-motorised users.	Speed management is addressed in Part B (Priority D).	Additional text to be added to Part E to refer to need to improve safety for non-motorised users of rural roads.
<i>Cllr Cubitt (Basingstoke &amp; Deane BC)</i> – need to tackle noise from M3 especially between J5&6. Bypass between J6 M3 and A339 needed.	Noted. HCC will continue to raise this issue in discussions with the Highways Agency. In the current financial climate, there is no funding available to construct such a bypass.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Cllr Radley (HCC &amp; HDC)</i> – raised concern of how public transport can be encouraged in a climate of reduced funding. Will only increase dependency on the private car.	Concerns acknowledged. HCC will know more about the future funding situation following an announcement expected by early December, This will inform content of future Implementation Plans for the LTP (setting out investment levels for these areas)	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Cllr Roberts (RBC)</i> – disappointed with the long-term vision, which is complacent and ignorant of issues of energy depletion in the near future. With reduced resources why should maintenance get more funding at the expense of congestion, alleviating pollution and road safety measures?	Noted. Vision in its' current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short, medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook that reflects funding constraints. HCC will know more about the future funding situation following an announcement expected by early December, This will inform content of future Implementation Plans for the LTP (setting out investment levels for these areas)	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Amport Parish Council</i> – vision accepts the status quo rather than encouraging more sustainable travel.	Vision in its' current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook that reflects funding constraints. Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O and P in Part B all seek to improve alternatives to the car to make them a more attractive choice.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Cllr Broomfield (Compton &amp; Shawford Parish Council)</i> – funding should not restrict policy choices as this may effect economic growth.	The Vision whilst mindful of short-term funding constraints, does suggest that HCC would like to work towards more ambitious policy options in the longer-term.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Ellingham Harbridge &amp; Ibsley Parish Council</i> – too general and does not tackle issue of peak traffic.	Vision in its' current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook that reflects funding constraints	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<i>Ellisfield Parish Council</i> – want to see roads maintained, support for community transport, traffic calming on Herriard – Axford road, higher speed broadband and improved capacity at congestion points: A339 going into Basingstoke and Black Dam.	Priorities noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Hound Parish Council</i> – vision need to include health, housing, environmental and economic development issues.	Our view is that these issues are already addressed within Part C. However greater prominence will be given in Parts A and B to the role of transport in supporting economic development and prosperity in response to comments.	Parts A and B to be edited to give greater prominence to the role of transport in supporting economic development and prosperity.
<i>Cllr Houghton (Hedge End Town Council)</i> – lack of transport for the elderly in Hedge End an issue.	This level of detail is too great for a long-term strategy. These issues will be covered in more local plans and programmes.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Longstock Parish Council</i> – consideration needed of high speed bus between park & ride at a number of designated motorway junctions.	The scope for informal park and ride solutions (alongside bus-based ones) are addressed in Part B (Priority D).	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Liss Parish Council</i> – accepts status quo as regards car use, needs to do more to support alternative travel.	Vision in its' current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook that reflects funding constraints. Priorities F, G, H, J, M, N, O & P in Part B all seek to improve alternatives to the car.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Lindford Parish Council</i> – how will maintenance budgets be protected? Will bus services be protected?	HCC will know more about the future funding situation following an announcement expected by early December, This will inform content of future Implementation Plans for the LTP (setting out investment levels for both of these areas)	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Minstead Parish Council</i> – plan offers no help to rural areas who depend on the private car. Needs support for community / public transport and high-speed broadband.	The travel needs of rural Hampshire are addressed in Part B (Priorities G and M).	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Tichborne Parish Council</i> – need to develop an integrated transport policy.	Improving integration between transport modes is addressed in Part B (Priorities E and J).	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Alresford</i> – need investment in dual carriageway roads.	Noted. HCC is not planning investment in dual carriageway roads because it would be both unaffordable and unacceptable in terms of environmental impact.	No changes to chapter are proposed.

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<i>Resident of Overton 1</i> – issue of lorries using B3400 much of this traffic could use the A303 / M3. By-pass for Overton?	Noted. Our view is that this issue is addressed by the delivery options for The Rural Hinterland within Part D (North Hampshire)	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Andover</i> – vision should focus on integrated transport, reducing car use and concentration of facilities within communities.	Noted. Our view is that these issues are already satisfactorily addressed by Priorities D and K within Part B.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Lyndhurst</i> – need to tackle issue of people using routes through the New Forest as a short cut. More emphasis needed on designated conservation areas.	Noted. These comments will be considered as part of revisions to Part E. Level of emphasis given in Part E to protection of specially designated areas for conservation is felt to be about right.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident (unspecified location)</i> – need to improve parking and remove signage.	Our view is that these issues are already satisfactorily addressed by Priorities D and K within Part B.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Park Gate</i> – need a co-ordinated integrated public transport policy.	Improving integration between transport modes is addressed in Part B (Priorities E and J).	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Romsey 1</i> – need to support cycling as alternative mode of travel.	Level of emphasis accorded to this in Part B (Priority N) is considered to be about right and addresses this issue satisfactorily.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Fleet 1</i> – need for integrated travel system. FTAP does not take account for road safety and traffic speeds.	Noted. Level of emphasis accorded to integration (within Priorities E and J of Part B) is considered to be about right. Comment on FTAP passed to officers developing this local strategy for their consideration.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Eastleigh</i> – people will not give up their cars. Public transport is expensive to support and the Council should be more circumspect in funding for public transport and cycling schemes.	Noted. Vision aims to strike the right balance between modes, and accepts that the car will remain the preferred mode of choice for most journeys.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Romsey 2</i> – not enough emphasis on cycling.	Level of emphasis accorded to this in Part B (Priority N) is considered to be about right and addresses this issue satisfactorily.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Fleet 2</i> – need for more BRT and integrated transport in Southampton & Portsmouth. More dedicated cycle lanes needed.	Noted. These issues are already addressed by the policies set out in Part F.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Alton</i> – LTP3 must be linked to town planning if need to travel is to be reduced.	Noted. Part B (Priority M) addresses reducing the need to travel. HCC works with Local Planning Authorities and developers to seek to mitigate the travel generated by new development.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment
<i>Resident of Lymington</i> – priority should be given to a reduction in traffic noise through the use of quiet road surfaces.	Noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Burley</i> – wants a reliable flexible bus service.	Comment noted. Provision of community transport solutions, such as shared-taxi services is the favoured approach in rural areas away from main bus corridors, as this offers better value for money.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Winchester 2</i> – too car orientated accepts the status quo.	Vision in its' current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook that reflects funding constraints.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Petersfield</i> – more emphasis needed on diverting cars away from town centres and investing in cycling network.	Measures to restrict car access to town centres are not included within the LTP Strategy, as this would be both harmful to the town economy (car drivers would travel to other towns). Level of emphasis accorded to cycling in Part B (Priority N) is considered about right. Cycling schemes will be included within future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Farnborough</i> – it is wrong for tax payers to subsidise bus and taxi companies through provision of bus lanes as these are private companies.	Noted. As set out in Part B (Priority F), HCC will continue to work in partnership with bus operators to improve the quality and reliability of services on main bus corridors, to offer an attractive choice to the private car.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Gosport 2</i> – encourage modal shift through investment in walking and cycling.	Encouragement of walking and cycling is covered in Part B (Priority N). Such schemes will be included within future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Ringwood</i> – invest in walking and cycling and provide school buses to mitigate impact of the school run.	Noted. Both issues are identified within Priorities I and N of Part B. Walking and cycling improvements and home to school transport solutions will be included within future Implementation Plans for the LTP	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Fordingbridge</i> – plan needs more emphasis on sustainability. More needs to be done to reduce car travel. Will 'local level' decision making allow Parish Councils to reduce speed limits on their streets, or introduce other measures to control traffic flow?	Level of emphasis accorded to this is considered to be about right and addresses this issue satisfactorily.  HCC will consider the implications of the Localism & Decentralisation Bill, which will clarify the sorts of powers that could be devolved to the Parish Council level.	No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.

<b>Respondent name &amp; main comments (paraphrased)</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to Vision section in light of this comment</b>
<p><i>Resident of Hayling Island</i> – more emphasis needed on cycling.</p> <p>Need to reduce speeds to 20 around schools.</p>	<p>Level of emphasis accorded to this in Part B (Priority N) is considered to be about right and addresses this issue satisfactorily. Speed management measures will form part of future Implementation Plans for the LTP</p>	<p>No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident (unspecified location 5)</i> – plan contains no vision. Accepts the status quo, little being proposed to achieve modal shift.</p>	<p>Vision in its' current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook that reflects funding constraints. Part B sets out a number of priorities that seek to improve modal choice.</p>	<p>No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Winchester 4</i> – cycling as an alternative to car travel needs to be given greater priority. One way streets should where possible have counter flow cycle lanes.</p>	<p>Level of emphasis accorded to this in Part B (Priority N) is considered to be about right and addresses this issue satisfactorily. Such schemes will be included within future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Hythe</i> – not enough attention given to HGV's and investment in dedicated HGV lanes.</p>	<p>HCC is working on production of a Freight Strategy as a supporting document to LTP3, which will set out approach to all forms of freight including HGVs. Provision of dedicated HGV lanes on the HCC road network is not considered to be an efficient use of road space.</p>	<p>No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Winchester 5</i> – vision is devoid of content.</p>	<p>Vision in its' current form summarises what HCC aims to achieve in the short medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook that reflects funding constraints.</p>	<p>No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Winchester 6</i> – need to add 'sustainable' to 'safe efficient and reliable ways to get around'</p>	<p>The headline vision statement already includes the word 'sustainable', so to refer to sustainability twice accords it too much emphasis.</p>	<p>No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Winchester 7</i> – need greater investment in walking and cycling and making road network more sympathetic to their needs.</p>	<p>Level of emphasis accorded to this in Part B (Priority N) is considered to be about right and addresses this issue satisfactorily. Such schemes will be included within future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to section are proposed for reasons given.</p>

**Part B – Suggested amendments to draft LTP3 ‘Emerging Strategic Transport Priorities’ to be made in light of stakeholder & respondent feedback received through the consultation process**

**Q4: Do you have any comments regarding the emerging strategic transport priorities A to P?**

<b>Respondent name &amp; main comments (paraphrased)</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to section in light of this comment which will form a ‘chapter’ of LTP3</b>
<p><i>Highways Agency</i> – the management of traffic to maximise efficiency, capacity and journey-time reliability and reduced emissions should be a common theme throughout the life of the plan.</p> <p>Suggest additional text added to support delivery of Priorities F-N demonstrating a commitment to promote the use of travel plans.</p>	<p>Noted. This is reflected in Priority B, which is one of three top priorities.</p> <p>Noted. HCC is committed to promoting the use of travel plans through Priorities I,M and N.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>Wording of Priorities I, M and N (or the supporting text) to be reviewed to incorporate a clearer commitment to promotion of the use of travel plans.</p>
<p><i>Hampshire Chamber of Commerce</i> – the overall priority should make stronger reference to the role of transport in supporting economic growth. Do priorities ABC include dealing with congestion?</p> <p>Priority D should include parking tariff reviews as parking tariffs may be detrimental to local businesses.</p> <p>Priority P could be priority to support economic growth, reword to read ‘Outlining &amp; working towards implementing a long-term transport strategy to enable sustainable economic development in growth areas’.</p>	<p>Noted. Agree with point about transport and economic growth. Priorities A and B partly cover tackling congestion, C is about management of vehicle speeds.</p> <p>The setting of parking tariffs is the responsibility of District Councils and private sector car park operators. The effect of charges on local businesses should be taken into account in setting them.</p> <p>Noted. Priority P is about more than economic development. A new priority</p>	<p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>Part B to be edited to give greater prominence to the role of transport in supporting economic development &amp; prosperity.</p>
<p><i>Transport Alliance</i> – Priority A should include all road users rather than just concentrating on pot-hole repair.</p> <p>Priority E more emphasis on emerging technologies such as real-time travel information.</p>	<p>Priority A is broader than simply filling in potholes – it is about highway maintenance and asset management in its widest sense and applies to all road users.</p> <p>Priority E already encompasses this.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>Transport Alliance (cont)</i> Priority I more resources should be provided to increase sustainable travel to schools &amp; colleges.</p> <p>Priority K more emphasis needed on redistribution of space to favour pedestrians.</p>	<p>Noted. The level of resources available for such areas will be set out within future implementation plans.</p> <p>Noted. This is implied, but may need to be stated more clearly.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>Priority K to be re-phrased using less ambiguous wording.</p>
<p><i>Natural England</i> – improving the quality of the natural &amp; built environment should be part of the overall priority common to all key themes.</p> <p>Main priority B should include reducing the impact of traffic on the natural environment.</p> <p>Theme 4 change ‘maintaining the quality of the environment’ to ‘conserving and enhancing’ also second sentence refer to rural as well as urban landscapes.</p> <p>Priority L amend to ‘Contribute to achieving local and national carbon targets, as well as air quality standards for human health and biodiversity, through transport measures’</p> <p>Need to recognise in Priorities M&amp;N the importance to health &amp; wellbeing of access to the countryside.</p> <p>Need to link to ROWIP’s</p> <p>Priority N needs to include reference to green infrastructure.</p> <p>Priority O need to investigate possible impact on natural habitats from increased water-borne transport.</p>	<p>Noted. The level of emphasis accorded to the quality of the natural and built environment is felt to be about right.</p> <p>Priority B is focussed on helping the economy through more reliable journey times. In part, it refers to reducing emissions. A better place for this would be by expanding scope of Priority L.</p> <p>Agree with first point. Do not agree with second suggestion as unlikely to be able to deliver due to funding constraints.</p> <p>Agree with broadening L to encompass air quality.</p> <p>It is felt that reference to this point would sit better within Part C “Transport and Health”.</p> <p>Agree that current reference to RoWIPs in Part C is not in the best place.</p> <p>Reference to green infrastructure in Priority N is too much detail – and is best dealt with by LDFs and the RoWIP.</p> <p>This priority only refers to investigating the potential of water-borne transport. It would be up to ferry operators to provide services if they felt it was viable.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>Scope of Priority L to be expanded to incorporate this.</p> <p>Reword first sentence of supporting text under Theme 4 “Quality of life and place”</p> <p>Reword Priority L to incorporate air quality improvements.</p> <p>Expand “Transport and Health” section of Part C to address this point.</p> <p>Reference to RoWIPs to be added to supporting text under Theme 4.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>Basingstoke &amp; Deane Borough Council</i> – considers the speed management priority is too narrow. Speed management needs to take into account the nature of the road &amp; environment.</p> <p>Priority D: park &amp; ride can have significant capital &amp; revenue cost implications. Need to establish business case first.</p> <p>Priority E: smart technologies should only be taken forward as part of a raft of wider measures, rather than stand alone.</p> <p>Priority G: concern about suggestion that this priority provides a safety net rather than maintaining or enhancing services.</p> <p>Priority I: would like to see greater integration between HCC education and transport services.</p> <p>Borough questions the effectiveness of BRT in terms of cost benefit.</p>	<p>Noted. In reviewing appropriateness of speed limits, HCC takes these factors into account.</p> <p>Noted. P&amp;R would be progressed in partnership with District councils, and would require a good business case.</p> <p>Noted. HCC is aware that smart technologies are most effective as part of broader packages.</p> <p>Noted. HCC needs to be realistic about what can be achieved in light of funding constraints. The wording needs to be pragmatic.</p> <p>Noted. School travel plans and Education and Inspections Act duties aim to improve this.</p> <p>Noted. BRT will be progressed where a clear good benefit cost ratio can be demonstrated. In many cases QBP approach may offer better value for money.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Supporting text before Priority D to be expanded to provide context/ justification for Priorities D and E.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>East Hampshire District Council</i> - no indication of importance of most of the priorities or how these are to be funded.</p> <p>Theme 2 will local communities be able to suggest or influence solutions to make network more friendly for pedestrians.</p> <p>Priority G how will community transport be funded in the future? How will road maintenance work be prioritised?</p>	<p>Text in the red box headed “Our overall priority” explains Priorities A, B and C are top priorities and rest are of equal importance. Funding will be covered within future LTP Implementation Plans.</p> <p>Yes, to reflect the localism agenda. This is too much detail for Part B. The mechanism for this could be through Hampshire Action Teams (HATs) process or Community/ Parish Planning.</p> <p>HCC will know more about future funding following an announcement made in early December. Funding will be covered within future LTP Implementation Plans.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>East Hampshire District Council (cont)</i> Investment in walking and cycling is confined to urban areas, missing opportunity to open up ROW in rural areas.</p> <p>Theme 2 Priority D amend to say ...district authorities and local communities.</p>	<p>Priority N suggests that most (not all) investment in walking and cycling will be targeted in urban areas – because it can make the greatest contribution to tackling congestion, improving health etc.</p> <p>Noted. Disagree with suggested amendment. District authorities have the power to set pricing for parking, and in doing so they should consult local communities.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Eastleigh Borough Council</i> – how are these priorities to be funded?</p> <p>Priority D is there likely to be a PUSH wide parking strategy? What does a coherent policy approach mean?</p>	<p>HCC will know more about future funding following an announcement made in early December. Funding will be covered within future LTP Implementation Plans.</p> <p>If there is an appetite for this from District Councils, then this will be looked at. One that is considered fair, balanced and helps to improve travel choice.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Fareham Borough Council</i> – themes 1 &amp; 2 lack a sustainable transport vision.</p> <p>Greater importance needs to be given to public transport, smarter choices and walking and cycling.</p> <p>Quality of life and place needs expansion and increased prominence.</p> <p>With the transport &amp; growth areas wording could be stronger as regards sustainable transport modes.</p>	<p>Noted. Sustainable transport comes more to the fore in Themes 3 and 4.</p> <p>Noted. Current emphasis accorded to sustainable transport is felt to be about right.</p> <p>Noted. Current emphasis accorded to quality of life and place is felt to be about right.</p> <p>Agree.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Will consider whether there is a need to expand the supportive text.</p> <p>Supportive text for Theme 5 to be revised to make more reference to importance of sustainable transport modes.</p>
<p><i>Gosport Borough Council</i> – needs a strategic priority to safeguard land and enable / deliver future highways improvements to reduce congestion, improve journey-time reliability and address environmental issues.</p>	<p>This is a detailed issue that is best covered at the area strategy level or within LDFs, as appropriate.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Hart District Council</i> – seeks confirmation that it would benefit from the improvements set out as the document refers to the whole of Hampshire rather than being place specific.</p>	<p>Part B sets of 16 countywide priorities, whilst Part D sets out the more detailed strategy approach for North Hampshire.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p>Priority H should have greater prominence. There is no mention of increasing capacity on trains.</p> <p>Priority N investment in walking &amp; cycling is needed in the rural areas as well as the urban.</p>	<p>Noted. Prominence is felt to be about right. HCC will work in partnership with rail operators to improve interchange facilities at stations. HCC will make the case for infrastructure and rolling stock investment when it is consulted on Network Rail strategies or re-franchising.</p> <p>Priority N suggests that most (not all) investment in walking and cycling will be targeted in urban areas – because it can make the greatest contribution to tackling congestion, improving health etc.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Rushmoor Borough Council</i> – would give lower priority to Park &amp; Ride schemes in Rushmoor. New technologies are important but benefits are not so apparent at this time.</p> <p>Higher priority should be given to bus travel and encouraging investment in rail especially reducing overcrowding.</p> <p>More needed to meet national carbon targets such as smarter choices.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Current emphasis accorded to bus and rail transport is felt to be about right (Theme 3, Priorities F and H).</p> <p>Noted. Measures described will help towards achieving national carbon targets and current emphasis given to smarter choices is felt to be about right.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Winchester City Council</i> – Priorities should avoid an over emphasis on urban areas. Rural areas &amp; market towns need greater investment.</p>	<p>Within the 16 priorities, the balance between urban and rural areas is felt to be about right, and reflect future funding constraints.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>New Forest National Park Authority</i> – maintenance programme should consider all users of the network walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>In protected landscapes maintenance should be agreed with key partners.</p> <p>If New Forest 40mph zone is to be reduced to 30mph authority wishes to be involved at all stages.</p>	<p>Priority A applies to all road users, including cyclists and walkers.</p> <p>Noted. HCC is the authority responsible for highway maintenance. Key partners will be consulted where appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. There are no plans to reduce this speed limit at the present time.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>New Forest National Park Authority (cont.)</i> Greater emphasis needed in LTP3 to station travel plans.</p> <p>Brockenhurst station should be included in the Plus-Bus initiative.</p> <p>LTP3 should acknowledge the New Forest Tour bus.</p> <p>LTP might mention the ferry services to Yarmouth and Southampton.</p> <p>Also needs a more positive wording to Priority L on climate change.</p> <p>Priority N replace 'principally in urban areas, with 'where there is maximum benefit'</p> <p>Authority would like to see reference to freight.</p>	<p>Noted. This level of detail is more appropriate to area transport strategies. Station travel plans are referred to in Part F</p> <p>Noted. This level of detail is too specific for this LTP strategy. HCC does not operate the plus-bus scheme. It tends to apply to larger urban areas.</p> <p>Noted. This level of detail is too specific for this LTP strategy.</p> <p>Noted. This level of detail is more appropriate to area transport strategies. Ferry routes using Southampton Water and the Solent will be shown in a contextual map for Part F.</p> <p>Noted. Wording of Policy L is felt to be pragmatic approach to climate change, but will be broadened to encompass air quality.</p> <p>Noted. Our view is that the current wording is more realistic, but does not exclude investment outside of urban areas.</p> <p>HCC working on a County Freight Strategy as a supporting document to LTP3. HGV issues are referenced in Parts D and E.</p>	<p>Additional references to station travel plans to be added to Parts D and E.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Additional text to be added to Part E to reference Yarmouth to Lymington ferry service. Ferry routes using Southampton Water and the Solent will be shown in a contextual map for Part F.</p> <p>Additional supporting text to be provided on this in Theme 4 "Quality of Life and Place". Priority L to be broadened to include air quality.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Associated British Ports (Southampton)</i> – LTP must contain a priority of supporting national, regional and local economies.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Additional text to be added to Parts B&amp;C to emphasise importance of transport network to support economy</p>
<p><i>DP World Southampton</i> – transports role in supporting economic growth needs greater emphasis in the overall priority.</p> <p>Priority P the priority to support economic growth should come under overall priority as fourth listed priority (main priority D?)</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Disagree. Priority P wording is about sustainable development, not economic development.</p>	<p>Additional text to be added to parts A B &amp;C to emphasise the importance of the transport network to economic growth.</p> <p>Additional text to be added to early section of Part B to emphasise the importance of the transport network to economic growth.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>North Hampshire Enterprise Andover</i> – congestion is a major concern and LTP must address this.</p> <p>Any future investment in rail must go hand in hand with parking and local transport schemes.</p>	<p>Noted. HCC is committed through Priority B to tackling congestion.</p> <p>HCC will continue to work with rail operators to improve services, and improve integration between modes (Priorities H and J). Parking at stations is the responsibility of Network Rail and operators, and parking elsewhere is controlled by the District Council or privately managed.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Go South Coast</i> – developing bus usage as a sustainable mode of travel must be done in conjunction with parking enforcement and charging and a commitment to reducing cars in town centres.</p>	<p>Car parking (including enforcement) is the responsibility of District Councils or is privately managed. Town Access Plans and QBPs are a good mechanism for improving modal choice, and thereby reducing car trips into town centres.</p>	<p>Reference to Town Access Plans to be added to Part B.</p>
<p><i>South West Trains</i> – Priority D real-time display link with railway station. Suggest providing real-time screens at off station locations would increase modal shift.</p>	<p>HCC intends to continue to work in close partnership with rail operators to improve integration and facilities, to make rail a more attractive choice.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Freightliner</i> – plan should reflect the vision of modal shift expressed at a national level. Scarce reference to rail or freight.</p> <p>Document needs to take into account the importance of Hampshire transport infrastructure in movement of freight from the ports.</p>	<p>Priority H refers to the movement of more freight by rail. HCC is working on a Freight Strategy as a supporting document to LTP3 which will set out approach to all forms of freight.</p> <p>Agree.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Additional text to be added to early section of Part B to emphasise the importance of the strategic road/ rail transport network as means of access to/from the ports.</p>
<p><i>Confederation of Passenger Transport</i> – work with bus providers to make buses attractive in terms of reliability and efficiency to achieve modal shift. Need for integration with other forms of transport.</p> <p>Plan needs to take into account tourist coaches and their effect on the economy.</p>	<p>HCC intends to continue to work in partnership with bus operators to improve services (Priority F).</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Additional text to be added to Part B Theme 3 referring to role of timetabled and tourist coaches &amp; need for adequate facilities.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>Hampshire &amp; Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust</i> – LTP3 does not address biodiversity issues, this should be addressed at the strategic level.</p>	<p>Agree that more prominence is needed.</p>	<p>More background data on importance of biodiversity (and how we will protect/enhance it) to be added to Theme 4 Quality of Life and Place supporting text and to Part C. Clearer signposting to the SEA Environmental Report to be provided as part of this.</p>
<p><i>South Downs Society</i> – no commitment to mitigation of Hampshire’s contribution to carbon emissions.</p> <p>Priority L deplore wording. No commitment to reducing carbon targets.</p>	<p>Agree that this needs to be considered within Part B.</p> <p>Wording of Policy L is felt to be pragmatic approach to climate change, but will be broadened to encompass air quality.</p>	<p>Additional supporting text to be provided on this in Theme 4 “Quality of Life and Place”.</p> <p>Priority L to be broadened to include air quality.</p>
<p><i>Campaign to Protect Rural England</i> – priorities do not address effect of transport on the landscape / character of Hampshire.</p> <p>Does not include safety on rural roads.</p>	<p>Agree that this needs to be considered within Part B.</p> <p>HCC committed to safety on all Hampshire’s roads as set out in Priority C.</p>	<p>Supporting text on Theme 4 to be amended to cover importance of protecting habitats and how traffic affects landscape.</p> <p>Add text to rural sections of Parts D and E to highlight importance of improving safety, particularly for non-motorised users.</p>
<p><i>Hampshire Countryside Access Forum</i> – Needs to take into account non-motorised users of rural roads.</p> <p>More emphasis needed on sustainable links between urban and rural areas.</p> <p>Association between health and well being and access to the countryside needs to be made. Benefit for those in rural areas as well as urban.</p> <p>No strategic recognition of the likely increase in recreational use of the countryside.</p>	<p>Noted. This level of detail is best addressed at the area transport strategy level.</p> <p>Priority N covers this adequately.</p> <p>Noted. This level of detail would fit best within Part C.</p> <p>Noted. This level of detail would fit best within Part C.</p>	<p>Add text to rural sections of Parts D and E to highlight importance of improving safety, particularly for non-motorised users.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Add text on this to “Transport and Health” section of Part C.</p> <p>Add text on this to “Transport and Health” section of Part C.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<i>New Forest Access Forum</i> – Priority N suggest using ‘particularly’ and not ‘principally’	Noted. Current emphasis on cycling is felt to be about right.	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>Railfuture Wessex</i> – BRT not a good transport option, rail or light rail is more efficient and popular.	Noted. BRT is more flexible than heavy or light rail, and lower cost. It will be looked at where a good business case exists.	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<p><i>CTC North Hampshire</i> – Priority B: do existing transport networks focus on cyclists as well as motorists?</p> <p>Priority E: what new technologies?</p> <p>Priority M: what are the smarter choices?</p> <p>Priority N: why only in urban areas? Only one mention of cycling in the whole document.</p>	<p>Yes, pedestrians too.</p> <p>These are listed.</p> <p>Sustainable modes of travel, working from home, lift sharing, personalised journey planning, travel plans</p> <p>Priority N suggests that most (not all) investment in walking and cycling will be targeted in urban areas – because it can make the greatest contribution to tackling congestion, improving health etc. Current emphasis on cycling is felt to be about right.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>Add supporting text under Theme 3 (clarifying what is encompassed by term “Smarter Choices”).</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
<p><i>New Forest Cycle Working Group</i> – Priority A: safety improvements should be for all road users not just motorists.</p> <p>Priority B: Capacity management, should take account of non-motorised users.</p> <p>Priority C: more emphasis needed on speed management on rural roads.</p> <p>Priority I &amp; M: why the special place given to schools over places of work, shops, colleges etc. Need to roll out use of travel plans. Smarter choices should be a priority in its own right.</p> <p>Priority N: greater emphasis on cycling in rural areas needed.</p>	<p>Priority A is for all road users, not just motorists. However, agree that Priority C wording implies this is focused on motorists – and this needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Priority B covers all road users, not just motorised users.</p> <p>HCC committed to safety on all Hampshire’s roads as set out in Priority C.</p> <p>HCC has a statutory duty to provide home to school transport. Travel planning is encompassed within Priority M.</p> <p>Wording of N, states investment will be focussed on urban areas, but not exclusively.</p>	<p>Priority C to be reworded so that focus is on improving road safety for all road users (of which speed management of vehicles is one dimension).</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Add text to rural sections of Parts D and E to highlight importance of improving safety, particularly for non-motorised users.</p> <p>Add supporting text under Theme 2 (to explain importance of Priority I) and under Theme 3 (clarifying what is encompassed by term “Smarter Choices”).</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>CTC North</i> – Priority A: safety improvements should be for all road users not just motorists.</p> <p>Priority B: Capacity management, should take account of non-motorised users.</p> <p>Priority C: more emphasis needed on speed management on rural roads.</p> <p>Priority I &amp; M: why the special place given to schools over places of work, shops, colleges etc. Need to roll out use of travel plans. Smarter choices should be a priority in its own right.</p> <p>Priority N: greater emphasis on cycling in rural areas needed.</p>	<p>Priority A is for all road users, not just motorists. However, agree that Priority C wording implies this is focused on motorists – and this needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Priority B covers all road users, not just motorised users.</p> <p>HCC committed to safety on all Hampshire’s roads as set out in Priority C.</p> <p>HCC has a statutory duty to provide home to school transport. Travel planning is encompassed within Priority M.</p> <p>Wording of N, states investment will be focussed on urban areas, but not exclusively.</p>	<p>Priority C to be reworded so that focus is on improving road safety for all road users (of which speed management of vehicles is one dimension).</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Add text to rural sections of Parts D and E to highlight importance of improving safety, particularly for non-motorised users.</p> <p>Add supporting text under Theme 2 (to explain importance of Priority I) and under Theme 3 (clarifying what is encompassed by term “Smarter Choices”).</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>CTC Central Hampshire</i> – Priority A: add ‘for all road users’</p> <p>Priority B: add ‘for all road users’</p> <p>Priority C: priority should take account of needs of non-motorised users.</p> <p>Priority I: should include travel to work, shops and not just to school.</p> <p>Priority N: cycling should not just be seen as an urban activity. Benefits of cycling not just in terms of health but also congestion and sustainability.</p>	<p>Noted. Current wording makes it clear that Priority A is for all road users, not just motorists.</p> <p>Noted. Priority B covers all road users, not just motorised users.</p> <p>Agree that this point needs to be made.</p> <p>HCC has a statutory duty to provide home to school transport. Travel planning is encompassed within Priority M.</p> <p>Wording of N, states investment will be focussed on urban areas, but not exclusively.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Priority C to be reworded so that focus is on improving road safety for all road users (of which speed management of vehicles is one dimension).</p> <p>Add supporting text under Theme 2 (to explain importance of Priority I) and under Theme 3 (clarifying what is encompassed by term “Smarter Choices”).</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>CTC Right to Ride Representative Havant area</i> – cycling could have a positive impact on all other priorities. N why is cycling only an alternative to short journeys and who defines what constitutes short?</p> <p>Plan contains no target to increase cycle use.</p> <p>Alternative message could be ‘cycling is a viable alternative to other forms of transport, and helps reduce congestion, pollution and carbon levels. Also has health benefits for the cyclist. HCC is committed to improving facilities and infrastructure for cyclists’.</p>	<p>Noted. The emphasis accorded to cycling (including the focus on shorter urban journeys – such as those of 5km or less) is about right.</p> <p>Noted. Potential indicators to measure LTP3 against are being considered, and will form part of the final LTP.</p> <p>Suggestion noted. The emphasis accorded to cycling is considered to be about right. Part C highlights the health benefits of active travel modes such as cycling.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Rushmoor Cycle Forum</i> – need for user hierarchy favouring pedestrians, cyclists and public transport over the car.</p> <p>Should introduce 20mph limit on all residential streets.</p>	<p>Noted. This level of detail is too great for Part B.</p> <p>Speed management is addressed in Priority C. Key criteria for speed limit reduction will be casualty reduction.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Eastleigh Southern Parishes Older People’s Forum</i> – no mention of needs of the elderly.</p>	<p>Noted. This issue is covered in more depth in Part C “Transport and meeting the needs of older people”. Priority G outlines HCC’s commitment to providing transport to enable independent living for elderly residents.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>WinAcc</i> – climate change only mentioned twice. Priorities B &amp; L inadequate no targets for reduction of carbon levels.</p>	<p>Level of emphasis accorded to this is considered to be about right within Part B. Issue is also covered in Parts A and C. Overall the LTP3 addresses this issue satisfactorily.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Winchester Friends of the Earth</i> – Theme 1: Priority A: Commitment to safety improvement too weak.</p> <p>Theme 2: Priority B: wrong emphasis the problem is too much traffic answer reduce it.</p>	<p>View noted. Emphasis accorded to safety improvement within Part B as a whole is about right. It is also addressed under Theme 2.</p> <p>Noted. Part A makes it clear that role of HCC is to improve travel options, enabling people to make own decisions about if or how to travel, potentially reducing traffic</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>Winchester Friends of the Earth (cont.)</i> Priority C: Should be given greater emphasis.</p> <p>Priority D: feel park &amp; ride is ineffective in meeting its aims and is very expensive.</p> <p>Theme 3: Priorities F to J: these are weak, more funding needed for modal shift.</p> <p>Theme 4: Priority K: need statement of street priority. Need to transfer public subsidy from the car to public transport.</p> <p>Priority L: targets for carbon reduction have been set nationally HCC needs to help meet them.</p> <p>Priority N: reduction of speed and new priority for streets will encourage modal shift without the need for costly infrastructure.</p>	<p>Accept that road safety should be given greater prominence than speed management.</p> <p>Noted. HCC view is that Park and Ride offers benefits of reducing congestion and improved air quality, which outweigh the costs.</p> <p>View noted. HCC view is that these are not weak. Wording of F and H, reflects fact that most control rests with private operators and Network Rail. Funding will be addressed in Implementation Plan</p> <p>View noted. Accept that is not clear what is meant by Priority K. Public transport services are not controlled by HCC.</p> <p>Wording of Policy L is felt to be pragmatic approach to climate change, but will be broadened to encompass air quality.</p> <p>View noted. HCC view is that investment in infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists is needed.</p>	<p>Priority C to be reworded so that focus is on improving road safety (of which speed management of vehicles is one dimension).</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Wording of Priority K to be revised to make meaning clearer.</p> <p>Wording of Priority L to be revised to incorporate air quality.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Ashton (EHDC)</i> – sustainable transport given a low profile and priority.</p> <p>Theme 2 –no indication of level of increase so no basis for planning.</p> <p>Does not indicate if HCC will support 20mph zones.</p>	<p>Level of emphasis given to sustainable transport modes is felt to be about right. All priorities apart from A,B &amp; C (top priorities) are accorded equal importance.</p> <p>Agree that information about likely increases in traffic levels would provide useful background context</p> <p>Speed management is addressed in Priority C The key criteria for speed limit reduction will be casualty reduction.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Part C to be broadened to include forecast increases in traffic levels.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Cubitt (BDBC)</i> – key issues for residents are speed management.</p> <p>Upgrade J7 of M3 and resurface J6 to J7 with quiet road surface.</p>	<p>Noted. Speed management is addressed by Priority C.</p> <p>The Highways Agency is responsible for the M3.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>Cllr Comber (EHDC)</i> – Priority A must include all rights of way.</p> <p>Priority C: speed management especially important in rural areas.</p> <p>Priority N: walking and cycling just as important in rural areas.</p>	<p>Noted. Rights of Way Improvements are addressed by the Rights of Way Improvement Plan, which is referenced in the LTP3.</p> <p>Speed management for all roads is addressed in Priority C.</p> <p>Wording of N, states investment will be focussed principally on urban areas, but not exclusively.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Roberts (RBC)</i> – plan is short sighted and does not tackle the main issues which will become increasingly important with time. Needs to be more radical.</p>	<p>Noted. Vision in its current form covers what HCC aims to achieve in the short, medium and long term and is felt to be a pragmatic outlook reflecting funding restraint.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Beech Parish Council</i> – little mention made to haulage. Need to encourage local supply to reduce need to transport goods.</p>	<p>Parts D and E of LTP refer to haulage. HCC is working on a Freight Strategy as a supporting document to LTP3 setting out approach to all forms of freight.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Botley Parish Council</i> – Priority F: work with bus operators to provide buses of varying sizes , more buses an hour.</p> <p>Priorities J &amp; M increase use of public transport.</p> <p>Need for a by-pass round Botley.</p>	<p>HCC does not decide on types of buses or service frequencies. Private bus operators decide on these issues, according to what will be commercially viable.</p> <p>HCC will continue to work in partnership with bus operators to seek to improve the attractiveness of bus services.</p> <p>Noted. This issue is too detailed for inclusion in Part B – it is addressed in Part F (South Hampshire Area Strategy)</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Ellingham Harbridge &amp; Ibsley Parish Council</i> – policy needs to be clearer as to how it effects different areas.</p>	<p>Part B applies to the whole of Hampshire. The three Area Strategies (Parts D, E &amp; F) provide more locally focussed approaches.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Fleet Town Council</i> – HCC needs to look at reducing scheme costs, through reviewing engineering standards.</p> <p>Insufficient recognition that rail transport is at capacity at peak hours.</p> <p>More emphasis needed on the impact of the school run.</p>	<p>Noted. Ensuring that transport schemes offer good value for money is very important.</p> <p>Priority H is worded to reflect HCC's lack of control of rail investment (Network Rail).</p> <p>Emphasis is about right. Priority N encompasses the school run.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>Hound Parish Council</i> – Priority B: wording too general needs to be more specific.</p> <p>Priority F: buses should be given more impact, smart cards and real-time information.</p> <p>Priority I: need to reduce impact of the school run.</p>	<p>Supporting text under heading “Theme 2” provides additional detail.</p> <p>Priority F is worded to reflect HCC’s lack of control of bus services. Smart cards and real time is covered in Priority E.</p> <p>Emphasis is about right. Priority N encompasses the school run.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Houghton (Hedge End TC)</i> - lack of transport in Hedge End for the elderly.</p>	<p>These issues will be covered in more local plans and programmes but are too detailed for a long-term strategy.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Longstock Parish Council</i> – Priority C: a considered approach to traffic speeds needed. Possibly reduce speeds in built up areas and villages.</p> <p>Priority G: improvement to community transport in rural areas essential.</p>	<p>Noted. Speed management is addressed in Priority C. The key criteria for speed limit reduction will be casualty reduction.</p> <p>HCC will continue to work in partnership with voluntary sector to improve and maintain services and support community transport.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Liss Parish Council</i> – provision of bus services too focused on urban south Hampshire. Strategy must take account of the need in rural areas. Possible bus network hubs needed e.g. at Alton or Petersfield.</p>	<p>Noted. Disagree. Priorities F and G apply across Hampshire, and include rural areas. Bus services are mostly run on a commercial basis. HCC support for rural areas must offer value for money.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Lindford Parish Council</i> – Priority H: need for a rail link to Bordon / Whitehill.</p>	<p>Noted. This is too detailed for Part B. Part E section of Whitehill Bordon states that feasibility study is currently underway to see if rail link is viable &amp; affordable.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Minstead Parish Council</i> – Priority G leaves rural communities to look after themselves. No commitment from HCC.</p>	<p>Noted. Disagree. HCC does actively support Community Transport sector and is working to encourage better broadband provision.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Nursling &amp; Rownhams Parish Council</i> – what is manual for streets?</p>	<p>Agree that Priority K needs better clarification of terminology used.</p>	<p>Consider rewording Priority K to defining manual for streets.</p>
<p><i>Petersfield Town Council</i> – Priority B: how is this to be achieved? No indication of funding.</p> <p>Priority F: assumption that car will remain dominant. Does not take into account needs of elderly in rural areas. Not enough on public and community transport.</p>	<p>Funding will be covered within future LTP Implementation Plans.</p> <p>Current emphasis on public and community transport is felt to be about right. Needs of elderly people are considered in Part C.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>Resident of Alresford</i> – Priority A: need dual carriageway roads between towns.</p> <p>Priority H: what partners?</p> <p>Priority M: provision of broadband is not the job of HCC.</p>	<p>HCC not planning to invest in dual carriageways as it would be unaffordable and unacceptable environmentally.</p> <p>Rail operators such as South-West Trains.</p> <p>Agree. But HCC can play a lobbying role to encourage telecommunications providers to invest in improvements.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Theme 3 Supporting text to be expanded explain of who partners are.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Farnborough</i> – need integrated transport.</p>	<p>HCC committed to working in partnership with bus and rail operators to improve integration between services (Priority J).</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Andover</i> – strategy needs to take account of peak oil by 2050.</p>	<p>Peak oil is referenced in Part A (Vision). The priorities are considered to be relevant and appropriate up to 2031.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Lyndhurst</i> – Priority E need to develop strategy of charging motorists commuting through the New Forest.</p>	<p>Noted. Disagree. HCC has no plans to consider charging motorists that are commuting through the New Forest.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Waltham Chase</i> – Need to provide alternative routes for vulnerable users. Signs for cycle lanes and their maintenance are poor.</p>	<p>Noted. Protecting character of village communities may mean it is not practical to provide off-road routes. Priority A includes maintenance of cycle lanes etc.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Fareham</i> – need to start putting back defunct rail stations to reduce the need for car travel.</p>	<p>These are decisions for rail industry, who is responsible for stations and rail services.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Fleet 1</i> – need to consider the schools strategy to reduce the need for travel to school. Priority O: why only south Hampshire? North Hampshire has weakest public transport.</p> <p>Priority P: HCC supported the Pyestock megashed it must now mitigate its affects.</p>	<p>Priorities F and P are not restricted to South Hampshire. Priority O reflects the need to provide high quality public transport services to reflect complex polycentric nature of travel patterns.</p> <p>Noted. Such detail is inappropriate in a high-level strategic document. Investment will be made to mitigate impacts of HGV movements.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Bramshill</i> – reduce speed limits on rural roads. More S.I.D.s are needed.</p>	<p>See Priority C speed limit reductions will be made on the basis of casualty reduction.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Eastleigh</i> – more could be done to reduce the number of cars on the road. Issue of parents driving their children to school.</p>	<p>Noted. Emphasis on supporting sustainable travel is felt to be about right. Priority N encompasses the school run.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>Resident of Rushmoor</i> – supports maintenance.</p> <p>Priority E,F at expense of what? Too woolly.</p> <p>H unrealistic no-one will build new rail lines.</p> <p>Priority I dealing with the school run is a high priority.</p> <p>N: resident does not support cycling.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Disagree. Supporting text provides additional detail.</p> <p>Priority H considered to be pragmatic. Re-opening of rail lines remains a long-term aspiration.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Basingstoke</i> – new development must be provided with supporting travel infrastructure, to reduce car use.</p>	<p>Noted. Agree. This is reflected in wording of Theme 5 (and priorities O and P).</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Four Marks</i> – C A31 Four Marks &amp; 30mph. Painted mini-roundabout at Telegraph Lane and new housing should slow traffic.</p>	<p>Noted. Such detail is inappropriate in a high-level strategic document.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Resident (unspecified location)</i> – Priority C do not think Parish Councils should control A roads of national importance.</p> <p>Some speed limits imposed are too low.</p>	<p>HCC awaits the publication of the Localism &amp; Decentralisation Bill to clarify what powers can be devolved. HCC not expecting such big devolution of responsibilities to Parish Councils.</p> <p>Priority C (speed management) does not propose higher speed limits, for road safety reasons.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Alton 1</i> – public and community transport needs to be made more attractive to get people out of their cars.</p> <p>Priority N: needs joined up thinking collaboration with CTC.</p> <p>More people first streetscapes and 20mph zones.</p>	<p>Noted. Priorities F, G, H and J seek to do this.</p> <p>Noted. HCC willing to work with such organisations to explore ways of working together to increase cycling.</p> <p>Speed management is addressed in Priority C The key criteria for speed limit reduction will be casualty reduction.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Gosport 1</i> – are our views going to be used and what weight do they carry?</p>	<p>Yes. Comments have all been logged and responses to every comment developed. Stakeholder views will be accorded more weight than members of the public (as latter not statistically significant).</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<i>Resident of Bramley 1</i> – buses should receive the greatest share of public expenditure.	Noted. HCC does not control bus services, which are run by private operators, mostly on a commercial basis. Of the funding for transport, there is strongest public support for investing this in highway maintenance. Investing it in buses is not realistic.	No changes proposed for reason stated.
<i>Resident of Petersfield 1</i> – Priority C limit car access to town centres.  Priority H improve access at stations.  Priority L essential to reduce transport emissions.	Noted. Consideration of restrictions on movements of cars within town centres should be at more local level than this LTP.  Noted. Agree that this point needs to come across.  Noted.	No changes proposed for reason stated.  Reference to station travel plans and improving access to be added to Theme 3 supporting text or Priority H.  No changes proposed
<i>Resident of Farnborough 1</i> – consultation format too time consuming, designed to put people off responding.	Noted. This was not the intention. By dividing the LTP Strategy into six (concise) sections, this was intended to allow people to respond only to those sections of most interest to them.	No changes proposed
<i>Resident of Andover 2</i> – reducing speed limits only increases journey-time and leads to greater congestion.  Increased broadband speeds will only lead to more online shopping and therefore deliveries by road.	Noted. Priority C is about encouraging safer road user behaviour, and adherence to existing speed limits.  Noted. Fast internet availability also would enable people to work regularly from home, negating the need to travel to work, thus reducing congestion.	No changes proposed for reason stated.  No changes proposed for reason stated.
<i>Resident of Test Valley 1</i> – improve the quality of repairs to the road. Remove road furniture and signs from the highway.	Noted. Priority A will seek to invest in highway maintenance. Sign and street furniture de-cluttering is part of Priority K, and is re-iterated at Area Strategy level.	No changes proposed for reason stated.
<i>Resident of Fordingbridge 1</i> – Priorities K, M and N: rural as well as urban streetscapes need consideration.	Noted. Part B does take account of rural (M and N not just urban). Issues also addressed in Parts D and E. Priority K is likely to be applied mainly in new developments due to high cost of retrofitting principles to existing streetscapes (urban or rural).	No changes proposed for reason stated.

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to section in light of this comment
<p><i>Resident of Hayling Island 1</i> – need proper cycle network. Make footpaths dual use.</p> <p>20mph zones around schools.</p>	<p>Priority N seeks to invest in cycling improvements, which could involve shared-use paths.</p> <p>This is an option that could be progressed within future Implementation Plans.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Resident (unspecified location 5)</i> – Priority F: not just main routes could be grown but rural routes.</p> <p>Priority O: define premium public transport provision.</p> <p>Priority N: TAP's should each look to develop a comprehensive cycle network. Need for a study on feasibility of inter-urban cycle routes.</p>	<p>Away from main routes it is difficult to increase patronage of bus services, due to low demand.</p> <p>Agree that this is jargon that has not been explained.</p> <p>Noted. Consideration will be given to cycle network improvements as part of TAPs. This is too detailed to be included in an LTP Strategy.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p> <p>Explanation of what is meant by this to be added to O.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Hythe 1</i> – not enough on improvement to traffic flows through speed regulation.</p>	<p>Priority C covers speed management. This is for road safety reasons rather than to improve traffic flows.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reason stated.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Winchester 5</i> – Priority A: seeks clarification on definition of resilient and efficient.</p> <p>Priority D: again clarification sought.</p> <p>Priority E: question the need for this as a priority. Policy not technology is what's needed.</p> <p>Priority F: LTP fails to put sustainable public transport at the core of its priorities. Modal shift needs to be given greater prominence.</p> <p>Priority L: Climate change commitment needs to be given more than mere lip-service.</p> <p>Priority M: HCC should aim to make all roads safe for walkers and cyclists rather than try and segregate these off.</p> <p>Term sustainable development needs to be defined within the document.</p>	<p>Supporting text provides an explanation.</p> <p>Supporting text provides an explanation.</p> <p>Noted. HCC believes that technology is part of the solution.</p> <p>Noted. Emphasis given to sustainable transport is considered to be about right. Improving travel choice is important part of strategy.</p> <p>Climate change is taken seriously and is referred to in Parts A, B and C.</p> <p>Noted. Cycling improvements will take various forms.</p> <p>Agree that this would be helpful.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons stated.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons stated.</p> <p>A glossary will be provided, including a definition of this term</p>
<p><i>Resident of Winchester 6</i> – not enough on carbon reduction.</p>	<p>Noted. Level of emphasis accorded to carbon reduction (Priority L) is felt to be about right and pragmatic.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons stated.</p>

<b>Respondent name &amp; main comments (paraphrased)</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to section in light of this comment</b>
<i>Resident of Winchester 7</i> – Modal shift can be achieved by tactical investment in bus and cycle infrastructure in those areas where change is most likely.	Noted. HCC will work with bus operators through QBPs on main bus routes and concentrate investment in cycling infrastructure on urban areas with best potential for strong take up.	No changes proposed for reasons stated.

**Part C – Suggested amendments to draft LTP3 ‘Wider Challenges and Policy Context’ to be made in light of stakeholder and respondent feedback received through the consultation process**

**Q5: Do you have any comments on the content of Part C? Has anything important been omitted?**

<b>Respondent name &amp; main comments (paraphrased)</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to Policy Context section in light of this comment which (along with background context) will form a ‘chapter’ of LTP3</b>
<i>Hampshire Chamber of Commerce</i> – Part C Q5 needs to mention TAP’s and acknowledge how these input into the LTP	Agree with need for reference.	Add reference to Town Access Plans
<i>Transport Alliance</i> – emphasis on emerging LEP’s is essential.	Agree need for reference	Add reference to LEPs.
<i>Natural England</i> – LTP does not contain the evidence base upon which its assessment of the impact of travel on the natural environment is made.  Transport and health concentrates on impact of traffic rather than creating green corridors people would use. Wish to see a coherent strategy to promote healthy options such as walking and cycling, and promote green infrastructure networks linking with the countryside. How is ROWIP linked to LTP3?	Noted. This LTP is based on a wide range of existing research, government data, forecasts on future transport trends and growth of ports.  Noted. Green infrastructure is covered by LDFs and ROWIP HCC has decided to align LTP3 with ROWIP’s so while separate from each other they are complementary.	Additional text to be added on “How this LTP was developed”, which will cover evidence used in formulating the LTP.  Additional text to be added to Part B to explain how rights of way issues have been dealt with.
<i>East Hampshire District Council</i> – is the Hampshire Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) still maintained? Does the strategy address the increased demand for community transport by an ageing population. More emphasis needed on sustainable transport to school.	Yes. Links with SCS will be made more clearly in reworded chapter.  Yes – the ageing population is recognised in Part C, and in Part B Priority G. Other comment noted. This is already addressed by Part B, Priorities, I, M & N.	Links with SCS will be made more clearly in reworded chapter.  No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>Eastleigh Borough Council</i> – would like to see mention to Safer Routes to School & School Travel Planning. Would not wish to see this work compromised through lack of funding.	This is already addressed by Part B, Priorities, I, M & N. As well as continuing to fund through LTP, scope exists to include these areas within future Local Sustainable Transport Fund bids.	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>Fareham Borough Council</i> – could do more the promote walking, cycling and public transport.	Our view is that the current emphasis given to public transport, walking and cycling is about right (covered in Part B).	No changes proposed for reasons given.

<b>Respondent name &amp; main comments (paraphrased)</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to Policy Context section in light of this comment</b>
<i>Winchester City Council</i> – insufficient emphasis on rural areas and market towns. Does not meet needs of rural non-car users e.g. the young and elderly.	Our view is that the current emphasis given to transport and travel needs of rural areas given within the LTP as a whole is about right.	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<p><i>New Forest National Park Authority</i> – would like to see reference to protected landscapes under transport and the environment.</p> <p>LTP3 might consider priority for capital funding for areas such as the national parks which generate little development.</p> <p>HCC has not explained why ROWIP not integrated into LTP3.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>The allocation of capital funding is an issue that will be addressed within future Implementation Plans.</p> <p>HCC has decided to align LTP3 with ROWIP's so while separate from each other they are complementary.</p>	<p>Section on Transport &amp; the Environment to be amended to cover importance of protected landscapes.</p> <p>Text added to Part A to cover this.</p> <p>Additional text to be added to Part B to explain how ROW issues have been dealt with.</p>
<i>South Downs National Park Authority</i> – needs to acknowledge that SDNPA will be producing an LDF.	Agree need for reference.	Add reference under Planning & Policy Context.
<i>Associated British Ports (Southampton)</i> – “Transport & Economy” section of Part C should be amended to reflect the national economic importance of reliable transport infrastructure within Hampshire.	Accept that more detail about role of routes providing access to gateways is needed.	Add additional text on role of strategic inter-urban network to Parts A, B & C
<i>North Hampshire Enterprise Andover</i> – Plan should not neglect the needs of haulage and freight.	HCC is working on production of a Freight Strategy as a supporting document on LTP3, which will set out approach to all forms of freight including HGV's.	No changes proposed for reason stated.
<i>Confederation of Passenger Transport</i> – concerned by the implication that public transport is only for the old, vulnerable and disadvantaged.	Noted. Our view is that the text within Part C and the rest of the LTP does not imply this.	No changes proposed for reason stated.
<p><i>Campaign to Protect Rural England</i> – does not take account of the recreational and tourist use of transport.</p> <p>Would like to see local communities given greater control over local speed limits.</p>	<p>Noted. More emphasis of this role has been added to part E.</p> <p>HCC will consider the implications of the localism &amp; Decentralisation Bill which should clarify what powers can be delegated to parishes.</p>	<p>Additional text to be added to Part B Theme 3 referring to role of tourist coaches.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Policy Context section in light of this comment
<i>Hampshire &amp; IOW Wildlife Trust</i> – would like to see more than just climate change mentioned, e.g. air pollution, land take, fragmentation, lighting and noise etc.	Agree that a reference is needed. These issues are covered in more detail within the SEA Environmental Report and HRA Screening Report.	Brief reference to be made in Transport and Environment section to air pollution, land take, fragmentation, lighting and noise issues.
<i>South Downs Society</i> – Stern and DaSTS mentioned but not carried into LTP. Lack of commitment to climate change.  ROWIP needs to be funded through LTP3.	These documents are part of the policy context. The LTP itself reflects local priorities for Hampshire. Reducing emissions is one of these priorities in Part B (Priority L)  HCC has decided to align LTP3 with ROWIP's so while separate from each other they are complementary.	No changes proposed for reasons given.  Additional text to be added to Part B to explain how ROW issues have been dealt with.
<i>West Berkshire Council</i> – partnership working with other authorities should be acknowledged.	Agree. This reference would fit better in Part B rather than the Policy Context.	Part A text to be revised to pick up this comment.
<i>Railfuture Wessex</i> – lack emphasis on rail and parking at stations.	Noted. Part C is not the right place for this. Covered by Part B (Priority H).	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>New Forest Cycle Working Group</i> – not enough is made of cycling and cycling infrastructure.	Current emphasis given to cycling is about right.	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>CTC North Hampshire</i> – Part C contains no reference to cycling or walking.	Current emphasis given to cycling and walking is about right.	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>CTC Central Hampshire</i> – lack of priority given to cycling reduces it opportunity to contribute to sustainable travel.	Current emphasis given to cycling is about right.	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>Eastleigh Southern Parishes Older People's Forum</i> – omits reference to concessionary travel, dial-a-ride and hospital travel.	Agree that adding these references would be beneficial.	"Transport and Older People" section to be amended to include these aspects.
<i>WinAcc</i> – document states how it will adapt to changes in climate but does not mention how it will mitigate its climate impact.	Reducing emissions covered under Priority L	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>Winchester Friends of the Earth</i> – little appreciation of the impending imperatives, HCC seems to think when the economy improves it will be business as usual.	Noted. We disagree with this view. The text in Part A suggests that "business as usual" is not a viable approach.	No changes proposed for reasons given.

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Policy Context section in light of this comment
<p><i>Cllr Ashton (EHDC)</i> – companion document to Manual for Streets does nothing to provide engineering standards. More needs too be done to tackle the congestion caused by the school run. No mention of cycling to school and need for cycle facilities at schools.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Issues identified in Priorities I &amp; N (Part B).</p> <p>This is too detailed for Part C. Current emphasis given to cycling and walking in LTP as a whole is about right.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Comber (EHDC)</i> – no reference to horse riders.</p>	<p>This is too detailed for Part C.</p>	<p>Reference to equestrians to be added to Part E.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Roberts (RBC)</i> – why is strategy for sustainable development long-term? This needs to be put in practice now.</p> <p>HCC needs to investigate all potential revenue streams.</p>	<p>Noted. HCC is already working to encourage sustainable development through its' approach to climate change.</p> <p>Agree.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Additional text will be added to Part A to cover potential revenue streams.</p>
<p><i>Ellisfield Parish Council</i> – document tries too hard to please everyone.</p> <p>Economy - Question the inclusion of equality of opportunity in transport.</p> <p>CO<sub>2</sub> issue is inappropriate for local authorities, it is an issue for central government.</p> <p>Environment – again questions inclusion of carbon targets. And questions the science behind many of the statements.</p> <p>Safety - Where does the figure of a third come from?</p> <p>Doesn't want street lighting in the village.</p>	<p>Part C is about the policy context. The LTP as a whole is about delivering the right sorts of transport improvements to best meet the needs of Hampshire residents.</p> <p>There are statutory obligations to do this within the LTP.</p> <p>Carbon reduction targets have been set by Central Government. It is up to local authorities to work with others to seek to realise these.</p> <p>HCC view is that climate change is an issue that it needs to address through all plans and strategy documents.</p> <p>The figure comes from the Government's consultation document.</p> <p>Noted. There are no plans to introduce new street lighting within existing rural communities where it is not currently in place.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Policy Context section in light of this comment
<p><i>Ellisfield Parish Council (cont)</i> Quality of Life – more work needed on manual for streets approach.</p> <p>Equality of Opportunity – questions HCC’s approach to transport provision for the elderly.</p> <p>Feels transport is being conflated with welfare.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Covered by Priority K.</p> <p>Noted. This is not the intention.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Minstead Parish Council – Part C</i> only solution given to rural transport is community transport. As good as saying rural communities have to look out for themselves.</p> <p>More support needed for measures which will mitigate effect of the school run.</p> <p>Over reliance on technology to solve problem of carbon emissions.</p>	<p>Noted. Our view is that the current emphasis given to transport and travel needs of rural areas given within the LTP as a whole is about right - covered in Part B (Priorities G &amp; M)</p> <p>This is too detailed for Part C. Current emphasis given to cycling and walking in LTP as a whole is about right – Part B (Priorities I, M and N).</p> <p>Noted. The text in Part A about carbon takes a broader view.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Nursling &amp; Rownhams Parish Council –</i> does not include any real plans or timescales.</p>	<p>Noted. Future implementation plans will contain this information.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Old Basing &amp; Lychpit (Cllr Waller)</i> – need to re-instate service between Old Basing and Lychpit. Provision of easy access vehicles.</p>	<p>Noted. HCC continues to work in partnership with bus operators as set out in Part B (Priority F).</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Petersfield Town Council –</i> needs to tackle the issue of the school run.</p>	<p>This is too detailed for Part C. Current emphasis given to cycling and walking in LTP as a whole is about right – Part B (Priorities I, M and N).</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Liphook –</i> Feels East Hampshire is not given enough prominence in particular issues around Liphook.</p>	<p>Parts A to C deal with countywide common issues. Local East Hants issues are dealt with within the other sections; Central and New Forest – Part E (covering Liphook) and South – Part F.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent name & main comments (paraphrased)	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to Policy Context section in light of this comment
<p><i>Resident of Alresford</i> – does not support capacity increase of strategic network to accommodate future traffic increase.</p> <p>HCC needs to invest in dual carriageway roads between towns.</p> <p>Imposing speed restrictions of dual carriageway roads actually causes increase in carbon emissions.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>HCC is not planning investment in dual carriageway roads because it is both unaffordable &amp; unacceptable in terms of environmental impact.</p> <p>View noted. Evidence suggests that this is not necessarily the case.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Overton</i> – more needed to tackle speeding on rural roads such as fines.</p>	<p>Noted. Covered under Part B (Priority C)</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Andover</i> – plan does not take into account diminishing oil supply or increased demand in the future.</p>	<p>Noted. HCC is committed to both mitigating and adapting to climate change (which incorporates consideration of supply and demand of oil).</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Lyndhurst</i> – action needed to deter use of 4x4 vehicles such as increased parking charges.</p>	<p>Noted. Role of HCC is to improve travel choice, not to dictate what vehicles individuals should buy/ use. Larger private cars pay more road tax.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident (unspecified location)</i> – wrong to put climate change at the heart of decision when there is no agreement as to what climate change is.</p>	<p>Noted. HCC view is that climate change is an issue that it needs to address through all plans and strategy documents.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Romsey 1</i> – more education needed for cyclist and drivers to enable both to use the road network safely. Removing the need to build costly cycle infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted. As part of Part B (Priority C) HCC continues to support road safety education measures on Hampshire's road network. There is a role for continued investment in cycle infrastructure.</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Waltham Chase</i> – integrated transport between bus and rail.</p>	<p>Improving integration is addressed in Part B Priorities, E&amp;J</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Fleet 1</i> – people in Fleet rely on the car as the bus service is so poor. As it is not used HCC reduces provision thus reinforcing need of locals for their cars.</p>	<p>Noted. HCC continues to work in partnership with bus operators as set out in Part B (Priority F).</p>	<p>No changes proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p>Resident of Bramshill – no mention of horse riders.</p>	<p>This is too detailed for Part C.</p>	<p>Reference to equestrians to be added to Part E.</p>

<b>Respondent name &amp; main comments (paraphrased)</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to Policy Context section in light of this comment</b>
<i>Resident of Rushmoor</i> – clarify resilient Hampshire. Questions the emphasis on climate change.	Current text on resilience makes it sufficiently clear what this means. HCC view is that climate change is an issue that it needs to address through all plans and strategy documents.	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Basingstoke 2</i> – accept reality of increased car use and increase capacity.	Role of HCC is not to dictate how people should travel, simply to improve travel options and choices, to allow people who wish to do so to travel more sustainably.	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Alton 1</i> – many alienated from community transport by inaccessible or unavailable transport options.	Noted. HCC wants to work with the voluntary sector to improve community transport provision (Part B – Priority G).	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Winchester 2</i> – reduce town centre car parking.	Noted. This is ultimately the decision of District Councils as Local Planning Authority. Any such plans need to be taken forward as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF)	No changes proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Fordingbridge 1</i> – LTP3 should be postponed until central government publishes its plans for local government.	Noted. HCC has a statutory obligation to produce an LTP by 31 March 2011. HCC will consider whether to make changes in light of the Decentralisation and Localism Bill, when this is published.	LTP to be reviewed once Decentralisation and Localism Bill is published.
<i>Resident of Winchester 5</i> – Part C unrealistic. HCC still sees a future where things can only get better.	Noted. HCC has sought to balance the challenges ahead facing the economy environment and society.	No changes proposed for reasons given.

**Part D – Suggested amendments to draft North Hampshire Area Strategy to be made in light of stakeholder and respondent feedback received through the consultation process**

**Q7: Any comments on the suggested approach in Part D / has anything important been omitted?**

<b>Respondent &amp; Main Comments</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment</b>
<i>Transport Alliance</i> – would like to see flexible work patterns and integrated transport introduced.	This is covered in Part B by Priorities J and M. HCC is leading by example on flexible working and is encouraging this and innovative business-led solutions to travel in businesses as part of workplace travel planning.	Make reference to supporting workplace travel planning and interchange improvements as delivery options within "Growth Areas" section.
<i>Natural England</i> – Would like to see more detailed consideration on levels of future growth and the infrastructure to support this.  Would like to see grater emphasis on development of a multifunctional green infrastructure.  BAP priority habitats & species where close to the road network should be mentioned in the characteristics and challenges section.	HCC is working closely with Local Planning Authorities, who are at varying stages in the development of Local Development Frameworks (LDFs). This level of detail is best addressed by LDFs (which will include Infrastructure Delivery Plans).  Noted. Green Infrastructure is also covered by LDFs and Rights of Way Improvement Plans.  Noted.	No changes to this chapter are proposed for the reasons given.  References to role of Green Infrastructure to be added.  Additional reference to be made to these habitats in this section.
<i>Basingstoke &amp; Deane Borough Council</i> – would like to see mention of peak-time capacity problems on rural roads e.g. A339 A340 A33 A339 A287 and B3400	Accept that adding this reference would be helpful.	Make reference to this issue within Inter-Urban (roads) section.
<i>Hart District Council</i> – would like more detail on the planned locations of electric vehicle charging points and mention of School Travel Plans  HDC has yet to confirm Fleet as a centre of growth and the status of other towns (e.g Hook) within the Borough needs clarification.	Noted. School travel and Smarter Choices measures are included in Part B (Priorities I and M). This level of detail is too great for a long-term strategy. These issues will be covered in more local plans and programmes.  Noted.	No changes to this chapter are proposed for the reasons given.  Make changes to text to reflect this.

Respondent & Main Comments	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment
<p><i>Rushmoor Borough Council</i> – would like to see a strategy drawn up in partnership with adjoining authorities such as Surrey</p> <p>Reference to Aldershot and Farnborough TAP's needed</p>	<p>HCC has been consulted on Surrey LTP3, and has considered cross-boundary issues as part of this. Surrey and adjoining authorities to Hampshire were all consulted on LTP3.</p> <p>Agree with need for reference.</p>	<p>Review text to ensure cross-boundary issues in Blackwater Valley are properly acknowledged.</p> <p>Add these as delivery options.</p>
<p><i>North Hampshire Enterprise Andover</i> – Part D does not mention broadband improvements, which would enable staff to work at home</p>	<p>This is addressed in Part B of the Strategy (Priority M).</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Hampshire &amp; Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust</i> – clarity needed on how the DaSTS Thames Valley Study fits within LTP3</p>	<p>Accept that text on page 1 about this study needs updating.</p>	<p>Text in Challenges and Characteristics section to be revised and updated.</p>
<p><i>South West Trains</i> – would support improved station and bus/rail interchange facilities at stations as this will aid modal shift. Believes there are further opportunities for passenger growth at Grateley, Whitchurch and Overton.</p>	<p>Noted, HCC keen to play a supporting role in helping train operators to improve attractiveness of rail.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Confederation of Passenger Transport</i> - would like to see the issue of coach drop off points in Andover addressed</p>	<p>This is an issue of detail that is best considered by local plans &amp; programmes not a long-term strategy.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Campaign to Protect Rural England</i> – need greater emphasis on de-cluttering and shared space initiatives</p>	<p>Priorities noted. Emphasis on these within the chapter is considered about right. HCC is supportive of Manual for Streets principles – set out in Part B (Priority K).</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for the reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Reading Borough Council</i> – why is managed motorway programme a challenge and what role does HCC think it will have in this?</p> <p>Do inter-urban bus services include those to Reading?</p>	<p>The challenge is in terms of the Highways Agency (HA) being able to secure funding for such measures. The HA leads in developing programmes for the rollout of managed motorways, and considering ramp metering, but we can play a supporting role in the vicinity of junctions.</p> <p>Yes, the Aldershot to Reading via Fleet and Hartley Wintney (No. 72) and Farnborough to Reading via Yateley (No. 82) services.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for the reasons given.</p> <p>No changes to this chapter are proposed.</p>

Respondent & Main Comments	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment
<p><i>West Berkshire Council</i> – would support and be keen to work with HCC on the following issues: Reducing car dependency through public transport provision and smarter choices.</p> <p>Capacity &amp; Journey-time reliability on the M3 /A34</p> <p>Mitigation of impact of new development especially around Basingstoke &amp; West Berkshire. Improvements to inter-urban bus routes.</p> <p>Reduction to the impact of HGV's on rural communities.</p>	<p>HCC is happy to work in partnership with adjoining authorities and all interested partners.</p> <p>All other comments noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Winchester Friends of the Earth</i> – no reference to how public transport improvements are to be funded.</p> <p>Inconsistency of message / contradiction between improving journey-time reliability through capacity on M3 / A34 and commitment to climate change, reducing need to travel and modal shift. (same applies to capacity work to relieve bottlenecks)</p> <p>All growth should be weighed in terms of its sustainability.</p>	<p>The issues of funding of bus services will be addressed within future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p> <p>Improving journey time reliability whilst reducing carbon and need to travel are complementary not contradictory and reflect current Government policy.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Railfuture Wessex</i> – would like to see improved car parking capacity at stations.</p>	<p>Noted. Parking at stations is the responsibility of Network Rail working partnership with rail operators. The rail industry is pursuing improvements to parking at a number of stations.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>CTC North Hampshire representative</i> – within the characteristics and challenges section no mention is made to walking and cycling. Also not enough is done to promoted cycling as a viable travel option for shorter journeys.</p> <p>Also questions how low carbon vehicles tackles congestion.</p>	<p>Our view is that the current level of emphasis given to walking and cycling throughout the chapter is about right.</p> <p>HCC committed to improving alternative modes of travel, to offer a better choice for journeys.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed.</p>

Respondent & Main Comments	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment
<p><i>Rushmoor Cycle Forum</i> - the chapter should have more emphasis on removing barriers to cycling and walking and going further to make cycling and walking a positive experience</p>	<p>Our view is that the current level of emphasis given is about right and addresses this issue satisfactorily.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>CTC North Hampshire</i> – No mention on how cycling could meet principle challenges. Will Operation Restore involve provision of space for cyclists on the carriageway?</p> <p>No mention to cycling as an alternative to the car.</p> <p>Need for targets for reduction of car journeys and increase in cycling. Travel Plans should be extended to businesses schools and colleges.</p> <p>Greater emphasis on the specific needs of cyclists within the strategy.</p>	<p>Our view is that the current level of emphasis given is about right.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Approx 96% of State schools in Hants already have a travel plan. HCC is working with local businesses to encourage take up of workplace travel plans.</p> <p>Our view is that the current level of emphasis given is about right.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for reasons given.</p> <p>Make reference to this within the text in Part B.</p> <p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Hartley Wespall Parish Council</i> – make better use of current rail service. Need for station at Chineham and increased parking capacity at Bramley station.</p>	<p>Noted. HCC are in ongoing discussions with BDBC and Network Rail to seek to progress a new station at Chineham as a longer-term aspiration. Parking at stations is the responsibility of Network Rail working partnership with rail operators.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Mike Roberts (Rushmoor Borough Council)</i> – need for cross authority / boundary working. Need for multi-modal ticketing. Lack of movement on resourcing for walking and cycling.</p>	<p>Individual walking and cycling initiatives will be undertaken as identified through future LTP Implementation Plans. HCC meets periodically with neighbouring authorities to discuss cross-boundary issues. Other issues noted.</p>	<p>Text to be added stating HCC's commitment to ongoing partnership working with neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary issues.</p>
<p><i>Fleet Town Council</i> – LTP should support expansion of community transport. Add a junction onto M3 through Junction 4b Fleet Services.</p>	<p>Noted. Highways Agency would not support public access to/ from the HCC road network via Fleet Services.</p>	<p>No changes to this chapter are proposed for reasons given.</p>

Respondent & Main Comments	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment
<i>North Waltham Parish Council</i> – more cycle paths connecting urban and rural areas. Re establish bus service to Winchester. Emphasis on community transport.	Comments noted. Priority N (in Part B) sets out that cycle improvements will be primarily focused in urban areas, to maximise use and value for money. Community Transport can in many cases offer better value for money than conventional bus services in rural areas.	No changes to this chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Sherborne St John Parish Council</i> – integrated transport hubs. Increased journey-time reliability. Support community transport.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to this chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Fleet 1</i> – the impact of the Pyestock Megashed has been omitted from the characteristics & challenges section.	This is an issue of detail that would not be appropriate to cover within a high-level strategy document.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Bramshill</i> – need for greater emphasis on speed restrictions on rural roads. Quiet Lanes project?	Priority for delivery noted. Speed management is addressed within Part B (Priority C). Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Fleet 2</i> – increased working with neighbouring authorities needed. Reduce the impact of HGV's on rural roads.	Priorities for delivery noted. HCC meets periodically with neighbouring authorities to discuss cross-boundary issues. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Rushmoor</i> – instead of reducing speeds HCC should look into fencing off the pedestrians and cyclists from traffic.	HCC committed to road safety & making network accessibly to all users, in line with manual for streets principles, which includes at-street level crossing provision. Guardrails add to street clutter and guidance suggests less (not more) is best.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Basingstoke</i> – need for increased road capacity and quality. Also need for increased bus / cycle provision.	Priority for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.

Respondent & Main Comments	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment
<i>Resident of Yateley</i> – concentrate on removing bottlenecks to improve traffic flow.	Priority for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident (unspecified location)</i> – need to develop a more comprehensive bus network with improved quality and frequency together with real-time information.	Priority for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<p><i>Resident of Winchester</i> – too much emphasis placed on increasing capacity, e.g. M3 / A34</p> <p>Does not address how improvements to bus services are to be funded.</p>	<p>Level of emphasis accorded to this is considered to be about right. Junction is a bottleneck on a key Strategic National transport Corridor.</p> <p>The issues of funding of bus services will be addressed within future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	No changes to this chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Hythe</i> – need to restrict HGV lanes / overtaking to improve traffic flow.	Priority for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<p><i>Resident of Basingstoke 2</i> – BDBC should restrict further development close to M3.</p> <p>HCC should develop a parkway rail station to the west of Basingstoke and concentrate future development around it.</p>	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Farnborough</i> – need for better interchange between rail routes in Blackwater Valley.	Priority for delivery noted. Such an improvement would need to be subject to feasibility work by the rail industry, as initial view is that this scheme would not offer good value for money.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reason given.
<i>Resident of Overton</i> – like to see rail link to Heathrow.	Ultimately this is a decision for the rail industry to reach (train operators working with Network Rail).	No changes to chapter are proposed for reason given.

<b>Respondent &amp; Main Comments</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment</b>
<p><i>Cllr Cubit (BDBC)</i> – M3 J5-6 needs resurfacing with quieter tarmac to reduce noise.</p> <p>Reference to new link road between J7 M3 and A339 omitted.</p> <p>Need for a western train station at Worting Farm.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. New road links such as A339 to M3 J7 link could only be delivered if it was required to unlock new development. Otherwise it is anticipated that funding to deliver will not be available. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Radley (HDC &amp; HCC)</i> – mention is needed of worsening traffic in residential areas, issues with speed and density of traffic. Increased impact of parking around schools and school run traffic.</p> <p>Need to improve car and cycle parking at Fleet station, and provide a reliable bus service for both the urban and rural populations.</p> <p>Growth area of Fleet needs to include Church Crookham and surrounding villages.</p> <p>Need to agree FTAP</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Issues of speed and improvements to bus services are covered in Part B (Priorities C and F). Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>

**Q8: Of delivery options listed, measures that respondent would most like to see delivered**

<b>Respondent &amp; Main Comments</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment</b>
<p><i>Transport Alliance</i> – measure to reduce congestion and free up space for essential users such as haulage and bus should be increased and improved.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>North Hampshire Enterprise Andover</i> – need to reduce car dependency through improved public transport and smarter choices programmes.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Test Valley Borough Council</i> - Would like to see reference to "Delivery of Andover Town Access Plan" as a delivery option for Andover</p>	<p>Accept that this reference is needed</p>	<p>Add reference to Delivery of Andover TAP as a new delivery option.</p>
<p><i>Associated British Ports (Southampton)</i> – would like to see delivered those options which improve the strategic transport corridors.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>

Respondent & Main Comments	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment
<p><i>Basingstoke &amp; Deane Borough Council</i> – address capacity and flow issues between M3 J6 and Black Dam.</p> <p>Target congestion hotspots, measures to widen travel choice (workplace travel planning)</p> <p>New rail station at Chineham</p> <p>Bus network more needed to improve flow / journey-time reliability and information. Partnership working with operators important. A variety of transport options needed for rural transport.</p> <p>Mitigation of new development. Need to take account of possible development in more rural areas / settlements and mitigate impacts on transport network.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Rushmoor Borough Council</i> – infrastructure improvements to support Aldershot Urban Extension. Farnborough / Aldershot TAP's</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Campaign to Protect Rural England</i> – improve safety on the roads for all users.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Railfuture Wessex</i> – increase capacity on Andover-Basingstoke to London line.</p>	<p>Priority noted. Improvements to capacity of the rail network are primarily the responsibility of Network Rail.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Beech Parish Council</i> – improvements to stations and ticketing facilities. Mitigate impacts from new development.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Ellisfield Parish Council</i> – targeted measures to improve road capacity.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Longparish Parish Council</i> – reduce impacts of HGV's and support community transport.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>

<b>Respondent &amp; Main Comments</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment</b>
<i>Fleet Town Council</i> – do not agree that development should proceed before mitigation of transport impacts. Need to revise FTAP. Need to reduce impact of HGV's from Pyestock megashed.	Priorities for delivery noted. Strategy supports timely delivery of Highway mitigation measures will be implemented for Pyestock development. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Nursling &amp; Rownhams Parish Council</i> – Improve public transport.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Old Basing &amp; Lychpit Council</i> – need for better parking at Basingstoke station.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Silchester Parish Council</i> – support community transport, community travel planning, road safety and reduce impact of HGV's	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Monk Sherbourne Parish Council</i> – reduce impact of HGV's on rural roads.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Romsey</i> – investment in walking and cycling promoted through schemes such as Bikeability.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Fleet 1</i> – mitigation of impact of new development, improved capacity at bottlenecks, improved public transport, inter-urban bus link in North Hants.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Bramshill</i> – improve safety on rural roads and stop HGV rat running.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Fleet 2</i> – upgrade Farnborough & Fleet stations improve parking facilities.	Priorities for delivery noted. Responsibility for this lies with the train operator. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.

<b>Respondent &amp; Main Comments</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment</b>
<i>Resident of Kingsley</i> – capacity improvements at bottlenecks	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Bramley</i> – increase rail capacity on the Basingstoke to Reading corridor (new station at Chineham)	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Yateley</i> – improve capacity at bottlenecks and upgrade rail interchanges. More park & ride schemes.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Cove</i> – integrate cycleways with rail stations.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Andover 2</i> – improve capacity, support low carbon vehicles, support community transport, improve Andover bus and rail stations and improve streetscape and signage.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident (unspecified location 1)</i> – reduce adverse effect of HGV's and support community transport.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident (unspecified location 2)</i> – expand cycle network, promoted cycling as alternative mode of travel.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Winchester</i> – bus network options are un-ambitious and do not address issue of modal transfer	In HCC's view, bus network options are realistic, and reflect key role of private bus operators who run services on a largely commercial basis.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident (unspecified location)</i> – need to invest in construction of dual carriageways.	Noted. However, this suggestion would be both unaffordable and unacceptable in terms of environmental impact.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Andover</i> – reduce need to travel.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.

Respondent & Main Comments	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to North 'chapter' in light of this comment
<p><i>Cllr Radley (HDC &amp; HCC)</i> – peak traffic congestion and density major concern as well as traffic speeds and rat running.</p> <p>Need to improve several road junctions e.g. Redfields Lane, Bowling Alley, Windy Gap, Reading Rd South / Connaught Rd / Aldershot Rd, Oatsheaf Kings Rd / Fleet Rd Aldershot Rd / Sandy Lane / Gally Hill Crookham X rds.</p> <p>Encourage sustainable modes for school travel.</p> <p>Improve access and parking at Fleet, Hook and Winchfield stations.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Cubitt (Basingstoke &amp; Deane Borough Council)</i> – quieter road surface M3 reduce speeds on rural roads and improved safety for cyclists.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>

**Part E - Suggested amendments to draft Central Hampshire and the New Forest Area Strategy to be made in light of stakeholder and respondent feedback received through the consultation process**

**Q10: Any comments on the suggested approach in Part D / has anything important been omitted?**

<b>Respondent Comment</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment</b>
<p><i>Natural England</i> – would like to see reference to ‘improving quality of life’ as well as minimising adverse impacts from traffic.</p> <p>Amend ‘Protecting the rural areas on the fringes of planned major development areas’ to ‘protection and enhancement...’</p> <p>Reduction of car dependency should be extended over central Hants &amp; New Forest. Likewise managing transport impact within the National Parks should extend beyond them.</p>	<p>Quality of life references are addressed in Part B (Priorities K to L).</p> <p>Need to be realistic about what can be achieved with resources available. Current emphasis is pragmatic.</p> <p>Given limited resources, these need to be targeted where scope for modal shift is greatest. This is within urban centres and on main-interurban bus corridors.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>East Hampshire District Council</i> – Little mention made of non-motorised road users. Need to lower speeds to enable these groups to use them.</p>	<p>Our view is that the current level of emphasis given is about right.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.</p>
<p><i>New Forest District Council</i> – Should be cross referenced to the NFDC Sustainable Community Strategy and Core Strategy.</p> <p>Disagreed with the statement many rural communities are well served by a relatively extensive inter-urban bus network.</p> <p>Would like A31 acknowledged as the main strategic link east-west. Also need to highlight north-south journeys.</p>	<p>View noted.</p> <p>View noted.</p> <p>Point about A31(T) accepted. Strategic north south corridors have already been identified.</p>	<p>HCC will look at providing policy context to Chapter as an appendix or whether LDFs of 12 LPAs could be incorporated into Part C.</p> <p>Minor rewording to say “a proportion of” rural communities have such a service.</p> <p>Add reference to role of A31 as key East-West route.</p>
<p><i>Winchester City Council</i> - Alongside revision of New Forest Transport Strategy, explore scope for simultaneously developing a similar strategy for the South Downs National Park</p>	<p>SDNPA are likely to want to develop a National Park wide approach. HCC will work with them on this.</p>	<p>Add reference to provision of timely input into any future SDNPA-wide strategy</p>
<p><i>New Forest National Park Authority</i> - would welcome a further explanation in LTP3 of how LTP3 and the New Forest National Park Management Plan can relate to and compliment each other</p>	<p>Accept that more detail on how the two plans align with one another is needed.</p>	<p>Add paragraph of text to explain the relationship between the two plans.</p>

<b>Respondent Comment</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment</b>
<i>South Downs National Park Authority</i> – Need to identify East Sussex and Brighton & Hove as ‘neighbouring authorities’ as regards SDNPA.	Comment noted. This is Hampshire’s LTP3, and we do not consider these authorities to be neighbours.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Campaign to Protect Rural England</i> – initiatives proposed for the National Parks should be extended beyond them into the countryside at large.	Our view is that the current level of emphasis given is about right.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Campaign for National Parks</i> – need for greater emphasis on modal shift and sustainable travel both within and outside the National Parks.	Our view is that the current level of emphasis given is about right.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Associated British Ports (Southampton)</i> – greater recognition of the strategic national corridors running through this area.	Accept that more detail about role of routes serving/ providing access to gateways is needed.	Additional text on role of Strategic Inter-urban network M3 and rail main line as access routes to the three International Gateways to be added.
<i>New Forest Access Forum</i> – need to note that visitors come from other areas of Hampshire. Feel New Forest should be grouped with South Hampshire.	Comment noted. This chapter deals with a predominantly rural area, including two national parks and other AONBs, whilst the South Hampshire strategy area is predominantly urban.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>First Bus (Hampshire &amp; Dorset)</i> – not enough emphasis on how important this area is to South Hampshire area.	Comment noted.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Isle of Wight Council</i> – No reference made to Isle of Wight as a neighbouring authority – or importance of Lymington-Yarmouth ferry route as key means of access.	Accept this point.	Add reference to Isle of Wight as a neighbouring authority and access via Lymington – Yarmouth ferry.
<i>Petersfield Town Council</i> – nothing in the document to indicate how local communities will be able to contribute to or influence their local area.	HCC will await Decentralisation and Localism Bill and will consider its approach to community engagement in light of this.	Chapter to be updated if necessary in light of Decentralisation and Localism Bill
<i>CTC Central Hampshire</i> – it is unacceptable to exclude cycling as a choice. Cycling needs to be supported if it is not to be stifled. Only mentioned in context of Whitehill-Bordon Eco-Town.	View noted. There is scope to identify these modes as delivery options in this section.	Walking and cycling and travel planning to be added as delivery options within Winchester and Market Towns section.

<b>Respondent Comment</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment</b>
<i>New Forest Cycle Working Group</i> – reference needed to Strategic Cycle Network (Support and Funding)	Our view is that the current level of emphasis given is about right. Strategic cycle routes tend to be used predominantly for leisure purposes. HCC priority is to increase cycling in urban areas.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Bentley Parish Council</i> – too much emphasis on the South Downs National Park as this is separately managed. HCC needs to protect villages bordering the Park from initiatives benefiting the National Park which could effect them adversely.	Our view is that emphasis on South Downs National Park is about right. As this is a relatively new body set to take on some planning powers it will become increasingly important in the future.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Lindford Parish Council</i> – Document is vague. Are speed cameras to be retained? Rail link to Bordon / Whitehill?	Accept that more detail on this is needed – perhaps in Part B. Feasibility work is underway to look at whether rail link is viable and affordable.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Cllr Saunders (Alton Town Council)</i> – concerned by the lack of any reference to Alton.	Agree that chapter needs to set out which towns are “market towns”	List of names of towns that are “market towns” to be included to aid clarity.
<i>Ellingham Harbridge &amp; Ibsley Parish Council</i> – Highest priority to reduce traffic on all roads. Better public transport and measures to mitigate impact of the school run.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Longstock Parish Council</i> – community travel should be given a higher listing (rather than second to bottom)	Apart from the top 3 priorities all other priorities are given equal importance within LTP3	Check that point about equal weight to Priorities D through to P is sufficiently clear.
<i>Minstead Parish Council</i> – resident concerns with public transport. No mention made to cycling.	Community Transport can in many cases offer better value for money than conventional bus services in rural areas. References to cycling to be added under Winchester and Market Towns section. For residents in rural areas, cycling is not always a viable option for many journeys.	Walking and cycling and travel planning to be added as delivery options within Winchester and Market Towns section.
<i>Nursling &amp; Rownhams Parish Council</i> – congestion issues at Lyndhurst.	HCC acknowledges the congestion and journey time reliability issues in Lyndhurst and is actively working to mitigate these as far as possible.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.

Respondent Comment	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment
<i>Whitehill Town Council</i> – contradiction in the statement about emerging strategy and car use and deliverable growth etc.	HCC does not share this view. Partnership working with developers and the Local Planning Authority is essential to ensure that the development is as sustainable as possible.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Romsey 1</i> - no mention of walking and cycling in the market towns.	View noted. There is scope to identify these modes as delivery options in this section.	Walking and cycling and travel planning to be added as delivery options within Winchester and Market Towns section.
<i>Resident of Alton</i> – Rather than investing in new technologies re-install railway tracks. Also real-time bus information in town centres.	Provision of additional rail capacity is a decision for the rail industry. HCC will implement real time information where affordable and practicable.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Lymington</i> – noise reduction should be a key priority replacing noisy surface dressing with quieter surfaces.	Comment noted. HCC will continue to carry out surface dressing work where appropriate as this is considered to be a cost effective solution.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Burley</i> – Bus service top priority.	Comment noted. Provision of community transport solutions, such as shared-taxi services is the favoured approach in rural areas away from main bus corridors, as this offers better value for money.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Ringwood</i> – reduce number of cars in the New Forest through parking charges and introduction of Park & Ride.	Parking is the responsibility of District Councils and the Forestry Commission. Part B (Priority D) commits to delivery of park and ride solutions where appropriate. This is more aimed at urban centres than for large geographical areas such as the New Forest.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of New Milton</i> – adequate reasonably priced parking needed at stations. Too much emphasis on improving facilities rather than cutting volume of traffic.	Comment noted. Setting of car parking charges at rail stations is the responsibility of train operators and Network Rail. HCC will feed back your comments to them.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.

Respondent Comment	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment
<i>Resident of Fordingbridge</i> – instead of widening roads to accommodate lorries, make them narrower with cycle paths alongside and change the priority to favour walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Lowering the speed limit as well should make commuting through the forest less attractive.	View noted. Narrowing of roads is not considered to offer sufficient value for money. Casualty reduction impact will be the main criteria influencing whether or not to reduce speed limits.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given. The Forest wide speed limit will be considered as part of the review of the New Forest Highway Strategy.
<i>Resident (unspecified location)</i> – Lacks vision. Improve cycling and bus provision. Need for integrated reliable transport system.	View noted. The chapter covers these, and is reinforced by Part B (Priorities F, J and N).	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Winchester 1</i> – emphasis is wrong. Needs to be looking at how to reduce driving over the next thirty years.	View noted. There is scope to identify walking and cycling and travel planning as delivery options for Winchester and Market towns section.	Walking and cycling and travel planning to be added as delivery options within Winchester and Market Towns section.
<i>Resident of Winchester 2</i> – plan doesn't do enough to meet carbon reduction targets.	View noted. There is scope to identify walking and cycling and travel planning as delivery options for Winchester and Market towns section.	Walking and cycling and travel planning to be added as delivery options within Winchester and Market Towns section.
<i>Resident of Hythe</i> – reduce congestion on trunk roads and motorways.	View noted. The importance of addressing congestion and journey time unreliability is identified in the challenges section and highlighted in the section on the Strategic Inter-urban Network.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident of Winchester 3</i> – the market towns section should give higher priority to walking and cycling.	View noted. There is scope to identify these modes as delivery options in this section.	Walking and cycling and travel planning to be added as delivery options within Winchester and Market Towns section.
<i>Resident of Lyndhurst</i> – HCC needs to enforce the changes it has already brought in.	View noted. HCC works with Hampshire Constabulary to enforce restrictions	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Resident (unspecified location 2)</i> – would like to see something about improved parking.	The chapter identifies scope to improve use of parking in market towns through improved signage and Priority D of Part B commits to looking at scope for informal/ small scale Park and Ride.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.

**Q11: Of delivery options listed, measures that respondent would most like to see delivered**

<b>Respondent Comment</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment</b>
<i>Hampshire Chamber of Commerce</i> – increased parking at stations and integrated transport hubs.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Transport Alliance</i> – improved access to rail stations and implementation of Station travel Plans where appropriate additional car parking.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Natural England</i> – priority should be to enhance and preserve the areas biodiversity and the protected landscapes and conservation sites.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>East Hampshire District Council</i> – minimise impact of traffic on quality of life, especially in rural communities and market towns. Support tourism through public transport and Rights of Way improvements.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>New Forest District Council</i> – Road safety and casualty reduction schemes. Access to the Southern Waterside A236 improved journey time. Access to coastal towns New Milton & Lymington. Community transport for vulnerable households.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Test Valley Borough Council</i> – should refer to the Romsey TAP	Agree that this reference is needed. Romsey is within the South Hampshire Strategy area, so reference to all TAPs will be added to this strategy.	No changes to chapter are proposed
<i>Winchester City Council</i> – focus on maintenance. WTAP and the Market town TAP's. Smarter Choices programmes and partnership working.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>New Forest National Park Authority</i> – key options: closer partnership with neighbouring counties. Managing road network to protect / enhance areas rural character. Reduce sign clutter and support local tourism through public transport and ROW improvements.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>South Downs National Park Authority</i> – de-clutter signage & support local tourism.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.

Respondent Comment	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment
<i>Isle of Wight County Council</i> – partnership working with neighbouring authorities.	HCC recognises the importance of working closely with our neighbours on cross-boundary issues.	No changes to chapter are proposed
<i>Campaign to Protect Rural England</i> – tackle issue of freight transport on rural roads.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>First Bus (Hampshire &amp; Dorset)</i> – strategic inter-urban network. Support Quality Bus partnership.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Confederation of Passenger Transport</i> – drop off point in central Winchester not well policed in the evening to keep cars out. More prominent signage may help with this.	Enforcement of parking/ waiting restrictions including signage is the responsibility of the City Council. HCC will feed back your comments to them.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>Railfuture Wessex</i> – improved services for passengers, including car parks, ticket office, vending machines and over-crowding.	This is more the responsibility of train operating companies and Network Rail. HCC has limited influence over these aspects of service. HCC will feed back your comments to them.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>WinAcc</i> – does not address the DaSTS goal to reduce carbon emissions.	View noted. DaSTS goals are no longer current Government policy. Tackling carbon emissions is a major recurring theme within Parts A to F as a whole. Accept that sustainable travel needs more prominence in Part E.	Walking and cycling and travel planning to be added as delivery options within Winchester and Market Towns section.
<i>Winchester Friends of the Earth</i> – National Parks need for a 30mph limit on all non-trunk roads and noise, speed and volume controls on the A31. doubt that the freight routing journey planner will deliver. Does not support Park & Ride options for the market towns.	Priorities for delivery noted. Changes to speed limits will be considered using casualty reduction criteria. Views will be taken into account as part of development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed for reasons given.
<i>CTC Central Hampshire</i> – not satisfactory should reflect the needs of all road users.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.

<b>Respondent Comment</b>	<b>HCC response to comment</b>	<b>Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment</b>
<i>Ashurst &amp; Colbury Parish Council</i> – rural areas must be protected from urban sprawl. Non car owners must be helped.	Decisions about where development should take place are taken by Local Planning Authorities. A safety net of public transport and community transport services will support non-car owners	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Beech Parish Council</i> – transport strategy for Bordon essential included in this must be a rail link to London. Also support community transport and better broadband for rural areas.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Bentley Parish Council</i> – priority speed limits and rat running. Whitehill-Bordon direct link to Bentley Station should be considered. Enlarge strategic inter-urban network Bentley station car park.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Chawton Parish Council</i> – install pedestrian crossing at Butts roundabout.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Ellingham Harbridge &amp; Ibsley Parish Council</i> – disagree with options for the National Parks but generally agree with rural areas. Would like to see: further speed limit changes, support for community transport, reduction of rat running and issue of HGV's.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Lindford Parish Council</i> – support for community transport and road safety.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Liss Parish Council</i> – support QBPs on well used inter-urban routes. Adequate parking at railway stations. Improve access at stations. Possible direct link to Bordon / Whitehill.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Longstock Parish Council</i> – maintain network, support community transport, speed limit changes in rural areas deal with HGV routing through signage.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Melchet Park &amp; Plaitford Parish Council</i> – prohibit HGV's from rural roads.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.

Respondent Comment	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment
<i>Minstead Parish Council</i> – options for National Parks do not provide benefits for residents. Maintenance has to be priority. Support for community transport, high-speed broadband. Need to manage rat-runs and route HGV's away from unsuitable roads.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Nursling &amp; Rownhams Parish Council</i> – support Park & Ride schemes.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Cllr Saunders (Alton Town Council)</i> – need more accessible buses. Problem of rat running and HGV's on unsuitable roads, needs better signage. Integrated transport.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Cllr Lloyds (Hedge End Town Council)</i> – improve accessibility for those without cars.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Petersfield Town Council</i> – support for community / public transport.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Ringwood Town Council</i> – need for greater co-ordination with the HA.	Noted.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Whitehill Town Council</i> – transport solutions which deliver sustainable development in Whitehill Bordon Eco-Town. Need to reduce car dependency. Mitigate transport impacts of new housing growth. Importance of a transport strategy for the town. Issue of air pollution targets	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Romsey 1</i> – support accessible buses and community transport.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
Resident of Waltham Chase – maintain highway network.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
Resident of Alton – support sustainable transport initiatives. Stop granting planning permission to out of town developments locate jobs and services close to population.	Priorities noted. Local Planning Authorities are responsible for decisions over site allocation.	No changes to chapter are proposed

Respondent Comment	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment
<i>Resident of Four Marks</i> – use technology to route drivers away from urban congestion.	Priorities noted. The existing network of variable message signs to a large extent already performs this role.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of New Milton</i> – support public / community transport. Improve accessibility through high-speed broadband and mobile banks and libraries. Strategic inter-urban network. Parking at train stations.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Fordingbridge</i> – manage road network to preserve the rural character of the New Forest. Improved co-operation with Wiltshire County Council.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident (unspecified location 1)</i> – expand and promote cycling and cycling routes. Targeted measures to increase road capacity. Improved bus network.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Winchester 1</i> – limit car access to New Forest. Support community transport. HGV measures will provide ineffective. Clarify what is meant by improved access by all modes. Need integration between rail and bus services.	Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account in the development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident (location not specified)</i> – bring main rural roads up to dual carriageway standard.	Noted. However, this suggestion would be both unaffordable and unacceptable in terms of environmental impact.	No changes to chapter are proposed.
<i>Resident of Winchester 2</i> – options for Winchester & Market towns totally inadequate. Need to reduce carbon based transport. Options for Central Hampshire are weak when compared with the options set out for North & South Hampshire.	Noted. Away from main urban centres, this area is essentially rural in nature, and many journeys cannot realistically be made by non-car modes. Improvements to rural bus services away from main inter-urban routes do not offer good value for money.	Review “Winchester and Market Towns” section, to explore scope for additional measures that seek to reduce carbon, where affordable and practicable.
<i>Resident of Winchester 3</i> – invest in walking and cycling.	Noted. This could be given more prominence within “Winchester and Market Towns” section.	New delivery option of “improve walking and cycling networks” to be added in “Winchester and Market Towns” section.

Respondent Comment	HCC response to comment	Change to be made to chapter in light of this comment
<p><i>Resident of Winchester 4</i> – deal with the traffic congestion at Junction 9 of the M3. maintain and restore the road surface throughout mid Hants.</p>	<p>The Highways Agency currently has no plans to carry out improvements to Junction 9. HCC will continue to make the case for improvements as a longer-term aspiration. Operations Restore and Resilience will invest in highway maintenance improvements, which is one of the top priorities for LTP3</p>	<p>Will clarify in the text on “Inter-urban network” section the longer-term timeframe for Junction 9 improvements.</p>
<p><i>Resident of Lyndhurst</i> – enforced speed limits, enforced 6’6” width restrictions in conservation areas and rural minor roads. Road charging to prevent rat running. Measures already in existence are not enforced.</p>	<p>Priorities for delivery noted. Views will be taken into account as part of development of future Implementation Plans for the LTP. HCC works with the Police on enforcement issues.</p>	<p>No changes to chapter are proposed.</p>