

Consultation Statement on the Vision for Land North of the M3 at Junction 7
(including summaries of the consultation responses received and the council response).

This Consultation Statement comprises the following sections:

- 1) Consultation on the draft Vision: Who was consulted and how.
- 2) Summary of the results of the consultation.
- 3) Summary of the responses made by organisations and individuals in an official capacity and the officer response.
- 4) Summary of the responses made by individuals through the online survey and by email and the officer response.
- 5) Schedule of proposed changes to the draft Vision.

1. Consultation on the draft Vision: Who was consulted and how

1.1 The consultation on the draft Vision was held from 20 November 2020 to 15 January 2021 and involved the following actions:

- A specific briefing to local ward Members and parish councils in the vicinity.
- Ongoing engagement with Hampshire County Council (as highway authority), Highways England (as operators of the M3 and its junctions) and the Hospital Trust (in light of emerging proposals for a new hospital).
- A webpage on the Vision created on 20 November 2020, which attracted 3,192 views (excluding visitors who didn't accept the website cookie data collection) until the consultation closed on 15 January 2021.
- An online survey for residents and other stakeholders to provide their comments, with a booklet and paper survey available on request.
- A social media campaign over the course of the consultation, including posting into Basingstoke and local community Facebook pages. This was picked up by local groups, including local interest group SWAG (South West Action Group) who promoted this issue to those on their database.
- The distribution of posters and window postcards for shops to key locations in the vicinity of the vision area to highlight consultation.
- Consultation information to stakeholders such as parish councils, local amenity societies, statutory and technical consultees, landowners and members of the public.
- News releases, before and during the consultation, sent to the local media, specialist media, parish councils and community magazines and websites for sharing. These releases were sent on 4 August, 28 October and 20 November 2020 and 7 January 2021.
- Two local radio interviews with the council's Leader. The Basingstoke Gazette's Leader's column in December 2020 focused on the consultation.
- The autumn 2020 edition of Basingstoke and Deane Today referred to the upcoming work on the Vision. Another article in the spring 2021 edition will focus on the next steps.

2. Summary of the results of the consultation

2.1 There were a total of 285 responses to the consultation of which 251 were received via the online survey and a further 34 responses were received via email or post. Individuals made 264 responses and 21 were received from organisations and individuals in an official capacity.

2.2 The responses to the specific questions in the online survey are summarised as follows in Table 1:

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS IN THE ONLINE SURVEY				
Question	Response	Number (%)		
Question 1: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the concept of establishing a Vision for Land North of the M3 at Junction 7?	Strongly agree	87 (35%)	Agree	58%
	Tend to agree	57 (23%)		
	Neither agree nor disagree	17 (7%)		
	Tend to disagree	21 (8%)	Disagree	35%
	Strongly disagree	69 (27%)		
	Total		251 (100%)	
Question 2: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed Vision for Land North of the M3 at Junction 7?	Strongly agree	34 (13%)	Agree	31%
	Tend to agree	45 (18%)		
	Neither agree nor disagree	17 (7%)		
	Tend to disagree	42 (17%)	Disagree	62%
	Strongly disagree	113 (45%)		
	Total		251 (100%)	

2.3 In addition to the questions above, the online survey asked of the respondents:

- If they had any specific comments.
- What key issues should be addressed in addition to those set out in the Vision and why these additional issues are important.
- To suggest how the Vision could be improved.

2.4 A summary of the results of the online survey are set out in section 4 below together with an officer response.

3. Summary of the responses made by organisations and individuals in an official capacity and the officer response

3.1 Table 2 below summarises the responses made by email and the online survey by organisations and individuals responding in an official capacity together with the officer response.

TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES MADE BY ORGANISATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS IN AN OFFICIAL CAPACITY AND THE OFFICER RESPONSE		
Organisation	Summary of Comments	BDBC Officer Response
North Waltham Parish Council	The Vision should make addressing climate change and the needs of biodiversity its main priority.	No change. The Vision recognises that addressing climate change and biodiversity are key issues as set out in Vision principle two 'ensuring sustainable development and combating climate change' and principle four 'delivering a green infrastructure network'. These principles will ensure that development is sustainable.
	The principle of a Park and Ride facility is questioned given the amount of land needed and given that this approach may not future-proof transport planning.	No change. The proposed Transport Interchange and Mass Rapid Transit route with the scope for a Park and Ride facility are well located by the A30 corridor and Junction 7 of the M3. A Park and Ride facility would make an important contribution to encouraging visitors to the town centre to use public transport for the final part of the journey.
	Enlarging the existing hospital in Basingstoke would be more appropriate and convenient than locating a new hospital in the Vision area.	No change. The Vision provides a framework to enable the delivery of a state-of-the-art hospital as part of a wider Health and Wellbeing Campus in the event that health providers identify this area as the preferred location. The Vision does not prejudice the role of the health providers in the selection of the preferred location. The potential location of a health care facility by Junction 7 of the M3 would optimise the opportunities for accessibility and connectivity for a catchment population that extends beyond the Borough of Basingstoke and Deane to a larger part of north and mid Hampshire.
	There is concern over the proposed loss of countryside and the erosion of the rural identity of North Waltham	No change. It is recognised that the implementation of the Vision would involve the loss of an area of countryside. This has to be balanced against the need to provide for future needs for housing, employment, health and other types of development. The implementation of the Vision would include a robust green infrastructure network to ensure the retention of some key

		elements of the countryside. The designation of a Strategic Gap for North Waltham, located to protect the rural and historic setting of the village, would mitigate much of the impact on the village.
	Roads into North Waltham should be made 'access only' to prevent rat-running.	No change. Traffic management measures will be investigated as part of the preparation of planning documents and planning applications in due course.
North Waltham Parish Council contd	The Strategic Gap to the east of North Waltham should be extended to Popham Lane in the south, to the A30 in the east, to Trenchards Lane in the north-east, to Oakley Road to the north and to Steventon Road to the west in order to protect the rural and historic identity of the village.	No change. The Strategic Gap, as indicatively shown on map four of the Vision, does broadly follow the line of Oakley Road to the north and Steventon Road to the west. It is considered that there is no need for the Gap to include all the land as far east as Trenchards Lane: its current indicative location does allow for rural views towards the high ground to the east of the village to be maintained thereby protecting the setting of the village to the east. It is considered that there is no need for the Gap to include land as far south as Popham Lane: the Gap's current indicative location along Maidenthorn Lane allows the gap to protect against potential coalescence with Basingstoke which lies to the north east.
	The whole of the Strategic Gap by North Waltham should become a woodland with the suggested name of 'The Jane Austen Heritage Woodland'. This would be an exemplar of sustainable development and a reference point to the area's heritage. This woodland would protect the rural and historic identity of the village, enhance biodiversity, provide carbon-offsetting, enable public access to residents and visitors from the local area and further afield, promote tourism, and mitigate air and light pollution.	<p>The layout and the design of the Strategic Gaps will incorporate features that are appropriate to the character of the area, deliver robust green infrastructure and also ensure that they fulfil their intended function. Whilst there are elements suggested that are appropriate such as enhancing biodiversity, providing access, filtering pollutants and carbon offsetting, it is considered that planting the whole area as woodland may not be appropriate. For example, not all biodiversity habitats are compatible with woodland, and one of the characteristics of the area around North Waltham are open fields.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is recognised that the function of the Strategic Gaps for both North Waltham and Dummer would be enhanced by improvements to their landscape and biodiversity features and to public access. It is therefore recommended that additional wording be introduced to criteria (a) of vision principle three 'protecting local villages and heritage assets' to allow for the enhancement of the function of the Strategic Gaps where practical (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement). It is also</p>

		<p>proposed to clarify the key and labelling of map 4 of the Vision such that the notation represents the 'Potential Location of Strategic Gap' instead of referring to the 'Potential Strategic Gap'. This ensures consistency with other references to the Gaps in the Vision.</p>
<p>Dummer Parish Council</p>	<p>It isn't clear why this development is required in this area which is 4 miles from the facilities of the town centre and where there are significant infrastructure constraints. It isn't clear that the area is sustainable or that it will achieve zero carbon. Infrastructure constraints include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic using the M3 Junction 7, A303 and A30 and the roads and junctions around them has increased significantly since the development of Hatch Warren, Gabriel Park, Beggarwood including The Fairways and Longacre in the past 25 years. It will become more heavily used when the Hounsome Fields (750 homes), Basingstoke Golf Club (1,000 homes) and the Island Site (45 apartments) are built out. There will also be increased traffic from the Manydown development and the refurbished Leisure Centre. • The A30 route to the centre of Basingstoke is congested with multiple roundabouts and traffic lights controlled junctions and pedestrian crossings. The new Hounsome Fields roundabout will serve this development and the Golf Course. It is also expected to be the southern access to the homes on South Manydown, which is promoted by HCC and BDBC in the SHELAA. The Kempshott and Brighton Hill roundabouts are already running close to capacity. • Public transport to the Vision Area is limited. There are no cycle paths. Footpaths cross the Southwood junction but there is no pedestrian phase on this junction. • The Wayfarers Walk long distance footpath crosses the Southwood Junction. Other footpaths meet at this point and next to the Basingstoke Garden Centre. No land has been reserved for these footpaths. • The Thames Water sewage network for southwest Basingstoke converges at the Winchester Road roundabout on the ring road with this section of the sewage network is at 	<p>No change. The Vision recognises the expected increases in population in the future with an accompanying need for homes, employment and facilities, the opportunities presented by Land North of the M3 at Junction 7 and the importance of articulating the Borough Council's aspirations for this area. The locating of a Health and Wellbeing Campus and employment uses by Junction 7 reflects the need for these uses to have good connectivity by road to a wide part of the county and region. The provision of sustainable modes of transport such as Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) will enhance connections with the town centre. The pressures on existing infrastructure are recognised; the Vision allows for infrastructure to be upgraded as the planning and development of the area evolves.</p>

	<p>capacity and subject to blockages and spillage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The power network to the Vision area is supplied by SSE from the south routed through the Candover Valley. This route is subject to interruption. Power cuts have resulted in road accidents at the Southwood light controlled junction. • The water supply is from Southern Water. The supply is subject to pressure fluctuations and frequent leaks in the old pipes. A winterbourne runs from the Basingstoke Golf Club across the Southwood Junction and through the Vision area. It is identified as a Flood Zone by the Environment Agency. • Broadband service in the area is variable as in many rural areas. 	
Dummer Parish Council contd	<p>There is no clarification in the document of where any north south route to Junction 7 would cross the railway lines or what route would be used to access the Oakley station.</p>	<p>Partly agreed. It is agreed to amend criteria (b) of vision principle 5 to refer to the future provision of a new non-strategic local road connecting the A30 to the A339 across the railway line to the north (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement). The Vision provides a broad overview for the future of the area. More detailed planning and transportation studies in due course would inform the location of any railway crossing and access to Oakley Station.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 3.2. The Island site development, which is outside the Basingstoke SPB and was not in the Local Plans, is not included in this list of development. Neither is the Fairways housing development on Beggarwood Area N.</p>	<p>No change. Paragraph 3.2 only highlights the larger housing developments. The Island Site is referred to in Map one of housing led development sites west of Basingstoke.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 3.5. The Critical Treatment Hospital hybrid application was present in the Local Plan period. The new warehouse development is double any provision included in the Plan.</p>	<p>No change. The location of the health and wellbeing campus optimises the opportunities for accessibility and connectivity for a wide catchment population. The Vision does not prejudice the proper implementation of Policy EP1 of the adopted Local Plan which highlights the need for new storage and distribution uses within the Local Plan period.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 4.3: bullet 11. There is no mention of Brighton Hill or Kempshott roundabouts.</p>	<p>No change. This strategic aim of the Vision at paragraph 4.3 (11) is the “strengthening and investing in existing transport corridors to build upon the area’s strengths in terms of connectivity”. The Vision provides a broad overview. The potential improvement of Brighton Hill or Kempshott roundabouts would be investigated as part of more detailed transport assessments in due course as the planning of the Vision area evolves.</p>

	Vision principle one: (d) The definition of “existing communities” is unclear. Local villages must be protected.	No change. Vision principle one (d) states how “Development should be well integrated with existing communities in south west Basingstoke, where suitable”. It is considered that this reference to south west Basingstoke is acceptable given the high level, strategic nature of the Vision. How development in the Vision area could integrate with surrounding communities would be investigated as part of more detailed studies in due course as the planning of the Vision area evolves. The protection of the local villages is addressed in vision principle three ‘protecting local villages and heritage assets’.
Dummer Parish Council contd	Vision principle four: (c) There are no “ponds and streams”.	Agreed. Vision principle (VP) 4 (c) is to be amended to remove the reference to ponds and streams (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
	Vision principle five: (e) Congestion and weaving are problems on the M3/A33 bifurcation.	No change. It is considered that the existing reference to “traffic weaving issues relating to Junctions 7 and 8 of the M3” in VP5(e) provides a suitable context for future studies.
	Vision principle five: (h) Walking and cycling routes to central Basingstoke will be unattractive to most users due to the 165m ridgeline, 80m above the centre of Basingstoke.	No change. The slopes involved in cycling between the Vision area and the town centre are recognised. But attractive cycle paths along this route would be expected to be used and contribute to sustainable forms of transport.
	Vision principle five: (i) The Wayfarers Walk and the rural footpath network and their surroundings must be protected.	No change. The protection of the setting of the footpath network is addressed by VP5(i).
	Vision principle six: (a) This area will be unattractive for older residents unless there is significant provision of local facilities.	No change. A significant level of local facilities would be required as set out in criteria (b) and (d) of VP6.
Hampshire County Council	<u>Local Highway Authority</u> Criteria (a) of vision principle five (VP5) ‘improving connectivity’ should refer to a ‘public’ transport interchange.	No change. Until detailed transport assessments are undertaken then it is not possible at this stage to determine that the interchange would only serve public transport. For example, the Interchange may include a Park and Ride facility.
	Criteria (a) of VP5. A note of caution is sounded on the inclusion of connections to surrounding villages given uncertainties over the coverage of future bus and Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) services.	No change. It is too early to discount the improvement of bus services to surrounding villages which may, in any event, not involve MRT. The ‘sustainable connections’ mentioned in the criteria would be expected to include the improvement of walking/cycling routes.
	VP5. Insert ‘and its junctions’ in reference to MRT on the A30 and cross-refer to the MRT Vision and Transport Strategy documents.	Agreed to refer to the A30 junctions in criteria (c) of VP5 (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement). Cross references to the MRT Vision and Transport Strategy are not necessary at this point given the strategic nature of the Vision. Reference is made

		to the Transport Strategy in respect of tools to assist with delivery, as set out in Section 6 of the Vision.
	Criteria (e) of VP5. The reference to the short weaving distance between J7-8 of the M3 is supported. This reference should also mention 'safety' and that these issues will be addressed in partnership/liaison with developers and Highways England.	Agreed to refer to 'safety' in criteria (e) of VP5 and that these issues will be addressed in partnership with Highways England and developers (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
Hampshire County Council contd	Criteria (h) of VP5 should refer to cycle routes and pedestrian footways being segregated where possible. Reference should be made to the HCC draft design principles for walking and cycling (to be published as part of Local Transport Plan 4) along with the recent Local Transport Note 1/20 to provide further clarity on the expectations of the infrastructure provision.	No change. The vision already refers to the routes being segregated. It is recognised that such routes bring significant benefits compared with facilities shared with pedestrians. However, it is considered there is no requirement to refer to detailed design guidance and other documents in this vision, which is intended to provide a higher level overview.
	Criteria (j) of VP5. Exploration of the role/use of heavy rail is supported but it must be done so with other competitive modes such as MRT in mind.	No change. Comments noted.
	There is no reference to off-site/wider Basingstoke transport improvements that may be required as a result of major development in this location such as the town railway station requiring a significant upgrade to cater for the rising demand in MRT/public transport. In turn there are implications for public transport infrastructure. For example, Eastrop roundabout would need to be remodelled to ensure priority for the MRT system to reduce delays and congestion.	No change. These comments are noted but are more appropriately addressed within the context of any future planning documents which address the wider borough and town centre. The Vision is a high level aspirational document which focusses on land north of the M3 at Junction 7. Mass Rapid Transit routes are expected to focus initially on links to the town centre. There is likely to be long term scope for other MRT routes as infrastructure is provided.
	The Vision would benefit from referring to the longer term need to link land south of the railway to that at North Manydown via a formal crossing of the railway line in accordance with the County Council's draft interim transport position for the west of Basingstoke.	Agreed to amend criteria (b) of vision principle 5 to refer to the link across the railway line to the north as this is part of the future transport network connecting to the Vision area (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
	The highway authority considers it unlikely that a strategic relief road/ bypass providing a sub-regional transport function will be required connecting the A30 with the A339 albeit. This would need to be revisited in subsequent local plan transport assessment work if there is a significant change in the scale of growth within BDBC or within other regional growth plans such as Winchester and West Berkshire. The Vision would nevertheless benefit from referring to the future provision of a new non-strategic local road connecting the A30 to the A339 for	Agreed to amend criteria (b) of vision principle 5 to refer to the future provision of a new non-strategic Western Link Road connecting the A30 to the A339 given that this is part of the future transport network connecting to the Vision area (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).

	development generated traffic.	
	The Vision would benefit from referring to how it proposes to address the likelihood of significant adverse traffic impacts on the local highway network, especially on the A30 and also with reference to the longer term improvements which are likely to be required at the Fiveways junction. A suitable multimodal and sustainable mitigation package should incorporate MRT priority into junction improvements, allow sufficient land for public transport/MRT lanes, and provide segregated cycling and walking facilities on the A30 as well as addressing other points of stress on the network.	No change. Criteria (e) of vision principle 5 is already proposed to state that “Reducing the need for travel and transport solutions for the area will limit the traffic impact on the local highway network and surrounding villages and will focus on using the appropriate parts of the local and strategic network for trips. Detailed transport assessments to be undertaken in the future will address how this can be achieved.
Hampshire County Council contd	Vision principle two ‘ensuring sustainable development and combating climate change’ could be enhanced by referring to sustainable development and movement principles such as: 15 minute walkable neighbourhoods; low traffic neighbourhoods, car free zones; neighbourhoods with ‘filtered permeability’ where traffic is filtered round a core network of main streets only and other streets are permeable to pedestrian and cyclists only, thus providing priority for non-car modes.	Agreed to address this issue by amending criteria (e) of vision principle 6 ‘creating a place for all’. Criteria (e) will refer to providing priority for walkable neighbourhoods albeit that the ways in which this could be done would be established in later planning documents (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
	<u>Local Education Authority</u> The County Council notes Vision principle six ‘Creating a place for all’ which includes criteria (b) “Provide supporting infrastructure to meet the needs of the local community including schools, community centres, sports pitches and other leisure facilities”. School places within any new residential development should be provided in the right location and at the right time which may be through the provision of new schools or the expansion of existing schools. Developer contributions towards the provision of additional infrastructure will be required whichever option is the most appropriate way of delivering new school places. Early discussion on educational provision is essential to ensure success in providing the correct quantum of school places to reflect the needs of the development. Regard must be had to the Children’s Services policy on school size to ensure the success of the schools provided.	No change. Comments noted.

	<p><u>Countryside Service/Public Rights of Way</u> The Countryside Service is supportive of establishing a Vision for the land at Junction 7. The Vision area includes or is connected to a number of Public Rights of Way (PROW) including footpaths and a number of important bridleways (including Roman Road), and the Wayfarers Walk long distance route managed by Hampshire Countryside Service. This access to the countryside connects a range of Sites of Nature Conservation Interest including key habitats designated for rare arable weeds and woodland sites, as well as a Roman Scheduled Ancient Monument. It should also be noted that Hampshire Estates are landowners of farmland in the north of the vision area.</p>	<p>No change. Comments noted.</p>
<p>Hampshire County Council contd</p>	<p>The vision is in line with the four strategic aims of the County Council Strategic Plan that Hampshire maintains strong and sustainable economic growth and prosperity; people in Hampshire live safe, healthy and independent lives, enjoy a rich and diverse environment and enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities. The vision also aligns with the Countryside Service Strategy and the vision that every person in Hampshire will have a lifelong active and emotional connection with the countryside, a love of nature and a desire to protect and support its recovery and the mission to inspire people to connect with and actively enjoy the countryside balanced with making space for nature to thrive.</p>	<p>No change. Comments noted.</p>
	<p>The vision does not currently appear to give enough importance to the conservation of the natural and historic environment and the protection and enhancement of the existing and wider green infrastructure. In order to combat climate change and protect local villages, the County Council suggest more weight should be given in the vision to the protection, conservation and enhancement of these existing resources. According to the Basingstoke Green Infrastructure Strategy, the vision area has better access to natural green space than other areas in the borough that the countryside service consider should be conserved and improved to ensure any development would result in demonstrable environmental gains. Subject to more importance being placed on valuing and conserving the</p>	<p>No change. The Vision already attaches great weight to the need to protect and enhance the environment. The following vision principles (VP) contain an extensive number of criteria which protect and enhance the environment: VP2 'ensuring sustainable development and combating climate change'; VP3 'protecting local villages and heritage assets'; and VP4 'delivering a green infrastructure network'.</p>

	landscape, green and biodiversity infrastructure, ecology, and the historic environment to improve the environment and ensure sustainable development, the countryside service are happy to support the aims of vision.	
Hampshire County Council contd	<p>The Basingstoke Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies an Ancient Woodland Network in the south west of the study area which is designated for biodiversity and as main connective corridors for Ancient Woodland priority areas for woodland management and prospective connective areas for the ecological enhancement of woodlands, heathland, grassland and rivers. The countryside service suggests the vision should include reference to this Ancient Woodland Buffer and the policy and supplementary planning guidance provided by BDBC Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD and the Green Infrastructure Strategy, both adopted in 2018.</p> <p>The opportunity to enhance the unique PROW network of historic tracks and quiet roadways from which the historic and natural environment is accessed and enjoyed must be sensitive to the need to conserve the existing interconnected network of habitats and corridors. The vision should respect and build upon the special qualities of the area and ensure future changes do not negatively affect the amenity of existing users and communities whilst also providing for a net enhancement alongside addressing climate change. The countryside service therefore suggests the need to avoid negative impacts, mitigate development and opportunities for enhancement should be further considered in the vision, taking account of the green and biodiversity infrastructure resources and landscape sensitivity of the vision area.</p> <p><u>Public Health</u> Public Health support: that climate change is being put at the centre of this vision; proposed developments that have clear links to health improvement including high quality homes with access to green spaces and a new health and wellbeing campus; the promotion of biodiversity and a green infrastructure network; the inclusion of sustainable development and environment as a key strategic aim; and the key role of sustainable forms of travel.</p>	<p>No change. The presence of the Ancient Woodland Network is noted. Vision principle 4 ‘delivering a green infrastructure network’ already mentions semi-natural ancient woodlands and provides a good framework for protecting these areas. The high level strategic nature of the Vision would not benefit from detailed references to planning guidance which are more appropriately mentioned in planning documents.</p> <p>Agreed to address this by amending criteria (i) of vision principle 5 to explain that walking routes will be enhanced so to benefit from the green infrastructure resources and landscape quality of the vision area (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).</p> <p>No change. Comments noted</p>

<p>Cllr Diane Taylor (BDBC)</p>	<p>A key issue is the connectivity of this area to the rest of Basingstoke. We cannot get anywhere with this unless the roads issue is addressed first and urgently. There will soon be no land left to the north of the railway line for a road link to be situated. This is one area where we cannot afford to let HCC play "catch up" with development. I fear that, with the stage of development of North Manydown, we might already be too late. I am delighted that this vision is being formulated. However, we have to be focused and determined to see it come to fruition - officers, councillors and residents - and be bold in rejecting proposals that are not in keeping with the vision. Let's take on the Government if necessary and show some courage and determination to enhance the reputation of our town and give it a Gateway to be proud of. Junction 7 of the M3 is already a tricky area and vehicles travelling north and exiting at this junction have a difficult manoeuvre to make, crossing traffic entering from the previous junction. If this is to be a major Gateway to Basingstoke, this has to be improved. There should be no development of land either side of the A30 until Junction 7 has been re-worked. Rather than concentrating on improving the A30, we should be looking at ways to create new roads off the M3 to access developments.</p>	<p>No change. It is agreed that transport capacity is a key issue. A comprehensive approach to the transport infrastructure of the area, including highway capacity and links to the north of the Vision area, will be prepared alongside future planning documents and planning applications.</p> <p>No additional references to improvements to Junction 7 of the M3 are proposed given that the Vision already includes: Key Strategic Aim no. 12 of the Vision which is "Ensuring a safe and convenient local and national highway network, working closely with Highways England to facilitate the delivery of new strategic infrastructure relating to the M3, if required"; criteria (c) of vision principle 5 refers to improvements to motorway junctions; and map four of the Vision indicatively highlights potential improvement works to Junction 7 of the M3.</p>
<p>Maria Miller MP</p>	<p>This Vision should be part of the new Local Plan Update process and not an ad hoc piece of work. This new Vision document includes one of the two possible locations for a brand new Hospital, part of the Government's National Hospital Investment Programme. Any consideration of this additional development at Junction 7 cannot proceed until the Hospital site has been finalised to avoid impeding the progress of a major national government policy programme. This has been identified as a possible Hospital site by the ambulance service because of access to the road network. Any other proposals would have to fully mitigate additional road congestion on the M3/J7, M3/J8/A303 and on local roads. Highways England have confirmed that no such work to reconfigure J7 and J8 has been undertaken, planned for, or budgeted for in the current planning period. Furthermore, there is vacant warehouse space available elsewhere in the Borough which negates the need for a rushed</p>	<p>Partly agreed. The Vision provides a framework to enable the delivery of a state-of-the-art hospital as part of a wider Health and Wellbeing Campus in the event that health providers identify this area as the preferred location. The Vision does not prejudice the role of the health providers in the selection of the preferred location. The potential location of a health care facility by Junction 7 of the M3 would optimise the opportunities for accessibility and connectivity for a catchment population that extends beyond the Borough of Basingstoke and Deane to a larger part of north and mid Hampshire.</p> <p>The Vision is not a statutory planning document. It articulates the Borough Council's aspirations for this area to provide clarity to nearby communities, service providers and partners on the opportunities that this area provides and what the important components are to create a successful place.</p>

	<p>consultation process which has the potential to jeopardise a national government policy project.</p>	<p>Detailed work on highway capacity, prepared alongside future planning documents and planning applications, will establish a comprehensive approach to the transport infrastructure of the area and ensure good access to any future hospital.</p> <p>It is proposed to replace references in the Vision to a potential distribution and logistics hub with broader references to employment uses. This would not preclude the potential for a distribution and logistics use in the Vision area if this was considered acceptable in detailed planning terms. Map four only recognises the location of the current application for warehousing.</p>
<p>Hampshire Hospitals Foundation Trust (HHFT) on behalf of Hampshire Together</p>	<p>The Trust (HHFT) welcomes the proposed Vision and the concept of taking a strategic and coordinated approach to the future planning of this potential major growth area to the south west of Basingstoke. In its response to the Issues and Options Consultation on the Local Plan Update, HHFT explains in detail the Modernising our Hospitals and Health Services (MoHHS) Programme which includes the provision of a new Hospital as part of a health care campus. As set out in that response, two site options have been identified for the health campus and one of these is within the area covered by the draft Vision. The Trust therefore welcomes the various references to the health and wellbeing campus in the draft Vision, in particular the key strategic aim under 'Economy and Infrastructure' of supporting the scope for a state of the art hospital on a wider health and wellbeing campus. The Trust agrees with Vision principle one and the need for high quality transport links if new health facilities are located in this area.</p> <p>The Trust agrees with the Strategic Aims and the Principles for Growth. With reference to the spatial representation (Map four) it is important that the location of a health and wellbeing campus optimises the opportunities for accessibility and connectivity for a catchment population that includes not only the Borough of Basingstoke and Deane but also a total population of 560000</p>	<p>No change in response to the specific comments of the HHFT whose comments are noted. No change is proposed to reduce the extent of the Strategic Gap with North Waltham as shown in map four. The Gap as currently proposed enables the landscape and historic setting of the village to be protected. The Gap is shown illustratively; its precise boundaries would be drawn up in due course as the more detailed planning of the Vision area evolves.</p> <p>However, it is proposed to move the Transport Interchange, as indicatively shown in map 4, to the north east to be nearer Junction 7; the Interchange would occupy a portion of the land shown in the draft Vision for the Health and Wellbeing Campus. To compensate for this, the previously shown illustrative location for a Transport Interchange would be occupied by part of the Health and Wellbeing Campus. These alterations would not affect the potential location of the Strategic Gap by North Waltham (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).</p>

	<p>covering a larger part of north and mid Hampshire.</p> <p>The Trust commends the Borough Council for the timely publication of the draft Vision and for the strategic approach which it is taking to ensure that the area is developed comprehensively and to the highest standards. It supports the principles of high quality, sustainability, protecting local villages, delivering green infrastructure and improving connectivity. These principles would apply to the development of a health and wellbeing campus in this location if it is eventually the selected option.</p> <p>The Trust supports the principle of protecting the local villages and their separate, historic identities and agrees with the principle of maintaining appropriate strategic gaps. It questions, however, whether, based on initial assessments of the area within which a health and wellbeing campus is indicatively shown, the extent of the gap with North Waltham might be excessive.</p>	
Highways England	<p>Highways England is concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network (SRN), in this case the M3 and, in particular for this consultation, Junction 7 and 8 of the M3 and the M3 between them due to the existing weaving issues. The vision recognises the existing weaving issue that exists on the M3 between Junctions 7 and 8 and that it needs to be resolved, which will require ongoing discussions with Highways England to progress any potential solution. The vision for the land at M3 Junction 7 needs to ensure that it does not stifle potential future improvements to the M3 and its junctions 7 and 8 by developing land that could be required to make those improvements viable.</p> <p>Overall, in accordance with national policy, Highways England looks to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council to promote strategies, policies and land allocations that will support alternatives to the car and the operation of a safe and reliable transport network. We would be concerned if any material</p>	<p>No change. Comments noted. The Borough Council is mindful of the need to fully assess the cumulative impact of traffic from new developments on the M3 and wider road network as plans for the area evolve. It is the intention to continue with the close working relationship that exists with Highways England and Hampshire County Council to consider this issue in more detail.</p>

<p>increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN or at its junctions because of planned growth within the borough, without careful consideration of mitigation measures. It is important that the Local Plan provide the planning policy framework to ensure development cannot progress without the appropriate infrastructure being in place.</p> <p>When considering proposals for growth, any impacts on the SRN will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible. We will support a local authority proposal that considers sustainable measures, which manage down demand and reduce the need to travel. Infrastructure improvements on the SRN should only be considered as a last resort. Proposed new growth will need to be considered in the context of the cumulative impact from already proposed development on the M3. As the Local Plan is developed it is important that any essential infrastructure required to deliver proposed allocations within the plan is identified. It would need to be demonstrated that there was a reasonable prospect of delivery of the infrastructure that is relied upon, otherwise there is a risk the Local Plan would not be sound.</p> <p>When identifying the preferred strategy for the spatial options, consideration will need to be given to assessing the cumulative impact of new sites that might be taken forward together with already planned growth in Basingstoke on the SRN. We welcome further dialogue on potential growth options particularly any site or sites around M3 Junction 7. When considering proposals for growth, any impacts on the SRN will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably practicable. As previously stated, we will support proposals that consider sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduces the need to travel. Infrastructure improvements on the SRN should only be considered as a last resort. Proposed new growth will need to be considered in the context of the cumulative impact from already proposed development on the M3. We look forward to discussions to ensure that the impacts to the SRN from</p>	
--	--

	proposals are fully considered and that an appropriate package of mitigation measures are identified. It is recognised that the proposed Local Plan will play an important role in delivering planned growth in Basingstoke.	
Network Rail	Network Rail very much welcome the inclusion of 'Vision Principle 5' relating to improving connectivity as this aligns with their ongoing strategic work investigating how the railway can better serve and connect communities. In 2021, Network Rail will commence a passenger capacity study and a freight capacity study. This will need to take account of the expected growth and demand for rail services that developments such as that in the Vision area will bring and how that will impact the service provided at Basingstoke station and how the station can be enhanced to accommodate the growth in passengers. The passenger study will also investigate how an additional service can be accommodated on the West of England Line to Salisbury which will provide an opportunity to further analyse the impact of a new station at Oakley.	No change. Comments noted. The Borough Council looks forward to on-going close working with Network Rail and other partners in the rail industry.
South Western Railway	South Western Railway (SWR) welcomes that the focus will be on promoting sustainable links to meet the 2030 climate target and give genuine alternatives to using the car. SWR is keen to work with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council to deliver the objectives of 'Vision Principle 5 and Vision Principle 6' to meet the needs of the proposed developments by ensuring that good public transport is in place. SWR has been delighted to work with the council and other key partners (such as Network Rail) in looking at a Masterplan for Basingstoke station and the surrounding areas and believe that this consultation will take the principles of supporting public transport to a wider area. We would like to continue this on-going dialogue with the Borough Council and partners especially on 'Vision Principle 5' in order to identify the opportunities for the Mass Rapid Transit and connectivity to Basingstoke station as well an evaluation on the effect on the train timetable of a proposed new station at Oakley or an upgrade of existing station such as Overton.	No change. Comments noted. The Borough Council looks forward to on-going close working with South Western Railway and other partners in the rail industry.
Cycle Basingstoke	The Vision is fine in principle, but is unlikely to be realised with respect to cycling as it depends on the (non) existing	No change. Comments noted. The Vision proposes a high-level aspiration for this area. As the planning of the area evolves, more

	<p>infrastructure. Detailed strategic planning and funding is required for success which must include a traffic management system to deal with the anticipated additional 13,000 cars on the existing road system within the next 10 years. Whilst we agree with the emphasis on sustainable forms of transport including cycling, the wording in the Vision is aspirational and there is a lack of specifics.</p> <p>Ribbon development and the siting of a major employment centre (hospital) on the periphery of the town far from the rail station will discourage cycle access, especially in the absence of any direct routes into town or elsewhere. Increased traffic on local roads will make travel by bike dangerous and unattractive. The siting of both the hospital and the distribution centre at junction 7 will discourage human powered transport but facilitate and necessitate the use of motorised transport putting further stress on traffic congestion on the M3. The proposed network of new roads will not help people to cycle instead of taking the car. This is not planning but reacting to pressure from developers. The potential strategic gap should read essential strategic gap.</p> <p>The cycle route map looks good but is deceptive. The routes shown are of poor quality, circuitous, on poor surfaces, not continuous and only suitable for occasional use not for regular travel, for example to work, to school or the shops. It needs to be improved to be of any benefit. A cycle audit and cycle map showing planned improvements is needed. This must be implemented before further building goes ahead. There is no mention of how the MRT route will provide direct cycle connections. There is no mention of e-cargo bikes for local deliveries or e-taxi bikes. These would be particularly attractive if the distribution centre were in a more central location for last mile deliveries.</p>	<p>detailed proposals will be put forward to ensure that a comprehensive and robust cycle network is established. The siting of the hospital and employment uses by Junction 7 reflects the need for these uses to have good connectivity by road to a wide part of the county and region. It should also be noted that work is underway on the preparation of a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan by Hampshire County Council. The engagement and the involvement of the local cycling community will be sought on this Plan, as well as proposals to develop a scheme to provide a high quality cycle link along the A30 in line with the latest design standards set out the Government's LTN1/20.</p>
National Grid	No specific comments at this stage.	No change. Comments noted.

Southern Water	The Vision area lies outside of Southern Water's water and wastewater service area. As such Southern Water has no specific comments to make with regard to the consultation document. Southern Water does provide wastewater collection/treatment services to the settlements of Oakley and North Waltham, which are in close proximity to the Vision area. Southern Water would welcome engagement from developers and the Council regarding any major development proposals in these areas.	No change. Comments noted.
SGN Gas	The gas infrastructure is found to the north, east and west of the Vision area. There is no infrastructure in the south. The development would likely be supplied through the SGN Medium Pressure (MP) gas tier either from a direct connection or an indirect connection through the localised Low Pressure (LP) tier. In terms of capacity, at this time, there shouldn't be any major issues connecting to the MP, the network in that area is relatively robust. No guidance is provided here on the Low Pressure tier, as the pressure on the system can be very sensitive to change.	No change. Comments noted.
Hatch Warren Nature Group	This vision fails to prioritise the planning of the area. There should be limitations on the extent and types of development if the aims for biodiversity, climate change mitigation and quality of life are to be realised.	Partly agreed. The Vision recognises the expected increases in population in the future with an accompanying need for homes, employment and facilities, the opportunities presented by Land North of the M3 at Junction 7 and the importance of articulating the Borough Council's aspirations for this area. The possible siting of a hospital and employment uses near Junction 7 reflects the need for these uses to have good connectivity by road to a wider part of the county and region. Integrating climate change, green infrastructure, sustainable development and the protection of the environment are central themes of the Vision. The Vision on page 4 of the document has been amended to emphasise the importance of protecting the natural environment.
	The distribution hub should be rejected as it is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary of Basingstoke as shown in the current Local Plan. The distribution hub will be hugely damaging in terms of traffic pollution, noise and light pollution on nearby homes, schools and any medical centre. Traffic will impact the movement of ambulances and other urgent traffic that might need to travel to a medical centre as well as people travelling into and	Partly agreed. It is proposed to replace references in the Vision to a potential distribution and logistics hub with broader references to employment uses. This would not preclude the potential for a distribution and logistics use in the Vision area if this was considered acceptable in detailed planning terms. Map four only recognises the location of the current application for warehousing. The Vision does not prejudice the proper

	out of Basingstoke using Junction 7. Distribution hub jobs are likely to be low in number and in salaries, both of which are likely to reduce as automation will be central to the operation	implementation of Policy EP1 of the adopted Local Plan which highlights the need for new storage and distribution uses within the Local Plan period. Policy EP1 does not preclude the provision of a distribution use outside the Settlement Policy Boundary of Basingstoke as shown in the adopted Local Plan.
Hatch Warren Nature Group contd	The hospital/medical centre has not confirmed a need for a site in this location shown in the Vision nor is there a proper assessment of other factors like green infrastructure that might affect any proposal in terms of location, function and size.	No change. The Vision provides a framework to enable the delivery of a state-of-the-art hospital as part of a wider Health and Wellbeing Campus in the event that health providers identify this area as the preferred location. The Vision does not prejudice the role of the health providers in the selection of the preferred location. The potential location of a health care facility by Junction 7 of the M3 would optimise the opportunities for accessibility and connectivity for a catchment population that extends beyond the Borough of Basingstoke and Deane to a larger part of north and mid Hampshire. The principles within the Vision allow for an assessment of how green infrastructure can affect the location and siting of development.
	The suggestion of a Park and Ride scheme is without evidence or merit. It will result in a large and unsightly car park when the town should be optimally using existing car parks. A better option might be to offer a parking 'app' that allows cars to pre-book a slot in an existing car park around the town near to where they want to go. The driver would be provided with directions to get there and be able to make payment. Some car parks might be expandable up or down to reduce land take.	No change. The proposed Transport Interchange and Mass Rapid Transit route with the scope for a Park and Ride facility are well located by the A30 corridor and Junction 7 of the M3. A potential Park and Ride facility could make an important contribution to encouraging visitors to the town centre to use public transport for the final part of the journey. The optimisation of parking arrangements within the town are under review.
	The Vision and its map does not reflect that green infrastructure is a priority infrastructure as indicated in its GI Strategy; it should be part of the initial design and optimised to meet the needs of people and wildlife. That includes the need to consolidate and expand, as well as adequately protect, ancient woodland to maintain the woodland function. Narrow corridors that link the woodlands is an inadequate response to ancient woodland threats. Housing and commerce, people and pets will have huge impacts on ancient woodland in the area if the proposed approach is adopted. This Council should not be allowing development that further undermines the remaining low level of remaining irreplaceable ancient woodland in England and this will	No change. It is agreed that ensuring biodiversity connections across and through the Vision area, and protecting and enhancing habitats including semi-natural ancient woodlands, is of great importance. Vision principle four sets out a series of criteria to ensure that a green infrastructure network including the protection and enhancement of habitat will play a key role in how the Vision is implemented. The Potential Green Corridors shown in map four of the Vision are only indicative. The location and width of such corridors would be informed by biodiversity studies to be undertaken in due course. The existing green infrastructure network and the scope for its protection and enhancement will be

	<p>be a consequence of this vision proposal. The Vision should prioritise viable green infrastructure and should map it at the outset in a way that predetermines what development might or might not be possible. Nature should not be treated as a "nice to have" and ending up with yet more degraded nature. The provision of biodiversity corridors should be informed by the National Habitat Network Maps prepared by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).</p>	<p>a key element in guiding and informing the design, development and delivery of the vision.</p>
	<p>There must be a significant crossing that goes over or under the M3 and A30 with a genuinely wide corridor of several hundred metres in approximately the location of the proposed distribution hub. That must be part of the vision so that a link can be created between the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the South Downs National Park.</p>	<p>No change. The issue of enhancing biodiversity links between the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the South Downs National Park is currently under consideration. However, if this were a preferred option the detail of how this could be achieved has not been explored yet and there is no evidence currently available to suggest that a significant crossing is required in the approximate location of the current planning application for a distribution hub. If links between the AONB and National Park are considered to be of benefit in the Vision area in due course then these can be incorporated into more detailed documents once studies of this issue are undertaken.</p>
Fuzzy Drove Conservation Group	<p>The Council should examine the potential for brownfield sites to meet development needs before considering developing greenfield sites. The Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) has identified numerous brownfield sites for development.</p>	<p>No change. The council, through the current preparation of the Local Plan Update, considers that there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet development needs into the future.</p>
	<p>It is important for wildlife to be protected and for the current residents to be able to continue to enjoy the natural habitat for their well being. The natural environment of Fuzzy Drove and the fields between it and Oakley is appreciated by a great number of people and it should be protected.</p>	<p>No change. It is recognised that the Vision would involve the loss of countryside and some existing habitats. These considerations have to be balanced against the need for development in the future. National and local planning policy require development to ensure a net gain in biodiversity.</p>
	<p>There is currently a healthy population of Hedgehogs, two types of Bats in Fuzzy Drove and Dormice are hoped to be encouraged into the drove from the woods near Pardown. All these species are endangered. If these developments go ahead we will lose them from this area for ever.</p>	<p>No change. National and local planning policy requires the avoidance, or mitigation, of harm to biodiversity and protected, key species by development. The biodiversity interest of existing habitats within the Vision area will be protected and green corridors provided as part of a robust Green Infrastructure network. Where harm to certain species cannot be avoided then off-site mitigation will be required.</p>

Bloor Homes	Bloor Homes have an interest in Land at Basingstoke Golf Course which has received outline planning permission for up to 1,000 homes subject to the completion of a legal agreement. Bloor welcome the opportunities provided by the potential development set out in the Vision including improved infrastructure, employment and health care uses which would complement the residential focussed Local Plan allocations at this south western end of the A30 corridor.	Comments noted.
	It is essential that improvements to infrastructure, the road network and public transport associated with the development of the Vision area take into account the timescales for the development of the Golf Course.	No change. It is agreed that developments within and nearby the Vision area need to be coordinated. No change is proposed to the document as the timing of transport and other infrastructure improvements will be coordinated through planning documents to be prepared in due course and the determination of planning applications.
	There is potentially a finite traffic and transport capacity along the A30 corridor. The impact of development associated with the Vision on the highway network must be fully mitigated.	No change. It is agreed that transport capacity is a key issue. No change to the document is proposed as more detailed work on highway capacity, prepared alongside future planning documents and planning applications, will establish a comprehensive approach to the transport infrastructure of the area. Significant improvements to public and non-car modes of transport are expected to partly mitigate increased levels of traffic.
	Given the expansion of development to the west of Basingstoke and the potential hospital use in the Vision area, future public transport enhancements should not just be focussed on radial links to Basingstoke town centre, but instead must look also to orbital routes. This would be convenient for public transport users who would not have to travel into the town centre and back out again. Furthermore, it is important that opportunities to travel by public transport be provided for employees at the warehouses, and for staff and visitors going to the access the health care facility, in order to reduce the number of private trips as much as possible.	Agreed to amend criteria (d) of vision principle 5 to refer to the future provision of a new non-strategic local road (which would include public transport infrastructure) connecting the A30 to the A339 given that this is part of the transport network connecting to the Vision area (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement). Transport plans and public transport improvements are expected to be implemented for any development for a health care facility and any employment uses.
Taylor Wimpey	Taylor Wimpey do not support the local planning authority's production of a vision for land north of the M3 at Junction 7. This Vision predetermines the spatial strategy of the Local Plan, and could seriously impact the consideration of reasonable alternative patterns of growth and the sustainability appraisal. As seen in	No change. The Vision is a council document with limited planning weight, which is being developed outside of the statutory planning system. It is considered that whilst the Vision will help to inform the Local Plan Update process by highlighting key issues for this area and helping to progress partnership

	<p>recent Local Plan Examinations for the West of England Joint Spatial Plan and Brentwood Local Plan, the pre-emptive identification of sites has been a key issue challenged by Inspectors; particularly how this may have influenced the spatial strategy and sustainability appraisal process, by not being supported by robust evidence. The Council is putting the Local Plan Update at risk of being found unsound.</p> <p>The publication of this document raises serious concern that the Local Planning Authority is not genuinely preparing a local plan to fulfil paragraph 15 of the NPPF 2019, and worse harming any chance that the Local Plan may be found sound, when assessed against the soundness criteria set out in paragraph 35 of the NPPF. By publishing this document now, BDBC is predetermining the spatial strategy of the Local Plan Update, without robust evidence and without the consideration of reasonable alternatives. As evidenced in the recent Issues and Options consultation, the council has produced limited evidence and undertaken no formal testing of potential spatial strategy or allocation options, particularly through any Sustainability Appraisal process.</p> <p>The credentials identified in the Vision are not achievable solely at the land north of junction 7 but can also be achieved elsewhere in the borough. In particular, opportunities to the northeast and east of Basingstoke could deliver great economic benefits to the borough, within cycling distance from the Kingsland, Basing View, Viabes and Chineham Business Parks as well as the town centre. This would better support investment and vitality with minimal vehicular travel, whilst also providing environmental and social benefits similar to that identified in this vision document. Furthermore, the positioning of the land north of Junction 7, near to Scheduled Ancient Monuments, the AONB, and within the catchment of the River Test (requiring nitrate mitigation) highlights key constraints that other sites to the east and north east of Basingstoke are not affected by.</p>	<p>working between key stakeholders, it does not prejudice the preparation of the Plan itself, making no decisions about where future growth in the Borough will be located. The Local Plan Update is being progressed in line with relevant legislation, building upon a developing evidence base, through a separate and independent process. The Vision has no set time period within which it is to be implemented unlike the Local Plan Update which will provide the planning framework for the borough up to at least 2039. Instead, the Vision sets a broad overview for the future of this area north of the M3 at Junction 7 for a time period which could extend beyond 2039 and beyond the purview of the Local Plan Update. Also, a purpose of the Vision is to set out key principles to help guide development which is coming forward in the area in advance of, and outside of, the LPU process. The consideration of options for the spatial strategy of the Local Plan Update is unaffected by the content of the Vision.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>It is fundamental that the Council maintains separation between its role as landowner and planning authority in order that it can assess all sites fairly and equally against a set of sustainability criteria that reflect the borough's growth ambitions for the future. This should consider the borough and town as a whole, without undue focus on any potential health/wellbeing campus that has no certainty of delivery. It is recommended that the local planning authority focusses on preparing a vision for the borough through the Local Plan Review process. The vision document should be withdrawn. The Council should proceed to produce a Local Plan that complies with the NPPF and the plan-led system.</p>	
Wates Developments	<p>Wates retains an interest in the ongoing phased development of up to 750 dwellings and other uses by Linden Homes at the Hounsome Fields site. The potential Western Link Road would utilise the current route of the Hounsome Fields spine road. Land has been safeguarded either side of the spine road so that it could be upgraded and widened to accommodate future additional traffic flow arising from the link road. Paragraph 3.1 identifies that land was safeguarded for a future railway crossing from Manydown to land to the south. Paragraph 3.2 identifies that land was safeguarded through Hounsome Fields to allow a link to be created to land to the west, should it be required. Wates supports the recognition of the land safeguarded for a potential Western Link Road and requests that this is carried through to the final version of the Vision.</p>	No change. Comments noted.
	<p>Wates supports the acknowledgement in the Vision that there are opportunities to improve the strategic and local infrastructure in the area. The timely delivery of this piece of infrastructure is an opportunity to support the Hounsome Fields and Manydown developments, together with Basingstoke Golf Course and other potential sites to the south west of Basingstoke, strengthening access to local services and enhancing the strategic road network.</p>	No change. Comments noted.
	<p>Wates requests that the indicative location of a potential Western Link Road is shown on Map 4 in the Vision to visually demonstrate that land is safeguarded for a potential future link between the Hounsome Fields site and Manydown.</p>	No change. The location of any link road connecting the A30 with Manydown will only be established following detailed Transport Assessments.

	<p>Wates requests that the opportunity for a potential Western Link Road is explicitly referred to in vision principle 5 in the final version of the Vision. A Western Link Road would minimise the impact of the development of Manydown for existing residents by providing a more direct connection to the strategic road network and the M3 motorway. It would also support the new development at Basingstoke Golf Course where approximately 1,000 homes will be delivered.</p>	<p>Partly agreed. Criteria (b) of vision principle 5 is to be amended to refer to a new non-strategic Western Link Road connecting the A30 to the A339 (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement). It is not considered that an explicit reference is needed in the vision principles to the connection through the Hounsme Fields site given the existing reference in paragraph 3.2 of the vision.</p>
<p>Southern Manydown landowners</p>	<p>This representation is provided on behalf of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) and Hampshire County Council (HCC) (in their landholding capacity) and the Society of Merchant Venturers (SMV). The production of the Vision by the Local Planning Authority is welcomed by the landowners. This land, due to its strategic location and the scale of potential development, including a potential new health care campus, presents a unique opportunity to create a sustainable and comprehensively planned mixed use development with place making, sustainability, energy efficiency and community at its heart. The scale of this opportunity allows for innovative new solutions to transport and infrastructure to be fully and comprehensively considered in the planning and design from the outset.</p>	<p>No change. Comments noted.</p>
	<p>The area covered by the draft Vision shown on page 1 should be extended eastwards, westwards and southwards to include all of the land being promoted for residential-led development at South Manydown and on the SMV land.</p>	<p>Agreed. The map showing the area of the Vision should be extended eastwards to the Roman Road, westwards and southwards to include all of the land being promoted for residential-led development at South Manydown and on the SMV land. This would reflect map 4 of the Vision which seeks to show the land being promoted for development (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).</p>
	<p>The landowners generally support the overarching aims of the LPA's Vision (see the text box on page 4). It is recommended that point 3 "An exemplar sustainable mixed-use development which combats climate change and protects the identity of local villages" should be expanded to more strongly reflect the ambition to develop a new sustainable community, based on the strategic residential-led allocation(s) which will be required to underpin its delivery and viability.</p>	<p>No change. The Vision provides a broad overview of the future of this area outside of the statutory planning system. As such it would be premature for the Vision to incorporate links to potential allocations in the Local Plan Update.</p>

	The Vision document should more clearly explain the characteristics of the area, its opportunities and constraints and local and regional needs. This would help the special qualities of the area to be more successfully addressed by development.	No change. It is considered that the characteristics of the area are already explained within the document. For example: the Vision on page 4 refers to 'beautiful countryside'; the section on page 2 under 'What is the Vision about' recognises that this area is an important gateway to the town with nearby historic villages with their own distinctive identities; map two shows the strategic connectivity of land north of the M3 at junction 7.
	The key strategic aims of the vision namely sustainable development and the environment, economy and infrastructure, and travel are supported. But they could be more "visionary". Reference could be made to the opportunity to create a successful place for residents to live, offering an aspirational and more sustainable lifestyle within a new garden community, containing generous green spaces with easy access to the countryside.	Partly agreed. The Vision on page 4 is to be amended to include references to the creation of a successful place that is aspirational and sustainable (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
	Vision principle 1 'Delivering high quality development' is supported but it should also state the ambition to create a sustainable garden community given the Council's Horizon 2050 Vision's ambition to create a garden community of over 10,000 homes in south west Basingstoke. This scale of new community is in line with MHCLG's advice to create a garden community like Southern Manydown "that offer opportunities for significant long-term housing and economic growth in an area".	No change. The Vision provides a broad overview of the future of this area outside of the statutory planning system. As such it would be premature for the Vision to incorporate references to the potential scale of housing allocations.
	Vision principle 2 'Ensuring sustainable development and combating climate change'. In criteria (b) it is right to seek to be "showcasing exemplars of sustainable development" but reference to the specific objectives should be included in the principles, rather than requiring specific types of energy provision (for example district heating), in order to avoid being prescriptive.	Partly agreed. The criteria would benefit from a more comprehensive approach to ensuring sustainable development. However the reference to district heating should remain since it is a good example of sustainable development (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement for proposed amendments).
Southern Manydown landowners contd	Vision principle 3 'Protecting local villages and heritage assets'. This principle refers to the 'special qualities' of the villages. It would be helpful to briefly set out the characteristics of these villages in order that it is clear what the 'special qualities' are.	No change. It is not necessary to set out the characteristics of these villages in the Vision which is a high level document. Such detail would be referenced during the preparation of more detailed planning documents in due course.
	The principle of the strategic gap is supported, in terms of ensuring that the separate and historic identify of relevant villages is safeguarded. However, the Updated Local Plan should include a review of all existing strategic gaps and a review of the	No change. The references to the consideration of Strategic Gaps in the Local Plan Update are noted. The potential location of Strategic Gaps are only shown in an illustrative manner on Map 4. This does not prejudice any future identification of their

	evidence base to support those. This could include consideration of new strategic gaps, where supported by an appropriate evidence base.	boundaries following more detailed technical studies.
	Vision principle 4 'Delivering a green infrastructure network'. Elements of this principle are supported, but more emphasis could also be given to the beneficial access to greenspace for recreation and leisure in terms of well-being and healthy living for residents.	Agreed. Vision principle 4 to be amended to refer to how the well-being of residents will benefit from excellent access to greenspace and the network of footpaths in the surrounding countryside (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
	Principle 5 'Improving connectivity'. In order to steer future development, it would be helpful if this principle could provide a hierarchy.	No change. It is considered that the criteria of the principle already provide sufficient guidance to prioritise sustainable forms of transport.
Southern Manydown landowners contd	Principle 6 'Creating a place for all'. Criteria (b) relating to "supporting infrastructure to meet the needs of the local community including schools, community centres, sports pitches and other leisure facilities" could be widened to cover place-making, which will complement the aspiration for high quality design and architecture in (d) by covering the investment required in public realm, facilities and public amenity spaces.	No change. It is considered that this criteria rightly focusses on infrastructure provision. Other criteria address high quality design.
	Map four 'vision for land north of the M3 at junction 7' should be amended so that the current 'possible location of health and wellbeing campus' should instead be shown as an 'employment hub'. This would include logistics development, alongside potentially some research and development/other employment uses. This location is ideally suited to these uses given that: its close proximity to the strategic highway network, meaning it is both accessible to the network and able to play a strategic role, benefitting the borough as a whole; whilst not flat, it is the flattest part of the site meaning it is the best location for logistics buildings of this scale; given the topography of this part of the site, away from the ridgeline, any potential visual impact would be minimised through fitting the buildings unobtrusively into the landscape; this location relates well to the proposed Newlands logistics scheme, helping ensure all logistics development is located together and creating a potential 'employment hub'; any HGV vehicular movements will be kept to the edges of the site, whilst ensuring the site provides an employment use, contributing not only to the wider economy of Basingstoke but the	Partly agreed. It is not proposed by officers to identify an Employment Hub due to the illustrative nature of the map and that this would be subject to a more detailed masterplanning exercise in due course. However, it is proposed to move the Transport Interchange to the north east to be nearer Junction 7; the Interchange would occupy a portion of the land shown in the draft Vision for the Health Campus. To compensate for this, the previously shown illustrative location for a Transport Interchange would be occupied by part of the Health and Wellbeing Campus. These alterations would not affect the potential location of the Strategic Gap by North Waltham (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).

	<p>sustainability of the site, through the creation of jobs.</p> <p>The possible location of the 'health and wellbeing campus' is therefore the best and only location for logistics. Furthermore, provision of an employment component responds well to garden city principles in terms of mix of uses and creating sustainable development sites. Any potential health and wellbeing site, is well situated to being located to the southwest of the 'employment hub'.</p> <p>To ensure the proper integration of the 'transport hub' within the site, this could then be re-located to the north of the 'employment hub'. This would ensure the transport hub which could incorporate a potential park and ride, next to the A30 and close to the 'Newlands junction' would be ideally located for those driving to Basingstoke from elsewhere close to one of the key gateways from the strategic road network (the A303(A30) and M3 J7) and is also positioned to ensure the hospital can be provided with a 'drop-off' point.</p>	
<p>Southern Manydown landowners contd</p>	<p>The landowners are concerned by the extent of strategic gap shown on Map 4 which appears to cover approximately more than 50% of the Southern Manydown sites width. This combines the existing Oakley strategic gap (from the adopted plan 2016) with the potential North Waltham gap, without referencing the supporting evidence base. This would leave a narrow neck for development and thus significantly impact upon the ability for the site to deliver the required housing and other uses, strategic infrastructure, and onward viability.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the Vision identifies the need for the LPA to produce an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Transport Strategy to support the further development of the Vision area. The landowners agree that these are important next steps. Other workstreams will need to be developed including those relating to long-term strategic infrastructure issues such as drainage, power supply and the potential provision of new secondary school for</p>	<p>The Strategic Gaps are only shown in an illustrative manner on Map 4. This does not prejudice any future identification of their boundaries following more detailed technical studies. The council is satisfied that the broad extent of the Gaps as shown on Map 4 does offer a reasonable basis for the protection of the landscape and heritage settings of the villages. It is proposed to clarify the key and labelling of map 4 of the Vision such that the notation represents the 'Potential Location of Strategic Gap' instead of referring to the 'Potential Strategic Gap'. This ensures consistency with other references to the Gaps in the Vision (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).</p> <p>No change. The comments are noted.</p>

	<p>south west Basingstoke. The Transport Strategy will need to set a robust vision for planned sustainability from the outset and demonstrate a clear commitment to developing an overall transport strategy which will also encourage a modal shift for existing trips in the area. There is also the opportunity related to the IDP to build on previous research work to upgrade the Further Education (FE) capacity of Basingstoke, to upskill the workforce and support the introduction of sustainable construction and green technologies,, anchor companies and educational institutions which could potentially form an ‘innovation district’. The landowners (within their Vision and Development Principles for Southern Manydown) have already committed to seeking to achieve a zero-carbon community in use. This would require a comprehensive approach to demonstrate how appropriate carbon auditing and offsetting will be achieved to support sustainable growth in south west Basingstoke. Other relevant new work-streams will relate the recent requirements to demonstrate biodiversity net gain and nitrate neutrality.</p>	
<p>Society of Merchant Venturers (SMV)</p>	<p>The Society of Merchant Venturers (SMV) make this representation in relation to land in their sole ownership at south-west Basingstoke. This land, together with adjacent land at Manydown South promoted by HCC and BDBC comprises ‘Southern Manydown’. This land at Southern Manydown provides a unique opportunity to create a sustainable and comprehensively planned mixed use development with place making, sustainability, energy efficiency and community at its heart. SMV support the principle of developing a vision for this area. SMV supports the Vision in highlighting the potential for a health campus which would provide an unprecedented opportunity for this location. The strategic aims under paragraph 4.3 of the Vision regarding the economy and infrastructure are supported and helpful. The recognition of ‘avoiding piecemeal provision’ is welcomed and aligns with national planning policy and a proactive approach to development.</p>	<p>No change. Comments noted.</p>
	<p>The area covered by the draft Vision shown on page 1 should be extended eastwards, westwards and southwards to include all of</p>	<p>Agreed. The map showing the area of the Vision should be extended eastwards to the Roman Road, westwards and</p>

	the land being promoted for residential-led development at South Manydown and on the SMV land.	southwards to include all of the land being promoted for residential-led development at South Manydown and on the SMV land. This would reflect map 4 of the Vision which seeks to show the land being promoted for development (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
	The relationship of the Vision area with existing commitments will be important to ensure the proper integration of the areas. It would be helpful to explain the role of these existing commitments more clearly within the Vision document, to help guide development to ensure it is well integrated with existing communities.	No change. It is agreed that the future planning of this area would need to demonstrate how the integration with existing development commitments can take place. However, this is considered to be too detailed a matter for the Vision which only aims to provide a broad overview of the future of the area.
	The Vision document should more clearly explain the characteristics of the area, its opportunities and constraints and local and regional needs. This would help the special qualities of the area to be more successfully addressed by development.	No change. It is considered that the characteristics of the area are already explained within the document. For example: the Vision on page 4 refers to 'beautiful countryside'; the section on page 2 under 'What is the Vision about' recognises that this area is an important gateway to the town with nearby historic villages with their own distinctive identities; map two shows the strategic connectivity of land north of the M3 at junction 7.
	Maps 1, 3 and 4 should make clear that the settlement policy boundaries are as existing and should the potential for the development of Southern Manydown be reflected in policies, then these boundaries are likely to be amended.	No change. The Vision provides a broad overview of the future of this area and it would be premature for it to reflect potential changes in the Local Plan policy framework for the area.
SMV contd.	Illustrating the extent of potential new strategic gaps on Map 4 could be misleading in terms of the areas they are likely to cover given that the relevant technical studies have not been undertaken. It is recommended that Map 4 shows the gaps at a much more illustrative and conceptual level using a zig zag line around villages.	The Strategic Gaps are only shown in an illustrative manner on Map 4. This does not prejudice any future identification of their boundaries following more detailed technical studies. The council is satisfied that the broad extent of the Gaps as shown on Map 4 does offer a reasonable basis for the protection of the landscape and heritage settings of the villages. It is proposed to clarify the key and labelling of map 4 of the Vision such that the notation represents the 'Potential Location of Strategic Gap' instead of referring to the 'Potential Strategic Gap'. This ensures consistency with other references to the Gaps in the Vision (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
	The 'what happens next' section on page 2 could summarise the next formal stages for progression of the local plan, the evidence base and technical studies that will inform that process, the importance of working with promoters and how this Vision	No change. The Vision provides a broad overview of the future of this area outside of the statutory planning system. As such it would be premature for the Vision to incorporate links to progress on the Local Plan Update.

	document will be updated as necessary to reflect that work. It should be explained how an informed approach to infrastructure will be taken, alongside the emerging local plan work and informed by consultation with stakeholders.	
	SMV suggest a number of detailed alterations to the wording as follows with additions shown <u>underlined</u> and suggested deletions shown struck through . Vision Principle One: ‘delivering high quality development to meet needs’ criteria (a) should read “Any new health facilities (health and wellbeing campus including a state-of-the-art hospital) and commercial uses (research and development centre and science park and potential distribution <u>including logistics.....</u>)”	No change in response to this specific suggestion. Yet it is proposed to replace references in the Vision to a potential distribution and logistics hub with broader references to employment uses. This would not preclude the potential for a distribution and logistics use in the Vision area if this was considered acceptable in detailed planning terms. Map four only recognises the location of the current application for warehousing.
	Vision Principle One criteria (b) should read “Development in <u>particular the residential development and development associated with the local centres</u> should reinforce the role of the area as a ‘gateway to Basingstoke’ ...”	No change. The Vision is a high level document. The identification of any particular areas which should reinforce the role of the area as a gateway is a detailed matter which should take place through the preparation of planning documents or through the determination of planning applications in due course.
	Amendments are suggested to vision principle 2 (VP2): ‘ensuring sustainable development and combating climate change’ to ensure the requirements are not unnecessarily prescriptive with regards to specific types of energy provision but focus on the overarching aims of renewable and low carbon energy use, where energy consumption is necessary. VP2 criteria (b) should read “Showcasing exemplars of sustainable development including the use of district heating where feasible, <u>reducing the need to travel, minimising energy use and seeking to incorporate low carbon/renewable energy for necessary energy consumption within the scheme.</u> ”	Partly agreed. VP2 criteria (b) is proposed to be amended to provide a more comprehensive approach to ensuring sustainable development. However the reference to district heating should remain since it is a good example of sustainable development (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
SMV contd.	VP2 criteria (d) should read “ <u>Minimising energy use and providing opportunities for generating sustainable/renewable energy where necessary for certain uses</u> and embedding this within the design of new development”.	Partly agreed. The reference to minimising energy use is proposed to be incorporated into criteria (b) and (d). However, the reference to ‘certain uses’ would unduly restrict the promotion of renewable energy (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).
	Vision principle three: ‘protecting local villages and heritage assets’. The principle of the strategic gap is supported, in terms	The Strategic Gaps are only shown in an illustrative manner on Map 4. This does not prejudice any future identification of their

	<p>of safeguarding the separate and historic identity of relevant villages. The Local Plan Update should include a review of all existing strategic gaps and could include consideration of new strategic gaps, where supported by an appropriate evidence base. This would ensure that the boundaries of any existing and potential new strategic gaps are informed by proper evidence giving any future designations more weight in the emerging local plan and ensuring their location is not prejudged. It would be helpful to briefly set out the characteristics of these villages in order that it is clear what their 'special qualities' are.</p> <p>Criteria (a) of VP3 should read "Safeguarding the separate and historic identity of the villages of North Waltham, Dummer and Oakley, ensuring a sensitive response to their setting. <u>The boundaries of existing strategic gaps will be reviewed and potential additional strategic gaps created; both informed by up to date evidence and technical studies including analysis of Strategic gaps will be maintained between land north of the M3 at junction 7 and these villages. The location of the strategic gaps will be informed by the local topography including such as ridgelines and other landscape features such as vegetation</u>".</p>	<p>boundaries following more detailed technical studies. The council is satisfied that the broad extent of the Gaps as shown on Map 4 does offer a reasonable basis for the protection of the landscape and heritage settings of the villages. It is proposed to clarify the key and labelling of map 4 of the Vision such that the notation represents the 'Potential Location of Strategic Gap' instead of referring to the 'Potential Strategic Gap'. This ensures consistency with other references to the Gaps in the Vision (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).</p>
SMV contd.	<p>SMV are supportive overall of Vision principle five: 'improving connectivity'. However, this should be considered within the context of the development of the overall site being designed in such a way as to reduce the need to travel overall. The proposals should all seek to 'internalise' trips where possible in order for journeys to be shortened and more likely conducted by active modes of travel. This will be achieved by the development of a community including complementary uses such as residential, retail, employment, education, leisure and places of worship. This will act to reduce the impact of travel within the Southern Manydown area. It would be helpful if the principle is ordered to reflect the travel hierarchy.</p> <p>It is worth highlighting that provision of a park and ride at the site on its own will not achieve a reduction in traffic. To achieve this overarching aim, it has to be with other complementary</p>	<p>Partly agreed to some points as detailed below. However, it is considered that the current wording of Vision principle 5 offers a good overview of how sustainable forms of transport will play a significant role in improving connectivity. No additional changes are proposed where a commentary is not provided. (See section 5 of this Consultation Statement for proposed amendments).</p>

	<p>measures, hence there are some proposed minor alterations to the wording to address this. Additionally, it is not clear what ‘pinchpoints’ are being referred to and any improvements proposed to the network will not be delivered in isolation, hence suggesting this wording is deleted. The following changes are accordingly proposed to Vision principle five: ‘improving connectivity’: “Growth will provide a significant enhancement of local infrastructure, to the benefit of existing communities, with an emphasis on sustainable modes of transport by:</p>	
	<p>a) Enabling a transport Interchange which facilitates quick and sustainable connections between new facilities, <u>and other locations, such as</u> Basingstoke town centre, residential areas and surrounding villages. b) Facilitating a mass rapid transit (MRT) system <u>which can connect</u> with a network of routes to <u>and from</u> Basingstoke town centre and across the town, with scope for a park and ride facility for those travelling to the town centre or station, and creating a critical mass to support travellers whilst helping to reduce traffic in the town centre <u>in accordance with other sustainable policies and complementary traffic management measures being promoted and implemented by the local highway authority.</u></p>	<p>Agreed to make this minor amendment to criteria (a) since it is intended that the network of the MRT will bring together various key locations.</p>
SMV contd.	<p>c) Improving the A30 to support <u>active travel and</u> the mass rapid transit system and aspirations for fast and frequent services, along with improvements to the motorway junctions.</p>	<p>Agreed to make reference to ‘active’ travel in criteria (c) which reflects study work underway to consider the A30 corridor in more detail for improved cycling facilities.</p>
	<p>d) Ensuring local connectivity to new services and jobs in the area from the wider borough, providing good accessibility <u>and helping to reduce pressure on key pinchpoints.</u></p>	<p>Agreed to remove reference to pinchpoints. Any improvements proposed to the network will not be delivered in isolation but as part of a comprehensive approach to mitigating traffic impact on the area.</p>
	<p>e) <u>Reducing the need for travel and</u> transport solutions for the area will limit the <u>traffic</u> impact on the local <u>highway</u> network and surrounding villages and will focus on using <u>appropriate parts of the network for the appropriate journeys and the strategic network</u> for trips. The location of any distribution uses will relate well to the strategic road network and will be easily accessible for heavy goods vehicles. <u>Development could contribute towards existing ‘traffic weaving’ issues relating to Junctions 7 and 8 of</u></p>	<p>Agreed to make reference in the first sentence of criteria (e) to reduce the need for travel. The need to promote a good level of internalised trip making is recognised.</p>

	the M3 will be addressed.	
	<p>f) Any health and wellbeing campus, including a hospital, will meet the accessibility needs of employees, visitors and patients to allow access by all modes <u>with an appropriate level of parking for operational needs and will include parking.</u></p> <p>g) Enhancing opportunities for active modes of transport such as walking and cycling through dedicated and direct <u>links within Southern Manydown and external links other destinations such as the town centre, transforming the local network of footpaths and cycleways and ensuring that nearby villages also benefit from further connections.</u></p> <p>h) New and upgraded cycle routes should be fast, direct, coherent and segregated and should integrate with the existing and proposed strategic cycle network (see map three). Multi-user routes such as those alongside Pack Lane should be retained.</p> <p>k) Providing opportunities for high quality and upgradable technology to support sustainable modes of transport such as infrastructure for electric vehicles and bikes and any SMART initiatives such as mobility as a service.</p>	Agreed to make reference in criteria (f) to parking for operational needs.
SMV contd.	Map Two—Strategic Connectivity of Land north of the M3 at junction 7. The map would benefit from the following improvements: more emphasis should be given to connections other than highway connections in order to promote sustainable travel; Newbury should be to the east of the A34; the built up area of Basingstoke appears to extend too far; the A27 (east of Portsmouth) is an important part of the strategic road network and should be included; the M27 should be in blue consistent with the remainder of the motorway network; the impression is given that the rail lines terminate at the same location in London, whereas one of the benefits of Basingstoke is the ability to access Waterloo and Paddington (via the GWR line from Paddington). It should also be reflected that the future Elizabeth Line can be a link to London.	The suggested improvements are agreed with the exception that: the dark green area should remain as shown as it reflects the borough of Basingstoke and Deane and not just the town of Basingstoke; and to retain the rail terminus in London as this shows figuratively how the Vision area is connected to central London.
SMV contd.	Map four 'vision for land north of the M3 at junction 7' should be amended so that the current 'possible location of health and wellbeing campus' should instead be shown as an 'employment	Partly agreed. It is not proposed by officers to identify an Employment Hub due to the illustrative nature of the map and that this would be subject to a more detailed masterplanning

	<p>hub'. This would include logistics development, alongside potentially some research and development/other employment uses. This location is ideally suited to these uses given that: its close proximity to the strategic highway network, meaning it is both accessible to the network and able to play a strategic role, benefitting the borough as a whole; whilst not flat, it is the flattest part of the site meaning it is the best location for logistics buildings of this scale; given the topography of this part of the site, away from the ridgeline, any potential visual impact would be minimised through fitting the buildings unobtrusively into the landscape; this location relates well to the proposed Newlands logistics scheme, helping ensure all logistics development is located together and creating a potential 'employment hub'; any HGV vehicular movements will be kept to the edges of the site, whilst ensuring the site provides an employment use, contributing not only to the wider economy of Basingstoke but the sustainability of the site, through the creation of jobs.</p> <p>The possible location of the 'health and wellbeing campus' is therefore the best and only location for logistics. Furthermore, provision of an employment component responds well to garden city principles in terms of mix of uses and creating sustainable development sites. Any potential health and wellbeing site, is well situated to being located to the southwest of the 'employment hub'.</p> <p>To ensure the proper integration of the 'transport hub' within the site, this could then be re-located to the north of the 'employment hub'. This would ensure the transport hub which could incorporate a potential park and ride, next to the A30 and close to the 'Newlands junction' would be ideally located for those driving to Basingstoke from elsewhere close to one of the key gateways from the strategic road network (the A303(A30) and M3 J7) and is also positioned to ensure the hospital can be provided with a 'drop-off' point.</p>	<p>exercise in due course. However, it is proposed to move the Transport Interchange to the north east to be nearer Junction 7; the Interchange would occupy a portion of the land shown in the draft Vision for the Health Campus. To compensate for this, the previously shown illustrative location for a Transport Interchange would be occupied by part of the Health and Wellbeing Campus. These alterations would not affect the potential location of the Strategic Gap by North Waltham (see section 5 of this Consultation Statement).</p>
Newlands	Newlands have an interest in land at Oakdown Farm and have	No change. Comments noted.

Property Developments	submitted two planning applications for warehousing on the site which are currently pending consideration with BDBC. One is an outline planning application for the construction of commercial and industrial units. The second is a full planning application for a storage and distribution warehouse. Newlands are supportive of the proposed vision. Newlands welcome BDBC's recognition of this area as a sustainable area for growth including potential distribution facilities beside the strategic network and as an area of opportunity for providing further employment, homes, and key infrastructure for the Borough.	
	The Vision should make it clear that the broad aspirations for various infrastructure projects will need to be tested and refined through the development plan making process. The new Local Plan, Vision and supporting evidence base should carefully assess the different types of infrastructure which is required and to be clear, via an infrastructure delivery plan, regarding the exact extent of provision, the cost of the provision and the required sources of funding.	No change. The Vision is a council document being developed outside of the statutory planning system providing a long term broad overview for the area. It is recognised that the infrastructure required to deliver the Local Plan Update will require assessment and testing. But this is being progressed as part of work on the Local Plan Update and should therefore not be referenced in the Vision.
	The Vision should acknowledge that the current planning applications for commercial development on Oakdown Farm would deliver direct highway improvements along the A30 and open up access to surrounding sites to the north of the A30.	No change. Highway improvements along the A30 is a detailed matter which is not suitable for inclusion in the Vision which aims to provide a broad overview of the potential future of the area.
	The Vision should highlight the contribution that this area can make towards economic prosperity to help meet a significant shortfall of land and premises for storage and distribution uses as recognised in BDBC evidence base documents. Good access to the strategic road network is an important characteristic for such uses and South West Basingstoke is therefore a prime candidate which should be acknowledged in the Vision.	No change in response to this specific point. Yet it is proposed to replace references in the Vision to a potential distribution and logistics hub with broader references to employment uses. This would not preclude the potential for a distribution and logistics use in the Vision area if this was considered acceptable in detailed planning terms. Map four only recognises the location of the current application for warehousing. It would be premature at this stage for the Vision to highlight that the area by Junction 7 of the M3 would be suitable for such a distribution use.

4. Summary of the responses made by individuals through the online survey and by email and post and the officer response

4.1 The following key issues were raised through written responses from individuals.

a) The need for a Vision

- The need for this proposed scale of development was questioned. Why was it necessary to accommodate so much new housing?
- Concern was raised over whether better alternatives for development such as brownfield sites and vacant units had been sufficiently explored to warrant a large expansion of the town of Basingstoke on this greenfield area.
- With more key uses such as a hospital being proposed on the edge of the town, then could this further erode the viability of Basingstoke town centre? More should be done to encourage some of the proposed uses to be located within or close to the town centre.
- It was commented that the Vision was not strong on an inward investment strategy. Notwithstanding the attractions of a health hub, the 'offer' of this gateway was unclear. Why would businesses or people want to live, work and play here?

b) Distribution Centre/Employment

- There was much concern regarding the harmful impacts of a large distribution centre close to Junction 7 of the M3. In particular, there was concern that it would lead to large levels of traffic which would disturb the existing residential areas of Basingstoke and the surrounding villages.
- There was concern that the large volume of lorries using the distribution centre would reach routes such as the A33 towards Reading by travelling through the centre of Basingstoke instead of using more strategic routes such the M3.
- The distribution centre would most likely cause significant levels of air and light pollution.
- There was concern over how many of the jobs in a distribution centre would be low paid and low skilled. How does this contribute to the economic health of the town?
- The references to a Science Park and research facility were welcomed but there was concern over how likely it would be that these would be implemented.

c) Proposed Hospital/Health and Wellbeing Campus

- There was much support for a hospital in this location given its proximity to Junction 7 of the M3 and that a brand new, high quality health facility would be provided.
- There was some concern that this location on the edge of the town may further weaken the town centre and inner Basingstoke.
- It was recognised that a new hospital could have a synergy with an education facility and science park to create a hub of excellence.

- d) Loss of countryside and wildlife habitat and impact on the surrounding villages
- There was much concern over the loss of countryside and the resulting harmful impact on the rural character of the area which was so appreciated by local residents in both Basingstoke and the surrounding villages.
 - It was unclear how this scale of development and the resulting destruction of countryside and habitats could be reconciled with the council's declaration of a climate emergency.
 - There was concern that the rural character of nearby villages such as Oakley, North Waltham and Dummer would be severely eroded.
 - There was support for the principle of new strategic gaps for North Waltham and Dummer.
 - There was concern over the loss of wildlife habitat and the local green infrastructure network.
- e) Transport
- There was concern over the large amount of traffic generated by such a large amount of development and how this would impact the already congested local highway network.
 - There was concern that the increase in traffic would be uncontrolled leading to rat running into, for example, the quieter residential areas of the neighbouring villages.
 - Improvements to public transport infrastructure were critical if the impact of a great increase in car usage is to be mitigated.
 - There was concern that the Vision did not provide a sufficiently detailed framework for enhancing cycle provision. The Vision should show more strategic cycle routes such as that linking Oakley to the town centre. It was critical that any development resulted in improvements to cycle routes outside the Vision area as well as inside it in order to create a successful cycle network.
- f) Community facilities and infrastructure
- Concerns were raised about the pressure that additional residents would place on local health and community services.
 - Concerns were raised that new health, school and community facilities would not be provided at a scale sufficient to meet the demands of the new population.
 - Concerns were raised over the ability of the development to affect the supply of water and power to the local area and on the sewerage capacity of the local area.
- g) Development Quality
- Concerns were raised that parts of the new residential areas would become 'ghettos' unless a high quality of facilities and transport infrastructure were provided.
 - It was considered important that new housing should promote sustainable lifestyles and that a strong green infrastructure and open space network should be a central part of any development.
 - The 'Garden village' principle should be promoted in order to raise the environmental quality of the Vision area.

- 4.2 The consultation on the draft Vision has raised a wide range of concerns that are fully recognised, for example, the loss of countryside and wildlife habitat and the increase in traffic on local roads. These aspects of a future development associated with the Vision will have a range of impacts on local communities. Yet, it is considered that these impacts do not negate the principle of a Vision for the area. It is necessary to meet the development needs arising from the expected increases in population in the future and to address the opportunities presented by Land North of the M3 at Junction 7. The potential scale of development observed in the Vision could not be met by using existing brownfield sites or vacant premises. Furthermore, in response to the online survey, a majority (58%) of respondents agreed with the concept of establishing a Vision for Land North of the M3 at Junction 7 compared with 35% who disagreed.
- 4.3 A majority of respondents (62%) to the online survey disagreed with the content of the Vision compared with 31% who agreed with it. Much of this concern centred around the urbanising effects of the Vision on the local area. It is not possible to meet all of these concerns if the principle of progressing a large mixed use development is considered to have merit. Many of the responses to the consultation showed concern over how the Vision would be implemented in detail rather than necessarily objecting to some of its aspects in themselves. Examples of this include concerns over whether proposed improvements to facilities and infrastructure would materialise and whether traffic growth would be managed effectively.
- 4.4 It is therefore considered that the principles set out in the Vision remain sound as a framework for the future of the area. The high-level view taken by the Vision does not make it an appropriate vehicle for the inclusion of detailed policies regarding precisely how it would be implemented. The list of proposed changes to the Vision in section 5 of this report are therefore not extensive. The proposed changes focus on how the Vision can act as a broad framework to achieve a high quality of development and which also mitigates as much as possible the impact on the local area. The proposed changes to the Vision therefore place an emphasis on:
- Creating a successful place that is aspirational and sustainable.
 - Reducing the need to travel, minimising energy use and seeking to incorporate low carbon/renewable energy.
 - The function of the Strategic Gaps being enhanced by improvements to their landscape and biodiversity features and to public access where practical.
 - Giving priority to walkable neighbourhoods.
 - The area benefitting from excellent access to greenspace and the network of footpaths in the surrounding countryside.
 - Walking routes being enhanced so to benefit from the green infrastructure and landscape quality of the vision area.
 - A Mass Rapid Transit network to include the future provision of a new non-strategic Western Link Road connecting the A30 to the A339 across the railway line to the north.
 - The replacement of references in the Vision to a potential distribution and logistics hub with broader references to employment uses. This would not preclude the potential for a distribution and logistics use in the Vision area if this was considered acceptable in detailed planning terms.

5. Schedule of proposed changes to the draft Vision

5.1 Table 3 below sets out the proposed changes to the draft Vision. Proposed additional text is underlined and deleted text is ~~struck through~~. These changes reflect amendments made in response to comments arising out of the consultation exercise. A number of other minor changes have been made such as those relating to presentation, factual amendments and updates reflecting the adopted status of the Vision; these minor changes are not detailed in Table 3.

TABLE 3: SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE DRAFT VISION
Page 1. Area covered by the draft Vision
The map showing the area of the Vision should be extended eastwards to the Roman Road, westwards and southwards to include all of the land being promoted for residential-led development at South Manydown including the SMV land together with the extent of the Oakley Strategic Gap and the indicative extent of the Strategic Gap by North Waltham as shown in map 4.
Page 4. Vision.
Land north of the M3 at junction 7 will create: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cluster of growth-focused regionally significant assets including a health and wellbeing campus, digital logistics <u>employment hub</u>, research and development centre and transport interchange. • An exemplar sustainable mixed-use development <u>that is aspirational and sustainable</u>, combats climate change and protects the identity of local villages. • <u>Protecting the natural environment of the area, and connecting and enhancing</u> spaces through a series of countryside and ecology corridors <u>which</u> contribute ing to a wider green infrastructure network.
Page 5.
Paragraph 1.2 bullet towards the top of page 5 to read: “employment opportunities with a range of roles from health-related activities and a research and development centre to potential jobs in <u>logistics in other types of employment use</u> ”.
Map Two. Strategic Connectivity of Land north of the M3 at junction 7
Map Two to be amended as follows: more emphasis should be given to rail connections in order to promote sustainable travel; Newbury should be to the east of the A34; the A27 (east of Portsmouth) is an important part of the strategic road network and should be included; the M27 should be in blue consistent with the remainder of the motorway network.

Vision principle one: delivering high quality development to meet needs

In order to ensure growth is sustainable and appropriate:

a) Any new health facilities (health and wellbeing campus including a state-of-the-art hospital) and commercial uses (research and development centre, ~~and~~ science park and potential ~~distribution~~ employment uses) in the area should be located close to Junction 7 of the M3 and the A30 to allow high quality transport links to the wider region Basingstoke town centre and other parts of the borough.

Vision principle two: ensuring sustainable development and combating climate change

Development in the area will combat climate change by:

b) Showcasing exemplars of sustainable development including the use of district heating where feasible which minimise energy use and seek to incorporate low carbon/renewable energy for necessary energy consumption.

d) Minimising energy use and providing opportunities for generating sustainable/renewable energy and embedding this within the design of new development.

Vision principle three: protecting local villages and heritage assets

The special qualities of the built assets of the area will be respected by:

a) Safeguarding the separate and historic identity of the villages of North Waltham, Dummer and Oakley, ensuring a sensitive response to their rural setting. Strategic Gaps will be maintained between land north of the M3 at junction 7 and these villages. The location of the strategic gaps will be informed by the local topography including ridgelines and other landscape features such as vegetation. The function of the Strategic Gaps will be enhanced by a comprehensive set of improvements to the green infrastructure, including appropriate landscape and biodiversity features along with public access.

Vision principle four: delivering a green infrastructure network

The area will benefit from a comprehensive Green Infrastructure network which will:

c) Reinforce the existing wealth of woodland, tree belts and other natural features of the area ~~including ponds and streams~~. Ecological networks will be created and the fragmentation of habitats prevented”.

e) Provide a range of well managed green spaces performing various functions including habitat creation, parkland, play space, sports pitches and sustainable drainage measures. The area will benefit from excellent access to greenspace and the network of footpaths in the surrounding countryside.

Vision principle five: improving connectivity

Growth will provide a significant enhancement of local infrastructure, to the benefit of existing communities, with an emphasis on sustainable modes of transport by:

- a) Enabling a transport Interchange which facilitates quick and sustainable connections between new facilities and other locations such as Basingstoke town centre, residential areas and surrounding villages.
- b) Facilitating a mass rapid transit (MRT) system with a network of routes to Basingstoke town centre and across the town, with scope for a park and ride facility for those travelling to the town centre or station, and creating a critical mass to support travellers whilst helping to reduce traffic in the town centre. The MRT network is to include the future provision of a new non-strategic Western Link Road connecting the A30 to the A339 across the railway line to the north.
- c) Improving the A30 and its junctions to support active travel and the mass rapid transit system and aspirations for fast and frequent services, along with improvements to the motorway junctions.
- d) Ensuring local connectivity to new services and jobs in the area from the wider borough, providing good accessibility ~~and helping to reduce pressure on key pinchpoints.~~
- e) Reducing the need for travel and transport solutions for the area will limit the traffic impact on the local highway network and surrounding villages and will focus on using the appropriate parts of the local and strategic network for trips. The location of any ~~distribution~~ employment uses will relate well to the strategic road network and will be easily accessible for heavy goods vehicles. Existing 'traffic weaving' issues relating to Junctions 7 and 8 of the M3 will be addressed in partnership with Highways England and developers in order to improve road safety.
- f) Any health and wellbeing campus, including a hospital, will meet the accessibility needs of employees, visitors and patients to allow access by all modes with an appropriate level of parking for operational needs ~~and will include parking.~~
- i) New walking routes should integrate with the leisure Wayfarers Walking routes whose setting will be protected where feasible. Walking routes should be enhanced so to benefit from the green infrastructure and landscape quality of the vision area.

Vision principle six: creating a place for all

Any residential development in the area will need to:

- e) Be of a high quality of architecture and design which people aspire to live and work in with sustainability at its heart including giving

priority to walkable neighbourhoods.

Map four: vision for land north of the M3 at junction 7

Map 4 to be amended to show:

- 1) The Transport Interchange to move north east to occupy a portion of the land previously shown as a possible location for the Health and Wellbeing Campus. The previously shown illustrative location for a Transport Interchange is to be occupied by part of the Health and Wellbeing Campus.
- 2) The key and labelling of map 4 of the Vision to be altered so that they refer to 'Potential Location of Strategic Gap' instead of 'Potential Strategic Gap' to ensure consistency with references elsewhere in the document.