

CONSULTATION STATEMENT
(Prepared under regulation 18(4)(b))
The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

Planning Contributions for Transport Supplementary Planning Document

Rushmoor Borough Council

1. Who was consulted?

Before adopting the Planning Contributions for Transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), as part of the Rushmoor Plan (LDF), the Council consulted with those bodies listed in appendix I to gather their views.

2. How were they consulted?

A six-week public consultation period took place from **22 February 2009** to **3rd April 2008**. The draft SPD was supported by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (draft report).

Letters dated 20 February 2008 were sent as in appendices II, III and IV.

The SPD and its accompanying sustainability appraisal were attached to the letter sent to the statutory consultees (see appendix II). The non-statutory consultees were referred to the website etc (see appendix III). The relevant nature conservation consultees were sent the draft SPD, its accompanying sustainability appraisal and a draft Habitats Regulations Assessment report (see appendix IV).

All three documents were available for viewing and downloading via the Rushmoor website at: www.rushmoor.gov.uk/spds.

Paper copies of all three documents were available via the Planning Policy section at Rushmoor, and available to view at:

- the Council Offices (first floor reception *8.30am-5pm Monday-Thursday and 8.30am-4.30pm*),
- Farnborough and Aldershot libraries during their opening hours (*Farnborough: 9.30-7pm Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday, Wednesday 9.30am-5pm, and Saturday 9.30am-4pm; Aldershot 10am-7pm Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday; 10am –5pm Friday, and 9.30am-4pm Saturday*).

An article was included in the February edition of the Borough Council's internal 'Bulletin'. There was an advertisement included in the local free 'Star'

newspaper on 21 February 2008. The Borough Council also released a press release in association with the consultation to all local media (see Appendix V).

The draft SPD stage of the process followed adoption of Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy: *A New Approach to Calculating Transport Contributions in Hampshire* (September 2007).

3. What issues were raised?

We received 19 responses duly made and the main issues raised are shown in Appendix VI.

A full list of respondents is shown in Appendix VII.

4. How were the issues addressed?

Appendix VI lists the comments made and the action taken (i.e. amendments to draft SPD prior to adoption). No projects were added or omitted however.

LIST OF APPENDICES:

- I. Names of persons consulted in connection with the preparation of the draft SPD
- II. Letter to statutory consultees
- III. Letter to non-statutory consultees
- IV. Letter to listed nature conservation consultees
- V. Press Release and Poster
- VI. Comments and Responses to the draft SPD
- VII. List of Respondents

APPENDIX I: Names of persons consulted in connection with the preparation of the draft SPD

Statutory and non-statutory consultees:

CONTACT	ORGANISATION
Mr J Cheston	GOSE
Ms P Alexander	SEEDA
Ms C Riddell	SEERA
Ms S Janota	SEERA
Mr S Blyth	Hampshire County Council
Mr B Clifton	Hampshire County Council
Ms T Haskins	Guildford Borough Council
Mr R Evans	Surrey County Council
Mr R Hawkey	Hart DC
Ms J Rickard	Surrey Heath BC
Ms G Malony	Waverley Borough Council
Ms B Hindle	Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Ms C Barrett	Highways Agency
Mr D Baker	Environment Agency
Mr K Hewitt	Natural England
	Equal Opportunities Commission
Mr S Williams	English Heritage
	The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England
Ms C Wilson	Mobile Operators Association
	The National Grid Co. Plc
	Hants PCT
Mr P Keeling	Surrey Hampshire Borders NHS Trust
Ms P Coster	Hampshire Primary Care Trust
Mr L Chasteauneuf	Frimley Park Hospital
	Southern Electricity Plc
Ms T Ward	National Grid
Mr A Ball	South East Water
Mr R Boother	Thames Water Property Services
Mr J Collis	Hampshire Waste Services
Mr B O'Reilly	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
	BT
Mr D Mather	Asda Foodstore
Mr P Austin	Austin Phoenix
Mr J Jerome	Aldershot Retail Action Group
Ms M Callcut	Sony Ericsson
Ms B Hansell	QinetiQ
Mr J Smith	BAE Systems plc
Mr T Bridgeman	QinetiQ

Mr P Piercy	Computer Sciences Corporation
Ms A Roberts	LAH Marketing
Mr E Godfrey	B&Q
Ms J Gill	Marks and Spencer
Ms K Gullett	Montagu Evans
Ms V Cloke	North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry Ltd
	Novartis UK Ltd
Mr R Waterman	QinetiQ
Mr N Litchfield	Vertu
Mr T Bolland	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited
Mr J Grenham	Sheldons (Farnborough) Ltd
Ms C Darcey	The Marketing Office
Dr A Cooper	Nokia Telecommunications Ltd
Mr F Franklin	HQ Aldershot Garrison
Dr K Briggs	RSPB/Urban Wildlife Group
Mr T Griggs	Fleet Community Hospital
	MB Design Services
	William Cook Associates
	Cove Construction
	LJ Osmond and Associates
	Tuline Ltd
	Yateley Designs
	KDH Design Services Ltd
	Jones Lang LaSalle
	Warmerhouse
	Zenith Conservatories
	Martin Perigo
	Day Tanner Partnership Ltd
	MGH Design Services Ltd
	David Harding Associates
	TL & L Design Ltd
	Light & Partners
	Paul Hewett Chartered Architect
	Signseen Ltd
	Philip Design Associates
	William Nimmo & Partners
	MGA Town Planning & Development Consultants
	John Fraser Architect
	Probus Technical
	KC Sampla
	Ascot Design
	QV Consultants
	Adams Associates Ltd
	Aldershot Underwood Bowling Club
	Faber Technical Ltd
	Baker Consulting Services

	Ray Robinson Design Services
	Silverley Homes Ltd
	RCC Ltd
	Peter Minett & Partners
	Jeremy Keep Associates
Mr M Tuthill	Barratt Southern Counties
Ms R Patterson	Devplan UK
	Kourosh Design
	AWA Ltd
Ms J Smallman	English Partnerships
	Pavillion Development Ltd
	Thorne Barton Estates Ltd
Mr A Williams	Gleeson Homes Ltd
Mr N Hilder	H H Hilder & Sons
Ms S Baines	Hyde Housing Association
	Hestia Limited
Mr P Johnson	Johnson Designs
	Martlet Development Consultants
	Duncan Soudan Cunningham Lindsey
	CL Design
	The Hall Design Group Ltd
Mr C Heaney	Persimmon Homes
Mr S Gough	Fairview New Homes
Mr D Staniland	George Wimpey Southern Ltd
Mr S Bolton	Try Homes
Mr P Thompson	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd
	Rialto Homes plc
	Jonathon Barlow Partnership Ltd
	Rocare Building Services Ltd
	CDS Development Services Ltd
	Simon Cooper Developments Ltd
	LSI Architects LLP
	Trident House Design Group
	Phillips Associates
	Wilcon Homes
	Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd
	The Abel Partnership
Mr N Fisher	Planning Issues
Ms A Turner	Jones Day
Mr F Ambrosini	RD Planning and Land Consultants
Ms L Ross	Stewart Ross Associates
Mr A Stenhouse	Standard Life Property Investments Fund
Ms LCowrie	Lennon Planning Ltd
	Alliance Environment and Planning Ltd
Ms T Eyles	Radian Group
Major J Usher	Aldershot Garrison
Ms B Garrett	Aldershot & District West Indian Association
Mr MK Choudhary	Aldershot & Farnborough Muslim, Social, Cultural & Education Society

Mr R Green	Aldershot Allotment Association
Mr L Lamplugh	Aldershot Civic Society
	Aldershot Football Club
Mr and Mrs Williamson	Aldershot Historical Society
Mr D Strong	Aldershot Military Historical Trust
Ms S Hulley	Army Welfare Service
Mr L Karim	Begali Wefare, Islamic Education Centre
Mr D Mahy	St Joseph's Catholic Church
Mr J Cook	Churches Together in Aldershot
Rev D Willey	St Peters Church
	Citizens' Advice Bureaux
	Farnborough Town Football Club
Mr R Gurung	Greater Rushmoor Nepalese Communities
Mr D Jebb	Methodist Church
Mr D Vaughton	Park Evangelical Church
Rev C Parker	Baptist Church
Councillor MS Choudhary	Muslim Community Welfare Association
Mr T Metcalfe	Netley & Winchester Street Residents' Association
Mr A Furness	Netley & Winchester Street Residents' Association
Ns N Williams	North Lane Residents' Association
Mr JJames	Elim Pentecostal Church
Mrs J Muir	Peabody Road Residents Association
Mr M Walker	Peacock & Smith
Mr M Axford	Planning Department
	Potters International Hotel
Mr E Tildesley	Church of the Ascension
Mr J Martin	St Michael the Arch Angel
Mr K Hodges	St Augustine's
Mr N Stephens	Rushmoor and District Football League
Mr C Higham	Searchlight
Mr P Bullus	Southwood Residents Association
Mr S Haire	Surrey Ambulance Service
Ms D Cole	U3A
Mr G Newton	Holy Trinity C of E Church
Mrs P Snashell	Womens Institute
	HQ Aldershot Garrsion
Mr D Bevan	South West Trains
	Marwalk Developments
	Tesco Stores Ltd
	White Young Green
Ms C Dollery	Hampshire Primary Care Trust
	Westbury Homes Ltd
	Lambert Smith Hampton
Mrs A Chambers	Cove and Farnborough W.I.
Mrs B Goodchild	Cherrywood Community Primary School
Mrs J Armstrong	Farnborough Grange Infant School
Miss J Thomas	Farnborough Hill

Mrs K Wood	Fernhill County Primary School
Mrs C Wareham	Grange County Community Junior School
Mrs C Bird	Marlborough County Infant School
Mrs M Moore	North Farnborough County Infant School
Mrs L Downes	Parsonage Farm County Infant School
Mrs S Harris	Pinewood County Infant School
Miss H Fletcher Davies	South Farnborough County Infant School
Mrs J Hooper	St Bernadette's RC (A) Primary School
Mrs F Hodgson	St Marks C of E (A) Primary School
Mrs S Bright	St Michaels C E (controlled) Infant School
Miss J Batstone	Talavera County Infant School
Mr T Hall	Talavera County Junior School
Mr J Hanna	The Connaught School
Miss A Rowley	The Wavell School
Ms C Jenkin	West End County Infant School
	BT
Mr D Windser	
Mr M Thomas	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Ms S Clark	HCC, Environment Department
	Department for Transport
Mr C Crocker	Housing Group, Electricity
	Southern Electricity Plc
Mr S Greener	TAG Farnborough Airport Limited
R Hopkins	Hampshire Primary Care Trust
Ms S Hathaway	Rushmoor Voluntary Services
Colonel N Josling	Aldershot Garrison
Mr G Di Palma	Conceptual Design Associates Ltd
Mr M K Choudhary	Pinecraft Developments Ltd
Ms J Rawlings	Aldershot Town Centre Manager
Mr D Carr	Business Link Wessex
Mr P Formstone	Federation of Small Businesses
Mr J Mitchell	Enterprise First
Mr N Wood	QM Systems Ltd
Mr J Gregory	Hampshire Economic Partnership
Mr D Mackay	DC Leisure Management Ltd
Mr M Lloyd	Defence Estates
	Development Manager, SEGRO
Ms R McKellar	Learning and Skills Council - Hampshire and I of W
Mr G Rowlands	Farnborough Air Sciences Trust
Mr I Wolloff	Farnborough College of Technology
PC 1145 L Jeffers	Farnborough Police Station
Mr J Hilson	Hilson Moran Partnership
Mr K Harpley	London Clancy
Mr J Harrocks	North Hants Chamber of Commerce
Mr D Bowen	Vail Williams
Mr R Hedges	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
Mr S Rutter	Key Property Investments (Number One) Ltd
Mr P Larkin	Systems Union Ltd

Mr J Watt	The George Hotel
Mr A Morris	Town and Country Markets
Mr I Webb	Wilky Property Holdings
Mr C Butler	Wilky Property Holdings
Mr C Thomas	Chris Thomas Ltd
Mr G Morris	White Young Green Planning
Mr S Bailey	Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership
Ms C Waite	Blackwater Wildlife Rescue
Ms C Barrowclough	Council for British Archaeology
Ms A Hebbert	Cove Brook Greenway Group
Ms A Preston	Environment Centre
Mr A Ashurst	Friends of the Earth, Blackwater Valley
Dr P Holmes	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
W F Fergie	Hampshire Buildings Preservation Trust
Mr J Eyre	Hampshire Ornithological Society
	IWA Guildford & Reading Branch
Ms K Adderley	British Wind Energy
Ms C Temple	RSPB
Mr J Dawkins	RSPB
Mr P Riley	Surrey & Hampshire Canal Society
	Victorian Society
Mr J Whitaker	Surrey CC Access Forum
Miss A Dodds	The British Wind Energy Association
Mr R Stennett	CGM Solicitors
	Award Design
	LWK Design
	Davtee Chartered Building Consultancy
	AKH Associates
	Graeme Stevenson Architects Ltd
	Giuseppe Zanre
	Charles Planning Associates Ltd
	Butterfield Signs Ltd
	Macallan Penfold
Ms R Caines	RPS Planning
	The Graham Bolton Planning Partnership
	GVA Grimley
	John Cooper Associates
	Turner Associates
	Lambert Smith Hampton
	Young and Butt
	ABS Consulting Ltd
	Allies and Morrision Architects
	Willes Simpson Woods
	Tvedt Group Ltd
	Annington Homes
Ms K Cortizo	Aspire Defence Services Ltd
	Bloor Homes
Mr D Thomson	CABE

	Sipson Gray Ltd
Ms L Mason	CB Richard Ellis
	Charles Church Developments
	Charters of Aldershot Ltd
Mr I Taylor	Raglan Housing Association
Mr E Dawson	CPRE
	CPRE (Hart and Rushnmoor DG)
Mr M Griffiths	Dreweatt Neate
Mr R Shaw and Ms A Budge	F P D Savills
	HGP Architects Ltd
Ms M Wylie	A2 Housing Group
	Trinder Architectural Ltd
	Bucknall Austin
Mr C Harrington	Hyde Housing Association
Mr C Gibbons	Development Planning Services
Mr B Wren	Home Builders Federation
Mr M O'Brien	Linden Homes Southern Ltd
	Hart Housing Association
	Bellwinch Homes Ltd
	Woodward Ambrose Architects Ltd
	Trinity Architecture Ltd
Mr P Kirby	Martin Grant Homes
	Omega Signs
Mr A Kayani	Bell Cornwell Partnership
Ms T Eyles	Parkside Housing Group
Mr A Emerson	Pavilion Housing Association
Mr JBrindley	Bellway Homes
	ETC Architects
Ms L Weaver	Levvel
	Premier Properties Plc
	Gregory Gray Associates
	TM Building Contractors
Mr C Kiely	Robert Shaw/Vail Williams Planning
	Mansell Construction Services
	Albion Planning Consultants
Ms J Porter	Sentinel HA
Ms V Bagnall	Sentinel HA
Mr P Turner	Daly International
Ms Y Edgar	Thames Valley Housing Association
Mr G Burnett	Thames Valley Housing Association
Ms K Chapman	Thames Valley Housing Association
	Accent Peerless
	Stone Ecclesiastical
	Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
	Artis Projects Ltd
	White Young Green Planning
	Arcadia Homes Ltd
	Drake & Kannemeyer

	Needham Haddrell Chartered Surveyors
	SMC Gower Architects
	Camberley Rubber Mouldings Ltd
	Elite Econoloft Ltd
	Glasshouse Company
	AAP Architecture
	Wates Homes Ltd
	Brimble Lea & Partners
Mr M Ashton	West Waddy ADP
Mr J Curren	Alder King Property Consultants
Mr S Irving	Landmark Information Group Ltd
Mr I Sowerby	The Bell Cornwell Partnership
Mr C Pittock	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design
Ms A Gillings	Rapleys Commercial Property & Planning Consultants
Mr D Ames	David Ames Associates (for David Wilson Homes Ltd)
Mr P Beetham	Bracknell Forest Borough Council
S Conlan	Crest Nicholson
	Merlion Homes
Ms B Southon	KC21 Kings Church
Mr L Hall	Blackwater Valley District Scouts
Ms M Gregory	Connaught Community Centre
Ms C Vernon-Jackson	Community Action
Mr A Kennedy	Rushmoor District Youth Office
	DeafPlus
Mr O Durrett	Rushmoor Access Group
T Dal Dewan	Gurkha Welfare Society
	Gypsy Council
Mr B Richards	Hampshire Association for the Care of the Blind
Ms K Evans	NE Hants Domestic Violence Forum
Mr M Richardson	Lennon Planning Ltd
Mr S Hanley	Local Dialogue LLP
Mr R Collier	Tourism South East
Mrs S Lucas	North Camp Matters
Mr J Packman	Rapleys LLP
Ms K Walker	Royal Mail Group
Ms T Scanlan	Tetlow King Planning
Ms R Freeman	The Theatres Trust
Mr A Jones	White Young Green
Mr A King	Workspace Group Plc
Mr G Howarth	House of Commons
Ms G Wells	Cadsquare Ltd
Ms H Castell	About my Area
Ms H Inger	Director of Strategic Development
Mr A Bateman	The Planning Bureau Limited
Mr C Allington	Hampshire Economic Partnership
Ms D Knowles	Mytchett, Frimley Green and Deepcut Society
Mr K Daley	Mytchett, Frimley Green and Deepcut Society
Mr I Lawson	Hampshire County Council

Mr R Omerod	Hampshire County Council
Mr R Greaves	National Grid UK Transmission
Mr G Marks	Farnborough Airport Residents Association
Ms L Clementson	Hampshire County Council
Ms S Robbins	Supporting People Team
Mr R Barr	Royal Pavillion
Ms J Baldwin	Explore!
Ms K Matthews	Firstplan
Mr S Mitchell	DHA Architecture
Mr A Wilson	Drivers Jonas
Mr R Blackburn	Planning Potential
Mr G Alexander	Rushmoor Voluntary Services
Miss K Nye	Beaumont County Junior School
Mrs A Bassford	Belle Vue County Infant School
Mrs Jt Sampson	Cove Infant School
Mrs H Dunn	Cove Junior School
Ms M Jones	Cove School
Mr C Gilbert	Fernhill School
Miss B Cook	Guillemont County Junior School
Mr R Thompson	Henry Tyndale School
Mrs M Penman	Manor County Infant School
Mr MSammes	Manor County Junior School
Mrs J Sargent	Newport County Junior School
Mr G Earney	Oak Farm Community School
Mrs P Durance	Park County Primary School
Mr P Wilson	Salesian College
Mrs L Smith	South Farnborough County Junior School
Mrs VFavell	Southwood County Infant School
Mr B James	St Josephs RC (GM) Primary School
Mrs E Wren	St Patricks RC (A) Primary School
Mrs E Collis	St Peters C of E (A) Junior School
Mrs A Dawson	The Samuel Cody School
Mr M Dunbavand	Tower Hill County Primary School
Ms D Glenn	Hampshire Primary Care Trust
Ms H Clanchy	Hampshire Primary Care Trust
Mrs H Lewis	Crondall Parish Council Clerk
Mr T Davison	HCC Estates
Mr F Baxter	Hampshire Transport policy
Mr S McVernon	Public Affairs Manager
Ms C Saunders	Waste Management, Hampshire CC
Mr C Mills	Atisreal UK
Mrs C Bosworth	HCC
Mr I Brown	Basingstoke Canal Authority
Ms C Sewell	Guildford Diocese
Mr A Hughes	Rushmoor Citizens' Advice Bureaux
Mrs C Davis	Farnborough College of Technology
Ms P Bushell	First Wessex Housing Group
Chief Superintendent P	Aldershot Police Station

Netherton	
Mr T Docker	Rushmoor Healthy Living
Ms A Cooper	Parity for Disability
Mr R Lane	Farnborough Civic Society
Farnborough and Aldershot Residents x53	

APPENDIX II: Letter to Statutory Consultees

Jim Pettitt

01252 398200

jim.pettitt@rushmoor.gov.uk

20th February 2008

Dear

Supplementary Planning Documents Consultation

I am writing to let you know that we are seeking your views on two draft Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):

- **Car and Cycle Parking Standards Draft SPD** and its Sustainability Appraisal. The SPD provides guidance on the provision of car parking space on new developments.
- **Planning Contributions: Transport Draft SPD** and its Sustainability Appraisal. The SPD provides guidance on transport contributions that may be required for planning applications.

An electronic copy of the Supplementary Planning Documents are included in the form of a CD. The documents and accompanying documents can also be found on our website via: www.rushmoor.gov.uk/spds.

The documents are available for consultation for six weeks, and we will need to receive any comments by 5pm on 3rd April 2008. You can submit your comments by email to plan@rushmoor.gov.uk, or by post to: SPD Consultations, Planning Services, Rushmoor Borough Council, Council Offices, Farnborough Road, Farnborough, GU14 7JU.

We look forward to receiving your comments and will notify you of the adoption of the SPDs, following consideration of all the representations made.

Yours sincerely

Jim Pettitt
Transportation Strategy Officer
Planning Services

APPENDIX III: Letter to Non-Statutory Consultees

Jim Pettitt

01252 398200

jim.pettitt@rushmoor.gov.uk

20th February 2008

Dear

Supplementary Planning Documents Consultation

I am writing to inform you that we are consulting on two draft Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):

- **Car and Cycle Parking Standards Draft SPD** and its Sustainability Appraisal. The SPD provides guidance on the provision of car parking space on new developments.
- **Planning Contributions: Transport Draft SPD** and its Sustainability Appraisal. The SPD provides guidance on transport contributions that may be required for planning applications.

Copies of both documents and other supporting documents can be found online at www.rushmoor.gov.uk/spds. Copies are available for public inspection (during normal opening hours) at the Customer Services Unit in the Council Offices (8.30-4.30pm) on Farnborough road, the Aldershot Office (8.45-4.15pm) and the Aldershot and Farnborough libraries (during normal opening hours).

The documents are available for consultation for six weeks, and we will need to receive any comments by 5pm on 3rd April 2008. You can submit your comments by email to plan@rushmoor.gov.uk or by post to: SPD Consultations, Planning Services, Rushmoor Borough Council, Council Offices, Farnborough Road, Farnborough, GU14 7JU.

Please let us know if you wish to be notified of the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Documents

Yours sincerely

Jim Pettitt
Transportation Strategy Officer
Planning Services

APPENDIX IV: Email to Nature Conservation Consultees

I am writing to let you know that we are seeking your views on two Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

- Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD and its Sustainability Appraisal
- Planning Contributions: Transport SPD and its Sustainability Appraisal

The draft SPDs will be also accompanied by a draft Habitats Regulation Assessment (prepared under The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) (Amendment) Regulations 2007). Prior to finalising the SPDs, we are consulting Natural England and other relevant agencies, seeking comments and advice on these reports.

As soon as the draft Habitats Regulations Assessment have been finalised, copies will be sent to you, along with electronic copies of the draft SPD and accompanying SA on a CD. In the meantime the draft SPD and the accompanying SA can be found online at www.rushmoor.gov.uk/spds

The documents are available for consultation for six weeks and we need to receive any comments by 3rd April 2008. Should you be unable to meet this timescale please let me know, otherwise it will be assumed that you have no comments to make.

You can submit your comments in writing by email to plan@rushmoor.gov.uk or by post to:

Supplementary Planning Documents Consultation
Planning Services
Rushmoor Borough Council
Farnborough Road
Farnborough
Hampshire
GU14 7JU

Jon Fewing
Natural England
Government Offices
Coley Park
Reading
RG1 6DT

Derek Baker
Planning
Environment Agency
Swift House
Frimley Business Park
Camberley
Surrey

Carrie Temple
RSPB

Carrie Temple
SE England Office
The Lodge
Sandy
Bedfordshire

Dr. Pauline Holmes
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
Beechcroft House
Vicarage Lane
Curdridge
Hampshire

Steve Bailey
Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership
Ash Lock Cottage
Government Road
Aldershot
Hampshire

APPENDIX V: Press release and Poster

Rushmoor Reviews its Parking standards for new development

Parking standards on new development across Aldershot and Farnborough have been reviewed by Rushmoor Borough Council and comments on a new Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to outline what will be expected of developers in the future are welcomed by the Council.

The new standards reflect national guidance and apply them more flexibly to suit the particular needs of people who live and work in Rushmoor.

Previous national guidance on parking standards, aimed to encourage reductions in car ownership by providing less parking in places with good accessibility to public transport and therefore placing less reliance on the car.

A change in this national guidance means that the Council has been able to review this policy and make changes to better reflect the situation in Rushmoor.

The review has shown that car ownership isn't always affected or reduced when a development is in an accessible location close to community facilities and transport links. The review has also led the Council to look at ways to improve parking options in new developments by using better design and layout to maximise spaces and ensure that parking is safe and accessible.

Councillor Roland Dibbs, Cabinet Member for Environment said: "Many of the existing parking problems in residential areas are linked to increasing levels of car ownership and this is something we will be considering as part of the review. The decision for car ownership is not always effected by the other transport options available locally and even with good transport links, many residents still choose to have a car."

Councillor Dibbs, added: "It is vital that sufficient car parking spaces are included in new developments. It is also just as important that parking layouts in our residential areas are accessible, of high quality and are safe and secure for the people of Rushmoor."

Public consultation on this Supplementary Planning Document (SPDs) on Parking standards as well as another which sets out the Council's approach to implement Hampshire County Council's Transport Contributions Policy for determining planning contributions for highway starts on Friday 22nd February and runs until 3rd April.

Copies of the SPD can be seen at the Council Offices in Aldershot and Farnborough, Aldershot and Farnborough libraries and Online at www.rushmoor.gov.uk/spds

Rushmoor Plan

PLANNING FOR RUSHMOOR'S FUTURE



Parking Standards & Transport Contributions **HAVE YOUR SAY**

As part of the Rushmoor Plan (the Local Development Framework for Rushmoor) we have produced two draft Supplementary Planning Documents. These documents provide guidance on parking standards for new development and requirements for contributions from developers towards transport improvements.

The planning documents aim to:

- *set out the appropriate parking level that is required for particular types of development*
- *ensure well designed car, cycle and motorcycle parking provision*
- *encourage more sustainable transport practices*

Consultation starts on February 22nd for six weeks.

Please ask at the Customer Services desk to view or borrow a copy of these documents. Copies are also available at Aldershot and Farnborough libraries.

**For more information, please contact Jim Pettitt,
Transportation Strategy Officer, Rushmoor Borough Council,
01252 398 200 or visit www.rushmoor.gov.uk/spds**



RUSHMOOR
BOROUGH COUNCIL

APPENDIX VI: Comments and Responses to the draft SPD

Planning Contributions: Transport Draft Supplementary Planning Document

Summary of comments received and proposed recommended changes

March-April 2008

This document has been prepared by Rushmoor Borough Council. It provides a comprehensive list of the comments, which were received during the statutory consultation period on the draft planning contributions (Transport) SPD, which ran from 22 February 2008- 3rd April.

For each of the comments made, a response has been drafted.

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
1	Anna Gillings	Comments are submitted following responses submitted previously to Hampshire County Council when the policy was first published. Wilky accept the principle of a formula based approach to contributions, which provides consistency and certainty. However, to ensure contributions are directly and reasonably related in scale and kind to a proposal, the policy must allow for local circumstances. To this end, the acceptance of the use of site specific Transport Assessments to quantify the multimodal trips generated by a proposal is welcomed. This will allow for more appropriate assessment However, a standard cost per trip figure has also been applied by the SPD to all uses outside residential. This must be justified, and must be specifically applicable to the use proposed, based on evidence. Without such evidence, the necessity of the payment is questioned. The allowance in the HCC policy which states that 'the economic viability of the site will be considered and there will be scope of negotiate from the starting contribution', must be translated into the SPD. This is a critical part of the HCC policy, and again allows for local site specific circumstances to be accommodated in any negotiation.	.Application of the transport contributions policy will take into account local circumstances by considering the impact of the development on the local infrastructure and comparing this against the existing situation.
		However, a standard cost per trip figure has also been applied by the SPD to all uses outside residential. This must be justified, and must be specifically applicable to the use proposed, based on evidence. Without such evidence, the necessity of the payment is questioned.	Hampshire county council has determined the level of contribution in relation to the number of multi-modal trips that can be expected from the developments.
		The allowance in the HCC policy which states that 'the economic viability of the site will be considered and there will be scope of negotiate from the starting contribution', must be translated into the SPD. This is a critical part of the HCC policy, and again allows for local site specific circumstances to be accommodated in any negotiation.	Principle 3 states that when a site has been in previous use the net increase in multi-modal trips will be used to calculate the contribution.
		There is no justification for the caveat to Principle 3, that 'where a site has been dormant for 5 years or more, all traffic generated will be considered new to the network'. This is unreasonable. If a use remains unlawful, then it can be reinitiated at any time without the need for planning permission (subject to abandonment tests which are a matter of fact and degree). This is routinely accepted to form the baseline position in transport Assessments. This caveat does not appear in the HCC guidance and there is no basis to include it at the local level.	The caveat relating to sites that have been dormant for 5 years or more is included in the Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy (para 6.3).
		The acceptance that contributions should be ring fenced, and repayable if unspent is welcomed. However, the SPD should confirm that the contribution is payable only on implementation, and allow for phased payments, ensuring that the payment of contributions equates with the generation of impact. These changes would ensure that the payments of contributions on this basis pass the tests of Circular 05/05.	The timing and phasing of payments will be agreed with the developer as they may vary across different types of development. The policy will be applied in accordance with the tests of Circular 05/05.
2	Andrew Herring	Principle 1 - The last sentence could read better: the policy is to apply to all development proposals for new development, redevelopment or	The Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy refers to new "developments of all sizes, from a single unit upwards" and

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
	HCC	for extensions to existing development. In its subtext the Principle should say 'and services' after off-site transport infrastructure.	does not include extensions to existing development.
		Principle 3 Sub-text : Paragraph 1 - Where the sub-text of Principle 3 proposes that if sites with a previous use have remained dormant for 5 years they will be considered as having a 'new' transport impact, Estates have a number of concerns. Where a site has an established use (irrespective of whether it has been dormant for 5 years), it can resume this use within 10 years where it can be demonstrated that it has the capacity to resume this use. Currently under planning law the historic transport impact on the highway network is accounted for as part of the proposed re-development of the site. By only considering dormant sites for 5 years and not 10, this does not fully take account the existing planning legislation. It is recommended that a locally established number of years for when a dormant site will no-longer be considered to have an established transport impact be considered further to this comment.	It is not proposed to vary from the Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy which states 5 years.
		Principle 4 Should this principle not refer to <i>Borough</i> rather than County, considering it relates to the Rushmoor area? It is appreciated that the Planning Contributions: Transport SPD is based on the County Council Transport Policy Guidance wherein the proposed cost-per residential multi-modal trip is based on recent Greenfield MDA development across Hampshire. In addition to the proposed cost-per multi-modal trip, the County Council would be interested to know if any local research been undertaken into transport contributions from Brownfield windfall sites within the Borough?. Given that Brownfield sites already have established highway infrastructure and may be subject to remediation costs, the application of a Greenfield-based tariff may reduce the viability of future Brownfield development and make windfalls less likely to come forward. It is suggested that a graded tariff be considered for non-MDA sites to take this into account.	Principle 4 has been re-worded to read "Borough". The SPD is introduced to enable the Borough as Planning authority to apply the Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy. The level of contributions therefore follows this policy to enable the consistent approach across the county that is understood to be a fundamental part of the county policy.
		Principle 6 In the subtext – For clarity this could say 'Residential (Class C3)'	Note added
		Principle 7 In the subtext of Paragraph 2 - This should say <u>'a proportion of the cost of these works may be deductible'</u> In the subtext of Paragraph 3 - 'may provide wider public benefit' should be replaced with <u>'will encourage sustainable access to and from the site'</u>	The wording in the draft document reflects that in the Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy. It is not proposed to change this to maintain consistency across the county.

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
		Principle 8 This should refer to the Department for Transport's <i>Guidance on Transport Assessment</i> either in the Principle or the sub-text.	This reference is now added.
		Principle 9 This should say ' transport ' improvement rather than 'highway' – The improvement necessary may not be infrastructure provision based. In the sub-text of Paragraph 3 - The County Council supports the ' <i>proposed highway improvements list</i> ' as this will add further transparency for developers and the public in relation to where transport contributions are spent.	The reference to "highway" has now been changed to "transport". Support noted.
		There does not appear to be any direct reference to Principle 11 of the <i>Car and Cycle Parking SPD</i> which states that ' <i>contributions may be required to secure the provision of bus services for up to 5 years in accordance with the SPD on Transport Contributions</i> '.	Principle 11 has been amended to include reference to securing bus services for up to 5 years.
		It is not clear from the SPD whether financial contributions towards bus services will be in addition to the proposed cost per multi-modal trip contributions. It also does not appear to state which developments (such as windfalls or SDAMDA) will require contributions towards bus services. It would be helpful if the SPD clarified the above points and justified any need for additional bus contributions for 5 years. The subtext of Principle 11 is against the terms of the DC Agency Agreement which requires all transport contributions to be paid directly to the County Council within 14 days.	As above.
		Whilst a Contributions SPD is important, the County Council would be interested to know why the Council has opted for a specific Transport SPD instead of more comprehensive advice within an SPD on developer obligations and contributions to cover other matters e.g. open space.	The wording has amended to clarify that the funds will be passed to Hampshire County Council (under the terms of the DC Agency agreement). The Borough Council has a separate policy on open space contributions and is introducing this SPD at this time to respond to the request from Hampshire to enable a consistent Transport Contributions Policy across the county.
3	Emily Butcher (see <i>Habitats Regulations Assessment draft report</i>)	Following the screening exercise (under the Habitats Regulations Assessment) it is however recommended that <i>Principle 9: Necessary Highway Improvements</i> , includes more information on the local schemes proposed, so that the proximity to the SPA and nature of any construction projects can be assessed. As an alternative, there should be an opportunity to assess any impacts at the project level, as specific details about the highway schemes associated with development proposals become available. Either way it is recommended that this is explained in the finalised SPD.	All transport improvements will need to be considered as separate development projects considered by the relevant planning process where necessary, including the Habitats Regulations.
4	Geraldine Molony	Thank you for consulting us on the "Car and cycle Parking Standards SPD" and the "Planning Contributions: Transport SPD". We do not have any comments.	Response noted.

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
5	Gregory Gray	<u>General</u> It is requested that each paragraph is numbered individually through each Section for ease of reference.	Noted
		<u>Principle 1</u> The document needs to refer explicitly to the fact that there are types of land use where no contributions are required or where a reduced level of contribution is reasonable having regard to the nature and the character of the use and in consequence the extent to which it will give rise to "transport impacts". A case in point is affordable housing and in particular sheltered elderly affordable housing where car ownership rates are exceptionally low (normally 25%) and where household occupancy rates are also low (normally 60%).	The Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy is intended to apply to all new developments. In Rushmoor it will only apply where it can be demonstrated that the proposed development will benefit from a proposed highway improvement (in accordance with Circular 05/05).
		<u>Table 5.4</u> Having regard to the comments made above then figures quoted for cost per dwelling are not only unduly onerous but also would require a level of financial contribution which clearly is at odds with the transport impact that uses like affordable and sheltered affordable housing will give rise to.	The Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy seeks a consistent level of contributions. The level of contribution will also reflect the existing use of the site.
		Table 5.4 and the document in general is insufficiently fine grained to take account of these important considerations. It is unreasonable to expect a developer to make excessive financial contributions in particular a Registered Social Landlord where such contributions have a direct economic effect on the ability to provide affordable housing.	The Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy seeks a consistent level of contributions across the county.
		<u>Principle 6</u> Whilst this principle acknowledges the points made above it needs to be reflected in guidance at the beginning of the document and more particularly allow a detailed calculation of trip cost and transport impact to be calculated rather than simply depending upon Table 5.4 and forcing the developer in effect to make a special case for a land use which plainly does not have the level of impacts claimed. Moreover the use of a cost per trip use for the employment uses is not likely to be an appropriate method for special classes of residential use.	Noted
6	Helen Booker	<u>Principle 7</u> To avoid duplication of contributions related to transport works, Fairview New Homes seek the wording to be amended: <i>"The cost of works associated with Section 278 agreements (essential highways works) and Travel Plans which provide wider public benefit</i>	The word "may" has been replaced with "will".

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
		<i>will be deducted from the calculated transport contribution"</i>	
		Principle 9: in line with Circular 05/05 transport contributions should only be sought when they meet <u>all</u> of the 5 tests (relevant to planning etc)	Noted
		FNH thus seek amended wording as follows: <i>"transport contributions may be required where it can reasonably be demonstrated that the proposed highway improvement are essential to the future use and benefit of the development, provided all the planning obligation tests set out in Circular 05/05 are met"</i>	Compliance with Circular 05/05 is already implicit in the SPD (see Principle 11).
		FNH additionally request that the regularity of the review and update of the "Proposed Highway Improvements List" is set within the SPD for clarity and accordingly suggests the list is reviewed and updated annually in conjunction with the annual SPD review.	The period of review, "annually" has been added to the SPD.
		Principle 12: request that the time period specified within the Planning Contributions Agreement for the return of unspent contributions is agreed at the time of drafting any relevant legal agreement (change wording of principle accordingly).	As it is likely that contributions for transport improvements will need to be pooled to enable the collection of further relevant contributions it will be necessary to retain contributions for 20 years. This period will be used when drafting legal agreements.
		Principle 13: object to the minimum time period for the return of unspent contributions being set as 20 years [...] It is considered that the specific future provision identified for pooled contributions will not extend to a period longer than 20 years; and on this basis the text should be amended as follows: <i>"Implementation of highway improvements: Should planned improvements needed in mitigation of development not proceed as planned then contributions will be returned to the developer. In the view of the need to pool contributions to enable the delivery of specific schemes the Section 106 contribution will require the contributions to be retained for an agreed period to be negotiated at the time of drafting any relevant legal agreement, having regard to time period for each specific scheme and the criteria set within paragraph B21 Circular 05/05"</i>	The wording of Principle 13 has been amended to refer to the retention of contributions for 20 years. This will also reduce any uncertainty at the time of drafting legal agreements.
7	Ian Mawer	Having viewed the documents and the supporting sustainability appraisals we do not have any comments to make. <u>2.2 Status of the document</u>	Noted.
8	James Stevens	We note that the draft SPD is based upon saved policies from Rushmoor's Local Plan Review and while we welcome the reassurance in the preceding section 2.1 that the policy will be reviewed annually as part of the Annual Monitoring Report, we would	

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
		also like reassurance that this SPD will be re-issued for consultation once Rushmoor has an adopted Core Strategy, or whichever is the relevant DPD, to ensure that the SPD is in alignment with any DPD policies.	
		<u>4.2 National policy context</u> Regarding the boxed text dealing with the interpretation of Circular 5/2005, a slightly more accurate interpretation would read that the pooling of contributions is permissible only so long as the collected monies are used to provide infrastructure that relates to an individual site, or collection of associated developments. Obligations should not be used to support the delivery of more generalised services across the borough. This would, we would suggest, include contributions to maintain the 'wider transport network' as Hampshire's Local Transport Plan endeavours to do. As paragraph B9 of Circular 5/2005 states, pooled contributions cannot be used to "resolve existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision". This is possibly a minor point since the Council appears to have reflected this principle elsewhere in the draft document in its approach to its town centre and urban extension SPDs, but perhaps this point should be clarified and, if necessary, the guidance in the box amended to reflect this important principle of Circular 5/2005?	Principle 9 confirms that transport contributions will only be used for improvements when the development will benefit from them. Principle 11 also confirms that the contributions will be allocated to schemes or improvements (or contributions to secure the provision of bus services for up to 5 years – as amended) in accordance with Circular 05/05.
		<u>4.5 Local policy context</u> Policy IMP1 of Rushmoor's Local Plan Review (2000) states that sites of over 1 hectare will be liable to contribute towards infrastructure, yet the Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy, upon which this draft SPD is in part based, seeks contributions from all developments of a single unit upwards. We are a little unclear and would welcome clarification if it is the intention of the Council to apply a threshold? Or have we simply misread this?	It is proposed to follow the Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy for developments of a single unit upwards with no threshold.
9	Joanne Chau	HA supports the use of Planning Contributions SPD to provide integrated transport solutions.	Noted.
		HA is concerned that contributions collected are for local transport interventions only and do not allow for mitigation of impacts on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Circular 02/2007 states that: "Improvements required to mitigate the impact of traffic generated by developments will also need to address any existing issues at that location, unless the Agency already has a firm commitment to do so".	The wording of Principle 8 has been amended to include reference to the potential for contributions to the strategic road network (if identified through Transport Assessments).
		Any existing problems on the SRN which will be exacerbated further as a result of the proposed development, will need to be planned for	

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
		through the LDF process. Therefore, the HA would like to see the SPD strengthened to ensure safe and efficient operation of the SRN is not compromised by any development and or developments. We suggest that Principle 8 (Transport Assessments) is amended to include the below or any wordings with a similar effect: “Transport Assessment (TA): Transport Assessments will still be required in accordance with national guidance in <i>Guidance on transport Assessment</i> (DfT, March 2007) and <i>Circular 02/2007 Planning and the Strategic Road Network</i> to assess the impact and acceptability of new development proposals. Should this assessment identify any impact on the local or strategic highway network that will not be remedied by measures (as listed on the Council's website at www.rushmoor.gov.uk/highwayimprovements) to be delivered through Planning Contributions, further measures specific to the development(s) must be provided and funded by the developer(s) to mitigate their impact”.	
		It should be noted that the Government is creating new Community Infrastructure Levy powers in the Planning Bill, which has just begun its passage through the committee stage. It is anticipated that local planning authorities will be able to take advantage of these powers from Spring 2009. The Council may wish to make reference to these new powers in the SPD.	Noted
10	Peter Munnelly	Comments made on behalf of owners of Princes Mead Shopping Centre within Farnborough Town Centre, who are about to seek redevelopment and refurbishment of the shopping centre, which will include extending onto adjoining land presently used as a car park.	Context noted.
		Principle 4: The proposed financial values per trip appear to make no distinction between sustainably-oriented residential development (i.e. car-free schemes). Although it is acknowledged that such schemes may place additional pressure on local public transport infrastructure and should therefore attract a contribution to improve such infrastructure, residential development transport contributions should be sustainably incentivised. In addition the multi-modal trip rates do not take account of the different types of tenure that may be required by the Council (i.e. private, essential rented shared equity etc).	The financial values have been determined by the County Council and seek to apply an average and consistent rate across the county.
		Principle 5: table 5.5 should clearly confirm which type of floorspace measurement it will base any calculation on (i.e. GLA, GEA etc).	Reference to Gross External Area (GEA) has been added.
		Principle 7- in addition to section 278 agreements identifying works required to access the site, agreements should also identify works which will mitigate the impact of any development. The cost of these works should be deducted from any final contribution. Any reductions	Principle 7 states that such works will be deducted from the calculated transport contribution.

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
		should also include section 38 works and walkway agreement works where benefits are provided to the wider public.	
		Principle 13: The minimum 20 year period for retention of pooled contributions is considered excessively long and should be significantly reduced.	In order to be able to pool contributions for part funding schemes this is considered to be necessary.
11	Richard Evans	Transport Draft SPD. Whilst we SUPPORT the general approach to Transport Planning Obligations and the principles of qualifying development, we are less clear on the about the contributions from Rushmoor Town Centre schemes to transport improvements which assist with general congestion within the Blackwater Valley. We have accessed the List of Schemes mentioned in the SPD (Section 6 Allocation of Funds) - located on the HantsWeb. The List does not seem to include any qualifying schemes for Aldershot/Farnborough - either major or minor schemes? We therefore assume it is left to individual town centre and other development schemes in Rushmoor to bring forward their own improvements, which may have benefits on the wider network within the Blackwater Valley. We would SUPPORT an integrated approach to such contributions to achieve transport improvements within the Valley.	The list of schemes will reflect transport needs for the local area aimed at mitigating the effect of traffic associated with the development and improving access to alternative modes of transport to the car for existing and new residents and businesses to the area.
12	Rob Lane	I can't find details of the highway improvements in those documents.	We did take a conscious decision not to include the list of highway improvements when consulting on the draft SPD. The reason for this is to concentrate the consultation onto the principle of collecting development contributions for this purpose and the method of so doing. The list of improvements will also be a continually updated document which we intend to report to a joint Rushmoor and Hampshire Panel. The draft list that we have at present includes schemes that have been identified to support town centre SPDs, highway improvements to support School Travel Plans (including footway and cycleway improvements) as well as highway improvement schemes required for the Aldershot Urban Extension.
		1. What area(s) of the country were used to derive the trip rates using NTS data?	To answer your specific questions I need to firstly clarify that our SPD is to enable Rushmoor to implement a countywide policy that has already been adopted by Hampshire. It was considered important for the county that there is a consistent policy applied across Hampshire so it does follow that the questions that you ask relate to the methodology employed by the county council. I can though answer the points that you raise. The trip rates are from the National Travel Survey statistics based upon National Transport Statistics in 2006, the county refer to them

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
			as being "National transport Trend statistics, where possible specific to the characteristics of Hampshire".
		2. Can you provide details of the cost data used. Number of cases in Rushmoor, no. of cases in hants, range of costs per unit of dwelling etc.	The cost data used is produced from a sample of transport mitigation packages at a variety of sites across the county, (the sites used were Picket Twenty MDA in Andover, Barton Farm in Winchester, Queen Elizabeth Barracks in Church Crookham and the West of Waterlooville MDA near Havant). A calculation of the estimated number of multi-modal trips to the costs of the mitigation measures gave an average cost of £534 per residential multi-modal trip. It is certainly expected that the transport contributions will include all modes of transport.
		3. Is it intended that the contributions will be applied to all modes including public transport?	The main departure for Rushmoor from the county policy is to ensure that we have a method to demonstrate transparency and consistency with Circular 05/2005 by requiring contributions where we have identified measures that will be directly related to the development and that are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The principle of having a list of improvements will be a main part of this and enable us to monitor that monies collected are only used for the purposes for which they were collected.
13	Rose Freeman	We have no comment on this document as it is not within our remit but look forward to being consulted on Planning Obligations for Community Facilities.	Response noted.
14	Stephen Foxcroft	The term 'multi-modal trip' is used to identify a contribution per trip for resi (£535) and non-resi (£230) trips. Does this mean the contribution will be calculated against each two-way trip? (i.e.: each trip consists of an outbound journey and an inbound journey) or against each individual trip? (i.e.: one outbound trip and one inbound trip would count as two trips and incur two times the per trip contribution).	The term multi-modal trip and the calculation of "value" has been arrived at by the County Council. It is my understanding that the contribution will be counted as a two way trip.
15	Sue Janota	The Assembly welcomes the comprehensive approach taken in both these documents and has no specific comments to make.	Noted.
16	Rob Lane	The production of this SPD is welcomed as it should provide clear guidance to developers, be fair to all and ensure that the impacts on the transport system due to developments are ameliorated by the provision of appropriate infrastructure	Support noted
		It is understood that the draft is based on a countywide SPD prepared by the County Council. It does not follow that the County scheme has to be adopted by RBC without alteration. It is the LPA's responsibility	Rushmoor is the planning authority and has prepared the draft SPD in response to Hampshire County Council who are the highway authority for the Rushmoor area. The SPD is different in several

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
		to enter into planning agreements and to develop appropriate policies for contributions. Rushmoor is sufficiently large enough area to have its own policies and it would in any event be better to have a consistent policy with its neighbours in the Blackwater Valley than with much remote parts of the County. The SPD as it stands does not comply with Circular 05.2005 or the Practice Guidance published in 2006. The document is therefore fundamentally flawed for the reasons stated below:	aspects to the Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy in particular that it will be applied only where a development may be linked to a transport improvement need identified in the published list of improvements.
		The difficulty with the SPD as proposed is that it may well not comply with the third test (of Circular 05/2005), "directly related to the proposed development". The reason for saying this is the distribution of residential development likely to occur in the borough. The very large expansion of Aldershot should have its own infrastructure requirements met by the contributions for that development. I note that the draft list of highway schemes likely to be funded via the new SPD includes those associated with the Aldershot expansion. This method would be unfair on the many smaller developments in the borough and therefore does not comply with the "third" test and possibly also the "fourth" test.	It is a requirement that the SPD complies with all of the tests set out in Circular 05/2005. This means that each application will be individually considered against the Policy tests which are that the contributions required are : i) Relevant to planning ii) Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms iii) Directly related to the proposed development iv) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and v) Reasonable in all other respects.
		Chapter 5 of the document "Planning Obligations: Practice Guidance (2006)" states a number of principles to be followed when developing formulae and standard charges. It is necessary to estimate the likely impact on the local environment and infrastructure of providing an additional dwelling. The NTS data that has been used comes from a several data sources and may not be relevant to the Rushmoor area. Research should be carried out to identify trip rates for comparable urban areas to Farnborough and Aldershot	The Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy seeks a consistent contribution level across the county, it therefore seems appropriate to use a national average approach as the county have followed.
		The information provided on the calculations for transport contributions does not follow the practice in the Practice Guidance. The assessments should be based on the likely cost of providing the infrastructure needed by future developments.	At the time of considering a formulaic contribution level it is not possible to know the nature of development or the infrastructure that may be needed. It does seem reasonable to base this on relevant historical information that, which has been used by the county.
		The draft SPD does not make it clear that the contributions will be applied to all modes of transport, including public transport. It would be better if the list of improvements was entitled transport improvements. The list should include the following measures; Accident prevention measures, pedestrian facilities, cycle facilities, highway improvements, public transport facilities and services, travel plans, safe routes to schools, travel information systems.	The list of improvements has been changed to transport improvements. The list of potential scheme types will be used when drawing up the list of transport improvements.
17.	Adrian Furniss	The term "contributions" appears to be jargon and is not immediately understandable to people not within the planning/ development	The confusion with terminology is noted. Unfortunately the guidance that we follow refers to "contributions" (and possibly even more

No.	Name	Comment	Recommendation
		process. At 3.1 the document defines Planning Contributions as agreements. Would Planning Agreements therefore be a more accurate title for this SPD.	unhelpful “obligations”). To refer to these as “agreements” is likely to lead to further confusion as we need to have legal “agreements” in place to collect the “contributions”.
		Are “Principles” binding? Why not use a stronger term, i.e “regulations”.	The Supplementary Planning document is a form of planning regulation. The use of “Principles” is an attempt to draw out the essential requirements of the policy.
18.	Jon Fewings	Natural England recognises and supports the general intent and breadth of the document. In particular we are encouraged to see the document recognises that all development considered deliverable or developable needs to recognise that the need for travel and transport infrastructure as part of sustainable development is essential. Natural England believes that there is a need to ensure that current and future Local Authority transport policies and associated infrastructure projects contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. We seek this as an essential part of delivering sustainable development. The UK needs a well-integrated, affordable transport system with effective networks (for instance public transport, cycling and walking) that provides a realistic alternative to road based trips. Your consultation document recognises this fact.	Support noted.
19.	John Cheston	It seems that the content of the SPD is consistent with national and regional planning policy and GOSE have no further comments to offer.	Support noted.

APPENDIX VII: List of Respondents

No.	Name	Organisation/ Address
1	Anna Gillings (on behalf of Wilky)	Rapleys LLP Maddox House, 1 Maddox Street, London W1S 2PZ
2	Andrew Herring	Hampshire County Council Room 18, Castle Avenue Winchester, SO23 8UD
3	Emily Butcher	Rushmoor Borough Council (internal consultee) Habitats Regulations Assessment
4	Geraldine Molony	Principal Planning Officer Waverley Borough Council
5	Gregory Gray	Gregory Gray Associates 1, Alexandra Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 6BU
6	Helen Booker (on behalf of Fairview Homes)	Assistant Planner RPS Planning, 1st Floor West, Cottons Centre, Cottons Lane, London. SE1 2QG
7	Ian Mawer	Regional Planning Assistant SEEDA Gross Lanes Guildford
8	James Stevens/ Pete Errington	Regional Planner (London) Home Builders Federation Ltd 1st Floor Byron House 7-9 St James's Street London SW1A 1DW
9	Joanne Chau	Highways Agency Network Strategy- South East Federated House London Road

No.	Name	Organisation/ Address
		Dorking RH4 1SZ
10	Peter Munnelly (on behalf of Standard Life owners of Princes Mead)	Montagu Evans Chartered Surveyors Clarges House 6-12 Clarges Street London W1J 8HB
11	Richard J. Evans	Planning Implementation Team Surrey County Council
12	Rob Lane	
13	Rose Freeman	Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust 22 Charing Cross Road, London WC2H 0QL
14	Stephen Foxcroft	WSP Development and Transportation Mountbatten House, Basing View, Basingstoke RG21 4HJ
15	Sue Janota	Angela Parkes Team PA South East England Regional Assembly Berkeley House, Cross Lanes Guildford, Surrey GU1 1UN
16.	Rob Lane	The Farnborough Society 30 Church Circle Farnborough Hants GU14 6QQ
17.	Adrian Furniss	Netley and Winchester Streets Residents Association 53 Osborne Road Farnborough, Hants GU14 6AP
18.	Jon Fewings	Natural England, Block A Government Buildings Coley Park, Reading Berks RG1 6DT
19.	John Cheston	Government Office for the South East Housing and Planning Directorate: LDF Team Bridge House 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU14 4GA